J
11
'R
-V.112
appx
mar 1-31

Appendix

Radio Broadcast of Edward P. Morgan Relating to Hearings Concerning the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, too seldom, because of my schedule, do I get an opportunity to hear the nightly news broadcasts of one of this country's most able and perceptive commentators, Mr. Edward P. Morgan. I know that many of my colleagues in the Congress share my opinion of Mr. Morgan's keen ability to report and interpret current events. Occasionally, I do have an opportunity to read transcripts of ABC's Edward P. Morgan and the news. In his broadcast of February 21, 1966, Mr. Morgan commented on the hearings recently held by the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to the war in Vietnam.

Because his analysis of the necessity and of the objective of the hearings may be of interest to the readers of the Congressional Record and because the hearings have been the subject of widespread discussion, I ask that the transcript of the broadcast of February 21 be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Edward P. Morgan and the News

Madison, Wis.—"J. William Fulbright," a liberal voter said to me in Los Angeles on Saturday, "is already my man of the year." It is not likely that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee occupies a hero's role in the public mind. It is certain that the White House is not about to nominate him to the hall of fame for his conduct of critical hearings on U.S. policy on Vietnam. Yet the Government and the country at large are surely in the debt of this Rhodes scholar from Arkansas and his brave little band of congressional colleagues who have insisted on exercising their prerogative as legislators in an open society to probe and question the policy decisions of the Presidency on so vital and fundamental an issue as war.

It was this insistence on review—in the tradition of the checks and balances of the American system—that provoked the admiration of the citizen in Los Angeles, rather than any particular view that Senator Fulbright himself expressed about the conflict.

It is useful to examine these policy hearings on these terms. Although they have rather been lost behind a high hedge of headlines and tangle of television cables concentrated on the Fulbright committee sessions, a group of liberal Democrats in the House, including Congressman Robert Kastenmeier, of Wisconsin, has been examining the U.S. position in Asia, too, keyed to the urgency of getting the war to the conference table. Consider the vast difference between these proceedings on Capitol Hill and the Army-McCarthy hearings or the inquiry into President Truman's firing of General MacArthur during the Korean war.

True, in a kind of hog-fat and hominy-grits mixture of comedy and pathos, Senator Russell Long, of Louisiana, tried last Thursday to wrap himself and Gen. Maxwell Taylor in the flag. He rolled out, like red, white, and blue bunting, the old Fourth of July phrases about patriotism and he took time to cite the bravery of American combat units in Vietnam and to note that we had never been defeated in war.

It happens that patriotism is not the issue here and the bravery of American fighting men is not in question. Nor is the issue of whether Americans are "international good guys or international bad guys"—which was about the only question Long interrupted himself long enough to pose to soldier-statesman Taylor. The issue is whether the abundance of American wealth, strength and courage is being applied with maximum wisdom and effectiveness to achieve, not a "military victory" in the old "hip hip horray" American Legion convention tradition, but a settlement in which a reasonably viable peace can be substituted for an ugly war threatening unlimited expansion.

Except for the ill-placed chauvinism of Senator Long and the excessive and uncalled-for outbursts against the Pentagon and the President by the otherwise meticulously logical and legal-minded critic of the administration, Oregon's Senator Wayne Morse, the Fulbright hearings have been models of restrained, dignified, balanced but trenchant inquiry.

Maybe the public thought that it loved Lucy more but the substance of the sessions proved the validity of Fred Friendly's protest resignation as president of CBS news last week on the premise that somehow when there is something more important cooking than a soap opera scenario, broadcasting has an obligation to serve it up.

But let's get back now to a longer look at the anguished attitudes and the purposes of that interesting minority group in Congress demanding that administration policy in Vietnam be publicly reviewed at the highest legislative level. For men like Senator Fulbright, Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, Albert Gore, of Tennessee, George McGovern, of South Dakota, Mike Mansfield, of Montana, Frank Church, of Idaho, and others this was not a pragmatic maneuver for personal political gain. Indeed if the public opinion polls up to now have meant anything, these men ran dangerous risks in flying in the face of a strong public endorsement of President Johnson's prosecution of the war.

Furthermore, these men are all loyal Democrats, deeply committed—with some individual qualifications—to the President's Great Society program and who have enjoyed—in varying degree—intimate political contact with Lyndon Johnson in the past and who, without exception, respect their former majority leader who is now their President. Capitol Hill is not a place where principle invariably wins out over the cynical opportunism of "practical politics" but it has to be reported that their overriding motivation was one of principle.

It is not that they hold burning convictions diametrically opposed to that of the White House or that individually or collectively they have a solution for Vietnam which they know is better than the formula the administration is trying to apply. So what are these minority Senators trying to do? One of them put it privately this way: "The President seems to have complete and utter faith in the advice he is getting from Secretary McNamara and the Pentagon military brass and from Secretary Rusk and his chief State Department advisers.

This faith may be well founded. But what if the premises on which their advice is based are wrong? The White House has not taken the time to detach itself from day-to-day command decisions to examine the premises on which our whole Asian policy, if any, is based. This is the question these congressional hearings are attempting to oblige the President himself to face."

This is a noble objective of the hearings, regardless of how or whether they influence Johnson policy or public reaction to same.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Madison, Wis.

Sam Blair, Outstanding Reporter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Chicago's American, one of our city's outstanding newspapers, recently suffered a real loss due to the untimely death of Sam S. Blair. Mr. Blair, although only 43 years of age at the time of his death, had already won for himself a reputation as one of the keen observers of the Chicago scene.

In 1947 he joined the staff of Chicago's American and soon distinguished himself as a crime reporter. For his efforts in this area, he won the first Jacob Scher Award from the Theta Sigma Phi professional journalism sorority.

I want to extend my condolences to his young widow, Mrs. Sheri Blair, for her great loss, and to my good friend, Mr. Stuart List, publisher of Chicago's American.

The article which appeared in the press about Mr. Blair follows:

Samuel Blair, Reporter for American, Dies

Samuel S. Blair, 43, of 1319 Grant Street, Evanston, a reporter for Chicago's American, died yesterday in Passavant Hospital after a long illness.

Mr. Blair had been a star football player at Hyde Park High School. He became a reporter for the City News Bureau in 1942, and later that year joined the Marine Corps. In 1947, he joined the staff of Chicago's American as a crime reporter. Mr. Blair won the first Jacob Scher Award from the Theta Sigma Phi professional journalism sorority in 1962 for his series on payroll padding in city offices.

His father, the late Samuel A. Blair, had been a well-known reporter for the American and the Herald and Examiner.

The younger Mr. Blair was a winner of the Associated Press Writing Award and numerous other awards for newspaper work. His widow, Sheri, is a reporter for WBBM-TV. The couple have a daughter, Cary, 1, and Mr. Blair had three children by a previous marriage, Samuel P., 16; Scott, 14; and Cathy, 17. Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. tomorrow in the chapel at 1567 Maple Avenue, Evanston.

Gary, Ind., Newspaper on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the newspapers in my home State which has taken a continuing editorial interest in the questions surrounding our Vietnam policies is the Gary Post-Tribune, whose editor is Dale E. Belles, Jr.

Among the editorials which the Gary Post-Tribune has presented for the enlightenment of its readers are three which appeared successively on February 3, February 6, and February 9. Edgar L. Mills is editorial editor of the Gary paper, which is one of northern Indiana's leading dailies.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Feb. 3, 1966]

MISPLACING THE BLAME

Those Americans who complain that our Government does too little to seek a peaceful way out of Vietnam's blood have, in our opinion, a tendency to misplace blame.

Their longing for peace is understandable and commendable. We share it. Our disagreement with them is their tendency to say it is our Government which really doesn't try.

The current statemate points up the situation neatly—if discouragingly.

Even as the United Nations debates the American effort to summon the combatants to the peace table, Hanoi says "No." It says the U.N. is not the proper body to sponsor such negotiations. The North Koreans say the problem falls only "within the competence of the 1954 Geneva conference."

So why not reconvene that conference? Are the Americans afraid of discussing the Asian war before that panel?

The facts are that Great Britain, one of the cochairmen of that group, has tried to reconvene it. It is doubtful the British would have made the suggestion without some indication that their American allies were willing to sit in. But each time the effort has been negated by the other cochairman nation. And who is that? Soviet Russia.

So one Red nation blocks approach to one peace table and another Red nation blocks the alternative.

There doubtless is discord between Communist nations—particularly between the U.S.S.R. and Red China—but on one thing they agreed, Kremlin hints to the contrary notwithstanding. That is that neither of those giant allies of the Red North Vietnamese and their puppeteers in the Vietcong are willing to talk peace until the Americans agree to pull out in advance.

Such a move, leaving South Vietnamese to the terroristic oppression of Communist masters, the United States is not about to make.

So the impasse remains. We don't like it. We don't like it because we don't like bloodshed and we don't like the distant involvement.

For the time being, though, we should bear in mind the color of the blame. It's Red.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Feb. 6, 1966]

AS WE SEE IT: LET'S DECLARE JUST WHAT WE MEAN IN VIETNAM

The American administration is coming through loud, but certainly not clear; on its policy in Vietnam. It is time it should.

The Post-Tribune thinks it understands our Nation's basic aim in that part of the world. We doubt that our adversaries do. We think many, perhaps most, of the American people are confused about it. We feel that confusion is beginning to divide the Nation's political leadership, particularly Senators of the President's own party.

We believe that aim is to stop the spread of communism except where that system is freely adopted by the expressed will of a people—which it hasn't been anywhere yet. It was the same aim that kept us fighting in Korea until reestablishment of the unsatisfactory but definite 38th parallel line. It is the same aim that has kept us standing in West Germany and in West Berlin. Successive administrations have talked it. They haven't declared it.

The formal declaration of that policy is what we adovcate now.

We advocate a formal declaration of defense, pinning that defense to the 17th parallel boundary between North and South Vietnam.

It would not be a declaration of war. Such a declaration as that would contemplate invasion of North Vietnam for destruction of the enemy, such destruction being a prime American military tenet in the event of formal war.

It would, however, be a declaration of military defense and spell out to the North Vietnamese, to the Red Chinese, even to the Soviet Union, that we would regard any violation of that border as a specific challenge of American declared policy and would be ready to use any means necessary to resist it.

It would put the power of Congress officially behind a specific policy, and, in so doing, arm the administration with emergency powers to keep that policy in force. It would spell out to the American people why we are there and that we intend to stay there. Some such spelling out seems necessary to explain to American families why their sons are being taken away in increasing numbers to fight and to die.

The spelling out—to ourselves, to our allies, to our enemies—is what seems important now.

The tactical implementation of that policy, of course, could not be spelled out by Congress. That is our most vital tactical problem now, and would remain so. It might mean that by declaring defense officially, we would halt the largely ineffectual half-bombing of North Vietnam again, but leave the warning that if that border were violated bombing would be resumed—but with all the earnestness and fury American power could make possible. At the same time it may take several hundred thousand more troops to meet this new commitment.

Such a declaration could be accompanied by a specific pledge that when, in an unspecified time, free elections could be carried out in South Vietnam we would abide by the decisions of those elections. We would stand ready to defend a democratic government if such were elected. We would step out if the South Vietnamese voted to go Communist.

Such a policy and such a declaration would still leave the major tactical problem of the Vietcong pockets—very large pockets covering what we would regard as whole states—to clear out, for certainly no really free election could be conducted as long as those armed pockets remain. The policy need not block those sincerely believing in communism from entering Vietcong (or National Liberation Front) candidates in an election when held.

It would leave the tactical problem of the much longer Cambodian border, through which much of the North Vietnamese aid to the Vietcong is infiltrated, to be worked out. The declaration of defense would also have to imply that we were ready to defend that border against further penetration.

We are not so naive as to think the mere declaration would solve all our problems overnight. We fear we are still in for years of trouble in Vietnam. Fighting under such conditions would continue.

But the American people, if they are fighting, want to know what they are fighting about. This would give them a chance to know. Our enemies need to be told what deeper dangers to themselves they are risking by continuing to fight. This would be a way to tell them.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Feb. 9, 1966]

COINCIDENCE UNDERLINES A POINT

There may be a coincidence of more than mere timing in the near simultaneous clearing by American troops of South Vietnam's An Lao Valley and the Hawaiian meeting of United States and South Vietnamese chiefs of state.

The military operation was both a rule book success and a sore disappointment. The linkup of U.S. Marines and the Army's 1st Air Cavalry Division, both working with South Vietnamese units, was a near classic climax to a pincers movement. The disappointment was that the pincers closed on almost nothing. The Vietcong forces which have controlled the area had disappeared.

The meeting of the high brass and their civilian superiors—or in the Vietnamese case, theoretical superiors—was also a success in the classic tradition. It brought out reiteration of "determination * * * to draw a line and to stop Communist aggression." It may have been disappointing to South Vietnamese chief of state Nguyen Van Thieu and others in his entourage who had hoped for expansion of North Vietnamese bombing which President Johnson thus far opposes. But underlying that is the deeper problem of how to press the war on the civilian front in South Vietnam.

What the accidental coincidence in timing of the two events seems to bring out in intensified clarity is that this is a different war.

Escape of the Vietcong aside, the Cao Valley operation still leaves a major problem. Regaining of tactical military control of the area is not enough. The people must be won over, too. It is our opinion that the Americans on the ground have come to understand this better than have the Vietnamese leaders whose Government still carries something of the oriental warlord taint. Americans, both with know-how and funds, can do much. What we do alone, however, cannot be decisive. There lingers from colonial days the understandable Asiatic resentment of the white man. If, however, we are able to convince those in power—with our support—in Vietnam that they must proceed with massive civilian self-help programs to win over the real support of their people, then we may get somewhere. Until they realize and implement that need, we gain little.

In the closing communique, the Vietnamese powers-that-be voiced an encouraging commitment to "constitutional democracy" and "a true social revolution," but action is required to prove the pledges.

The Post-Tribune's advocacy Sunday of a formal "declaration of defense" as a means of spelling out the U.S. posture in this strange war was not intended as a purely military gesture. It contemplated also a concentration of effort within the South Vietnamese "defense" sector on the problems of developing a self-sufficient and self-government capability on the part of the people there.

Johnson's emphasis on this aspect at Honolulu is encouraging. We hope it bears fruit. A fruit harvest, however, requires painstaking time, particularly when the crop is not yet really planted. Let's get on with it.

Tribute to Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the death of Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the House of Representatives, was a shock to all of us and countless others who knew and respected him.

Many of you knew of the warm friendship existing between the late Dr. Braskamp and Charles B. Hoeven, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa, until his retirement in 1964.

The moving tribute to Dr. Braskamp by his longtime friend will be of deep interest to everyone.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BERNARD BRASKAMP

(By Hon. Charles B. Hoeven, former Member of Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa)

Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, was one of my dearest and devoted friends. I deeply regret his sudden passing and shall miss him very much in the days that lie ahead.

Dr. Braskamp became Chaplain of the House of Representatives in 1950 and served in that capacity with honor and distinction until the time of his death. Prior to becoming Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp had served as Assistant Chaplain for 3 years during the absence of the then Chaplain, Dr. Montgomery.

Dr. Braskamp was born in my hometown of Alton, Iowa, and I recall making a speech in the House of Representatives when he was first chosen to be the Chaplain of the House. In that speech, I tried to reflect the feeling of admiration and pride which the people of Alton had for one of their distinguished sons. Later on, when Dr. Braskamp's prayers in the House were first published as a House document, he asked me to write the foreword which he continued to use in subsequent publications until the time of his death. It also has been my rare privilege, as chairman of the Republican conference of the House of Representatives, to nominate Dr. Braskamp for the position of Chaplain on the convening of three sessions of the Congress.

In introducing Dr. Braskamp to some of my friends, I often referred to him as one of my "shirttail relatives," in that his oldest brother married one of my father's sisters.

In short, we had a close companionship throughout our joint service in the House of Representatives, and I have many happy recollections of our close association throughout the years.

Dr. Braskamp took great pride in the fact that for many years three Alton, Iowa, boys served together in official capacities in the House of Representatives; they being the late Claude S. Scheckel, one of the official reporters of debates, Dr. Braskamp as Chaplain, and myself as a Member of Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa, in which the town of Alton, Iowa, is located. Practically every day when the House was in session, the three of us chatted together about people and events in our old hometown. Naturally, our friendship ripened throughout the years.

Dr. Braskamp was a great and a good man, whom I can best describe as a first-class Christian gentleman. Although an ordained minister of the Gospel, with deep religious convictions, he was also one who had the "common touch." He was a dedicated and loyal servant of his Lord and Master and served well his day and generation. Those in the House of Representatives, whom he served so well, have had their lives enriched through the daily prayers offered in their behalf. Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to the surviving son and daughter and to all members of the family.

"Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy our thy Lord."

Award of Certificate of Merit to Howard E. Haugerud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on February 4 in the John Quincy Adams Room of the State Department, a ceremony was held for the purpose of presenting to Howard E. Haugerud, Deputy Inspector General of Foreign Assistance, the American Red Cross Certificate of Merit for saving a life. I could not be present for the presentation of this award, and many of my colleagues were also unable to attend.

Howard Haugerud is a former Senate employee and well known among Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. He is to be commended for his presence of mind and calm judgment in saving the life of U.S. Park Policeman Gerald Grauel. The award of the certificate of merit by the Red Cross is certainly well deserved.

I ask unanimous consent that the certificate of merit citation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an article from the Washington Daily News of Friday, February 4, describing the incident which led to the award, and also an article from the State Department newsletter of February 1966, and several letters from Members of the Congress commending Mr. Haugerud.

There being no objection, the certificate of merit, articles, and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS: CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

This certificate is issued by the American National Red Cross to Howard E. Haugerud, Arlington, Va., in recognition of services rendered on December 1, 1965, when he gave first aid to Pvt. Gerald Grauel for severe injuries sustained in an accident. Preventive measures were taken to prevent fire from gasoline. Quick thinking and immediate action saved the victim's life.

Issued at Washington, D.C., January 10, 1966.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Honorary Chairman.
E. ROLAND HARRIMAN,
Chairman.

DRAMATIC MINUTES ON A BRIDGE: "I AM SURE THAT HE SAVED MY LIFE"

(By Julian Morrison)

Assistant Secretary of State Howard Haugerud left his house at 2609 South Hayes Street in Arlington last December 1 and swung into the morning rush hour traffic for Memorial Bridge, where he got trapped in a line of cars.

Up ahead, drivers were getting out, and Mr. Haugerud joined them. He saw a crowd staring at something. Then he did what nobody else on the bridge was doing. He ran.

SIGHT

He ran to the spot where U.S. Park Police Pvt. Gerald Grauel lay twisted on the pavement, his hip broken and his left leg nearly torn off below the knee.

Moments before, his motorcycle had been in a collision with a cab, and as he lay on the bridge, gasoline poured out on his uniform from the cycle's ruptured tank.

As he ran to the injured policeman, Mr. Haugerud said he began recalling a Red Cross first-aid course he had taken in 1943.

He took off his belt and made a tourniquet around the injured leg, stopping the blood flowing from the wound.

"What got me," he said yesterday, "was that nobody was doing anything to help him. They were just standing around looking.

"A couple of guys were even standing there smoking, with all that gasoline pouring out on him. I told them to get the hell away from there."

HELP

It was 10 minutes before an ambulance could get through the crowded streets to take Private Grauel to George Washington Hospital where the leg was amputated. Mr. Haugerud went on to his job as Deputy Inspector General for Foreign Assistance.

But he didn't forget Private Grauel. He has gone to see him three times in the hospital since the accident, and they've become good friends.

What he didn't bargain for was the Red Cross, which investigated the accident and has awarded him its certificate of merit for saving Private Grauel's life.

This morning, with Dean Rusk looking on, the Red Cross formally presented the award at the State Department.

Private Grauel, whose 32d birthday was last month, is still in the hospital.

"But," Mr. Haugerud said yesterday, "he's in very good spirits.

"He's going to be retired from the Park Police, but they've lined up a civilian job for him with the Interior Department."

"I am sure that Mr. Haugerud saved my life," Private Grauel said. "He knew what to do and did it.

"I remember I could feel the warm blood pumping out of me. I felt as if I was going to die."

RED CROSS CITES HAUGERUD FOR SAVING POLICEMAN'S LIFE

Howard E. Haugerud, Deputy Inspector General for Foreign Assistance, has been awarded the American Red Cross Certificate of Merit for Saving a Life.

The presentation was made by Edward Burling, president of the District of Columbia chapter of the Red Cross, at a ceremony in the Department's John Quincy Adams Room on February 4. The certificate was signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson as honorary chairman of the Red Cross and by E. Roland Harriman, chairman of the board of governors.

Mr. Haugerud also received letters of congratulations from Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey; Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Representative Thomas E. Morgan, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and other leaders.

The State Department official was cited for his quick thinking and prompt application of Red Cross first-aid techniques in helping to save the life of a U.S. Park Policeman, Pvt. Gerald Grauel. Officer Grauel was gravely injured when his motorcycle collided with a taxicab on Memorial Bridge on the morning of December 1.

When Mr. Haugerud, who was driving to work, reached the scene the officer was bleeding profusely from a leg injury. He took off his belt and applied a tourniquet.

Mr. Haugerud also kept people from smoking because the injured man and the area were saturated with gasoline. Officer Grauel was rushed to the hospital. Although the leg had to be amputated, Mr. Haugerud's swift action was credited with saving the policeman's life.

The Vice President,
Washington, February 3, 1966.

Dear Howard: My warmest congratulations on the well-deserved honor you are receiving from the American Red Cross. What wonderful presence of mind and first aid you demonstrated in saving the life of the park policeman. Even though he later lost his leg, you showed what an alert citizen can do—by quick thinking and solid training. Sorry I cannot be with you to shake your hand in person and tell you how proud I am of you.

I always knew you were a "life saver," but now I see that that is not only figuratively, but literally true.

My greetings to the many fine citizens who are gathered in your honor.

Warmest regards to Mary.

Sincerely,

Hubert H. Humphrey.

Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, February 3, 1966.

Mr. Howard E. Haugerud,
Deputy Inspector General of Foreign Assistance, Department of State Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Howard: I regret extremely that official business in Pennsylvania will prevent my being present tomorrow morning when the American Red Cross will present you with its life-saving certificate.

I know that all of your friends are proud of the presence of mind and heroism which you displayed in saving the life of Pvt. Gerald Grauel of the U.S. Park Police.

It is, indeed, good to realize that the American Red Cross has been alert to recognize the fine citizenship which you displayed on that occasion. As one who has had occasion to note your efficiency in the discharge of your usual duties for the Government, I am glad to take this opportunity to add my own praise and commendation to that of the American Red Cross.

With kindest personal regards and very best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Thomas E. Morgan,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate,
February 3, 1966.

Mr. Edward Burling, Jr.,
Director, District of Columbia Chapter, American Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Burling: I regret that my schedule in the Senate is such that I will not be able to be present for the presentation by the American Red Cross of the award to Howard Haugerud.

Mr. Haugerud, whom I have known for several years and with whom I have worked, is certainly to be commended for his quick thinking and prompt assistance to Pvt. Gerald Grauel. I am pleased that the American Red Cross is recognizing him in this way, and hope you will convey to him my personal regards and congratulations.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. W. Fulbright.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1966.

Mr. Edward Burling,
President, District of Columbia Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Burling: Please convey to my good friend and fellow Minnesotan, Howard Haugerud, my warmest congratulations and admiration for his extraordinary courage in saving the life of a park policeman last December.

His action was typical of his concern for his fellow man, and it is fitting and proper that he be recognized by the District of Columbia Red Cross and by all of us.

I deeply regret that I cannot be here personally to express my admiration, and I appreciate your relaying my message.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

Walter F. Mondale.

U.S. Senate,
February 3, 1966.

Mr. Edward Burling, Jr.,
President, District of Columbia Red Cross, Red Cross Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Burling: I wish it could have been possible for me to attend the activities surrounding the ceremonies planned for my good friend Howard Haugerud. Unfortunately, the press of legislative duties will not permit my presence at that time.

I consider it a privilege to count Mr. Haugerud as a close friend, and as such, I have had ample opportunity to judge at close proximity his depth of character and empathy for others. Consequently, it comes as no great surprise to discover that he is being cited for heroic action. His exemplary action on behalf of Officer Grauel displays to me the highest measure of compassion for one's fellow man.

This special occasion is indeed a fitting tribute to a most deserving individual with a high sense of public service. I congratulate the State Department upon its good fortune in having such a man working on behalf of our great Nation.

Please extend to Howard my warmest regards, and I am,

Sincerely yours,

John L. McClellan.

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1966.

Mr. Howard Haugerud,
Deputy Inspector General of Foreign Assistance, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Dear Howard: It is hard to express in words the feeling one has upon learning that a friend has saved another's life. Too often we read or hear about cruelty through individual unwillingness to help another human being. This letter is not to congratulate you, rather it is a thank you for two things: one, saving a life and secondly, standing as an example to all of man's humanity to man.

We are proud of you.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Fraser.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1966.

Mr. Howard Haugerud,
Deputy Inspector General of Foreign Assistance, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Dear Howard: I am sorry it is not possible for me to be at the ceremony tomorrow when the Red Cross presents you with a lifesaving certificate.

I know I share the pride and respect of fellow Minnesotans in this tribute to you for your example of quick action by saving the life of Park Policeman Gerald Grauel.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Eugene McCarthy.

Cleaning Up the Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues may have noted the recent editorial in the Washington Daily News, which hails the administration's program to clean America's dirty waters.

It quotes the President's warning that:

> This generation has already suffered losses from pollution that run into billions of dollars each year.

The News asserts that:

> Indications are that the country is ready, even impatient, for the massive job. We have passed the point where we merely want to prevent any more damage to our water environment. Now we are eager to correct the abuse of decades.

Contrary to the belief of many in the populous areas of our Nation, the President's warning is apropos to the more wide open sections of our country. The people of the Middle West are as well in accord with the notion that action must come now.

In the conviction that many will want to read this forthright appraisal I offer the article for publication in the Record:

Cleaning Up the Abuse

President Johnson's message on pollution Wednesday indicated he means business on cleaning America's dirty waters. He wants whole river systems salvaged. He wants the Federal clean water effort organized in one agency. And he wants some teeth written into Federal law to stop offenders.

His sense of urgency will be welcomed by most Americans. As the President pointed out, every river system in the country is suffering. More and more communities have become concerned and are taking action on their own.

But there is a clear role for the Federal Government in helping to clean rivers and watersheds which spread over many municipalities and several States.

The President sounds a helpful note when he recommends that the water resources work being done by several Federal agencies be pulled into one. This move could save a lot of bewilderment for city and State officials who will be dealing more and more with Washington in the expanded effort.

Last month, the Senate Subcommittee on Pollution called for spending $20 billion over 5 years to improve our water. This is surely an ambitious and expensive program, but a necessary one. As President Johnson said, "This generation has already suffered losses from pollution that run into billions of dollars each year."

Indications are that the country is ready, even impatient, for the massive job. We have passed the point where we merely want to prevent any more damage to our water environment. Now we are eager to correct the abuse of decades.

Resolution To Revise the American Military Commitment to NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to my recent resolution, House Resolution 728, which I introduced February 10. My resolution calls for the President to revise the American military commitment to NATO and to Europe in such a way as to permit the maximum withdrawal of American troops consonant with American security.

I believe my resolution includes in its preambles most of the reasons for which I urge its passage, and I would thus like to put it in the RECORD. I would also like to put in the RECORD an excerpt from a Republican coordinating committee task force report of last August 30. This report, approved by former President Eisenhower, and by Candidates Nixon, Dewey, and Goldwater, as well as our own colleagues FORD, LAIRD, and ARENDS, recommends the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe just as my resolution does.

It is also interesting to note that the Democratic majority of the Joint Economic Committee favored consideration of European troop withdrawals in their 1965 report to Congress. My resolution is not just Republican policy, it is bipartisan commonsense. I urge the Members of this House to support House Resolution 728.

The text of House Resolution 728, together with the text of the Republican policy statement, follows:

H. RES. 728

Whereas the United States is engaged in mounting combat in southeast Asia which poses an ever-increasing strain on our military capability;

Whereas the United States is confronted with a severe balance-of-payments problem, partially occasioned by the large outflow of dollars to support American military presence in other parts of the world;

Whereas the United States is confronted with a steady decline in United States gold reserves, now at a postwar low of $13,800,000,000, as a result of gold outflow predicated on the balance-of-payments problem;

Whereas the United States military presence in Europe allows reduced European defense budegts and lowered European tax rates subsidizing European industry and trade to the detriment of United States trade and the United States balance of payments;

Whereas the United States military presence in Europe is concentrated in nations which have reacted in the years since 1960 by directly, or indirectly through sale of dollar holdings, causing the withdrawal of almost $5,000,000,000 worth of gold from the United States;

Whereas the United States military presence in Europe is concentrated in nations which have from time to time traded with the Government of North Vietnam, with the forces of which the United States is engaged in hostile combat;

Whereas the United States military presence in Europe is withholding from the Vietnamese conflict troops that would furnish the additional manpower necessary for that conflict without further resort to the draft of students and other young Americans in unusual number;

Whereas the United States has nearly one-third of a million military personnel stationed in Europe at the cost of many billions of dollars a year;

Whereas the United States military presence in Europe is largely, but not to its full extent, predicated on the security of the United States rather than the security of the host nation; and

Whereas the United States might improve its military position in both the Western Hemisphere and southeast Asia and strengthen the United States balance of payments, gold reserve, and trade surplus if revision of our European military commitments was undertaken so as to reduce American military strength in Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall undertake any possible revision of the American military commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to the several nations of Europe in order to permit the withdrawal of such American military forces as may be withdrawn consonant with the security of the United States.

[From Republican Federal fiscal and monetary policy task force report, Aug. 30, 1965]

7. Redetermine the extent of need, under present conditions, for U.S. military forces in the European theater, with the objective of reducing our expenditures there.

The time has long since arrived when a substantial reduction of our military establishment in Western Europe would appear to be wise if not necessary. Approximately 700,000 military and associated personnel are still being maintained in Europe, at a net outflow in the balance of payments of about $1.5 billion (approximately half the recent annual balance-of-payments deficits). A force of this size was unquestionably desirable 15 years ago, as an emergency protective matter, when our European allies were weak and relatively defenseless. But with their economic recovery, the Western European countries should be able to marshal their own conventional forces against invasion, backed by our continuing firm commitment to assist in their defense.

A small detachment of our forces can serve as evidence of this commitment, backed by our newly demonstrated ability to airlift reinforcements swiftly to any place in the world from central bases in the United States, and by our strategic air and missile striking forces.

An immediate reappraisal of the extent and character of our European-based military forces and financial commitment in the light of these changes in conditions should be undertaken both in our country and with our friends abroad as a matter of urgency. The results should substantially reduce our expenditures there.

These observations are backed by military experts and have been enunciated by both Democratic and Republican leaders. They were expressed by the Democratic majority in a 1965 report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress:

"The committee urges that the review of Government expenditures abroad focus particularly on the possibility of reducing our troop commitments in Europe. * * * Our overseas manpower was not cut back to the extent which the massive increase in our airlift capability would have permitted. * * * We must reduce our military expenditures in these countries."

There is no reason why our European friends, given a full appreciation of our views, should continue to depend on us to carry such large forces on their soil. Our commitment to the preservation of freedom in Western Europe will not be reduced by a return of a considerable portion of these forces to our shores.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a voice of democracy contest. This year more than 300,000 school students participated in the contest and competed for scholarships which are awarded as top prizes. The contest theme was "Democracy: What It Means to Me."

The winning contestant from Alabama was Miss Mabelle M. Segrest, from Tuskegee, a city in my district. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am proud to include the text of Miss Segrest's speech:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Mabelle M. Segrest)

In reading about democracy and considering what it means to me, two ideas kept recurring. Included in every definition of democracy was always the term "the people"—by Lincoln's definition, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." But to me, before you could have "the people" you must first have "the person." That was the first idea—the individual. The highest and most important goal of democracy is to protect the right of a man to be an individual—to think without fear, to worship as he chooses, and to act according to his own conscience. It is only when this "unalienable" right has been insured that "the people" can be effective. Then I came to the second idea—"the people."

"No man is an island, entire of itself"—nor does he want to be. People are involved in other people—and when they are, there must be rules governing their relationship. In a democracy, these laws that govern "the people" are made by them and enforced by them. In this social relationship, "the individual" becomes "the citizen."

There are very few citizens who can by themselves affect the course of their government. They have to act collectively to have any force at all. Citizens with similar views tend to form organizations through which they can all cooperate to reach their common goal. This is the principle behind political parties, churches, clubs—all organizations.

It is a principle vital to democracy. It is contained in the very word itself: "democracy" comes from Greek words meaning, literally, "rule by the people." But "rule by the people" can all too easily degenerate into "rule by the mob." When people act collectively without first thinking independently, "the people" become "the mob." But democracy protects the right to think independently and in so doing protects itself.

But what does all this mean to me personally? Very simply this: I am free. As a student in an American high school, I am freer than any other student in any other country in the world. I am free to be a scientist, a housewife, a beggar, a Protestant, an atheist, a Communist—I am free to criticize or to praise—to work or to loaf. I am free to be myself.

So what can I do to protect this precious right? I can exercise it. If I don't exercise my muscles, they grow flabbly—if I don't exercise my rights, I shall lose them. If democracy protects my right to be an individual, then my acting and thinking as an individual will protect democracy.

And what can my generation do to insure democracy for our children? Before we can do anything, we must first realize how precious is that which we have. I remember a speaker at commencement one year saying, "Most Americans don't know what freedom is, and because they don't know, they're loosing it. And they don't even know it's gone, because they didn't know what it was when they had it." We must first realize what we have, then no one will have to sell us any line about keeping it.

But simply wanting freedom to endure is never enough. If we expect democracy to survive, we must work for it—and if necessary fight for it. We cannot praise Democracy then sit at home on election day. We cannot praise our laws then sit back when we see them broken because "we don't want to get involved." We cannot praise freedom of speech then remain silent when we see our rights trampled. And when we do speak out, we must not be solely critical, but constructive also.

My generation—the "younger generation"—seems to be coming into focus as a generation of protest. "End the war in Vietnam." "Peace at any price." But it does no good to decry the war in Vietnam without then offering a practical alternative. "Peace at any price" is slavery. The right to criticise must be coupled with the responsibility of trying to correct what is criticized. We must not merely tear down the bad, the unjust, then walk away from the rubble. We must build something better. That is the responsibility, the challenge, and privilege of my generation.

School Job Plan Succeeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILLIP BURTON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I note a fine demonstration job-study project, which has just completed its first successful semester in the city of San Francisco.

I wish to congratulate the Fireman's Fund American Insurance Companies, the Miranda Lux Foundation, and the San Francisco School District for their participation in this program.

It is this kind of forward looking activity on the part of concerned corporations working with foundations and public agencies that will help to win the war on poverty.

Let us hope that other companies will follow the lead of Fireman's Fund.

The following two newspaper articles outline in greater detail the success of this program.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 7, 1966]

School Job Plan Succeeds

A demonstration job-study project—first of its kind in San Francisco—has completed a successful semester without the use of any public funds, it was announced last week.

The project has been jointly operated by Fireman's Fund American Insurance Companies, the Miranda Lux Foundation and the San Francisco School District.

The insurance company created special part-time jobs for 12 students—high school seniors from low-income Negro, Chinese and Mexican-American families. It pays them a starting salary of $1.50 an hour for jobs in key punch, tabulating, records, and mail work.

Fireman's Fund personnel vice president, Jack B. McCowan, said yesterday that the company is highly pleased with the results, and hopes to hire some of the students permanently after they graduate.

The major cost of the program is being carried by the Lux Foundation, which has granted $17,405 to the schools to provide classroom instruction and such incidental items as carfare for the students.

School Superintendent Harold Spears said that the project is a promising means of persuading students to complete their education, and also aids the school system in learning the requirements of local business firms.

"We hope other major San Francisco companies will follow this lead," Spears said.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Feb. 14, 1966]

Insurance Today: Insurance Companies Are Active in Programs Encouraging Students To Stay in High School

(By Alexander Picone)

The high school dropout, that painful problem of the education system, is getting increasing attention from the insurance industry. Two companies, for instance, the Fireman's Fund American Insurance Cos. and the Employers Group of Insurance Cos. are actively participating in programs aimed at preventing young students from dropping out of school.

The Employers Group discourages the hiring of the dropout but it is willing to help young people who demonstrate a willingness to help themselves and to stay in school.

Under its work-study program, which is open to those youngsters who are sure to receive their diplomas, the high school students work at the Employers office for several hours a day after school.

PLAN A SUCCESS

The plan has been successful for Employers. Each year, it hires some 60 students to work at clerical jobs in the home office in Boston and only 1 or 2 do not stay on with the companies after graduation.

The Employers Group makes the program available to high school students in each of the cities where it operates. The organization has 14 regional offices located in Colorado, Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Georgia, and Illinois.

Providing incentives for the student to finish a formal education is the avowed purpose of a demonstration project being conducted in San Francisco under the joint sponsorship of the San Francisco Unified School District, the Miranda Lux Foundation, and Fireman's Fund American Insurance Cos.

Twelve high school seniors—eight girls and four boys—from low-income Negro, Chinese, and Mexican-American families are participating in the program. They combine a half day of classroom work at George Washington, Polytechnic, and Galileo High Schools with a half day of on-the-job training at the insurance company's headquarters in Laurel Heights. The schools give academic credit for the students' curriculum study, and Fireman's Fund American pays hard cash for their work in entry jobs.

NO PUBLIC FUNDS

According to Dr. Herold Spears, superintendent of schools, "This Miranda Lux-Fireman's Fund project is designed to urge students to complete their high school education, to teach them responsibility and adult values, and to make each a more productive member of the community. The demonstration project has several factors that make it unique. The first is that no public funds are being used, as the Miranda Lux Foundation and Fireman's Fund are sharing the costs. Second, these jobs were created by Fireman's Fund for training purposes. This means the company is also providing supervisory attention, and we in the school system are getting new information on the actual training needs of local employers. Frankly, we hope other major San Francisco business firms will cooperate in similar projects in the future."

Jack B. McCowan, personnel vice president of Fireman's Fund, is delighted with his company's results in the project so far.

"San Francisco is our hometown," Mr. McCowan says, "and we feel we have a responsibility to help solve the community's dropout problem. In the process, we are working with a lot of bright, nice kids. We also hope to hire some of these students on a permanent basis after they graduate."

WORTHWHILE PROJECT

The project began last October 11, when the students first reported for work at the insurance company. The first year of the program will end next June 30, although it may be extended for 3 years if all parties agree it has been worthwhile.

Half the students go to school in the morning and to work in the afternoon. The other half start the day at work, then attend classes in the afternoon. They are working at entry jobs in key punch, tabulating, records, and mail operations, where they receive a starting salary of $1.50 per hour. (The California minimum wage is $1.25 per hour.) All of the trainees receive regular pay raises and promotions as they become eligible, Mr. McCowan says.

The Miranda Lux Foundation is bearing the major costs of the demonstration project with a $17,405 grant to the San Francisco Unified School District. Dwight L. Wilbur, M.D., president of the foundation explains, "The grant covers classroom instruction for the students, clerical costs for the school system's records on the project, equipment used in classroom training and other items such as car fare for the trainees. This kind of private financing is a logical extension of the foundation's traditional interest in job-training programs."

"There is no substitute for a specific skill or ability when securing a position in today's highly specialized economy," concludes Superintendent Spears. "This carefully super-

68 208 AA A 30

vised program of part-time work experience while still attending high school represents a sturdy bridge leading from graduation to worthwhile employment."

GOP in Criticism Exposes Its Own Weak Viet Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the following article from the Detroit Free Press, an editorial of March 1, 1966:

AS WE SEE IT: GOP IN CRITICISM EXPOSES ITS OWN WEAK VIET ROLE

Few in Washington or anywhere else suggest that the continuing clash between Vice President HUMPHREY and Senator ROBERT KENNEDY about the U.S. policy in Vietnam lacks political overtones. The time may be late or it may be soon, but one of the two men might well pick up the reins of Democratic power when Lyndon Johnson lays them down.

As a member of the administration, HUMPHREY is both the beneficiary and the victim of its policies. If he can take some credit for the good, he is also stuck with the bad. And so far as Democratic liberals are concerned, his entry into the house of Johnson and Company left a vacuum in leadership for the left wing of the Democratic Party. It is a vacuum which KENNEDY has been trying mightily to fill.

Nor, one should add, has either of the men been wholly above criticism.

But it seems to us that criticism from the Council of Republican Organizations is in particularly poor political taste and exposes the GOP's own vulnerable position regarding Vietnam. Formed after the Goldwater debacle and composed of leading Republican liberals, the council impugns motives and charges HUMPHREY and KENNEDY with using the Vietnam issue "as a vehicle for future control of the Democratic Party."

In a statement of considerable length, the council said that its members "decry" the undermining of the Nation's policy by "political feuding and posturing" and "deplore" KENNEDY's and HUMPHREY's activities.

Overall it is a statement of pious self-righteousness which those deeply concerned about U.S. policy in Vietnam will find hard to take. For what the HUMPHREY-KENNEDY exchanges have disclosed, as they were never disclosed before, is the gap between what the administration appears to be saying when it calls for "unconditional" negotiations and what it is actually saying.

KENNEDY would deal directly with the Vietcong, the enemy in the field. HUMPHREY would not. KENNEDY, looking ahead, foresees that any really free election in South Vietnam where the Vietcong controls most of the territory and a large portion of the people is likely to have Vietcong winners. HUMPHREY prefers to call the Vietcong names—murderers, assassins—and blandly asserts that it would be highly unlikely any of them would win election to government posts.

Assuming that HUMPHREY speaks for the administration, his position reveals why the Vietcong and North Vietnam may have been reluctant up to now to participate in any negotiations ending hostilities. The view leaves them little choice but to grind on to what they hope eventually will be military victory or a stalemate with them largely in control of the countryside.

There has been unfortunate confusion about what the administration's position is on negotiations. If KENNEDY's comments have clarified it in any way, they have made a significant contribution.

Which leaves the Council of Republican Organizations in the position of criticizing a critic of the administration's fuzzy Vietnam policy and of making absolutely no contribution of its own.

Without Medicare Alert Many Would Miss Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to support the Sioux City Council of Community Services in its application for Operation Medicare Alert. As a result of approval of that program in Sioux City, Iowa, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a solid report as to the progress being made in this vital undertaking.

I wish to personally commend my good friend, Paul Springer, for his dedication to a most worthy task. Also, I want to give special consideration to a most able news reporter, Mr. Bob Gunsolley, a highly competent and proficient journalist of the Sioux City Journal.

WITHOUT MEDICARE ALERT MANY WOULD MISS BENEFITS: PROGRAM HERE IS VALUABLE FOR OLDSTERS

(By Bob Gunsolley)

A small group of elder citizens is going door to door in Sioux City spreading the word on medicare among fellow oldsters.

They are finding that, despite the widespread publicity about medicare, many of the over-65 persons who are eligible for the benefits are confused about what they have to do to receive them.

The citywide canvass of the elderly has been going on since Febraury 7 under a federally financed project known as Operation Medicare Alert. It must end by March 31, when all those eligible have to decide on whether to enroll for medical benefits.

Paul Springer, former YMCA secretary here who is in charge of the project, said the assistance it provides is proving to be a real boon to many oldsters who might not otherwise have applied.

NOT REACHING ELDERLY

In most cases, the publicity just hasn't been getting to elderly persons, especially those with low income who live alone without radio or television and who rarely see a newspaper.

Some have hung back from applying because of misunderstanding, Mr. Springer said. One man said he thought he would have to sign over his property in order to apply for benefits.

Despite the controversy that preceded congressional adoption of medicare last year, the elderly beneficiaries, at least, appear to be almost solidly grateful for the program, Mr. Springer said.

Hostility has been at minimum among those called on. Some of those just don't like to admit strangers to their homes. In an even smaller percentage of the cases, less than 1 percent, hostility has been expressed toward medicare itself because it is a Government program.

EXPRESSING THANKS

Except for those few, persons visited so far have expressed gratitude not only for medicare, but also for the assistance rendered by medicare alert canvassers.

All of those involved in the project, including Mr. Springer, are 65 or over. Nine persons are being used in the door-to-door campaign, each of them working on a part-time basis. To supplement the home interviews, group meetings have been scheduled for each neighborhood as it is canvassed so that officials of the local social security office can answer some of the more difficult questions about medicare.

One such meeting was held Tuesday afternoon at the Sanford Center. Another one is scheduled for 2 p.m. Monday at Roosevelt School and a meeting will be held March 4 at Floyd School.

Mr. Springer estimates that there are about 10,000 persons in Sioux City 65 or older. Operation Medicare Alert hopes to reach most of those by the March 31 deadline, especially those in the low-income areas of greatest concentration of the elderly.

In order to become enrolled for medicare benefits, persons on social security must fill out and send in application cards they already have received in the mail. Hospitalization benefits will be free, but additional medical benefits will cost the elderly person $3 a month withheld from their social security checks if they enroll, according to Ralph Leonard, assistant manager of the local social security office.

Persons not on social security are also eligible for both hospitalization and medical benefits if they are 65 or older, but they will be billed for the medical payments. They must fill out special forms to enroll.

The purpose of Medicare Alert is to be sure that everyone who wants to has enrolled and to help those who haven't yet done so.

Of 1,000 persons called on last week, 450 were interviewed. The canvassers helped 418 of them fill out the necessary forms. Nine persons were referred to the council of community services for special help and 14 were referred to the social security office for special information.

WOULD HAVE MISSED

Mr. Springer estimates that without Operation Medicare Alert, about 75 of those visited last week would never have gone ahead on their own to apply for benefits.

Some of the canvassers find themselves doubling as social workers. They have found persons low on food who find it difficult to get to grocery stores. These are referred to the proper agencies for home food delivery.

Some who live alone and get few visitors were found to be starved for company. Ministers are notified to call on them.

Mr. Springer said that some persons on old-age assistance weren't aware that the State will pay for their medical benefits under medicare.

Connecticut's Voice of Democracy Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the

United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest. The winning contestants from each State are brought to Washington for the final judging as guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the top five participants are awarded scholarships of $1,000 to $5,000.

Since this program provides an excellent vehicle for the stimulation and expression of serious thought on our Government's virtues and its shortcomings, I am especially pleased to note that one of my constituents, Miss Cynthia H. Griffin, of Waterbury, Conn., is the winning contestant from my home State. Miss Griffin's observations on the elements of democracy afford a refreshing insight into the thoughts of our young people, and under unanimous consent I include her essay as part of the RECORD.

(Cynthia H. Griffin, Waterbury, Conn.)

It is the pecularity of man to be introspective—to search within himself for motivation. Man is also unique in that he seeks significance in the world around him.

As a man matures, the need to find a meaning in his existence becomes more acute. The young person becomes increasingly aware of his own existence and his existence in relationship to others. He becomes more aware of the society in which he lives.

And so, as the young person searches for meanings—the meaning of his existence, the meaning of his society—he searches also for the meaning of democracy. He searches within himself and within others. For, democracy is government by the people. To be able to comprehend democracy, one must look to the people who comprise it.

Democracy is the most pliable form of government. It is soft clay placed in the hands of each new generation, bringing with it a challenge to each generation to sculpt its own future. Democracy takes on the color, flavor, character, and inclinations of its people. It is a government which relies on an informed, educated populace, sensitive to the needs of others, and acutely aware of the responsibility of each citizen for the common good. This is what makes democracy exciting—exciting and challenging.

The American democracy is not a government of the mass, it is a government of the people—of individuals, each contributing in his particular way to the good of the whole.

In America democracy has many faces. These faces may be those of a wealthy broker on Wall Street, a conservative politician in California, a strong-willed farmer in the Midwest, a patriotic cab driver in Washington, D.C., or an outspoken actor in Chicago. Each different, yet each representing a facet of democracy.

As a young person I must encounter democracy in the faces of these people. I must see that the Wall Street broker represents the right to succeed. He is the capitalist who gives us a healthy, wealthy, ever-striving economy. As a young person, I must realize that the sounds of the bulls and bears arguing over shares and the ever-present ticking of stock market machines are an important part of the voice of democracy.

The conservative politician represents the right to oppose. He is the man whose views may not be those of the majority, yet he is a thriving part of the democratic machinery. As a young person I must realize that the right to oppose has limitations; and if I exceed these limitations, as many of my peers have recently done, I hinder rather than help democracy.

The midwestern farmer represents the right to own property. He is the baker who fills the breadbasket of the Nation.

The cab driver represents the right of the people to be a part of the Government. It is a right which is intensified by the citizens' privilege to vote. The cab driver is one of the workingmen who are the backbone of this society.

The actor represents the right to speak freely. He is the artist who illustrates the special nobility of the arts in a democratic society. As an American youth, I must look to the arts to appreciate the richness of a culture which is free to flourish.

This is a brief sketch of the variety of people who make up this democracy and the variety of the privileges which they possess. Young people searching for the meaning of democracy will find it in these people. To know democracy is to know one's role in a democracy; to know one's role is to know one's ability to work for the improvement of democracy.

America challenges her youth to develop themselves as individuals, so that they may develop democracy as a whole. Students seeking democracy will find that the image of democracy is stamped on the faces of its people. It is an image which is mirrored in this statement—democracy is the freedom to be what is varied and the responsibility to do what is right.

The Federal Times, a Specialist Newspaper on Governmental People and Matters, Marks Its First Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago a new newspaper appeared on the scene called Federal Times. At that time, its editors claimed that they would be dedicated to objectively reporting all news of importance to the millions of persons employed with the Government in a civilian capacity. A year later, it is evident that the editors of Federal Times have lived up to their promise.

As vice chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have taken an understandable interest in Federal Times. I can say that its coverage of our many subcommittee and committee hearings of this and last year has been of the highest journalistic quality. This worthy publication, in addition to covering the many facets of legislation pertaining to Federal civilians, has, through its editorials, feature articles, and departmental coverage, provided employees with virtually all information vital to them in pursuing their careers.

I wish at this time to commend the Federal Times and wish it many, many more anniversaries. I also include in the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the March 2 anniversary issue:

THE FIRST YEAR

With this issue, Federal Times begins its second year of operation. The year completed has been a good one. In that short span of time we have reached a weekly paid circulation in excess of 50,000 copies.

This was not an easy accomplishment. We are most grateful to the people who made it possible. Special thanks are due to the many Government and union officials who saw in Federal Times a vehicle through which each could work toward understanding the problems of the other.

The free flow of information is essential in a democracy. It is vital in a field made up of some two and one-half million people scattered across the country and around the world.

We have worked to gain the confidence of these leaders. We have done this by reporting, as accurately and rapidly as possible, both the good and the bad sides of the news. This was our announced aim in the first issue. It continues to be our policy.

A year ago we spelled out our objectives in our first editorial. Since so many of the objectives remain just as true today, we felt it would be fitting to review some of them as we begin our second year.

Editorially, we promised to support a policy of providing salaries high enough to attract and retain talented people in Government service. We continue this view and will support a raise this year which will move the Federal worker closer to salaries comparable to those paid in private industry for similar work. We will campaign not only for salary increases, but for gains in fringe benefits as well.

We promised to be a "listening post" by which the Federal worker could make his views on important subjects known to the men who make the laws. This we have done through our editorial page, our letters to the editor and our readership polls. We appeal for your participation in these polls since the results are transmitted to the policymakers and could make a difference in votes on key issues.

We promised to provide Government workers with a medium in which they could exchange ideas on how to improve both efficiency and working conditions. To do this we called upon respected leaders of both management and labor and provided them with space to express their views. Typical of these services were the reports by Dr. W. Brooke Graves on utilization of personnel, and Robert Ramspeck on the civil service system in general. Both of these articles received widespread dissemination being widely quoted and reprinted in other publications. Similar articles will appear in the weeks ahead.

We realized there would be an interest in jobs open in the Federal Government. We began with a limited list and have expanded it week to week ever since. All agencies are invited to submit their lists of vacancies. These are run without cost to the agency or the jobseeker.

Our service department answers a growing number of questions each week. In addition, special reports have covered subjects of key interest. These, too, will be expanded and enlarged to cover more subjects in the weeks ahead.

We have tackled controversial subjects like the need for reform in the sick leave policy; a review of the Hatch Act; the role of unions in government; and the adequacy of the last pay raise. In future issues we will discuss veteran preference the "buddy system," equal opportunity and other areas in need of closer inspection.

None of the things we have done or endeavored to do would be possible without the cooperation of a large number of people. It is a tribute to our civil service system that we have leaders who are willing to discuss both sides of a controversial issue. It is impressive that each side on occasion can be strong enough to admit it could be wrong.

A special word of thanks is due to our readers. By their letters and communications they have let us know what they want in a paper. By their high renewal rate as the first year ends, they indicate satisfaction with the job we are doing.

In our second year we shall continue to try and merit this confidence.

Consumer Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr Speaker, I believe I speak for the great majority of the people of Michigan's 12th Congressional District when I urge favorable action on the two most important consumer bills before the 89th Congress—the truth-in-packaging and truth-in-lending proposals.

The principal sponsors of these two measures, my Michigan colleague, our State's distinguished junior Senator [Mr. HART], and the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], have worked long and hard on behalf of the two truth bills.

I hope this session of Congress will stamp itself as the "consumer Congress" by enacting the truth bills as well as other legislation to protect the interests of America's consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the February 19 issue of the AFL–CIO News carried an article summarizing the main points made in an article which appeared in the AFL–CIO's magazine, the American Federationist. The News article is a good rundown on the consumer legislation on the list of unfinished business before the 89th Congress. I include the article as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CONSUMER TRUTH LAWS NEED STRESSED—SHOPPING SAFEGUARDS HELD VITAL TO PRESERVE BARGAINING GAINS

Wage increases won at the bargaining table are being lost at the shopping center in the absence of laws to protect consumer.

An article in the February issue of the AFL–CIO American Federationist documents this warning with examples of everyday sales and lending practices which reduce the buying power of every family's earnings.

The AFL–CIO's magazine discusses the two big consumer bills on the unfinished buiness agenda of Congress—truth-in-packaging and truth-in-lending legislation.

It also focuses attention in lesser known consumer legislative issues—including the need to close loopholes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, extend Federal meat inspection, bring standards and safety to the sale of automobile tires, and expore the ramifications of trading stamps given away with purchases.

Most of the pending consumer bills have been urged by President Johnson. But the article points out that "strong consumer and labor support will be needed if consumer legislation is to move from committee rooms into actual enactment."

MAIN POINTS

Anne Draper of the AFL–CIO department of research prepared the article, which makes these main points:

The purpose of the truth-in-packaging bill sponsored by Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, is to require intelligible packaging so that the consumer will be able to compare brands on the basis of price and contents—without using a slide rule or a magnifying glass.

It would require the net weight of the contents to be plainly printed on the front panel. It would bar such meaningless descriptions as "jumbo half quart" as a substitute for 1 pint. It would prohibit manufacturers' "cents off" promotion when there is no assurance that the cents off are actually passed on to consumers.

WEIGHT STANDARDS

It would also authorize Government agencies to set standards for reasonable weights or quantities in which packaged products can be sold. Today, for example, a busy shopper may be faced with a choice between a 20-ounce package for 35 cents or a competing brand's 24.5 ounces for 40 cents.

In another area of consumer discontent, the Hart bill would permit establishment of meanings for such descriptive terms as "regular," "large" or "kingsized." It would authorize definitions of "servings" so that the claim "serves four" would have some relation to reality.

The bill would also prohibit slack-filled packages—where the contents do not fill the container thus presenting a deceptive impression of the amount to the buyer.

Industry spokesmen have claimed that this is often inevitable with the use of high-speed packaging machinery. The Federationist article counters with the question:

CANDY ILLUSION

"But how does this explain the 4-inch candy bar packed in a 6-inch tray—giving the illusion of 6 inches of candy?"

To illustrate the loss to consumers through confusing or misleading packaging, the Federationist cites an experiment conducted at Eastern Michigan University.

Thirty-three young, married women were instructed to select the most economical package—the largest quantity for the price—for each of 20 products at a selected supermarket.

The shoppers made mistakes on an average of nearly half the purchases. And their mistakes cost them more than 9 cents extra on each dollar spent—the equivalent of a 9-percent pay cut.

If consumers are handicapped in shopping for groceries, they make even more costly mistakes when it comes to securing a loan at the lowest cost or getting the best deal when buying goods on the installment plan.

Very often, in fact, they never know how much they are being charged for credit.

TRICKY DISCOUNTS

For example: discount rate of 7 percent for 1 year is a true interest rate of about 13.9 percent, while a $7 per $100 add-on rate is about 12.9 percent in true interest.

But most often there is no simple way to judge a sales offer. For example, an advertisement for a used car might read: "Only $1,644, $97 down, $11 a week."

The heart of the truth-in-lending bill of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, is the requirement that the borrower be told both the dollars-and-cents cost and the true annual interest rate of a loan or credit purchase.

Prominent disclosure of interest costs in terms that can be compared with each other would do a great deal to bring down the cost of borrowing by encouraging credit shopping, the article notes.

It cites a University of California study of families using installment credit to buy automobiles.

Four-fifths of them did not check any credit source other than their car dealers. They paid an average of 22.9 percent in true interest charges. The one-fifth that did check other lenders came out with a relatively low 12 percent rate.

Over two-thirds of the families said they did not know how much they were paying for credit in terms of annual interest and of those who thought they did know, most were under the impression they were paying 5 or 6 percent.

If each family had used the best available credit source, the average saving on new cars would have been $148 and on used cars $74.

Here is an example of how the Douglas bill would help a car buyer decide between paying off $1,500 at the rate of $53.40 a month for 36 months or $60 a month for 30 months.

CHARGES STATED

Under the Douglas bill, the first lender would have to state that the payments include a finance charge of $422.40 at an annual interest rate of 18.3 percent. The second lender would have to state that his plan represented a finance charge of $300 at an annual interest rate of 15.5 percent.

Thanks to the Federal meat inspection law, about 85 percent of all meat and 65 percent of processed meat products are federally inspected. But inspection is not required of meat and meat products which do not cross State lines. Only 6 States have adequate State inspection laws, and 19 States have none at all.

Representative NEAL SMITH, Democrat, of Iowa, has introduced a bill to extend Federal meat inspection to virtually all meat and meat products.

Cosmetics can now be put on the market before being tested for safety—making the consumer a guinea pig for new products. Only after injuries occur, and the Government hears about them, can action be taken to get unsafe products off the market. And persons with allergies often are unaware of the risk they take in using certain cosmetics, because no list of ingredients is required.

Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, is sponsor of a bill which would correct this.

A bill to establish Federal safety standards for new tires and a grading system for tires has been introduced by Senate Commerce Committee Chairman WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, after hearings sponsored by Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

TIRE CONFUSION

To the consumer and to most tire dealers, the nomenclature of tires is a confusing jumble of meaningless adjectives.

There is no fixed meaning for terms such as premium, first-line, and second-line. One manufacturer's second-line may be equivalent to another's premium or a third firms' de luxe.

Several congressional committees have expressed interest in investigating the effect of trading stamps on prices—to determine if the consumer actually benefits or whether the added cost boosts prices beyond the value of any "gifts" received by stamp savers.

The Time To Pay Debts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the current extravaganza of public spending causes great concern among my constituents. But even more alarming is the failure of our Federal Government to take a positive step toward curbing deficit spending and reducing the national debt.

An editorial appearing in a highly respected newspaper in my district, the Thomasville, Ga., Times-Enterprise, recently questioned:

> If the Government of the United States cannot begin paying off some of its indebtedness during the current boom time, it is only fair to ask when it may be expected to do so.

This, in my opinion, is a reasonable question. I commend the editorial to my colleagues for its sound commentary:

THE TIME TO PAY DEBTS

If the Government of the United States cannot begin paying off some of its indebtedness during the current boom-time, it is only fair to ask when it may be expected to do so.

Certainly the Government cannot and will not make payments on its indebtedness when it is faced with a depression period in which conceivably there might be a drop in Federal receipts because of lower income tax payments and from other sources which might be affected by adverse conditions.

It's easy to put off the paying of debts, but the average individual is fully aware that the time to pay bills is when one is working or has a satisfactory income. If unemployed or if revenue sources are not adequate one may find it difficult to pay.

Unlike Government, the average individual cannot continue to bypass his debts. His creditors will call on him for payment. Business in general faces an identical situation. But Government can keep on blowing up the currency balloon making money cheaper and more plentiful. An individual or ordinary business cannot do so. Bankruptcy would be the only alternative.

Liberality with public funds has become such a popular pastime with government and legislative bodies that all sense of responsibility as to the sacredness and validity of honest debts seems to have been lost in this era when the danger of inflation grows by the hour, and the apathetic attitude of the public does not serve to check the current extravaganza of public spending.

Education of Americans for International Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the president of George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, Tenn., was a participant in the White House Conference on Education here in Washington on November 30 of last year.

On that occasion, Dr. Robb presented an address entitled "Education of Americans for International Cooperation."

Dr. Robb's speech was one of the highlights of the Conference and has been widely quoted and acclaimed since its delivery.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert Dr. Robb's speech in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

EDUCATION OF AMERICANS FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

(By Felix C. Robb)

It is a high privilege to be asked to speak to this Conference on "The Education of Americans for International Cooperation." All of us take heart and hope in President Johnson's assertion that our "dream of a Great Society does not stop at the water's edge."

I believe that if an infusion of power and determination in international education can be accomplished comparable to the current and dramatic investment in our domestic educational system, the quest for amity in international affairs will be accelerated and life together on planet earth will be facilitated.

A brief glance at the climate in the United States for international cooperation reveals that changes in the world and in our society have far outstripped the performance ability of American education at the local and institutional levels to adapt, to change, to innovate. Yet, by all odds the greatest force for international cooperation in this country—and indeed the chief affirmative influence upon American citizens and voters in their attitudes toward other lands and other people—is education.

Because all nations, whether highly developed or underdeveloped, feel that their future development is much dependent upon education, it is clear that education becomes the central affirmative force in the world.

The broad base of citizen support for political leaders willing to give top priority to international cooperation derives from the work of American schools, colleges, and universities. Without the strong involvement of our public schools and our million and a half teachers, a favorable prevailing climate for participation in the United Nations would not exist in this country. I further believe that had it not been for the work of respected and courageous university leaders, the once strong American isolationist sentiment would be a grave threat to our leadership in the free world.

As Pogo once said: "We have met the enemy—and he is us." We Americans do so much that is fine and good both here and abroad that we tend to think we have no flaws, when in truth our Achilles heel in international relations is our tendency to be basically proud, provincial, and unprepared for cultural shock. We do not really appreciate fully our own subcultures, let alone understand the rest of the world and its awesome problems. To a degree we are still insular, as if that were necessary to our mental health.

Too long we have taught about foreign cultures in an earnest but antiseptic, sterile way, thereby perpetuating a large gulf between our people and this Nation's foreign policy, a policy which is increasingly complex and sophisticated. Teachers are expected to know, to teach and talk about the world outside our Nation's borders, yet only infinitesimal numbers of them have lived or traveled off this continent. American teachers need more cross-cultural experiences.

We need to have some better means of encouraging an international outlook and awareness on the part of America's teachers, for they are the key to America's future and are the central personages in the remaining years of this century.

Recognizing our inevitable involvement in world affairs, the power and the potential influence of teachers and other educational leaders are enormous and absolutely essential to any effort to make the United States a permanent cooperating member of the family of nations. But the real capability of education to facilitate and induce international cooperation has scarcely been tapped.

To promote understanding of other countries and cultures; to maximize our own capacity for viewing the world's people and their problems with greater concern; to help make the world safe for diversity; and to prepare a large corps of responsible, well trained, and influential international leaders capable of moving the nations of the earth toward international amity and toward a sharing of the benefits of the greatest society we can conceive for a free world—I wish to identify several strategic leverage points and to propose a vastly heavier commitment of our national resources to international education.

These leverage points and this investment should be of two types: (1) the underwriting of expanded programs that have proved themselves in the past, and (2) the support of new ventures which can provide additional strength in the struggle against provincialism, international misunderstanding, and international misadventure.

I see seven major action areas, or leverage points, where a substantial investment could pay large dividends. I will also propose for your consideration some machinery with which to get at the needed improvements.

Among our targets are these:

1. The reorientation of materials of instruction on all levels to the realities of today's world. This is a task so massive it seems overwhelming, but it must be accomplished in this decade.

2. Vastly increased opportunity for foreign study and for work-study experience in other countries.

3. A revolution in foreign language study to build proficiency in a second language into an ever-increasing percentage of our population.

4. Fullest possible exploitation of certain underdeveloped subject areas in schools and colleges such as geography and cultural anthropology. Their relevance to our time can be demonstrated; their usefulness to the Nation deserves through testing.

5. International education as a field of study. There are too few competent specialists in the highly complex business of studying, directing, and teaching in international and comparative education.

6. An awakening of America's adult out-of-school population to better understanding of other cultures and the issues that underlie war and peace among nations.

7. More research. We know too little about the content, the methods, and the effects of international education.

Blocking the path to large-scale preparation of Americans for international cooperation are such obvious barriers as insufficient funds; inadequate materials of instruction; outdated leave and tenure provisions for teachers in local school systems that fail to recognize the value of foreign study and service; failure to utilize living laboratories for international education that exist in every community having a subculture derived from a foreign-born population; an evident inarticulation in international matters between the schools and the colleges; weaknesses in planning for international experiences at the regional, State, and local levels; and a seriously deficient utilization of Americans returned from foreign service and of the never-ending stream of international visitors who give and gain less insight than they could if we afforded better institutional and local arrangements for them.

The greatest yield of international good will and cooperation in our entire foreign policy program, in my judgment, derives from our investment in people—not in things. There is need for a massive effort within the United States to establish world awareness through expanded interchange of mature students and through the introduction of informative and attractively presented information about the cultures and nations of the earth outside our own borders. Some procedure needs to be established for determining how this can be accomplished in the neighborhood school, in the community school system, on a statewide basis, and in the country as a whole.

The largest payoff is the best single leverage point is a program of longstanding repute; namely, the exchange of teachers and students. Limited though it has been, the success of thoughtfully planned educational exchange, vis-a-vis tourism, is evident. The exchange-of-persons program so ably managed by the Institute for International Education should be expanded a hundredfold for carefully selected American schoolteachers and college professors. Success of the IIE further reveals the potentiality of para-educational agencies when their expertise is harnessed, and similar citations could be made about the Foreign Policy Association, the Asia Foundation, NEA's Teach Corps, the AACTE overseas visitation programs, and on and on. The dividends from sending teams of school and college administrators, as well as teachers and students, for brief, intensive study-tours abroad also are enormous and should be greatly multiplied.

We have enjoyed the fruits of the highly productive National Science Foundation. Now the humanities have their national foundation. And before the social scientists present their very worthy cause to Congress, I propose the formation of a Foundation for International Studies.

We need to inject new substance and new life into the international content of the American school and college curriculum. Materials of instruction are woefully inadequate and what exists is disproportionately heavy in its orientation to Western Europe.

We need revitalized and more realistic and accurate portrayals of other nations. What is known about other lands and cultures has been greatly expanded in the past quarter of a century. Yet this information is not widely reflected in either the curriculum of our public schools or in the texture of materials available to teachers and pupils. There is need for dastic revision in the nature of information provided to America's youth about the world in which they live.

This conference should call for a reorientation of school curriculum materials toward more realistic concepts of country and culture, toward the understanding of individual differences among people and nations, with far greater stress on human similarities and on the oneness of the human race than is evident in our textbooks today. If we are to build a strong base for international understanding, our educative processes must reveal clearly that men have much more community of interests than they have things not in common.

Of great latent potential in the schools is the largely moribund field of geographic education. It is improbable that even 1 percent of the U.S. adult population could locate correctly the major countries of the several continents. This has no special significance per se except as it becomes one index to an abysmal ignorance that the past 100 years of schooling have done little to eradicate. Vastly more important, of course, is learning about the interaction of geopolitical forces in a changing world. But such subtleties are lost on those who slog around in rudimentary geographic ignorance. Geography as a subject to be learned and taught has never fulfilled its promise; has never really been given the promotion and the chance it deserves. Its potential as a base for international understanding is tremendous.

In the teaching of modern languages we grossly neglect Asia, Africa, and South America. No longer can we afford to let Americans grow up thinking that all one needs in order to be a cosmopolite is to learn French or German. The study of languages and cultures of India, China, Russia, Latin America, and the developing African countries should be encouraged with appropriate incentives to schools, to teachers, and to students. Unfortunately, no university, not even the greatest, provides a sufficiently wide span of language offerings; and foreign languages in the schools are taught mostly by people who have neither lived nor studied in the countries where the language is indigenous.

To enable colleges and schools to offer the great variety of language and culture studies needed today, I propose that we supplement our traditional commitment to a handful of major languages. To replace the restrictive language lockstep, colleges and schools should be helped to provide study opportunities and cross-cultural experiences in at least from 25 to 50 basic languages and dialects, these to be accomplished by administrative arrangements and links of American universities, colleges, and schools with their counterparts in those countries we deem important to understand, to learn from, and to help.

In residential centers around the world, intensive language study should be available for 6 to 9 months to facilitate mastery and to replace the superficiality that still characterizes most language instruction in the United States. The cost would not be small, but as we begin to shuttle large numbers of teachers and students back and forth to other countries in a planned program, the unit cost of transportation should drop. Most importantly, we would produce internationally able people to serve industry, government, and education and, with them, build bridges to every nation of the world.

No area of American education is in greater need of research than our efforts in international education.

We need to know what really happens when an American and his foreign counterpart work together or when they exchange places. We need to know more about the variety of educational approaches to economic, social, and political development and about educational planning and assistance programs.

Just as America's entire elementary and secondary school program had long been hampered by a lack of empirical evidence on which to base decisions, even more are we in the dark as to what we are doing in international education. For instance, we have no clue whatsoever as to the international enrollment in our secondary schools. Is it near zero or a significant factor? We don't know. We need more facts and more research to provide answers to questions and solutions to problems, to fill large gaps in our total effort, and to reveal countless lacunae.

We need badly a definitive study of the international dimensions of the American school, its curriculum, its staff, and its children and youth. At the top of the list of research endeavors to challenge a contribution to world affairs from behavioral scientists, I would urge the assignment of an international team of psychologists, anthropologists, historians, and educators to an exhaustive study of the child as a unifying force in society.

Too little is done in teacher education to bridge the cultural gap or to take advantage of every American's opportunity to become acquainted with his own Nation's subcultures and his own community's international resources.

Some agency should underwrite a program of planned international experiences for master teachers who would later serve as catalysts in "team teaching" situations and as supervisors. These key leaders would need to be especially sensitive to and enthusiastic about education in international matters.

There are few adequate programs of study for foreign student advisers, for professors of international education, for directors of international centers, and for the soon-to-be-born new breed of internationally oriented administrators and specialists without whom a large school system, a State department of education, or a university cannot hope to coordinate and manage successfully the international aspects of its activities.

A different kind of internationally minded teacher is needed in America—a teacher keenly aware of the great tides in history, alert to contemporary issues, experienced in at least one culture or subculture than his own, and strong enough in his faith in America to be willing to admit that on occasions we make mistakes and are honestly, earnestly seeking to find the real road to lasting peace while we defend freedom on many fronts.

Most of our million and a half teachers would welcome involvement and participation in world affairs. The world outside their classrooms and their immediate communities needs to come alive for them. Teachers have the natural curiosity of the learner; they have interest; most of them have a deep commitment to this country and prefer to resort to reason in settling international disagreements.

I would like to see every teacher have a meaningful experience other than tourism in other land and another culture. Short of this, which for many people and for a variety of reasons would not be possible, I think that there should be developed in the United States as many notable centers for the study of international affairs by schoolteachers as can be established, encouraged, and then identified for the teaching profession.

Where are the programs of international education that are specifically beamed at the public school teacher? Where can a teacher get a comprehensive view of world affairs in a summer?

To promote to the maximum the education of Americans for international cooperation and to involve cooperatively all relevant agencies, institutions, and key individuals in our society, I propose the initial establishment of 10 prototype, multifaceted, regional academic centers for international education. These centers would concern themselves with virtually every phase of international living and learning. They would promote, arrange, catalyze, and coordinate within their respective regions international activities for children, undergraduates, advanced graduate students, and adults, engaged in continuing study.

Such international centers would offer unusual opportunities for coordinating the academic and residential programs of many international students and Americans preparing for overseas service. They would support foreign and American students in a long-term regular academic program. In the centers assistance would be available for visiting educators from overseas being oriented in American culture and education. Such centers could also prepare more adequately for overseas activities an unending stream of American businessmen and other noneducators, as well as teachers and school administrators.

Carefully selected professors and advanced graduate students serving as interns would work closely with international students in their various areas of special interests. In turn, resident resource specialists would be appointed from among the international students connected with the center. It is envisaged that international students associated with these centers would be able to contribute directly, and on a regularized basis, to a pool of resource personnel available to public schools for supplemental teaching of social studies, history, and geography at the elementary and secondary levels.

The proposed facilities of the centers would focus on three aspects: (1) a materials and artifacts collection and documentation library; (2) lecture and seminar facilities; and (3) arrangements for teaching, research, and writing to foster a continual intellectual exchange at the highest level between different cultural groups committed to working in international and developmental education. This theme should be related to the production of more effective and adequately trained personnel in education and their greater availability for overseas service.

In the future we may expect to see the development of consortiums of educational institutions joining together in regional centers to seek solutions to the problems of overseas education.

The centers would act as focal points in attracting and successfully serving students and educators from overseas. Increasing numbers of foreign visitors, on educational and professional missions, are coming to the United States each year for brief periods of time. They are primarily interested in visiting cultural and educational centers in America for observation and for exchanging ideas and information with their colleagues and others in this country. To such visitors, a regional international center would offer a unique facility for assuring the widest possible range of university, community, and school contacts.

Academic centers for international education would also aim at initiating new programs and developing and strengthening existing programs of study and research.

To educate more Americans better for international cooperation, we must institute fundamental improvements at all levels of education: elementary, secondary, collegiate, graduate, and continuing education of adults. All have a valuable contribution to make. It is clear that when we improve the elementary school program, we affect virtually every American at an early age when lasting attitudes and viewpoints are formed.

The whole process starts with little children. We must be concerned not only with bright, eager children, but with the unfolding minds of the average and the not-so-bright child and the child whose cultural base is largely one of disadvantage. These children are numerous and they perceive the world in a different way from our version and our vision of it—and this limits their perspectives. We need to involve the American school—both public and private—in ways and in depth never before undertaken in world affairs. Every academic discipline has a contribution to make and in turn has much to gain from a major quest for greater international dimension. Through our common concern for international affairs, we can make cultural advancements which only come with interdisciplinary approaches to problems of living and learning.

What machinery can help us most to get on with the task of mobilizing the international competence of the United States?

Obviously the U.S. Department of State has played and will continue to play a powerful role in the field of international education, especially in other countries. It can do more than any other agency internationally to help to place education in its proper context of economic, political, and social advancement.

But the task of encouraging nearly 200 million Americans to be internationally oriented and minded also decentralization and the broadest participation of States and their local educational units. Much of the present impetus for an international outlook in education stems from the work of school systems and from the two thousand plus institutions of higher learning and their associational groups. These must be utilized.

I applaud Mr. Howe's concern about the private agencies and their importance. But, it seems to me that the U.S. Office of Education which, under the leadership of Commissioner Keppel, has been reorganized and expanded enormously to mount the greatest domestic educational effort in the free world, is the appropriate agency to coordinate this Nation's major thrusts in international education, lending all possible aid to States, communities, regions, and paraeducational agencies to adopt a vigorous plan for international involvement. Incentives are needed which only the Federal Government can provide in a comprehensive manner. In other words, I urge the creation of a major operation in the Office of Education to deal with international education.

In conclusion, I believe that the program I have outlined could be an appropriate national response of education to President Johnson's challenge to get on with international cooperation. Indeed, this conference can be the launch point in a comprehensive strategy for educating Americans for a world in which cooperation is the dominant theme.

Permanent Special Milk Program for Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which, if enacted, would provide a permanent special milk program for children, and extend the special milk program for children as currently authorized, beyond next year. It is necessary that this action be taken at this time to express the will of Congress that funds for the special milk program not be reduced as indicated by the budget proposal for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966.

Certainly, we are all for economy in government. We are all against unnecessary deficits, and we are all against inflation. We should and must scrutinize the budget, but we must use our own good judgment as to where appropriations should be maintained or increased, and where appropriations should be reduced or new programs delayed until such time as we can afford to take a look at them.

There is no segment in our population more important to the country than our children. There is no program that can provide better nutrition than has been developed through the special milk program for children. This program has been in operation since 1954. It has been enthusiastically supported by the school system and the other participating outlets. A program of this type cannot be started and stopped without destroying the confidence of State and local institutions in the Federal Government, and in fact in the U.S. Congress as well.

If there is to be a special milk program for children, the schools, day camps, and child-care centers must make plans. It is, therefore, imperative that the Congress act now, as I am sure it will.

The special milk program for children, although vital to the interests of our children, is also of extreme importance to dairy farmers, and the dairy industry. The milk furnished to children is marketed through commercial outlets, thus utilizing the facilities of our milk plants and making jobs for their employees. At the same time, it provides a market for approximately 1.6 billion pounds of milk for U.S. dairy farmers.

In Kansas in 1965, 34.9 million half pints of milk were paid for, in part, by Federal funds. The total expenditure in 1965 in Kansas was $1,131,000, and there were 1,285 schools, day camps, and child-care centers in Kansas participating in the program. Summarized below is a record of the performances of the special milk program for children in my own State:

Kansas—Special milk program, number of ½ pints of milk reimbursed, number of outlets participating, and program operations, 1955–65

Year	Number of ½ pints reimbursed (millions)	Number of outlets participating	Program operations
1955	5.2	512	$194,526
1956	14.5	907	505,072
1957	19.6	1,096	677,091
1958	21.3	1,128	719,153
1959	23.8	1,226	811,229
1960	25.6	1,244	891,342
1961	29.0	1,297	968,072
1962	30.8	1,303	1,026,728
1963	32.9	1,294	1,081,784
1964	34.9	1,260	1,160,000
1965	34.9	1,285	1,131,000

Wanted: Change of Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my attention a very forceful article on the current problem of coping with lawlessness, written by a former Michigan sheriff.

The article entitled "Wanted: Change of Attitude," appeared in the February issue of the American County Government magazine. It was written by Mr. Ferris E. Lucas, executive director of the National Sheriffs Association, which has some 20,600 members and is the largest organization of its kind in the world. For 18 years Mr. Lucas was sheriff of St. Clair County, Mich., and is a graduate of the FBI Police Academy. He is well qualified to make the challenging presentation contained in the article.

It follows:

WANTED: CHANGE OF ATTITUDE

(By Ferris E. Lucas)

Every sheriff in the United States is frequently asked by citizens of his county what can be done about the steadily rising crime rate and how the trend can be reversed.

While these questions are flattering, they are also frustrating. They are flattering because they show recognition that the sheriff is the primary locally elected official charged with the preservation of law and order in his county. It is frustrating because there are no easy answers * * * no simple, all-inclusive solutions to the problems of crime and criminal activities.

Federal Bureau of Investigation figures do show that crime has increased at a far greater rate than has our general population over the past decade. The statistics show that since 1958, while our general population rose by 10 percent, crimes of violence have risen 40 percent and crimes against property went up 61 percent. The greatest increase in crimes committed was seen in those persons under 25 years of age. Another phenomenon evident in the FBI reports is that crime is increasing in our suburbs at a faster rate than in our inner cities. This, of course, adds to the burden of the county sheriff.

While we can continue to quote facts and figures ad infinitum to show that the cost of crime apparently is continuing to spiral upward, we cannot generalize the basic answer to the omnipresent question, "Why?"

We are not alone. There is no person in our Nation so sure of his theories or hypotheses that he will attempt to pinpoint the exact cause of crime or prescribe the one magic pill that will erase this threat. We can only continue to probe and theorize. We might compare the problem to an attempt to solve a gigantic jigsaw puzzle complicated by having the pieces constantly changing as we try to arrange them in proper order. The pieces in our arcana are continually in a state of alteration because they are human beings, subject to differences in mood, desires, and needs.

The President of the United States asked for legislation to assist in the problem of isolating the roots of crime. He signed the enabling legislation (S.J. Res. 102 and H.R. 8027) September 22, 1965. At that time President Johnson stated that the goal of this legislation is "to develop facts, and having done so, to translate facts into active programs that attack the springs of criminal behavior."

He continued, "We are not dealing here with subsidies. The basic responsibility for dealing with local crime and criminals is, must be, and remains local." The local law enforcement officer "is the frontline soldier in our war against crime. He bears a burden which increases each day. We must give him modern training, organization, and equipment if he is to succeed in saving (us) from the malignancy of crime."

It is encouraging to note that all over the country people are beginning to look for the answers behind the rapid rise in criminality. Until a problem is recognized, until an illness is diagnosed, no treatment is possible.

This does not mean that we should figuratively throw up our hands in despair and say because we don't have an answer we must wait until one is found before we can attack the problem. Before penicillin, there was little that could be done for a pneumonia patient other than to make him comfortable and try to improve his mental attitude while waiting for nature to run its course. The physician did not give up but kept on trying to the best of his ability with the available knowledge and drugs of that day. We'll talk more about attitude shortly. While this word may not be the "24-hour relief" promised by some of our pharmaceuticals, it is, at the moment, apparently our best hope.

There are a number of questions asked of us daily. These questions usually relate to our basic query, "Why?" Let's examine some of these lesser interrogations.

A CRIMINAL CLASS?

What has caused the increase in crime? While we have always had crime and criminals, why has the intensification been more accelerated during the last decade? Why is crime increasing faster in the suburbs and smaller towns than in the cities? Do the juveniles who commit crimes come from any particular segment of our society? In other words, is there an identifiable criminal "class"?

The only apparently unfailing conclusion we are able to draw from the foregoing questions is that there is not a distinguishable criminal class per se. Biologists tell us that there are those who have been either shorted or gifted in their genetical inheritance. These differences in blood, bone, or texture cannot unfailingly be said to predetermine one's criminality or lack thereof. Sociologists tell us that environment plays a part in our lives. How important a role one's family and surroundings play is impossible, however, to measure exactly. Those of us who have seen and studied lawbreakers for years know that they come from all social strata, from all environmental backgrounds, and have intelligences ranging from moron to genius.

Juvenile delinquents or, as some prefer to refer to youthful offenders, juvenile criminals, come from culturally disadvantaged homes and from well-to-do families. At times they are intelligent; at others they are below the norm. Some come from broken homes; others come from perfectly normal homes with both parents seemingly fulfilling their parental roles fully. The only common denominator seems to be our familiar word, "attitude." The offenders do not look upon society as a friend but rather as a challenge.

The automobile is often blamed for the increase in juvenile crime. This seems an oversimplification. While it is possible that the automobile may have contributed somewhat to the reported rise in teenage pregnancies, it does not seem overly probable that it has had a material affect on the commission of serious crime.

A boy and a girl parked in an automobile, alone, and far enough away from their home neighborhood to feel safe from recognition by family friends, may indulge in biological familiarities which would be suppressed if they were instead within easy view of their parents. Mankind is, in part, biological, and Mother Nature can be a strong persuader. But can an automobile make a criminal out of a person who otherwise would be a law-abiding citizen? It seems there must be more to this question than the simple answer so often given.

Television is often blamed as being responsible for moral degeneration in our rural areas. Does this seem a reasonable assumption? I think not. While there is a certain amount of television which may properly be called a "wasteland," there are also many worthwhile programs. Does watching the President of the United States addressing Congress contribute to juvenile crime? A ridiculous question? Obviously. Of course, there are programs which teach little and are certainly not uplifting. There are programs which are considered by some as purveyors of sadism and sex. Let us remember, however, that all television stations operating within the United States are under the control of the Federal Communications Commission and the continuous scrutiny of the National Association of Broadcasters; so violations of public "decency" are necessarily held to a minimum. Here again, we return to attitude. If the attitude of the viewers demanded more programs of the caliber of "CBS Reports" or "Hallmark Hall of Fame" instead of "Peyton Place" or other "soap operas," the simple economics of staying in business would upgrade the entire television industry within a short time.

A QUESTION OF ATTITUDE

One question that we hear frequently is, "What can I personally do to decrease crime in my county?"

The answer briefly, simply, stated in one word, is again attitude. Attitude is defined as a mental position or feeling or emotion toward a fact or state of being. Let's think about this word and its correlation to the increase in crime.

The Michigan State University Police Administration Division has estimated that for every dollar lost by direct theft; i.e., shoplifting, in the Nation's stores, there are between $10 and $15 stolen by dishonest employees. This embezzlement includes both cash and merchandise. "White collar" crime may not fit into our usual picture of criminal activities but it does show the attitude of those who pilfered in excess of $1 billion last year.

Nor are the heads of some of our large corporations entirely free from guilt. One study indicated that 16 percent of the legal decisions against 70 of our top corporations were of a criminal nature: violation of trust, misrepresentation in advertising, rebating, etc.

Almost daily we hear of crimes committed in the presence of witnesses who stand idly by because they don't want to become involved. People die while neighbors watch. What is these neighbors' attitude toward life, toward their fellowman?

RESPECT FOR LAW

We have demonstrators who deliberately set out to violate some law or other in the hope of being arrested. What is their attitude toward law and order? Many of these protesters openly say that because they don't agree with the law, they'll ignore it. They go on to say that this is their right. Apparently some people's attitude toward law is that it should only be obeyed if it's convenient, if it suits their mood at the moment.

Some 2,000 years ago, the Greek thinker, Socrates, was tried and convicted of corrupting the minds of the Athenian youth. The charge was absurd. The sentence was death. The entire case has been considered a mockery of the principle of justice. As Socrates was being held in jail pending the execution of his sentence, a group of his friends urged him to escape. Escape would have been easy. Socrates, however, refused, Plato's Crito tells us that the Athenian answered his friends, saying: "Do you imagine that a state can subsist and not be overthrown, in which the decisions of law have no power, but are set aside and trampled upon by individuals?"

Socrates refused to escape because by so doing, he felt he would weaken the government of his city-state. He was fully cognizant that in a democracy a "bad" law can be written and enacted. An elected official can turn out to be incompetent or even corrupt. These isolated instances, however, do not give a right to the individual citizen to set himself above the law. If the law is bad, it can be changed. No unpopular law will long remain in force in a democracy. Even our Federal Constitution can be changed, and has been at least 22 times in the relatively short history of our Nation. If an official is unfit for office, he can be impeached, and, if found guilty, removed from office.

But while a law remains in effect, while a sheriff or other legally responsible law-enforcement officer attempts to enforce that law, while a judge sits upon his bench, the law and the judge's decision must be carried out. Only a higher court can set aside a verdict and even then it must be done under the very law governing the original verdict. No citizen can capriciously ignore or disobey a law or set aside a judge's decision. If he were allowed to do this, anarchy would result. Democracy of the type which has made our Nation great is based on government by laws, not by men.

Finally, the questions of more funds for the operation of sheriffs' departments, larger staffs, better trained personnel, adequate facilities—do we need these things? Yes, we do. We need them desperately, and I urge all county officials to take a long, hard look at the budget for the sheriff's department in their counties. Let them take the time to study the needs of their counties, the desires of their constituents. What is their own attitude toward law enforcement?

A physician can inoculate his patients against many diseases. Unfortunately, we cannot vaccinate our friends against criminal attack. We can only point out that even as the physician realizes the importance of his patients' mental attitude, so should we examine our attitudes and those of our friends and associates. Attitude then represents, if not an outright cure, at least a possible form of curative for the cancer of crime. Attitude: the individual's attitude toward himself, his family, his fellow man, his community, his State, his Nation, his laws, and social customs.

When a majority of people realize that it is they who can help control crime, who can materially help to preserve our Republic, then and only then shall we see a diminution of crime. Attitude is our hope for the future. John Donne, the British poet, put it most eloquently when he penned: "No man is an island, entire of itself. Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind."

Fino Urges Federal Income Tax Deduction for Apartment Rent Payers as Well as Homeowners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to provide a Federal income tax break for those who rent apartments instead of owning their own homes.

This legislation calls for a Federal income tax deduction to be allowed to rent-paying taxpayers in the amount of 7 percent of their yearly rent payments. Homeowners can presently deduct their real estate taxes paid, while rent payers get no deduction for the part of their rental payments attributable to real estates taxes. This bill would give the rent payer a deduction for the real estate taxes he indirectly pays.

This legislation will put rent payers on an equal footing with homeowners as far as deducting the burden of real estate taxes which falls upon them. While homeowners can deduct—quite rightfully—the entire burden of local real estate taxes, rent payers get no deduction at all for the real estate taxes which eat up about 14 percent of gross rental income throughout the Nation.

Because the landlord can deduct his real estate taxes from his Federal income taxes, he only passes on about half the cost of the taxes to the tenant. I propose to let the rent payer deduct that real estate tax burden from his income tax just like his homeowning friend can. The deduction my legislation would allow is 7 percent of the rental paid during the year. For many a middle-income family, this would mean another $100–$200 worth of deduction during the year, and a tax savings of $30–$65. I think that middle-income taxpayers deserve this equal treatment with homeowners. The added deduction would particularly benefit older citizens who, because of medical expenses, itemize deductions.

I realize that this would put a double deduction into our tax laws. The landlord corporation would have one deduction, and the tenant would then have another, smaller percentage, deduction. I do not see what is wrong with a double deduction when I know that double taxation is perfectly legitimate by present law. Double taxation of corporate dividends, for example. First the corporations pays a tax, and then the man in the street pays a tax on the dividends he gets from the corporation after the corporation has paid taxes. Frankly, I think double deductions are a better idea than double taxation.

In my 24th Congressional District of New York there is a community called Parkchester. With 12,000 families, it is the world's biggest one-owner rental community. My bill would give the families of Parkchester a tax break of approximately $500,000. My district will soon have another, even bigger, rental community—Co-op City—which will have 50,000 people when completed. My bill would also provide a great tax break for the residents of Co-op City.

I hope that Congress will soon give the rent payer his due. Each year, more and more people are renting homes. They have many expenses in connection with their rentals which are not deductible, while homeowners can more easily get deductions for expenses and improvements. I think my bill is a sound step toward tax equity for rent payers. payers.

United States Ponders Alcoholism in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, while serving as a member of the Iowa Board of Control, I became interested and deeply involved in the study of one of the worst diseases known to mankind—alcoholism.

Unbelievable as it may seem, there are over 5 million alcoholics in the United States. Because the members of an alcoholic's family suffer with him in the chaos and indignities that accompany his disease, it directly involves over 30 million Americans.

We too often fail to recognize that alcoholism is the third greatest health problem in the United States, trailing only heart disease and mental illness in severity.

While we are striving to put the economic opportunity program into full operation, we must recognize that we have a large number of persons who are well trained and fully equipped but have been rendered inoperative because of this disease.

The dynamic Governor of Iowa, Gov. Harold Hughes, is an alcoholic and is an active member of Alcoholics Anonymous. During a recent visit to Washington, Governor Hughes suggested a war on alcoholism to Director Sargent Shriver of the Office of Economic Opportunity. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to present an article from the Des Moines Register describing the Governor's proposals.

I would also like to insert an article from the Carroll Weekly Times on this same subject. It is only fitting that this article be inserted this month since it deals with Abraham Lincoln's profound views on alcoholism.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Feb. 14, 1966]

UNITED STATES PONDERS ALCOHOLISM DRIVE IN IOWA: HUGHES' SUGGESTION INTERESTS SHRIVER

(By George Mills)

An antipoverty drive to combat alcoholism among Iowa's low-income group is being considered in Washington, Gov. Harold Hughes said Sunday.

The Governor said such a drive would be justified because alcoholism is the cause of much poverty.

Hughes said he suggested such a project last week in Washington to Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). The OEO is in charge of the antipoverty program.

SHRIVER INTEREST

Hughes said Shriver expressed interest in the idea and indicated that perhaps a pilot project could be established in Iowa.

Any antipoverty money could not be spent to combat alcoholism directly, the Governor said. Many alcoholics have good incomes, he explained, and thus would not qualify for assistance through the OEO. But there are plenty of alcoholics in the low-income groups who do qualify, Hughes said.

Alcoholism causes serious difficulties to families and individuals, the Governor said, and leads to divorces and separations and to commitments to mental hosiptals and prisons.

"I am vitally interested in the development of such a program through the OEO if possible," the Governor said. Hughes is an active member of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) himself.

PRISON PROBLEM

A new report from the board of control of State institutions Sunday showed that alcohol is a major problem among prisoners in the State's three penal institutions.

The report covered a survey involving 2,287 persons incarcerated in the prisons: 1,247 in Fort Madison Penitentiary, 965 in Anamosa Reformatory, and 75 in Rockwell City Women's Reformatory.

The report said a total of 1,388 inmates in the 3 institutions have an alcohol problem, or slightly more than 60 percent of the total penal population.

The report showed 768 prisoners with an alcohol problem in the State penitentiary, 600 in the men's reformatory, and 20 in the women's reformatory.

[From the Carroll Weekly Times]

WISDOM THAT BEARS REPEATING TODAY: ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON ALCOHOLISM

(The profound insight of the great President into the dilemma of the habitual drunkard.)

In my judgment such of us who have never fallen victims have been spared more by the absence of appetite than from any mental or moral superiority over those who have. Indeed, I believe if we take habitual drunkards as a class, their heads and their hearts will bear an advantageous comparison with those of any other class.

When one who has long been known as a victim of intemperance bursts the fetters that have bound him, and appears before his neighbors clothed and in his right mind, a redeemed specimen of long-lost humanity, and stands up, with tears of job trembling in his eyes, to tell of the miseries once endured, now to be endured no more forever: of his once naked and starving children, now clad and fed comfortable; of a wife long weighed down with woe, weeping, and a broken heart, now restored to health, happiness, and a renewed affection; and how easily it is all done, once it is resolved to be done—how simple his language. Human feelings cannot resist.

I have not inquired at what period of time the use of intoxicating liquors commenced; nor is it important to know. It is sufficient that, to all of us who now inhabit the world, the practice of drinking them is just as old as the world itself—that is, we have seen the one just as long as we have seen the other.

Those who have suffered by intemperance personally, and have reformed, are the most powerful and efficient instruments to push the reformation to ultimate success. It does not follow that those who have not suffered have no part left them to perform. Whether or not the world would be vastly benefited by a total and final banishment from it of all intoxicating drinks seems to me not now an open question.

The victims of it (alcoholism) were to be pitied and compassioned, just as are the heirs of consumption and other hereditary diseases. Their failing was treated as a misfortune, and not as a crime, or even as a disgrace.

There seems ever to have been a proneness in the brilliant and warmblooded to fall into the vice—the demon of intemperance ever seems to have delighted in sucking the blood of genius and of generosity. What one of us but can call to mind some relative, more promising in youth than all his fellows, who has fallen a sacrifice to his rapacity? He seems ever to have gone forth like the Egyptian angel of death, commissioned to slay, if not the first, the fairest born of every family.

Happy day when—all appetites controlled, all passions subdued, all matter subjugated—mind, all-conquering mind, shall live and move, the monarch of the world. Glorious consummation. Hail, fall of fury. Reign of reason, all hail.

And when the victory shall be complete—when there shall be neither slave nor drunkard on the earth—how proud the title of that land which may truly claim to be the birthplace and the cradle of both those resolutions that shall have ended in that victory. How nobly distinguished that people who shall have planted and nurtured to maturity both the political and moral freedom of their species.

For the man suddenly or in any other way to break off from the use of drams, who has indulged in them for a long course of years and until his appetite for them has grown tenor a hundredfold stronger and more craving than any natural appetite can be, requires a most powerful moral effort. In such an undertaking he needs every moral support and influence that can possibly be brought to his aid and thrown around him.

It is an old and a true maxim that a drop of honey catches more flies than a gallon of gall. So with men. If you would win a man to your cause, first convince him that you are his sincere friend.

Is it just to assail, condemn, or despise them? The universal sense of mankind on any subject is an argument, or at least an influence, not easily overcome. The success of the argument in favor of the existence of an overruling providence mainly depends upon that sense; and men ought not in justice to be denounced for yielding to it in any case, or giving it up slowly, especially when they are backed by interest, fixed habits, or burning appetites.

Another error, as it seems to me, into which the old reformers fell, was the position that all habitual drunkards were utterly incorrigible, and therefore must be turned adrift and damned without remedy in order that the grace of temperance might abound, to the temperate then, and to all mankind some hundreds of years thereafter. There is in this attitude something so repugnant to humanity, so uncharitable, so coldblooded and feelingless, that it never did nor ever can enlist the enthusiasm of a popular cause.

Dumping, Antitrust Policy, and Economic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to place in the Record for the consideration of my colleagues an article entitled "Dumping, Antitrust Policy, and Economic Power," which will appear in a forthcoming issue of business topics.

The authors are Walter Adams, professor of economics at Michigan State University, a highly regarded economist and specialist in the antitrust field, and Joel B. Dirlam, professor of economics, of Rhode Island University. In the light of arguments made by proponents, their discussion of the implications of proposed antidumping legislation is particularly worthy of our attention:

Dumping, Antitrust Policy, and Economic Power

(By Walter Adams and Joe B. Dirlam)[1]

(Note.—This article is to appear in Business Topics, Spring 1966, and is here reprinted with the kind permission of the Graduate School of Business Administration of Michigan State University, publisher, and Professor Leo G. Erickson, editor.)

What is called dumping in foreign trade in the international equivalent of predatory price discrimination in domestic commerce. The Antidumping Act of 1921 was passed to protect U.S. industry from such predatory discrimination by foreign sellers. This law has remained virtually unchanged and unchallenged, and its administration was accepted by U.S. industry until, beginning in 1964, vigorous efforts were initiated to introduce fundamental changes in its provisions and philosophy. These changes, incorporated in the Herlong-Hartke bill (H.R. 8510 and S. 2045) currently pending in Congress, are the subject of examination in this article.

Present procedures under the Antidumping Act of 1921 provide for an inquiry by the U.S. Treasury, following a complaint, to determine whether an imported item is being sold in the United States at "less than fair value"—i.e., below the price for the same item, under comparable circumstances, in the country of origin. If the Treasury determines that there has been a sale at less than fair value—in other words, that price discrimination has occurred—it sends the case to the Tariff Commission for further action. The Commission must then decide, in the light of the evidence submitted, whether the discriminatory sales have caused an injury (or are likely to cause such injury) to a U.S. industry. Only after a finding of injury can special antidumping penalties be imposed.

In the past, the Tariff Commission appears to have followed the spirit in which the law was drafted, and has been careful to impose antidumping penalties only on imports which fell into the category of predatory price discrimination. Normally, the Commission has not regarded the mere existence of discrimination as sufficient to condemn the imports in question, because the lower U.S. price might have been designed to meet domestic competition or the low (but nondiscriminatory) price of other imports, or because the alleged injury to a U.S. industry was found to be nonexistent or de minimis.

In short, both the Treasury and the Tariff Commission appear to have consistently cleaved to a policy of curbing only predatory dumping injurious to U.S. industry.

Yet, in the face of this reasonable interpretation of a law enacted to protect U.S. business against the discriminatory tactics of foreign cartels, some industry groups now claim that the Tariff Commission is no longer applying proper antitrust concepts—that the Commission is whittling away at antitrust analogies and using standards other than those of unfair competition. In view of these allegations, it is instructive to explore whether the proposed changes in the Anti-Dumping Act would indeed be congruent with our traditional antitrust philosophy and legislation.

PHILOSOPHY OF THE SHERMAN ACT

The first Federal antitrust law was a political response to the popular outcry against the "Moloch of Monopoly" and the emergence of industrial feudalism. As early as 1888, the Republicans declared in their party platform their "opposition to all combinations of capital, organized in trusts or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens," and recommended "such legislation as will prevent the execution of all schemes to oppress the people by undue charges on their supplies, or by unjust rates for the transportation of their products to market." In the same year, the Democrats announced that "the interests of the people are betrayed when, by unnecesasry taxation, trusts and combinations are permitted to exist, which, while unduly enriching the few that combine, rob the body of our citizens by depriving them of the benefits of natural competition." And so, with hardly a ripple of dissent, the Congress enacted the Sherman Act of 1890—which Chief Justice Hughes later called a "charter of economic freedom."

The clear purpose of the law to curb the concentration of economic power and to prevent the attainment of market control, either by conspiracy or monopoly. Over the years, the courts have repeatedly emphasized this goal of antitrust legislation:

"It may well be assumed that Congress, when enacting that statute, shared the general apprehension that a few powerful corporations or combinations sought to obtain, and, unless restrained, would obtain, such absolute control of the entire trade and commerce of the country as would be detrimental to the general welfare."

"One of the designs of the framers of the Antitrust Act was to prevent the concentration in a few hands of control over great industries. They preferred a social and industrial state in which there should be many independent producers. The law wished that industrial and trading corporations shall operate under the checks and balances imposed by free and unrestrained competition. * * * Congress wished to preserve competition because, among other reasons, it did not know what to substitute for the restraints competition imposes."

"The fundamental purpose of the Sherman Act was to secure equality of opportunity and protect the public against the evils commonly incident to the destruction of competition."

"It cannot be doubted that the Sherman Law and the judicial decisions interpreting it are based upon the assumption that the public interest is best protected from the evils of monopoly and price control by the maintenance of competition."

---

[1] The authors are professors of economics at Michigan State University and the University of Rhode Island, respectively.

"Size should be jealously watched. In the final analysis, size is the measure of the power of a handful of men over our economy. That power can be utilized with lightning speed. It can be benign or it can be dangerous. The philosophy of the Sherman Act is that it should not exist. For all power tends to develop into a government in itself. * * * Industrial power should be decentralized. It should be scattered into many hands so that the fortunes of the people will not be dependent on the whim or caprice, the political prejudices, the emotional stability of a few self-appointed men. The fact that they are not vicious men but respectable and social-minded is irrelevant. That is the philosophy and the command of the Sherman Act."

The virtues of the competitive system which the Sherman Act sought to preserve need not be recounted at length. It is a system where consumers are protected against excessive prices and artificial shortages because no one seller (or group of sellers) can dominate price and output decisions; where technological innovations are not artifically restrained and where the economy is thus allowed to remain dynamic and progressive; where producers are assured of both economic and legal freedom of entry into markets and access to raw materials.

The attractiveness of this system is as much social and political as economic in nature. It derives from the fact that power is essentially decentralized; that there exists a broad base for the class structure of society; and that there is a basic freedom of opportunity for new men, new ideas, and new organizations to make their influence felt. It is a system deeply rooted in the American tradition—the tradition of federalism, the separation of powers, the separation of church and state, and the opposition of trusts and monopolies.

It was for these reasons that Congress passed the first antitrust law. It was for these reasons that legislators, judges, and economists ever since have sought to civilize, constrain, check, and harness market power—to purge it of its anticompetitive traits and to make it function in the public interest.

PHILOSOPHY OF THE CLAYTON ACT

Like the Sherman Act, later antitrust legislation reflected a pronounced hostility to economic concentration. However, instead of calling for a frontal assault on market power, these laws focused on the practices employed by powerful firms either to attain such power or to use it in an anticompetitive fashion. The objective here was to nip monopoly in the bud—to forestall damage to the competitive system in its incipiency.

Under the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, "all unfair methods of competition are hereby declared to be illegal." The Clayton Act of the same year forbids interlocking directorships between firms with combined assets of more than $1 million, and prohibits stock acquisitions, tie-in sales, exclusive dealerships, and price discrimination "where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly." These forms of market behavior are not outlawed per se, but only where they have the specified anticompetitive effects. Thus, hundreds of firms are permitted to merge with impunity every year, but Bethlehem may not combine with Youngstown and Du Pont may not acquire a controlling share of General Motors stock. A small firm may impose tie-in contracts and exclusive dealerships on its customers, but Standard Oil of California may not force its retail stations to sign a "requirements contract." The crucial test is not the practice itself, but its impact on competition.

Of course, this means, as the courts have repeatedly recognized, that decisions under the Clayton Act must eventually turn, not on what is done, but by whom it is done. As Justice Frankfurter pointed out in the Standard Stations case, the firm's degree of market control is the most important variable in determining the illegality of its acts: the greater the dominance of the firm's position, "the stronger the inference that an important factor in attaining and maintaining that position has been the use of * * * (devices) to stifle competition rather than to serve legitimate economic needs." A given market strategy may be inherently neutral; however, its use by an industrial giant, by the very force of circumstances, may inevitably convert it into a weapon for suppressing competition.

Experience with price discrimination underscores the validity of legislative purpose and judicial interpretation under the Clayton Act. Indeed, the incorporation of a price discrimination clause in the Clayton Act is largely attributable to the success with which the Standard Oil Trust had used this practice as a means of eliminating competition and achieving a 90-percent control of the petroleum industry.

After an elaborate investigation, the Federal Bureau of Corporations (a predecessor of the Federal Trade Commission) had found that: "One of the most effective means employed by the Standard Oil Co. to secure and maintain the large degree of monopoly which it possesses is the cut in prices to the particular customers, or in the particular markets of its competitors, while maintaining them at a higher level elsewhere." It engaged in selective, geographical price discrimination to eliminate competition, locality by locality, area by area.

It was the unfairness of this method, inter alia, which persuaded the Supreme Court to condemn the trust as unreasonable and to order its dissolution in 1911. It was the potential use of this practice by other would-be monopolists which persuaded Congress to include in the Clayton Act a specific bar against predatory price discrimination, i.e., discrimination which may have the effect of substantially lessening competition. The purpose was not to protect individual competitors, but to safeguard the competitive process itself against erosion.

In 1936, in the Robinson-Patman Act, Congress once again underscored its determination to prohibit price discrimination from being used as an anticompetitive or monopoly-creating market tactic. Just as the old Clayton Act was designed to prevent discrimination by powerful sellers (primary line discrimination), so the Robinson-Patman Act was to preclude the extraction of discriminatory discounts by powerful buyers (secondary line discrimination). Again, the prohibition was not couched in per se language but became operative only where there was probability or even possibility of anticompetitive effects.

Nevertheless, the Clayton Act (as amended by Robinson-Patman) permitted two defenses to a charge of price discrimination. The first, the so-called cost justification defense under section 2(a), stipulated that a seller, who could show that the different prices charged to different customers merely reflected the difference in cost of dealing with each, would be free of any legal liability.

His cost justification would stand as an absolute defense to the discrimination charge—even where the effect was to substantially lessen competition—because the law was intent on preserving the economies of mass production and distribution. The second defense, under section 2(b), allowed a seller to engage in price discrimination where he finds such conduct necessary to meet "the equally low price of a competitor in good faith." The obvious purpose here was to sanction price discrimination which was practiced in self-defense and, therefore, constituted a bona fide effort at legitimate business rivalry.

In sum, the Clayton and Robinson-Patman Acts are designed to protect the integrity of the competitive process by shielding the viability or profitability of small competitors against the predatory use of market power by their larger rivals. They seek to bar the use of price discrimination as "a cheap way of protecting a dominant position without seriously upsetting the market or as a source of competitive advantage unrelated to efficiency." In a word, they seek to forestall injury to competition, while preserving legitimate and genuine economies of scale in business enterprise.

A final word about "injury" resulting from price discrimination. In measuring such injury, the antitrust authorities have never had to face the controversial task—confronted in merger cases—of defining the "relevant market." The market is simply coextensive with the extent of the discrimination, and injury is related to the competitors disadvantaged by the discrimination.

If injury at the seller's level is in issue (primary line discrimination), as in the Anheuser-Busch case, the relevant market consists of all the competitors of the discriminating seller who suffer from the practice. If injury results from discrimination in favor of a large buyer (secondary line discrimination), as in the United Biscuit case, the relevant market comprises all the competitors of the favored buyer.

Neither the Federal Trade Commission nor the courts stop to inquire whether the product which is the subject of a discriminatory price is a substitute for one or more other products. Such inquiries are germane in merger cases, but not in cases involving price discrimination.

THE HERLONG-HARTKE AMENDMENTS

An examination of the proposed amendments to the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921 discloses a great many procedural changes which would make it more difficult for the Treasury to dismiss complaints, and would throw serious obstacles in the way of a finding that the challenged imports are not being sold in the United States at less than fair value. But we are not here concerned with these matters. Our task is to evaluate the allegation that the Tariff Commission has failed to follow antitrust principles, and to appraise the proposed Herlong-Hartke amendments in the light of those principles.

Two general considerations should be noted at the outset. First, there is no "antitrust" language in the Herlong-Hartke bill to parallel the Clayton Act provisions, tying measurement of injury to competition. While the antitrust laws are designed to protect the competitive process (rather than individual competitors), the very flavor of the proposed amendments, and the supporting speeches of their sponsors, neglect these essentials. Under the Herlong-Hartke bill, the relevant standard would be the impact of an import on the sales of a particular competitor in a particular market segment.

Unlike the Clayton Act, there would be no proviso to absolve imports which were devoid of substantial anticompetitive consequences or which could sustain a "cost justification" or "good faith" defense.

Second, the bill's proponents make no mention anywhere of the relative market power of the foreign sellers and the domestic industry—i.e., the comparative size of those who perpetrate discrimination and those who are its alleged victims. Indeed, and ironically so, the industries pressing most consistently and passionately for revision of the Antidumping Act are highly concentrated industries like steel and cement which seldom clamor for tougher antitrust laws. These industries are dominated by giant firms, while their foreign competitors are typically of trifling size.

Thus, the whole Belgian steel industry has less capacity than Bethlehem's plant at Sparrows Point, and no European cement company compares in size with Lone Star, Penn-Dixie, or Universal Atlas. Moreover, there is nothing to show that any European cartel is attempting to depress prices in foreign markets: producers' efforts, rather, are directed at keeping prices up—somewhat unsuccessfully.

Under the circumstances, the elements are simply lacking for justification, on antitrust grounds, for governmental protectionism that would result in higher prices to consumers. Large U.S. firms may find it difficult to meet the competition of smaller foreign firms; to date, there is little evidence that they are being subjected to predatory price discrimination by giant rivals. If the purpose is to guard against such an eventuality in the future, any revision in antidumping procedures should simply incorporate the relevant language of the Clayton Act. Liability should hinge on injury to competition rather than to individual competitors.

But what are the amendments which ostensibly represent the incorporation of antitrust principles into the antidumping law?

1. Definition of discrimination: Price discrimination must be measured from a base that reasonably reflects the normal price of the firm alleged to be threatening the competitive process. The Herlong-Hartke bill, however, would require the Treasury to make a finding of discrimination whenever the U.S. price (after adjustments for cost of shipment, etc.) is less than the price in the exporter's home country—even if he sells as little as 15 percent of his output in that market. If he makes less than 15 percent of his sales "at home", the Treasury can look to whatever country (other than the United States) takes the largest amount. We need scarcely point out that where there is such a diversity of markets, any systematic or pervasive threat to the United States is quite improbable. In any event, the bill, by arbitrarily selecting one market, with less than 15 percent of the sales, fails to provide a sound base from which to calculate the existance or extent of discrimination.

Even more curious—and showing the gulf between price discrimination as it has been attacked under antitrust and dumping as the Herlong-Hartke bill would define it—is the use of sales in the "home market" by firms not involved in the dumping proceeding as the base from which to determine discrimination. If a firm has geographically diversified sales, and has no sales in its home market, the Treasury is nevertheless directed to use as a base the sales in that market by any other firm, as long as that firm has 15 percent or more of its sales in the home market. In other words, one firm can be found guilty of price discrimination abroad, because of the prices charged by its rivals at home.

The bill would also revise the 1921 act to provide specifically that the foreign-market-value base from which the U.S. discrimination is to be measured may be modified for "differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery resulting from the fact that the wholesale quantities" sold in the United States are "less or greater" than the quantities sold elsewhere. But the "due allowance" the Treasury shall make depends on whether the reflection of the cost difference resulted from it being "actually considered and taken into account by the vendor in establishing his price."

This provision seems almost consciously designed to make it impossible for foreign sellers to justify any price differential on a cost basis, since proof that such costs were taken into consideration in making a price would superimpose a subjective issue on an already impossibly vague accounting determination.

2. Definition of injury: Supporters of the Herlong-Hartke bill place great emphasis on their proposed change in the definition of injury. Such injury is to be determined by measuring the impact of an import on the vendors of domestic merchandise in any area where the imports have been sold. When it appears that the imports have accounted for 5 percent or more of total sales in the market, the Tariff Commission is directed to find a violation—unless the exporter can show by "clear and convincing" proof that the domestic industry would not have increased its sales during the period in question—an obviously impossible burden of proof. Specific provisions require similar findings of injury, if the Commission concludes that imports contributed to a decline in prices on 50 percent of the domestic sales during any month, or a 5-percent decline in domestic man-hours employed.

The first of these provisions would seem sufficient to assure a finding of injury in almost any case where a complaint has issued. The bill defines the market so narrowly that even the smallest hamlet might qualify as the relevant area. According to the bill's language, it is "any geographical area to which" the import "has been supplied in competition with domestic merchandise of the same class or kind."

Under the second provision, the vulnerability of imports to adverse findings is heightened by extending the definition of the relevant product market in such a way that quite dissimilar items can be considered "competitive" in the same market. According to the bill, "reasonable interchangeability in use" is the standard to be used in judging whether a competitive product has been injured. This standard is crudely transplanted from merger law, where it is applicable, to price discrimination cases, where it is not.

3. Summary: The Herlong-Hartke bill, then, broadening the product market, narrowing the geographic market, minimizing the actual injury that need be shown to prove a violation—indeed, it is difficult to see how, under the 5-percent rule, there could in most cases be any actual injury to domestic markets—add up to what has often been called a policy of "soft" competition or protectionism. The domestic producers are to be shielded from competition by exporters—at the expense of the liveliness of the competitive process and to the detriment of the ultimate consumer—without inquiry into the relative market power of the domestic firms vis-a-vis the exporter.

It is one thing to protect the competitive process from predatory price discrimination, where there is no justification in terms of lower costs or the good-faith meeting of competition. It is quite another to design a law that incorporates defenses against discrimination of an ad hoc character which turn discrimination in international trade into a per se offense; i.e., an inherent evil.

When this is done in a context of arbitrary measurement of discrimination, so that discrimination must be found even in highly unstructured markets, using prices of firms other than the exporting firm as measures of value, one can only conclude that the Herlong-Hartke bill is intended to prevent competition rather than to eliminate dumping.

CONCLUSION

Contrary to the assertions of its proponents, the Herlong-Hartke bill is not an application of our traditional antitrust philosophy to the international trade of the United States. Instead, it represents an effort by the same interests against which antitrust has always been applied—the most highly concentrated segments of U.S. industry—to insulate themselves from competition and to sabotage the competitive process.

As Professor Ellsworth warned long before the Herlong-Hartke bill was ever introduced: "The charge of dumping is frequently but a smokescreen for general protection against foreign competition. To most businessmen and politicians, dumping means nothing more than sales at a price thought to be too low. Since a really competitive price is generally considered objectionable, the appeal to dumping as a basis for protection is likely to lead merely to a general increase in duties."

This warning is especially applicable to the proposed legislation. The controls embodied in the bill do not protect against monopoly, but tend to foster it. The aim of the bill is not to promote competition, but to prevent it—not to regulate imports, but to stifle them. Unlike the antitrust laws, the Herlong-Hartke bill protects industrial giants from competition, not the independents from discrimination. It represents an abuse of governmental power on behalf of vested interests which neither need nor deserve its beneficent dispensations.

McKittrick Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the members of the American History Club of Austin, Tex., which was organized in 1893, strongly supports the embodiment of McKittrick Canyon into my bill to establish Guadalupe National Park. Preservation of this area by our Federal Government is uppermost in our thoughts so that generations now and in the future may enjoy this spectacular natural phenomenon.

The American History Club of Austin has prevailed upon one of their members, Miss Frances Alexander, to summarize in verse the grandeur of McKittrick Canyon, which I submit today for the enjoyment of my colleagues:

McKittrick Canyon

(By Frances Alexander)

El Capitan stands tall,
Eight thousand feet and more,
To enthrall
The human eye,
And to confer,
With the taller Guadalupe peak
While they speak
Of distance and of time.
There they stanchly hold
Against the heat and cold
Against the rain and thunder
That strive to best their grandeur
And wash them to the sea.

Other lofty mountains
Range around them
And join their hardy set
Against erosion's leveling
Making beauty out of loss
With cliffside beveling
And shadowed canyon.
There, ponderosa pines
Five by seven score
With ring on ring
Keep tally
Of years on years
In gulch and valley.

Deep embedded fossils
In limestone walls
Make record that recalls
The shallow Permian Sea;
The whitened bones
And remnant arrow stones
Tell tales of the Apaches
And the Spanish searchers
For the seven cities
Built of gold;
And rusting bridle bits
Give credence to the story
Of Bartlett's lost patrol.

Thousands of feet
Below the cliffs' gray draperies,
A 4-mile trout stream
Traces McKittrick Canyon
And whispers tales
Of Old Ben Sublett,
His mine and nuggets
Then disappears
Into some hidden cavern,
Leaving the threading winds
To tell of other seekers
On nimble-footed mules
Who dared the edges
And explored the ledges
Finding seashells
Arrow heads
And plane propellers
Eagle nests
And rodent dwellers.

A modern cowboy
Breaks upon the skyline,
Looks across the vastness
Of the hardy peaks
And down into the hollows,
Then bravely follows
On sure-footed mount
To take the perilous turns
And dizzy switchbacks
Down and down and down
Into the many acred bowl
To find the level trails
By creatures made
Where virgin wilderness
Still keeps the elk,
The pig-nosed bear,
The big-horn sheep,
Wild turkeys,
And the porcupine.

Where rock wrens whistle
Above the thorn an thistle
And mockingbirds make song
Above the Lupine and the Columbine;
Where green-winged bugs
And crimson dragon flies
Seek pond and creek
That hold a streak of sky;
Sets maple trees aflame
And spring rains coax
Maguey and cactus bloom
Where weeping junipers
Give ample room
To sleeker trunked
Madrona clumps.

Saddle sore
The cowboy rests
Within a cool grotto
Where white stalactites
Slowly drip and grow—
No hotel register
Found to show
What hardy souls
Had rested there
Before him.
In fancy he can read
The names; Geronimo,
McKittrick,
Butterfield, Bob West,
Bartlett of the lost patrol
Ben Sublett and his own son Roith
And old Ben Watson
Who still declines
To tell the placing
Of the Sublett Mines.

The inky record
Would be scarcely dry
That held the names
Of Pratt and Hunter
And Noel Kinkaid
Of sourdough fame.

The cowboy leaves
The cool grotto
And mounts again.
He takes the upward trail
Through crag and brake;
And on Pine Peak at last
He gazes at the tumbled vast—
Then pictures to himself
The scientists
The journalists
The beauty lovers
Adventures and poets
Who may one day come to wonder,
And to companion
The majesty of mountains,
The mysteries of cave and canyons.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a "voice of democracy" contest. In the last contest over 300,000 school students participated in the contest and the winning contestants from each State were brought to Washington to compete in the finals.

These contestants vied for scholarship prizes ranging from the $5,000 first-place scholarship down to fifth prize worth $1,000 to the contestant.

I am proud that the winning speech from the State of New Jersey was that of Miss Jacqueline Squillace, of Cliffside Park, N.J., which is within my congressional district. I take this opportunity to congratulate Miss Squillace for presenting an excellent discourse on the topic "What Democracy Means to Me." I also wish to take this opportunity to extend to Miss Squillace my most sincere best wishes for her continued success in any endeavor which she may wish to undertake in pursuing her future education.

Since the subject has been so well covered and the speech so well written, I would like to share it with my colleagues in this honorable body. Under leave to extend my remarks, I present Miss Squillace's remarks as part of the RECORD so that my colleagues can have the benefit of her thoughts on this subject of democracy:

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

(By Jacqueline Squillace)

Democracy, I feel sorry for you. Hardly anybody seems to think of you any more. The world is so worried about atomic bombs, Vietnam, and income taxes, that it loses sight of your true meaning. People are so busy enjoying you that they never take the time to pause and think what life would be like without you. And when they suddenly find themselves on the verge of losing you or are plunged into war defending you, only then do they realize your true worth.

But let's think back for a moment and recall what you preach, Democracy. You claim that men are fit to rule themselves. Now that's a wonderful philosophy. Surely it's an idea worth dying for, but even better, living for. However, Democracy, I'm sure that self-rule isn't the only thing you stand for. Couldn't human respect and the dignity of the individual be included in your meaning, also? At least they used to be. I wonder what happened.

You've certainly had an interesting history, Democracy. Your beginnings in Greece were very distinguished, and even after the decline of that country, your presence was felt in Rome. Those were the good old days: The Roman Senate, all the fiery speeches in your defense, voting, and the proud boast: "I am a Roman citizen"—and then along came a man who changed the face of history: Julius Caesar. Democracy, you were almost unknown after the appearance of this man. The governments following his were either autocratic or in the hands of a minority. Then something wonderful happened. The American Colonies squirming under British rule, dreamed of establishing you as their form of government. But dreams such as their's could not be realized without paying a price—a terrible but glorious price called the American Revolution. Yes, men died for your sake, Democracy, but their sacrifices bore fruit. The Revolution was successful and from it emerged men of vision; architects of the new nation, whose blueprints consisted of new and daring ideas of government. After a stormy beginning, the young country, now called the United States of America, established itself firmly and became the model for other nations desiring liberty.

Then all of a sudden men forgot about you again, Democracy. They forgot most of all about your great ideas concerning human dignity and respect. It took the Civil War to remind them again, and even that didn't quite do it. There were two other wars, enormous wars, so vast that almost the whole world was involved in them.

Right now, Democracy, you are experiencing what is perhaps the worst period in your history. My friend, you are in danger of being removed from the face of the earth. You've had some formidable enemies before, but never one so ruthless, so cruel, so determined as communism. A single full-scale war is not being fought against this new threat, but a number of small ones which are getting bigger every day. These wars are not only being fought with bullets and bombs; oh, no, they're being fought with other more subtle things like espionage and underground plots, propaganda, and ignorance.

Unfortunately, these wars many times are not being won by those on your side, Democracy. Sad, isn't it that you've come so far, after such a long time, only to be in danger of being pushed right back into the oblivion from whence you came. When people think of communism, they don't think of losing you, they think only of losing their right to vote or some other personal freedom. If only we would realize what you mean to us, Democracy, and that everything we deem precious comes through you from God, I doubt whether anyone would have to feel sorry for you again.

Indiana University, a "Campus" Which Stretches Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gordon Englehart, staff writer for the Louisville Courier-Journal, has caught the spirit and the sinew of the new, "internationalized" Indiana University in his excellent article which appeared February 27, 1966.

This great Hoosier institution has assumed a role of influence throughout the world through its thousands of alumni from foreign lands and through its fine international studies program.

We are proud, and understandably so, of this great Midwestern university and its growing international reputation.

And we are honored to have Mr. Englehart and a newspaper of the stature of the Courier-Journal recognize the contributions Indiana University is making to the Nation and to the world.

The article follows:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY "CAMPUS" STRETCHES AROUND THE WORLD—FARFLUNG ACTIVITIES OF STUDENTS, FACULTY REFLECT ITS SPREADING INTERNATIONAL SCOPE

(By Gordon Englehart, Courier-Journal staff writer)

BLOOMINGTON, IND.—Hoosiers who fret that Indiana University has grown too big "on the banks of Jordan River" may be startled to learn how far flung the university really is.

Indiana University students—up to 200 a year—are pouring over books in universities along the Elbe River in Germany, the Manzares in Spain, the Rhine in Germany, the Reno in Italy, and the Lower Rimac in Peru.

Indiana University faculty members are directing government or Ford Foundation projects near the Indus River in West Pakistan, the Rio Negro in Uruguay, the Orinoco in Venezuela, the Ganges-Brahmaputra in East Pakistan and the Chao Phraya in Thailand.

Other Indiana University faculty members—at least 70 this year—are studying, teaching, or doing research close by famous rivers all over the world, including the Naktong in Korea.

It's a two-way street. Some 1,000 students from countries around the globe are enrolled every year at Indiana University.

Lynne L. Merritt, Jr., vice president for research and dean of advanced studies, stood last week beside an enormous world map on his office wall.

PINS ON THE MAP

Here, there, everywhere, in every continent, were stuck tiny flags and pins with colored heads—denoting places where Indiana University people are at study and work.

"This is an international university now, in a way, in part," said the towering Merritt, drawing slowly on a cigar.

"I've been here 24 years, and when I look back, the university has really changed. We had a few students from abroad. There were a few foreign faculty members, but not many."

The change, Merritt said, "is due almost entirely to Wells" (Chancellor Herman B. Wells, who served as president form 1937 to 1962).

"Wells is a remarkable person. What I suspect is, he started out early to make Indiana University a major institution. He did it by going around and picking up the best professors, some experts on various areas, some of them natives from these countries.

"He would meet outstanding students abroad, and pretty soon they'd show up at Indiana University, saying they had met Wells one place or another."

Out of all this grew Indiana University's present major programs for training and research in African, Asian, Latin American, Russian and East European and Uralic-Altaic studies.

"It's been a very gradual evolution," Merritt said.

The Latin American program is typical. To start with, Spanish and Portuguese were taught. These courses in turn "tended to create a few courses in culture" and—finally—a comprehensive area-studies program.

Today, a student is offered a wide choice of courses dealing with races, geography, history, social problems, folklore, and literature of all Latin American nations. The other area programs cover the same fields.

WAR SPEEDED PROCESS

World War II helped speed up the internationalizing process. Indiana University during the war was called on by the Army to train people in "critical languages."

"At the end of the war, there was a big spurt in special languages," Merritt said. "Then, about 1954, the AID (U.S. Agency for International Development) and the foundations started coming in with overseas contracts."

Under such contracts, the AID or the Ford or other foundations pay the costs of Indiana University people carrying out specific projects all over the world.

In Thailand, for instance, Indiana University personnel spent 8 years setting up an institute for training teachers, and 9 years establishing an institute for training public administrators. That project has since been expanded to cover business administration, statistics, and economic development.

One result Merritt noted proudly, "We probably have more alumni in Thailand than any other university in the world."

Among many "contract" jobs over the years: training medical-school teachers in West Pakistan; training clerks, typists, and secretaries in Indonesia; training nurses in Korea; audiovisual instruction for Africans.

Indiana University today is administering eight contracts:

Starting an institute of education and research in West Pakistan

Training vocational-education teachers at the University del Trabajo in Uruguay.

Teaching audiovisual techniques in Nigeria.

Observing a Peace Corps project in Sierra Leone. Peace Corpsmen have trained at Indiana University.

Upgrading the economics department of Catholic University of Caracas, Venezuela.

Upgrading business methods of the National University of San Marcos, Peru.

Setting up an institute of business administration at the University of Dacca, East Pakistan.

The continuing Thailand project.

Indiana University's international-studies program got a tremendous boost in 1961 from a $2.8 million grant by the Ford Foundation. And this year, Ford threw in $3 million more.

FOUR UNIVERSITIES JOIN

Ford in 1964 also made a $3.5 million grant to the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Actvities (MUCIA), composed of Indiana University, Wisconsin, Michigan State, and Illinois.

With this money, the four universites are joining in various projects, in Nigeria, Peru, Thailand, Okinawa, and other countries, and are sweetening related research by their own graduate students.

Indiana University also has joined six other universities in another consortium to help develop sciences at Mindanao State University in the Philippines. This, too, is Ford-financed.

In 1959, Indiana University opened a study center for Indiana University students at the University of San Marcos in Lima, Peru.

Last September, along with Purdue University, it opened similar centers at universities in Hamburg, Germany; Madrid, Spain, and Strasbourg, France. By itself it opened another at the university in Bologna, Italy.

About 30 students each are enrolled at Lima, Hamburg, Madrid, and Strasbourg and nine at Bologna.

Every student is proficient in the language of that country. Most are language and literature majors, but Indiana University is trying to interest students in other major fields. One Indiana University or Purdue faculty member oversees each center.

By last May, the internationally oriented programs at Indiana University had grown so rapidly and in such profusion that the board of trustees established an International Affairs Center to coordinate them all.

TRAINING FOR FACULTY

The center, directed by Robert F. Byrnes, not only rides herd on the campus programs, the overseas contracts, the foreign college study centers, and folklore, international business and international development research programs.

It also has charge of student and faculty exchanges with other schools, the summer honors program for high-school students who are sent to Mexico, France, and Germany, and a nonwestern studies project which provides training for faculty members from 34 Indiana colleges. And there are other programs.

Why this great reaching out by a landlocked State university in a State that has long been viewed—rightly or wrongly—as insular and isolationist?

"It's just a matter of living in a modern world," Merritt said simply.

"Back in the 1800's, a person in Indiana didn't expect to go abroad; he didn't expect to see someone from abroad; this country itself didn't have much to do with foreign countries.

"Nowadays you have to know what's happening abroad. It's a proper part of student training."

"The university," Merritt said, "has teaching, research, and service obligations to the State, the country, and the world.

"Contracts abroad are part of our service obligations, not just to the State and the world, but to the United States. The United States, for instance, has an interest in seeing that Thailand remains free. And this is tied up with its economic development.

"Universities are the only places that can carry out some of the contracts sponsored by the AID. Many involve establishing or bettering educational systems abroad."

The university has benefited, Merritt added, through a faculty that has become much more knowledgeable and experienced.

Another boon is a larger facutly. Professors on overseas contracts are paid by the AID or the foundation. State money that had been provided for their salaries is used to hire replacements on the campus.

REPLACEMENTS RETAINED

When the contract professors return in a coupel of years, they are absorbed back onto the State payroll, while the replacements are retained.

Merritt said this practice is justified because of normal growth of the university and its departments.

Sometimes a top-notch man is hired away from another university specifically to take on an overseas contract. When that's finished, he returns to Indiana University.

Earlier this month, the Indiana University international program drew high praise in a 300-page report by Education and World Affairs, a private, nonprofit organization that studied Indiana University, Cornell, Michigan State, Stanford, Tulane, and Wisconsin.

The report said there's no ready explanation "why this small frontier college should grow into a university with a worldwide reputation and strong international commitments."

But it suggested that it "is attributable to the interplay of three elements:

"The individual enthusiasm on the part of the facultey members; the backing of the administration, especially the internationalizing influence of Chancellor Wells, and the resulting climate on the campus, which helped stimulate more and more international involvement."

Whatever the reasons, Merritt obviously enjoyed telling about a recent trip he took through Africa with some fellow MUCIA representatives.

"No matter where we go, way out in the bush, we always run into a graduate of Indiana University," Merritt quoted one of his companions as saying.

Ability Counts, Not Disability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues an amazing success story concerning a resident of Anadarko, Okla., in my district, which I think is most inspiring.

Mr. Lawrence P. Kuykendall, at the age of 10 years, came in contact with a high-tension electric power wire while attending a county fair. He survived, but his injuries were so major that both of his arms had to be amputated just below the elbows.

His remarkable will, not only to survive but to prevail, made Mr. Kuykendall a success in his occupation as a drivers' test examiner, an active civic worker, and as head of a family.

Mr. Kuykendall's story should be widely told to serve as an inspiration to handicapped people everywhere.

The Lawton, Okla., Morning Press related this very interesting and inspiring feature story in the November 26, 1965, issue, as follows:

SET HIS OWN PATTERN; HE'S THANKFUL: HANDLESS YOUTH MAPS SUCCESSFUL FUTURE

CHICKASHA.—Are you truly thankful? Appreciative?

Lawrence P. Kuykendall, a Fort Sill employee from Anadarko, whose arms were partially amputated as the result of an electrical accident at the age of 10 years, is a smiling, bright-eyed man who didn't give up, and who is truly thankful for his blessings.

The accident which cost Kuykendall his hands and the lower part of his arms occurred when he grabbed a high-tension wire while attending a Caddo County fair. It was necessary to amputate his arms just below the elbows.

Love is the one thing that has helped Kuykendall overcome his handicap, he told an Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts class in health, physical education, and recreation.

"When I came home from the hospital, my mother cried and like all parents sobbed out her worries about my future. She was so concerned, I cried, too.

"Right then and there I made up my mind to relieve my mother's anxieties, to overcome my handicap, and to prepare myself to make a living," he told the class.

Admonishing the students to make something of themselves and to be of help to others and of service to mankind, he told the students, "Preachers need your help, parents need your help and teachers need your help. You can give them your cooperation and attention in order that you may achieve the goals they dream for you."

Kuykendall told the group that from his experiences, he had developed his own pattern for life and his concern for following, in order that he, too, might lead, the teachings of first, God; second, parents; and third, teachers. "I call this my 'Big Three.' "

Kuykendall's mother helped him as a lad obtain his first job * * * that of carrying papers for the Anadarko Daily News. It happened this way: The paper's circulation manager came by his home. Mrs. Kuykendall asked about a job as a carrier for her son. The deal was made that Lawrence could have a route, if he established one for himself. With this in mind, he started out. The first day he picked up 10 papers, and by nightfall he had 10 customers. The second day, he picked up 20 papers, and so it continued until he developed his own route of 145 customers. He held this job 7 years, or until he entered Langston University.

A natural as an athlete, Kuykendall didn't let his handicap keep him from performing. For 4 years he was captain of his high school football team. He also lettered in basketball and softball, and during county fair time, he was a jockey, riding horses owned by the late Eli Phillips. Upon graduation, he was presented a medal as the school's outstanding athlete.

At Langston University, he continued his athletic career, playing football and basketball, while majoring in history.

Kuykendall, who has been a Fort Sill employee 19 years, for some years now has been a civil service driving instructor.

He started to work at Fort Sill, as a summer laborer in 1942, to earn money to return to Langston. When he returned to Fort Sill, he was employed as a truckdriver, an automotive equipment operator, a test rating examiner and a driver's test examiner. It is estimated he has licensed over 300,000 people in the last 15 years and teaches classes in "how to drive everything over a deuce-and-a-half * * * tractor and trailers, dump truck, 37- to 45-passenger buses."

At one time Kuykendall held down five jobs, although he always considered the one at Fort Sill as No. 1. He was an athlete at Langston at the same time Marcus Haynes was there. When Haynes left the Harlem Globe Trotters to form the Harlem Magicians, he immediately thought of Kuykendall.

"He asked me to join the team, feeling my handicap would prove a drawing card. I couldn't feel I would leave my Fort Sill job, but I often took my leave to play with the Magicians, or flew to join them for top games. On these occasions, I played one night, then flew back to be on the job at 8 o'clock the next morning."

At the same time, Kuykendall refereed Fort Sill football games on Saturday afternoons, and from 7 to 11 p.m. was a disk jockey for a Lawton radio station.

The fifth job was that of operating a grocery store, with help of his family. The store was started with $135 cash and with perserverence, it grew until 4 years later he was offered $7,000 for the business. After 15 years in the grocery business as a sideline, and after Mack Kuykendall (a son now a student at OCLA) signed with the Chicago Cubs, the family decided to get rid of the grocery business.

Instead of selling out, Kuykendall actually gave it away. He called customers who owed him money telling them he was canceling their debt and that if in the future he reentered business, he would appreciate having them trade with him. He gave sacks and boxes of food to many. The icebox and other like equipment, he gave to the church.

While Kuykendall has been a busy man with his many jobs, he hasn't given up sports either. From service personnel at Fort Sill, he organized the Kuykendall Road Runners, a group that includes eight men and three WAC's. The team plays anybody, but largely it is in demand for benefit games sponsored by civic clubs or other groups.

At the age of 18 years, Kuykendall wrote a poem, which in a manner of speaking, reveals his philosophy of life. Two lines are quoted as an example, "Rest if you must but don't you quit" and "many a failure would have been won without a doubt if you'd just stuck it out."

Kuykendall's family includes his wife, Nevana; two sons, Don, a student at Oklahoma State University, and Mack, a student at OCLA; and a daughter, Kathleen, at home.

A History of the Chicago Motor Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Motor Club has been in the forefront serving its members and the general motoring public for 60 years.

This year, 1966, the Chicago Motor Club marks its 60th anniversary.

Like many other business and social groups which have formed associations and clubs to protect their interests, the motor club was founded in 1906 to protect the rights and interests of a new group on the American scene—motorists. The motor club, whose territory embraces the northern two-thirds of Illinois and the northern tier of counties in Indiana, is affiliated with the American Automobile Association.

Always interested in the safety of young people, the motor club has, since 1920, sponsored and actively supported the school safety patrol movement. A pioneer in patrol organization, the club has spent considerably more than $2 million in continued support of the patrol. To maintain the patrols, the club provides, free of charge, numerous items to patrol units in Illinois and Indiana.

It has been estimated that since the patrols were pioneered by the Chicago Motor Club in 1920, some 17,500 persons in Illinois and Indiana are alive today who otherwise would have become child traffic fatalities.

The motor club has been a leader in another major area concerning traffic safety for young people—high school driver education. During the early 1930's, the club quickly saw the merits of a new idea—to teach youngsters the proper methods of driving as part of their high school curriculum.

Since 1946 the club has helped to provide 4,700 dual-control driver training cars for use in Illinois and Indiana high schools. Also, since that year the club has helped to train more than 1,700 driver education instructors through intensive courses at Northwestern University, the University of Illinois, and Purdue University.

Statistics strongly point to the effectiveness of driver education. Evidence indicates that youths who complete the courses have only half as many accidents on the average as those who have never had such training.

In 1958 the Chicago Motor Club inaugurated its first Illinois Editors' Traffic Safety Seminar, a nonprofit organization devoted to helping newsmen reduce traffic accidents and fatalities throughout the State. The seminar is held annually, attracting each year some 200 newspaper editors and editors of industrial publications to its sessions.

The club has been an important factor in the promotion of neighborhood traffic safety for the past 30 years. The club since that time has sponsored several area councils which have brought together community and neighborhood civic and business leaders, educators, and others interested in traffic safety.

Through the tireless efforts of these groups, under the sponsorship and active support of the Chicago Motor Club, countless traffic safety projects, such as traffic signals, grade separations, traffic channelizations, and many other improvements to traffic safety and flow have been effected by these groups.

As a watchdog to motorists' pocketbooks, the club has been effective over the years in guarding against raids on motorists' tax money for nonhighway purposes. The club has been credited with a major role in many successful campaigns to prevent enactment of legislation designed to divert motorists' tax money; likewise the organization has been instrumental in preventing unjust and exorbitant taxes against motorists.

In the early days of the motor club, when cars were gradually becoming accepted in increasing numbers, the need for improved highways because a vital necessity. To pull the motorist "out of the mud" and to give him good, well-marked highways was a cause fervently championed by the club. The club continues today to fight for adequate highway facilities to meet the demands of the modern motorist.

The Chicago Motor Club, whose ever-growing membership now is approaching 300,000, is proud of its hard earned reputation as the strongest force in its territory for safeguarding the interests of the motorist in such matters as taxation, legislation, modern highway construction, traffic control, and safety. The club is pledged to remain in the frontlines battling for the safety and protection of its members and the motoring public.

Education for All Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the address of Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., of Southern Illinois University, entitled "Education for All Mankind." It was prepared for lay citizens' leaders in education, as Dr. Reuter is a member of the Illinois Citizens Education Council and adviser to the National Committee for the Support of the Public Schools.

I thus desire to call the address recently delivered in Chicago to the attention of my colleagues:

EDUCATION FOR ALL MANKIND

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

The winds of equality are blowing irresistibly throughout the world today. It was first Thomas Jefferson and later Abraham Lincoln who unchained the seeds of equality in America. It was not a lesson to which either statesman accepted willingly or quickly. The conviction which finally resulted in the Declaration of Independence and the Emancipation Proclamation took much of their adult years to conceive and develop. In fact, there was an earlier seed planted outside America. This came from the great Persian poet, Saadi, who wrote of man's inhumanity to man as follows: "You who can keep aloof from the misfortunes of your other you, have no claim to the title of man."

Many years later President Franklin D. Roosevelt, with his New Deal, harnessed the wild horses of revolution to the wagon of measured reform. He built upon the foundation of free enterprise a system of stability truly responsive to the needs of our Nation—a peoples' capitalism of wealth widely shared.

The men who laid the foundation of this country had definite convictions regarding the objectives of a free people. The primary one was to assure that the rights of every human being would be safeguarded and that he would have the opportunity to develop his talents and capacities fully. Many of these dreams have been delayed for generations. Without presuming to make a precise allocation of the blame, we think it is beyond question that the contemporary conservative philosophy, which has dominated in many marketplaces in America for generations, has made a sizable contribution toward blunting the objectives of the Founding Fathers. Of course, there has always been a certain number of people making a living on the educational iconoclasm circuit.

We cannot fear to face the world or the needs of our times. We must invite to this land of freedom the peoples of all nations and all races equally. We must offer equal justice to all the people and be sufficiently flexible in conducting our international affairs so as to serve the best interest of our Nation.

Given the prevailing winds, it seems equally undesirable that the opponents of mankind have provided fresh impetus for disrespect for law and order. A prime example is education. Yes, occasions bring back vividly the events which led to the establishment and development of our public and private educational systems. At any given time since Washington Irving, there have been books and individuals attacking current practices in education. The early croakers and prophets of doom as usual have been wrong.

Americans across the political spectrum are now engaged in vigorous and at times heated debate over our country's role and purpose in public and private education. The enactment of needed Federal legislation in the area of education in 1965 by the Congress, and the serious consideration of additional educational bills, have provided serious criticism. The growing intemperance has evoked a menacing climate intolerant of any expression of agreement in many circles. We venture no simple solution to these complex, even agonizing problems that must be solved. We urge only that after adequate Congressional debate that must ensue that the fundamental and necessary educational programs of President Johnson for 1966 be allowed to proceed untrammeled.

Those who support the Johnson program in the area of education find the same opponents as in the areas of civil rights, reapportionment, and urban development. Great polyglot cities have learned to absorb newcomers, no matter how strange, impressive, and awe inspiring, but they urgently need additional Federal assistance. While money is not the sole goal, it nevertheless, facilitates all relations and is important in the development of adequate programs where most of the people live.

The idea of our Founding Fathers that we must provide assistance when needed is deeply imbedded in Jewish tradition that has been brought into our culture. The Hebrew word "mitzvah," frequently used to connote "good deed," means "commandment." The common term for charity, "tsdokeh," can be defined as "social justice." The current burdens of the Johnson administration and the liberals are great in this area. The liberal is considered here as a leader with an open mind, unafraid of change, with faith in the improvability of mankind, happiest on the side of the angels and willing to battle for all people.

ANCIENT BACKGROUND

A foundation of ancient culture is necessary and Christianity provides the avenue of approach. Belief, faith, truth, and free will are several key terms that mankind has used to understand and develop sound governments, and later educational programs. There is belief on the basis of reasonable evidence. The Bible teaches certain things. The importance of belief cannot be overemphasized if we are determined to live Christian lives. The Christian has a firm belief in the teaching of the Bible, the power of Jesus Christ to save and support his life, the promise of the word of God that eternity with all its indescribable opportunities lies before him and these are his for the asking. Belief becomes an implicit trust, it goes beyond what is known, beyond what appears to be reasonable.

We receive the grace of God by faith. We claim the promises of God by faith. We endure suffering for Christ's sake by faith. Faith causes one to desire to please Christ and to be energized for doing the work of Christ. If faith is not productive of good works, it is dead. If it does not inspire hope and love, it is unreal. If it does not lead to obedience and unselfish service, it is futile. If it does not contribute to fortitude and humility and loyality, it is a farce. Faith is the means by which we apprehend spiritual truth, comprehend it and put it into practice. A Christian society is as revolutionary a condition as you can imagine, and it is our job to promote that revolution.

Skeptics either flatly deny the distinction between truth and falsehood, or they put truth utterly beyond the reach of man's understanding, or, as in the case of the Sophists, they regard as true whatever anyone wishes to think is true. In the ancient world, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle were vigorous opponents of the Sophists. In our day, Sigmund Freud asserted that those who claim there is no such thing as truth are intellectual anarchists.

Philosophers such as Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, Kant, and Hegel believed that we have the power to choose our actions freely, and that we know that our wills are free. The determinists were the critics here. "Free choice," Aquinas asserts, "is part of man's dignity." Hegel says: "Freedom is just as fundamental a character of the will as weight is of bodies." The freedom of the will, Descartes maintains, is a matter of universal experience known to all men. According to this view, people are morally responsible for acts they commit of their own free wills. French existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre is a believer in the view that our wills are free. He writes: "Man is condemned to be free. This is true, because once he is thrown into this world, he is responsible for everything he does."

From the time of Aristotle and Plato, people have earnestly debated the role of government in a nation's economic life. There has never been a time in American history when government has not participated in our economic life. Pope John XXIII, in his encyclical "Mater et Magistra," in 1961, recognizing that industries undergo sudden and profound changes, stated: "Workers should be allowed to play an active part in the affairs of an enterprise" and pointed out that those who are daily involved in an enterprise must not be reduced to the level of mere silent performers, concluding, "It is appropriate and necessary that besides the holders of capital or their representatives, the workers, also, or those who represent their rights, demands, and aspirations, should have some place in such authorities or institutions."

CURRENT REALITY

It is no longer revolutionary to urge, as it was when Pope Leo XIII stated it in 1891, in the encyclical "Rerum Novarum," that working conditions which unduly endanger health and safety cannot be tolerated and that wages, due to the inherent dignity of man, must be such as to keep him and his family in reasonable comfort.

Yes, we have become the finest illustration in history of how a people enrich life and raise their whole level of economic well-being when they are given justice, liberty, and incentive. Many examples could be cited, but certainly a prime one was Dr. C. Oscar Johnson, who was one of the greatest forces for good ever to serve the metropolitan area of St. Louis, on both the Missouri and Illinois sides. He was pastor of the famed Third Baptist Church in St. Louis for 27 years before he retired in 1958. He was a tireless fighter for right and truth and justice. He died on November 24, 1965, in Oakland, Calif. He enriched the lives of all who knew him, but his lay service to public education, as a member of the St. Louis Board of Education will be remembered, as well as the fact that he was mighty and strong and powerful in the pulpit for Christianity and humanity.

Thirty years ago only 1 out of every 8 employed Americans had been to high school. Today, 4 out of 5 attend high school. Thirty years ago, only 4 percent of the youth were in college. Today the figure is 35 percent for the entire country, and about 50 percent for metropolitan areas. An estimated 54 million students, or about 28 percent of the total population, are enrolled in schools and colleges this academic year. We will spend at least $39 billion on education during the current school year.

The Federal Government has responded to the educational challenge at many levels and with increasing means, but this must not indicate that the States and localities can abdicate their responsibilities. As we strive to meet the needs of the Nation in a new and changing world, there is still an enormous amount of unfinished business. Vast backwaters of educational poverty still exist in our beloved America.

The demands are thus growing. Machines supply 98 percent of the power for our industry. Workers are free from the hardest physical labor and drudgery. Our people have more leisure hours, receive better wages, and have more plant, equipment and energy-producing facilities working for them than any people in any other setting. There is the growing acceptance now by employers and employees of the philosophy that the economy of a nation operates best if credit at all times is relatively easy with interest rates kept low.

By just considering one industry for a moment, we find that by 1980, it is estimated that we will have 50 million more automobiles on our highways. If our population increase continues at its rate, we will have 350 million people by the end of the next 35 years and they will use 300 million cars.

FUTURE NEEDS

The Federal Government has spelled out the principle of State leadership in the culminating provision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Title V of the act is directed to help build our State departments of education, the pivotal agencies on which we must depend if we intend to keep American education both strong and decentralized.

In our beloved country, Government statistics show that of every 100 who reach age 65 in America, 84 are without funds, 8 are very poor, 6 are comfortable, and 2 are well off. We must continue to help mankind at home and abroad. In Africa, 97 percent of the 240 million people are of African origin and they speak seven hundred languages or dialects and live on a continent almost 5,000 miles long and 4,500 miles wide. The needs are great, because 85 percent of the people cannot read or write and 62 million of the 83 million children of school age are not in school. The average annual income of $132.00 per person is less than that of any other continent. Even in South America, over 50 percent of the adults are unable to read and write.

These pressures from within and without America are great and they are expanding. Regardless of philosophy, our citizens must become aware that action in the public sector must be as imaginative and progressive in providing the public service we will require as the private sector in providing the luxuries we will want. The proper approach is to prepare now domestically and internationally. From our recent book, "Democracy and Quality Education,"[1] we suggest the guidelines for the single area of public education and it is our firm wish that others will suggest guidelines for the other vital areas. The guidelines are:

1. The public must recognize proper status of teachers.

2. The public must recognize educational trends.

3. The public must recognize the role of the educational specialist.

4. The public must recognize the seriousness of the problem (status quo).

5. The public must recognize the importance of learning.

6. The public must recognize the importance of the eradication of fear and doubt.

7. The public must recognize the importance of serving the needs of great numbers.

8. The public must recognize the importance of teamwork.

9. The public must recognize the importance of improving accelerated learning programs.

10. The public must recognize the need of providing for the slow learner.

11. The public must recognize the need of selecting qualified teachers for exceptional children.

12. The public must recognize the need for including hand and tool subjects in the curriculum.

13. The public must recognize the need of utilizing a sound physical education program.

14. The public must recognize the need for including a program of adult education.

15. The public must recognize the need of furthering home economics.

16. The public must recognize the need of the proper type of supervisor.

17. The public must recognize the need of including the junior high school in the overall plan of public education.

18. The public must recognize the need for positive, cooperative attitudes with private education and private institutions.

19. The public must recognize the need of permitting and encouraging collective bargaining among teachers.

20. The public must recognize the need of equal educational opportunities for all.

21. The public must recognize and encourage experimentation in education.

22. The public must recognize the psychology of students and teachers.

23. The public must recognize and encourage careful examination of existing educational programs at all levels.

These 23 guidelines will be important in providing quality education under democratic procedures for all children. Let us, therefore, reinforce the American conscience and the American ethic. The Bible reminds us: "Where there is no vision the people perish." By providing vision for the future, education will become a major part of the Great Society.

---

[1] George S. Reuter, Jr., and Helen H. Reuter (Educational Research Association of the U.S.A., Cambridge, Mass., 1965). pp. 138–141.

Words and Actions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 23, 1966, the following editorial appeared in the Bristol Herald Courier of Bristol, Tennessee-Virginia, an outstanding newspaper with an enviable record of more than 90 years of public service.

The editorial points out several reasons for the increased crime rates throughout the country, and in so doing, it brings to mind that possibly what we need is not more laws to curb crime, but rather better examples of how our citizens, collectively and individually, should conduct themselves in our land of the free. We should remember that laws alone do not guarantee freedom, that freedom endures and flourishes only in the spirit in which these laws are carried out.

With this thought, I commend this fine editorial to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

NO WONDER

The increase in crime, and particularly in juvenile delinquency, is a major U.S. problem. The lawlessness between nations and the sharp practices indulged in by States and nations are far from shining examples of integrity for our people to follow—instead they see the practice of might makes right.

A single issue of a U.S. newspaper recently carried two news items that illustrate the "might makes right" theory practiced by governments.

First, from New York State it is reported that the Seneca Indians, to make way for a flood control dam, have been moved off their land and into modern new houses in the face of a U.S. treaty giving the lands to the Senecas as long as the moon rises, the grass is green, the river flows, and the sun shines. The reason for breaking the treaty is rationalized, but the Senecas have to move to new locations provided by the Government whether they like it or not. A solemn agreement is broken.

In Oregon, the highway department is reported burying a water pipeline of a small town so deep under a fill that it cannot be repaired and denying responsibility under the law for damages or paying for relocating the line.

With such examples of might trampling on individual rights, is it any wonder that lawlessness by juveniles and their elders increases as the principles of the golden rule are buried?

People Are Bewildered by L.B.J.'s Efforts To Ride in Opposite Directions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include this editorial from the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News of February 18:

PEOPLE ARE BEWILDERED BY L.B.J.'S EFFORTS TO RIDE IN OPPOSITE DIRECTIONS

(By Jack W. Gore)

President Lyndon Johnson is in the unenviable position today of a man trying to ride a horse in two different directions at one and the same time and unable to figure out why he isn't getting anywhere.

With one hand the President is attempting to steer the horse he is riding to some kind of a military victory over our enemies in southeast Asia. Toward that end he has built up our military forces in Vietnam to some 200,000 men, and he has authorized these forces to engage in combat activities of an aggressive nature calculated to seek out and destroy the enemy and weaken his will to carry on the war.

In this respect Mr. Johnson has committed himself and our Nation to the principle of winning a military victory over our enemies regardless of the price we must pay in terms of casualties and effort to win that fight.

Yet, with the other hand, the President is trying to steer his horse in another direction when he and his advisers constantly preach their objective is not a military victory over our enemies but simply one of creating a military stalemate whereby eventually this whole dreary and costly mess will be settled around the conference table.

To that end the President has sharply restricted our military commanders in the kind of force they can use against the enemy. He has freely admitted that he and Defense Secretary McNamara personally select the targets our Air Force may attack and that no effort will be made to expand the war by crippling the enemy's industrial capacity, his powerplants or his ports of supply.

In other words, while we are going to resist the enemy most vigorously on the ground in Vietnam, thereby increasing our own casualties, we are not going to pursue the war with the same vigor in the areas where the enemy can be hurt the most and where his capability to continue fighting can be seriously, if not completely, crippled.

Thus, we have a paradox that cannot be easily explained away and which is the primary cause of the increasing public worry in this Nation that we have wedded ourselves to a policy and to a strategy that is self-defeating and that must inevitably end in either an embarrassing failure or an outright disaster.

The President has tried to explain his paradoxical policy on the grounds that we have no other real choice of action. Should we apply all the destructive force we have available and seek to win an outright military victory over North Vietnam and the Vietcong, Mr. Johnson indicates this policy may bring both Red China and Russia into the war against us, thus escalating a little war into a major conflict.

The other alternative to fighting a limited war, the President claims, is equally unpalatable in that it would mean giving up not only Vietnam to the Communists but all the rest of southeast Asia in the long run.

So, what President Johnson has decided to do is to follow a kind of middle-of-the-road policy whereby we fight the enemy with one hand, while the other is kept busy trying to drag him to the conference table.

This is a policy that pleases neither the hawks nor the doves. The hawks argue that by constantly reminding an enemy that we don't intend to fight this war with victory as our ultimate goal, we only serve to harden his resolve to continue fighting and to spurn all our offers to sit down and negotiate.

The doves argue that, since we shouldn't be where we are in the first place, we ought to get out as quickly and as honorably as possible, and we shouldn't go on aggravating the enemy by resorting to such unkindly things as dropping bombs on his homeland installations. The best way to end the fighting in the opinion of the doves, is for us to pull back to strictly defensive positions and permit the United Nations or some neutral countries to take over the task of stopping the fighting and getting the conflict to the conference table.

While this argument rages our soldiers, our airmen and our naval forces must go on fighting what to them is a very real and very dangerous war, indeed. They have no choice in regard to what kind of a war, if any, they want to fight. They are too busy keeping themselves from getting killed to give much thought to the verbal debate going on back home, but they certainly must wonder, at times, why they are being asked to risk their lives fighting a war that even their Commander in Chief states we aren't really trying to win.

The parents and the wives of these men are puzzled and angered over the same question. So are the wives and the parents of thousands of other young men and boys facing the imminent prospect of being drafted and being sent to Vietnam.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to sell these people on the concept that while we must fight a dirty war we must forget the idea of ending it by winning a victory. These people believe, and many other Americans share their belief, that if a cause is important enough to fight for in the first place, it is important enough to demand more than just a half-hearted fighting attempt.

This logic is hard to refute, and because it is hard to refute, more and more of our people are becoming convinced with each passing day that our only choice in Vietnam is either to fight the war to win it as quickly as possible, or to pick up whatever marbles we can still salvage and get out.

Behind the smokescreen of the acrimonious debate now going on in Washington and throughout the Nation this is the real issue at stake, for our present policy is getting us exactly nowhere, as not even President Johnson has enough political magic or power to convince our people he can ride the same horse in two directions at one and the same time.

Tribute to Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with others of my colleagues in their tribute to Albert Thomas, of Texas. It is impossible to sum up in any number of words and glowing phrases the life and accomplishments of so learned and competent a legislator as Albert Thomas Each of his 29 years in the House speak most eloquently of his dedication to his constituents and country. He was a public servant in the most honorable and unselfish sense.

All of us who knew him feel a real loss at his passing. Never will we forget his ability to work with his colleagues in the legislative branch. His service in the House was impressive, effective, and uncommon.

The same courage and resourcefulness he showed in the House carried over to his personal life and was apparent in the manner in which he responded to his serious illness. Regardless of personal pain and sacrifice, he carried out his duties.

Mr. Speaker, I add my personal message of sympathy to his devoted wife and daughters. I share their sense of loss at this time.

Admiral Smith to Head the U.S. Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to learn of the recent appointment of Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith as Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, effective on June 1, 1966, when the present Commandant, Adm. Edwin J. Roland, is scheduled to retire.

I have had the good fortune of knowing both of these very able men since coming to Congress 3 years ago. As a member of the subcommittee on the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I met with Admiral Roland on many occasions and also was always pleased to listen to him when he testified before our committee on Coast Guard matters. I wish him well in the years of his retirement.

His successor, Rear Admiral Smith, is well known to us in Connecticut where he served two duty tours at the Coast Guard Academy at New London, in my district: first, as commandant of the cadets at the Academy, from 1957 to 1960; then, as Superintendent of the Academy from June 1962 until July 1965. He was graduated from the same Academy in 1933 and on several occasions later served as aide to the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

Admiral Smith has had a distinguished record of service in the Coast Guard extending over more than three decades. Connecticut, where he lived for a number of years and where he is well known and well liked, is indeed proud that a man of his caliber and talents has been named to head the Coast Guard. We wish for him success in the years ahead.

At this point in the Record, I wish to insert the text of a brief editorial published on February 22, 1966, in the New London Day, expressing the sentiments of the whole community in connection with the appointment of Admiral Smith as Commandant of the Coast Guard.

It reads as follows:

[From the New London (Conn.) Day, Feb. 22, 1966]

THE COAST GUARD'S NO. 1 MAN

The promotion of Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith to Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard strikes a proud and happy chord in this community. The appointment emphasizes the importance of the Coast Guard Academy, which he directed as superintendent for 3 years until last June. It also reflects his professional attainments and, perhaps more importantly, the manner of man he is.

Admiral Smith's interest in southeastern Connecticut, which led him to take part in many community activities, stems from his genuine concern with people. What better recommendation for an officer who is to be the No. 1 man in the Coast Guard?

For the Coast Guard, while it demonstrates courage and resourcefulness in combat, is primarily concerned with the safety and well-being of people, be they travelers, merchant seamen, or the hundreds of thousands of people who sail their own boats strictly for pleasure. This is what makes the Coast Guard unique among the Nation's uniformed services.

The Academy plays a key role in the service's activities, graduating the highly trained men needed to direct its missions. More and more in recent years, it has emphasized the study of the humanities as part of a well-rounded officer's education.

Now, for the first time in this generation, a recent Academy superintendent is elevated to the Coast Guard's highest office. He will be the spokesman for the entire service in Washington and he goes to his new post well prepared.

Admiral Smith's service record, including distinguished tours of duty at the Academy, insures the Coast Guard a continuing strong voice in Washington. The post of Commandant is no easy one. But, based on what this area has seen of Admiral Smith, he'll more than measure up to it.

Hon. Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the more than two decades that I have been privileged to serve as a Member of this body I have also had the privilege of serving on the House Committee on Appropriations with the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas. But ALBERT THOMAS is now gone and we are saddened by, and poorer for, his absence.

In all his years of membership on the House Committee on Appropriations, ALBERT THOMAS provided continual guidance and leadership to the entire House of Representatives. Yet he always, too, had time for the warm greeting, the kind word. He was truly a fine gentleman. He also was truly a fine Congressman and one is hard pressed to call to mind a superior chairman of a House Appropriations Subcommittee. His interests ranged from defense, to veterans, to space and aviation, just to name a few. He fought for what he believed was right and slashed away at inefficiency and waste. And at all times ALBERT magnificently represented the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Texas and the city of Houston. I doubt that any Member of this House has achieved more for the people of his home city and congressional district than ALBERT THOMAS.

To lovely Mrs. Thomas and their charming daughters I offer my deepest sympathy and prayers.

The SSBN "Simon Bolivar"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy, on August 22, 1964, launched another fleet ballistic missile nuclear submarine, the *Simon Bolivar*, SSBN–641.

Thus, another nuclear polaris striking force joins the fleet—mobile, hidden, ready for instant action—contributing to the powerful deterrents of the United States to those who might otherwise be tempted to start a global war.

The launching of another nuclear underwater mobile base, as powerful and terrifying to the enemy as it might be, is not alone what I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues, since this is the 31st of the polaris submarines that we have put into the water. Rather, it is the name of the submarine to which I address myself. And I believe that it is fitting that we say a few words here today about Simón Bolívar, the George Washington of South America.

Much thought is given in selecting names for these powerful underwater units of the U.S. war fleet, and it was felt that the name of the illustrious South American statesman and liberator was eminently suitable for the category, since fleet ballistic missile submarines are named for distinguished Americans and others whose lives have paralleled and contributed to the growth of democracy.

Simon Bolivar is the incarnation of Spanish America's struggle for independence.

When the former provinces of Spain in the Americas embarked upon struggles for their independence following the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, Bolivar enlisted in the movement immediately, and with Francisco de Miranda he succeeded in having a local Congress proclaim the independence of the Captaincy General of Venezuela on June 5, 1811.

Tirelessly, Bolivar led the struggle for liberty from within the country and without. Despite initial successes, he was forced from the field in 1814, and the Spanish royal authority was restored.

Bolivar escaped to the West Indies but he returned again to the Island of Margarita to lead a guerrilla campaign for the reconquest of Venezuela. He assumed the presidency of the country and then conceived a plan for the liberation of northern South America. He crossed the Andes and defeated a superior royalist army at the Boyaca River in 1819. In 1821 he won victory at Carabobo and united Venezuela with Ecuador, Colombia, and Panama in the Republic of Gran Colombia, of which he became chief executive. Following this he proceeded to free Peru and what is now Bolivia from Spanish rule, and achieved the triumph of the movement for independence in South America.

Pursuing his vision of a union of Spanish America, Bolivar in 1826 called a conference in Panama of all the new republics. This meeting was the forerunner of the Pan American movement of today.

Bolivar planned a single, powerful Hispanic American nation but he was not to see it formed. The Republic of Gran Colombia was dissolved, with the secession of Ecuador and Venezuela. After resigning his presidency, Bolivar, poor and sick with tuberculosis, sought refuge in the little port of Santa Marta, where he died when only 46 years old, in 1834.

His political thought is well expressed in his words:

> To form a stable government, one must have as a national base a general spirit whose object is to incline everyone uniformly toward two points: moderation of the general will, and limitation of public authority.

It was entirely fitting, I think, that the name of this statesman and soldier of democracy be given to the *Simon Bolivar* SSBN–641 which, submerged and silently and invisibly patroling the dark, underwater depths, will guard the freedom of the world. We hope that not one of the *Simon Bolivar's* terrifying missiles need ever be released and thrust. But it is comforting to us and to all free peoples that this powerful ship and her sister craft are constantly on guard and continually detering any nuclear enemy from attacking.

Hon. Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been deeply saddened by the passing of our great and good friend and colleague, ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas. All of us who had the privilege of serving with him in this body know the warmth of his personality, and the courtly and gracious and courteous manner in which he discharged his responsibilities.

I shall always remember ALBERT THOMAS best as he was when he was steering one of the appropriation bills from his own committee through the

House. He always stood in the aisle, alongside the majority committee table, never in the well, with his glasses either in his hand or shoved back high on his forehead, a smile on his face, always trying hard to meet the desires and wishes of questioning or critical Members. ALBERT THOMAS in action on this floor was a legislative wonder to behold, the kind of grace in motion that President Kennedy used to refer to. He represented for all of us, I am sure, the epitome of the effective legislator, something we all hope ultimately to become.

One more point, Mr. Speaker, and that is the fantastic courage which ALBERT THOMAS embodied. Few who watched him steering a bill through this House could have dreamed of the heavy burden he was carrying. Yet he always faced the future with confidence, with hope, and with good cheer. What an inspiration for us all. How much we shall miss his voice and his step in this Chamber in the days ahead.

Social Security May Soon Need New Revenue Source

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune, Feb. 28, 1966]

SOCIAL SECURITY MAY SOON NEED NEW REVENUE SOURCE

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—The idea that social security benefits can be increased without raising taxes has the interested attention now of Great Society thinkers. They like the idea.

This idea is a prescription for a political painkiller. More precisely, it is a device to escape the discipline whereby Congress has voted always to accompany increased social security benefits with increased payroll taxes.

Politicians are galled by discipline, especially by any discipline that requires Congress to tax the voters for funds with which to pay for the Federal goodies provided for them.

The leftwing sodality called Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) is promoting a fly-now-crash-later plan whereby benefits would be much increased without a matching increase in taxes.

ADA is well represented in the Johnson administration. It has done much of the Great Society thinking and planning. The ADA would supplement the payroll tax with funds from the general revenue.

That means to draw upon the general fund of the U.S. Treasury for benefits. The general fund receives general tax revenue and also the proceeds of Treasury borrowing.

If benefits could be siphoned out of the general fund into the pockets of the pensioners, the level of benefits could be raised without the levy of additional taxes. Thus would come true the politician's dream of keeping the voters happy—and remaining in office—by giving the voters something for nothing.

More accurately, the politicians would delude the voters into believing they were getting something for nothing. The voters are shortsighted and easily deluded.

The liberals or leftwingers of both parties uniformly whoop it up for bigger and better borrowing and spending. The conservatives of both parties usually advocate balancing spending against revenue and reducing the public debt. The voters over the years have preferred the liberal free lunch to the conservative pay-as-you-go.

Thus it is that Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball recently told a U.S. Chamber of Commerce audience that social security costs were going up and were raising the possibility of a change in financing.

"A major public policy issue in the next 5 years," said Ball, "may be whether to tap general sources of revenue for social security. Payroll costs (for social security) are going to seem very large if benefits go much higher."

Costs now are shared between employer and employees. Ball said the Federal Government may have to share some of the cost as a social obligation. Conceding that self-financing had been a tremendous strength of the program, Ball noted that the British system, for instance, split costs three ways among employer, employee, and the British Government.

Ball also said that it would be necessary to increase the $3 monthly U.S. medicare premium which becomes effective July 1. He said costs surely would rise. Precedent would require that the pensioners increase their contribution one way or another.

Resolution of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I command to this body the following resolution of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. It calls for the establishment of a new national cemetary in the area of Valley Forge, Pa.

There is great need for another such cemetary and there certainly can be no quarrel about the area of Valleg Forge. I hope Members will give very serious consideration, and ultimate approval to this proposal.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Recently it was disclosed that the nearest national cemetery to Pennsylvania would soon be closed since it has no available space remaining.

In Tredyffrin Township which is in the Valley Forge State Park area there is presently available 510 acres of land that could be very well used as a site for a national cemetery. This land is ideal in that it could be made an integral part of our national heritage being so close to the place where many American soldiers died in order to make our country what it is today.

A national cemetery located at Valley Forge would be a truly symbolic and meaningful idea: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass the necessary legislation needed to establish a new national cemetery in the Valley Forge area; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of Congress from Pennsylvania and to the Honorable HUGH SCOTT and the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK.

Attest:

ROBERT K. HAMILTON,
Speaker.
ANTHONY J. PETROSKY,
Chief Clerk.

Stanley Helzerman's 36 Years of Service to His Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise today to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the work of an unsung hero. Mr. Stanley Helzerman, of Willis, Mich., in the Second Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent in this body, has been a cooperative weather observer with the U.S. Weather Bureau since 1929. For 36 years, Mr. Helzerman has made accurate daily weather observations from his farm in Willis, and by so doing has added immeasurably to the Nation's composite weather knowledge.

I am pleased to submit, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a description of, and tribute to, the work of our Nation's cooperative weather observers:

The Weather Bureau's more than 12,000 cooperative weather observers perform a public service that is surely unequaled anywhere. Freely, these volunteers devote a total of about 1 million hours each year to observing and recording the weather, and their records form a history of the climate of the United States.

Three decades ago, a group of outstanding scientists advised President Franklin D. Roosevelt that the work of the cooperative weather observers "is one of the most extraordinary services ever developed anywhere and probably nets the public more per dollar expended than any other Government service in the world."

Business and industry, agriculture, and aviation, and the general public rely on knowledge of climate. We all owe a great debt to the Weather Bureau's corps of observers whose unselfish efforts have built a national treasury of weather information.

JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

The cooperative weather observers have a proud tradition of more than 100 years of voluntary public service. A number of families have kept weather records at the same place for several generations. Many individuals have observed the weather every day for 30, 40, or 50 years, and a dozen or so dedicated volunteers have served for more than 60 years.

A century ago, when Americans were settling western lands, they had little information on what to expect in the way of heat, cold, rain, or snow. In the act of 1890 establishing the Weather Bureau, Congress directed the Bureau to "record the climate of the United States."

Today, with the information gathered by cooperative weather observers throughout the years, we have a vast storehouse of records of our Nation's climates. The private citizen, traveling to a distant part of the United States, can check on average maximum and minimum temperatures there before packing his suitcase. A businessman considering expansion into new markets may seek information on climate before making his decision.

With all the advances of modern technology, including satellites and automatic stations for observing the weather, the services of the volunteer observers are more needed and more valuable than ever. It is private citizens who keep official records of the weather at more than 12,000 places throughout our Nation. These devoted men and women give us the detailed knowledge of United States climates that is essential to the solution of many problems of an increasingly complex society.

ROBERT M. WHITE,
Administrator, ESSA.

HOW COOPERATIVE OBSERVERS' RECORDS ARE PROCESSED AND STORED

The daily observations that a cooperative observer makes are recorded by him on a form with space for an entire month's record. At the end of the month the form is sent to the National Weather Records Center, Asheville, N.C., where each day's observation is placed on a punched card. The cards are then used to make listings and comparisons. Data which appear inconsistent or erroneous are subject to professional review by a meteorologist, and erroneous entries are corrected or deleted.

After the records are checked the cards are used to prepare copy for the publication Climatological Data, thus making the records available to the public.

After this, the cards are filed for about 2 years, during which time they may be used for special tabulations or searched for particular combinations of significance to a specialized user. Before they are discarded they are placed on microfilm so that they can be recalled as needed in the future.

As of the end of 1965 an estimated 338 million cards containing weather data will be stored in the National Weather Records Center Archives plus an additional 170 million weather data cards on microfilm. These records are an invaluable national asset and are carefully preserved, since, unlike many other items, weather records increase in value with age.

HOW COOPERATIVE OBSERVERS' WEATHER RECORDS ARE USED

Since life on earth is dependent on the food we eat, the water we drink, and the air we breathe, it follows that the weather is an important factor in everyone's life. This is borne out by the varied and numerous uses made of data accumulated by cooperative observers.

Following are some examples of uses of weather records:

Evaluating and comparing the prospects of commercial vegetable growing in Arizona and in Florida. This study included comparisons of the frequency and duration of droughts, and of periods of high and low temperatures, length of the freeze-free season, and the distribution of rainfall as related to the growing season of various truck crops.

Planning hospital design and construction.

Making an industrial survey for a New Jersey area.

Correlating new homebuilding starts with weather data.

Evaluating insurance liability risks, verifying and paying insurance claims.

Preparing a marketing booklet on Alaska.

Determining the climate of a town.

Studying the effect of weather on mortality in New York City.

Studying the relationship between rainfall and frost data and the growth characteristics of red pine trees.

Surveying community airport development.

Comparing and adapting existing types of school construction and building materials to extreme environmental and climatic conditions.

Studying climatic change; is the climate changing and if so, in what way?

Delivering fuel supplies.

Planting and harvesting crops; studying the growth of trees, studying the risks of freezing by specified dates, and studying the relationship between climate and altitude.

Selecting a retirement location, or a climate favorable to a particular health problem.

Computing snow-melt rates over a watershed for which dams are being planned.

Determining the need for company salesmen to have air conditioners in their cars.

Making drought studies and determining drought disaster areas.

The Weather Bureau is able to help requesters with these and other problems as well as to help researchers in their attempts to learn more about our climates because thousands of cooperative observers have faithfully recorded the weather at various locations for decades and decades.

Hon. Albert Thomas

SPEECH
OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I deem it an honor to add my voice to the many already raised in this Chamber in praise of a great and good American lawmaker, ALBERT THOMAS.

When I came to this Congress 3 years ago, I discovered very quickly that I would need the almost daily counsel and wisdom of as many of my distinguished seniors as I could possibly get. To my everlasting gratitude, not one request for guidance on my part has ever been denied, no matter how small or unimportant the issue may have seemed.

ALBERT THOMAS lives in my memory as one of those who tried, at all times, to give me the benefit of his experience. He was a kind, courteous, considerate gentleman whose 30 years in this House have left a mark of distinction and impressive achievement.

Above all, he was a man of consummate courage.

Those final days of his life were a shining monument to an indomitable human spirit.

I think we all should take consolation in the fact that one man among us could confront the daily reminder of impending death with an invincible faith in his fellow man.

I am privileged to count myself as one of the numberless thousands whose lives have been enriched by ALBERT THOMAS, a dedicated public servant and a devoted friend.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, history has a way of pulling words out of our language and making them generic terms, single words that stand for a whole body of thought or a whole set of circumstances. This is especially true of wars and events of similar international impact.

The term "Waterloo," for example, is more than a place or even the name of a famous battle. It has come to mean a great deal more in terms of human events. Munich is another such word. We all know what it means when someone uses the term "another Munich."

"Hiroshima" conjures mental images far more complex than simply that of a small city in Japan. "Pearl Harbor" is a term symbolic of many things, of ideas that go far beyond the peaceful Polynesian paradise it once was.

There are countless other words and terms in the English language that bring to mind a whole complex flood of images and ideas that have no apparent relation to the literal term itself.

We are presently living in an era that is bound to produce another such generic term out of a rather awkward oriental word: "Vietnam."

History will use the word "Vietnam" to describe a complex, frustrating, see-saw kind of warfare with battle lines as indistinct as the shadows of the jungle in which they are being fought. It will include the background of uncertainty and displeasure voiced by dissident groups of citizens back home. And it will include the kind of lofty heroism shown by the fighting men themselves who, in spite of the morale-shattering debate back home, continue to face the enemy and to yield their lives on the battlefields.

The readers of the Berkshire Eagle in my hometown of Pittsfield, Mass., were recently treated to a penetrating summary of many of the aspects which compose the idea of Vietnam today. The column was written by Peter Potomac, a pen name obviously, whose delightful prose and incisive commentary on current events have long provided one of the most read columns in our paper.

Because I believe it contains in concise form most of the perplexing and seemingly contradictory ideas that are involved in the Vietnam situation today, as well as an important focus on the more promising trends in our debate over Vietnam, I respectfully commend the column to the attention of my colleagues.

The column follows:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Feb. 28, 1966]

THE KENNAN-GAVIN POSITION

(By Peter Potomac)

WASHINGTON.—The great debate about Vietnam has escalated suddenly—with interesting results. Within the last few weeks, the antiwar forces have unveiled two new allies—Gen. James Gavin, and George F. Kennan—around whom they have formed enclaves which are being defended with increased vigor. Interestingly enough, one of the principal achievements of Kennan and Gavin have been to destroy one of the earlier enclaves of the antiwar forces; namely, the idea that the war in Vietnam is a civil war in which we have no business interfering. The extent to which the antiwar group believes this was seen in a recent article in the Eagle by Edward K. Shanahan. He reported on a group of professors in Washington who gathered to discuss the war in Vietnam and said that underlying all of the meetings was the assumption that "the Vietnam war is a civil war, a case of internal revolution. In fact, this basic assumption was never seriously debated."

Well, the professors had better get back to the old seminar table and start debating it because their two new spokesmen—Kennan and Gavin—present their arguments with an underlying assumption, that the Vietcong is a subversive force directed from the north, "I see in the Vietcong," says Kennan "a band of ruthless fanatics, partly misled, perhaps, by the propaganda that has been drummed into them, but cruel in their purposes, dictatorial and oppressive * * * I think their claim to represent the people of South Vietnam is unfounded and arrogant and outrageous."

In his statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week, Kennan, of course, went on to state his opposition to the war in his quiet, articulate manner and managed to define once and for all the essence of the debate, to wit, should we make it our policy to contain Chinese imperialism in Asia as we contained Russian imperialism in Europe? Kennan's answer is that we should not. It is significant that Kennan is the man who has emerged as the leading spokesman (along with Walter Lippmann) of this view because he is one of the three men (the other two being President Truman and Dean Acheson) most closely associated with the policy of containing the Russians. However, he states flatly that we should not become entangled in the affairs of Asia and closes his presentation with a quote from John Adams to the effect that America "goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy."

The same reasoning, if applied to Europe, would have permitted the fall of Greece, Turkey, and West Berlin to the Communists and possibly all of Western Europe. But many who supported, and still support, America's containment of Russia in Europe oppose our containment of China in Asia, and Kennan has made a major contribution by centering the debate on this point. And it is hoped that we have heard the last of the peasant revolt nonsense.

Getting to the center of the debate, it is asking a lot of American people at this stage in history to abandon Asia to totalitarian power. We fought one major war to prevent Japanese imperialism from dominating Asia and we fought an unpopular smaller, but costly, war in Korea to resist Communist imperialism. So what it boils down to is that those who are counseling withdrawal in Vietnam are saying that we should let the forces of tyranny have by "wars of national liberation" what we would not let Japanese or Communists have by open aggression.

In fact, they go further: They say that we cannot defeat guerrillas (at least, not after stable local leadership is eliminated, which is one of the Communists' first objectives); that we cannot fight a land war in Asia; that we cannot continue to resist the Communists wherever they threaten the status quo, and that we cannot go on letting the Communists pick the battlefields.

The answers to these arguments are, it seems to me, (1) that we are fighting in Vietnam to prove we can successfully resist Communist guerrillas and that the issue has not been decided yet; (2) most U.S. military men agree we should not fight a large land war in Asia and we are not yet doing it; (3) we will not necessarily have to continue resisting Communists over and over again. Both the Russians and Chinese have shown they will go only so far in testing our determination to resist, but no further, and maybe we only have to win one war of national liberation to make our point. Of course, if we stay in Vietnam, the Communists may well open up another front, in Thailand, or Korea, or Cambodia, etc. But if they have the resources to do it, one wonders why they haven't done it already. The answer may be that they are even less anxious than we are to be involved in more than 1 war of liberation at a time; (4) as long as it is our policy to defend nations threatened by the Communists, we have no choice but to let them pick the battlefields. It is unreasonable to expect them to try to "liberate" a country where conditions are favorable to us.

Finally, there is the new argument that we should retreat to enclaves and sit tight until the Communists tire of trying to force us out. There is much to be said for this, but experience suggests that it would result in an endless conflict which in the long run would lead to the same political unrest in the country that exists now but with the opposition, coming from the hawks, rather than the doves. Lyndon Johnson obviously does not want to go into another presidential election with this unpopular war still going on, which is why, having made every effort to end it at the conference table, now appears to be making every effort to end it on the battlefield.

There are, in short, good arguments for withdrawing from Vietnam and good arguments for staying to fight it out—which is why this is one of the most complex situations any President has ever faced. Almost every day I ask someone new what they think the solution is and frankly, I have not yet received a satisfactory reply.

Love of Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the following essay was written by Mr. Doug Carpenter, a student at Huntington College, Huntington, Ind. Mr. Carpenter's prize winning essay was read by him on the occasion of the Huntington College annual Washington birthday celebration. It was an inspiration to me and I take this opportunity to share it with my colleagues and the American people.

LOVE OF COUNTRY

(By Doug Carpenter)

Mr. Rudyard Kipling once told the story about "The Ship That Found Herself." He narrated the story of a ship; newly launched, starting out on her trial trip. At first every part of the ship was finding fault with every other part. Every girder and beam and brace, every rod and piston and rivet, was complaining against all the rest. But by and by the ship encountered a storm. The heavy winds began to blow, the great green billows rolled over the decks, and then, in the emergency, somehow all the parts of the vessel began to draw together. All those discordant voices melted into one great voice, which was the soul of the ship, and that voice spoke out in one triumphant cry, as the splendid craft realized that she was not a thousand discordant pieces, but one swift, beautiful, indestructible vessel.

In the year 1898 our country, the Republic of the United States, found herself. Until then we were not wholly united as a people. There were differences between the North and South; there were discordant voices between East and West. But in that year when Dewey's guns boomed out in the harbor of Manila, and when a little later Cervera's fleet lay riddled and stranded along the coast of Cuba, our country found herself. East and West, North and South, blended into one. Parties united; local differences and prejudices vanished.

It is a great blessing to be living at such a time. Hundreds and thousands of boys and young men have lived without hearing any call, on the part of their country, for sacrifice. They have, perhaps, never felt the patriotic thrill, or heard the call to repel an enemy. But most of us here tonight have seen the regiments marching down Broadway. And we have seen them come home again, worn, pale, and broken. There may be some here tonight may be enlisting themselves, in the near future. You have at least seen friends go, some of whom may never return. This country is in a unique position in the great world's arena tonight. Your role is patriotic love. If you do not love your country, who will love it? If you here tonight do not stand by this flag, who will stand by it? If you are not patriots, this land will never have them.

But what is it to love one's country? Is it to carry a banner in a procession? Is it to shout as we see the flag? Is it to fling confetti from the tops of the buildings, and send off skyrockets in the evening? Vastly deeper than that is love of country, deeper than any soldier's uniform, deeper than any pictures of missiles with which we adorn our walls. To love your country—is to love that for which your country stands: Freedom, education, and religion. The man who does this, and he alone, is the one who loves his country.

There are two figures guarding the Atlantic coast tonight that I trust may symbolize all of the life of our dear country.

In the harbor of New York rises the figures that you have seen on many a night—Liberty with her uplifted torch, enlightening all the world. And on the Massachusetts coast, in the harbor of old Plymouth, rises another statute, carved in the whitest of Massachusetts granite—the statue of Faith, looking out with unswerving eyes over the bay into which the *Mayflower* came, and with silent finger pointing upward unto God. The light from the Statue of Liberty shines out across land and sea toward the upturned face of Faith, and tonight those two symbolic figures together guard our coast.

So long as those figures do guard our shores and truly symbolize our life, this country is safe. So long as we believe in liberty and faith, freedom and religion, in widest possibility for everyone, and utmost allegiance unto our fathers' God, this country can never perish. God give us to understand more deeply the meaning of patriotism, and to love our country more deeply and worthily in the years that are to come.

Our Policy Is Not To Overthrow Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Feb. 28, 1966]

OUR POLICY IS NOT TO OVERTHROW REDS

EDITOR, THE UNION: President Johnson has finally revealed, in overt terms, the new American foreign policy. It was a long and contradictory succession of official statements from various Government sources that led up to his disclosure. Now it is official.

It is not the American way to seek victory for our fighting men, nor to seek the overthrow of any government, regardless of its crimes. We seek only to prove that we will not allow open aggression against helpless people.

This type of policy may prevent a war but it openly encourages bloodshed. What risk does the aggressor take? Will he be punished for inflicting terror, torture and even murder on his victims? No. Our policy says it is logical to negotiate with him in the interest of [illegible]. We will even condone the Reds' hav[illegible]presentation in the new government of the land they are plundering.

This proves the old cliche, "Two steps forward and one step back will eventually get you to all of the jack."

The President also stated that poverty is the root of all war. I disagree. A revolution yes, but not a war. A poor nation could not conduct a war. Men cause war. Not poor uneducated men, but rich, highly educated, power-hungry men. They use every means at hand.

Our no-win policy is nothing but expensive procrastination. That is an open invitation to worldwide anarchy by the evil elite.

ERIC H. SHERMAN.

LA JOLLA.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Feb. 28, 1966]

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO OUR PATRIOTISM?

EDITOR, THE UNION: In a recent editorial, you said our greatest need at this time is patriotism.

I can remember a time when we didn't need it, because we had it. It was a time when the only dissenters were those who, through age limits or physical shortcomings, were rejected for military service in the fight to protect our type of democracy.

It was an era when the John MacCraes and the Joyce Kilmers already had left their indelible marks in poetry, their blood in Flanders fields. It was a time when the slender filled up on bananas to make the weight limit; when the underage were unafraid and proud to forge birth certificates that fooled the recruiting stations.

Maybe this is a peculiar type of patriotism that leaves present-day shirkers cold, but I believe it is still something to make one's blood run warm, one's pulse vibrate. It is based on a faith that will prevail when all the enemies of our hard-earned freedom really have been left cold by their foreign deceivers.

As you say, most Americans realize, and will combat the present evils that beset us. For the others, one can only feel a sense of compassion that is somewhat akin to sorrow.

HARRY PERT.

LA JOLLA.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly in keeping with the American tradition to offer congratulations and best wishes when our friends celebrate a worthwhile achievement. Thus as our fellow Americans and the people of Estonia celebrated February 24 as that nation's independence anniversary, I extend to them my warmest congratulations.

The very fact that the Estonian nation ever came into existence is a clear example of determination and courage of the Estonian people. Their burdens under Russian domination date back as far as 1710, but they never lost sight of their goal of freedom and independence in their own country. Between 1721 and 1918 czarist Russia engaged in a severe program of Russification that met little success. Communist Russia today is having scant success in its own attempts to force a break in the Estonian people's ties to their own cultural heritage.

During its 22 years of independence Estonia was busily engaged in a program of industrial and agricultural progress and democratization. Under their own system of government as compared with that of the Communists Estonian domestic achievements were remarkable. But with the forced signing of the "Mutual Assistance Pact" of 1939 the days of Estonian freedom were dramatically lessened. The tragic end came in July 1940 when an Estonian Government handpicked by the Soviets declared Estonia a Soviet Socialist Republic.

Under Stalin mass deportations, executions, and intimidation were the order of the day. Hitler's Nazi regime provided no relief for the Estonians, and with Nazi expulsion in 1944 Russia resumed once more its illegal occupation.

It is perhaps a twist of irony that one of the states of Europe that was created after World War I as a direct result of the newly enunciated concept of self-determination should find itself a captive of one of the participants of the war—a war to save democracy.

The people of Estonia are unable to join us this week as we commemorate the 48th anniversary of their country's independence, but their example of tenacity, fortitude, and courage should serve to inspire us as we attempt to lead the way in man's constant struggle to better himself and his fellowman.

Rev. Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, for 16 years the U.S. House of Representatives was privileged to have as its Chaplain the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp. This servant of the Lord lived a life reflecting his profound belief in God and the principles He taught.

Reverend Braskamp's actions will long serve as an inspiration to each of us who knew him. His wise reflections and ministrations were sources of strength and courage to this House in many difficult times.

I would take this opportunity to express my sympathies to Dr. Braskamp's family. What a great sense of loss they must feel at this time. At the same time, they must also sense a feeling of pride and love knowing that God's work was furthered during Reverend Braskamp's lifetime.

Accomplished Wit, Serious Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, public service is not an easy profession. This is particularly true on a State level, where the low compensation for the hard work and long hours makes it very difficult for many capable citizens. It is with great pride, therefore, that I bring to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun on February 28 discussing the talents and dedication of a prominent Maryland delegate, a Talbot Countian, a sportsman, and a gentleman, Thomas Hunter Lowe. I think the article will be interesting reading for my colleagues.

NO COUNTRY BUMPKIN: ACCOMPLISHED WIT, SERIOUS LEGISLATOR

(By Jonathan Cottin)

ANNAPOLIS, February 28.—Thomas Hunter Lowe, a countryman who spent nearly half his life in the city, is really putting people on.

A huge cowlick forms a careless dark comma over his forehead. His collar is frequently unbuttoned. His shoes are often smudged.

But underneath the appearance of studied dishevelment is a Renaissance man whose family roots lie in the 17th century.

Among his many interests is the house judiciary committee, which he heads with hard-driving efficiency, churning more than 1,000 bills a session onto the floor for action.

RUNS A MILE A DAY

Given to quoting from Shakespeare and Jefferson, he runs a mile every morning on his 12-acre Wittman farm, then pounds away at a boxing bag in his garage before 7 a.m. breakfast.

But on the house floor, where he has the reputation of being a needler, or in the extracurricular give-and-take of legislative life in Annapolis, Mr. Lowe is by turns forceful and amusing—sometimes too funny for words.

Not long ago, he had a penchant for cocktail parties, although he neither drinks nor smokes. More than once he has sent out invitations across the State to a soiree in the hotel room occupied by a fellow lawmaker. He has even gone so far as to post notices of the dreamed-up affairs in Eastern Shore stores.

SCOLDS CITY DELEGATES

When the unsuspecting lawmaker begins receiving replies to the invitations he never sent, Mr. Lowe affects an innocent air.

On the floor the other day, Mr. Lowe rose, ostensibly to announce the next meeting of his committee. He spent 20 minutes harassing the Baltimore city delegation for spending so much money on capital improvements.

During a recent session, Mr. Lowe saved up some State newspapers for a week. Then he wrapped the front page of a current edition around week-old papers and delivered the useless periodicals early each morning to House and Senate minority leaders. The miffed minority chieftains reportedly never knew who did it.

But Mr. Lowe has also been the target of pranksters.

His friends once ordered 10 tons of horse manure dumped on his front lawn. He forgave his tormentors as they excused him.

IDEOLOGICAL DILEMMA

But he can never excuse Congress and the U.S. Supreme Court, twin nemeses that have forced an ideological dilemma upon him.

Court decisions on reapportionment and congreisonal ratification of stringent civil rights laws have made him fight against his most cherished principles.

His sense of duty won out over his devotion to his beliefs.

He opposed redistricting of the legislature until the Supreme Court handed down its landmark one-man, one-vote decree. Then in 1965, after the Court said both houses should be apportioned on a population basis, he led the battle to reapportion Maryland.

He also opposed public accommodations legislation. But after Congress enacted the public accommodations law, he led a 15-day floor fight for enactment of a similar bill in Maryland.

CONFEDERATE VIEW

Mr. Lowe breaks into a broad grin when visitors point to his office etching of an old, bedraggled Confederate soldier who is saying: "Forget, hell!"

Forced to break with the traditions of the past, however, unlike the diehard segregationist in the picture, his mind now copes with the revolutionary facts of life in the 20th century.

"I have as little bias against Negroes as anyone in the general assembly," he says.

He attacks as "liars" the parlor liberals who say "some of their best friends are Negroes."

On other ideological issues, he often takes the conservative line, but does it with a smile.

VIEW ON MEDICARE

He opposed medicare until its enactment, but adds: "The doctors helped bring it on themselves. I have paid some ungodly medical bills."

He finds nothing humorous about proposals to provide Government-supported legal services—"judicare."

On the other hand, "the Supreme Court is 100 percent right on school integration. There is no such thing as a separate but equal *school*."

The 38-year-old lawyer says he is in Annapolis for the last time as a lawmaker. He would like the vacant Talbot County judgeship, but insists that is not why he will not run again.

ATTORNEY GENERAL ROLE

With a *wife, newborn son, niece* and nephew *to* support, he says, the time has come to earn some money. This is something he claims he has been unable to do with great success because of the necessary 3 months a year in Annapolis.

He declines comment on speculation he may try *for attorney general* this year, despite reports he has been encouraged to do so.

Virginia Winner of Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech on the subject of "Democracy: What It Means to Me" that won first prize in the State of Virginia in the annual Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Its author is Miss Deborah Lynn Slate of Route 4, Box 200, Hillsville, Va., in my congressional district.

More than 300,000 high school students participated in this contest competing for the five scholarships ranging in value from $1,000 to $5,000. The winning contestant from each State will come to Washington early in March for the final judging.

The speech follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Deborah Lynn Slate, Hillsville, Va.)

I am the voice of democracy. Each of you has heard me speak, many, many times before. You have heard me in the booming of cannon and the thundering of guns; you have heard me in a judge's gavel and a jury's verdict; you have heard me in a child's laughter and a mother's prayer. You have heard, but have you really listened? You have heard, but do you understand?

When the first man gasped into his body the breath of life, when his throbbing heartbeat rent the veil between mortality and immortality, it was then, then that I, democracy, was born. Yes, I was born with mankind, born in mankind, for deep within the heart of every individual there burns a fire of yearning, yearnng for the liberating bondage that I am.

Liberating bondage—that I am, for as I offer my sons and daughters freedom, I simultaneously bind them to an ideal, bind them to a responsibilty, bind them to a promise.

My ideal is not to grant freedom from, but to insure freedom to. Jefferson was my son. I did not offer him freedom from oppression, controversy, or persecution; I offered him freedom to life, to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness. Lincoln was my son. I did not offer him freedom from *poverty and hardship*; *I offered him freedom to overcome these* obstacles and to obtain the goals he sought.

Franklin Roosevelt was my son. I did not offer him freedom from depression and financial crises; I offered him freedom to regain a lost prosperity. You are my sons and daughters. I do not offer you freedom from sacrifice; *I grant you freedom to give of your best to God* and to the world. I do not give you freedom from hatred; I bless you with freedom to love. I do not extend you freedom from failure; I insure you of freedom to succeed.

But so great a freedom is not possible without bondage. The *blood of your* ancestors became the blood of my life; their dreams and tears became a well of hope for their posterity; their prayers moved mountains which battles and bloodshed could never touch.

But now the torch is passed. Yours is now the blood to sacrifice; yours are the dreams to build and the tears to shed; yours are prayers to raise; yes, all this is yours, yours that you may keep for yourselves and your posterity the blessings of liberty.

My life rests in your hands. I, democracy, cannot live if you neglect your responsibility to be an alert, informed, a participating citizen. The benefits of liberty are yours; will you accept with equal grace the responsibilities which accompany these benefits?

I bring freedom; I bring responsibility; but perhaps greater than these is the promise I offer. This is the promise that rang the Liberty Bell; this is the promise that settled the plains and led the Conestoga wagons to the open arms of the West; this is the promise that launched men into the infinity of space. This is the promise: That as long as men dream, there shall be progress; as long as men persevere, there shall be success, and as long as men care, there shall remain "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

House Is Final Hope of Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

HOUSE IS FINAL HOPE OF TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

(By Raymond Moley)

The President's proposal for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives would, if written into the Constitution, have two effects. It would greatly increase any President's domination over the House, and it would lead ultimately to a one-party government. For the plan is to elect all Members in a presidential election.

This sort of constitutional amendment fits snugly into L.B.J.'s grand design to impose on this country complete domination by his majority in the Democratic Party. Most of his programs already enacted are calculated to cement several powerful minority groups into a monolithic political potential. This in large part would be based upon exacting revenues from all the *people* and *distributing* them to bribe-favored minorities.

In the past few years the Senate has been more and more obedient to Presidential directives, and its Democratic-liberal majority seems safe for years to come.

The House, closer to the electorate because of shorter terms, remains the final hope *of the two-party system*.

But *if*, as planned, the terms of House Members should be lengthened to 4 years, the majority would almost certainly be swept in with the presidential candidate.

The President's argument for this change is a collection of half-truths. He said when he asked for the change that *it* would attract *as candidates* "the best men in private or public life." But, instead of the best and most independent and courageous people, it would attract those who would seek the advantage of running as supporters of the presidential candidates.

It would attract people who crave a sure thing, with long tenure untroubled by biennial tests at the polls. It would remove Members further from the obligation to keep close to serve the needs of their constituents.

It may be annoying to some Members to maintain close relations with the people at *home in their districts. But if popular gov*ernment means anything, those people are entitled to close contacts with and continuous control of their representatives. Whatever independence Members now have from the House leaders and the men in the White House is gained by knowing that they have the confidence of the people back home.

Good representatives give constant attention to their constituents. They do this by answering their mail; by periodic, sometimes weekly letters to their constituents; by seeing people from home who come to Washington, and by presenting their constituents' views to the House—on the floor or in the Congressional Record.

These services are not too great a burden, for Members have allowed themselves fairly lavish personal staffs of assistants. If a Congressman is as industrious as he should be, he still has the time to study and vote upon the bills before his committees and the House.

On the practical side, the Johnson argument falls short. A considerable number of House Members are fairly sure of reelection. Many have no opposition. This is especially true of, Members who have large influence because of seniority.

Finally, there is the need for holding a President and/or a congressional majority to strict accountability. The mid-term election, especially in a year like 1966, is a useful referendum on presidential and congressional policies.

Four years is too long to give a grant of unchecked power to any President, any party or any Member. That is especially true in changing times like these. We need not only efficient government, but responsible government. The makers of the Constitution planned it that way. It should remain that way.

Congressman William S. Mailliard's Address to the Commonwealth Club of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman William S. Mailliard, of California, on February 18, delivered an address to the Commonwealth Club of California entitled "We Now Have Rustbucket, Not National Defense Reserve Fleet—Are Scraping Bottom of Barrel."

The Commonwealth Club publishes a house organ known as the Commonwealth in which the addresses delivered to their weekly luncheons are summarized in what they call the Friday Flashes. These Flashes taken from the address by Congressman Mailliard are as follows:

[From the Commonwealth, Feb. 28, 1966]

"We Now Have Rustbucket, Not National *Defense Reserve Fleet—Are Scraping* Bottom of Barrel"—Representative Mailliard

(From address by Hon. William S. Mailliard, Member of Congress)

The present complete lack of any national maritime policy has persisted now to the *point of constituting a hazard to the na*tional well-being and security.

Where are we going to get the ships? To meet the national needs—in peace and in war; today, tomorrow, and decades to come.

In World Wars I and II, we engaged in crash programs of building ships to the tune of $22 billion of the taxpayers' money. This figure does not include the enormous sums paid out for use of foreign shipping until our own efforts began to produce results.

In each instance we were left with a huge fleet of mass-produced austerity ships, obsolete as soon as the world's maritime nations were able to produce new vesels of peacetime design and construction.

Twenty years after World War I, the United States was no longer a significant maritime power.

VIETNAM SUPPLIED BY SEA

Here we are, two decades after World War II, with our aging merchant marine just barely adequate to meet our own commitments in a relatively small-scale military effort in southeast Asia, and only at the expense of turning commercial cargoes over to foreign competition, and even utilizing foreign ships under direct charter.

Information received by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries indicates that the estimated loss in revenue to U.S.-flag ships was approximately $12 million during the last half of 1965—a direct loss in our international balance of payments.

TWENTY PERCENT OF PRIVATE FLEET "DRAFTED"

Economics compel this dependence on ships rather than aircraft. It would cost 57½ cents per pound to airlift cargo to Vietnam compared to 7 cents per pound by ship—8 to 1. Even the most optimistic estimates for the huge new C-5A could not reduce this ratio to less than 5 or 6 to 1.

The Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service has been augmented since last July by more than 200 general cargo commercial and reserve ships. This represents approximately 20 percent of our privately owned merchant fleet.

More than 50 vessels have been chartered from American-flag subsidized operators and many of these are the finest, most modern and fastest ships in the world. All were constructed with Federal assistance under the vessel replacement program of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Unfortunately, we have too few ships of this caliber. The replacement program is proceeding at dead slow speed and is almost 100 vessels behind schedule.

NO HOPE OF MODERNIZING TRAMPS

As a result, about half of the 300-odd ships in our subsidized merchant fleet are rapidly approaching the end of their economic lives. In spite of this fact, the administration sent to Congress last month a ship construction budget calling for a maximum of only 13 ships to be built in fiscal year 1967.

Another segment of the Vietnamese sealift is made up of nonsubsidized American-flag tramps. These ships also are more than 20 years old—the aid available, by law, for their replacement has been denied by administrative decision.

RESERVE FLEET IN BAD SHAPE

Under present policies there appears no *hope of modernizing this portion of the* active fleet.

We have reactivated more than 100 ships of World War II vintage. This fleet responded very well to our needs during the Korean conflict—but Korea was 16 years ago.

These ships were constructed more than 20 years ago. Age and limited maintenance *has severely diminished their utility. Parts* and equipment are being cannibalized to reactivate these vessels with costs averaging $400,000 per ship.

The vast majority of them have had material failures in operation and have been put out of service from a few hours to as much as 45 days.

It might be more appropriate to call this our "rustbucket" fleet rather than our national defense reserve fleet.

CAN'T RELY ON FOREIGN SHIPS

To resort to foreign-flag vessels presupposes that they will carry your cargo when and where we wish. Several foreign-flag ships, chartered for Vietnam, have already refused.

Our request that free world shipping stop trading with North Vietnam and Cuba has fallen on deaf ears.

Recently the President authorized the shipment of 3 million additional tons of grain to India. What if other grain programs double? Where are we going to get the ships?

More than half the ships normally in this trade are now employed in the Vietnam sealift. Yet, according to the U.S. Embassy in India, 90 shiploads of wheat will be arriving at a rate of 2 and 3 ships a day.

Are we going to waive the preference requirement that 50 percent of such Government cargoes move in American bottoms? Is this a preconceived maneuver to insure waiver of the preference requirement?

If we are compelled to draw heavily on foreign shipping, we will soon be paying exorbitant rates for the services required.

BUILD IN FOREIGN YARDS?

Certain administration officials are proposing that there be established a fixed level of shipbuilding needed for national security. Federal funds would be made available up to this level. Beyond it, ship operators would be allowed to construct their ships in foreign shipyards. What we are being asked to remove is one of our most effective aids to American shipyards.

SHIPYARDS A DEFENSE INDUSTRY

We have seen examples of the folly of our misplaced overreliance on foreign-flag shipping. What greater folly than to accentuate this error by relying on foreign shipbuilding?

It is through shipyards that we produce the tools of seapower. Shipyards are a defense industry. We cannot afford to relinquish control of this essential mobilization asset.

The Soviet Union is not as apathetic as we to its merchant marine. Russia is rapidly becoming a major maritime power. Last October, the U.S.S.R. had on order an estimated 450 merchant ships while we had 40 under construction or on order.

Today, Russia's merchant fleet exceeds our own active fleet in size and is increasing at a rate of more than 10 times ours. In 5 years, she will have a superiority of two to one.

As a free-world shipping executive is reported to have remarked: "The possibilities for economic blackmail are incalculable."

FIVE TO TEN YEARS LEFT FOR RESERVE FLEET

This is the situation *today: under present actions of our Government* and with no policy for the future; within 5 years probably, and certainly within 10, we will have no useable reserve fleet. Our active fleet will still consist of at least two-thirds obsolete vessels, reaching the very end of their useful life, if not already consigned to the scrapyard.

Five to 10 years may sound ample to correct this situation—but decisions must be taken now—should have been taken 5 years ago if, in 1970 to 1975, we are to have the needed vessels in being. It does take time to plan, finance, and execute a shipbuilding program and time is rapidly running out.

If we do not resolve now to make the necessary effort, beginning immediately, we will not be able to avoid a period of some years during which our merchant shipping capability may be the limiting factor to our ability to project the military and economic power of our Nation in pursuit of national policy and goals.

Answers to written questions from floor

Question (John A. Rowe, Jr.). Does Secretary of Defense expect to use airlift in real emergency?

Answer. There's great reliance on anticipated capacity of new large cargo aircraft. But it's dangerous to get tied to one system of supply.

Question (J. R. Klawans). How long to build a modern ship? To acquire modern fleet?

Answer. Design, financing, to operation, about 3 years. Time to build fleet depends on yard capacity we've allowed to dwindle. If decided today—5 years.

Question (Caspar Zwierlein). How can companies like Matson operate without subsidy?

Answer. They're protected from foreign competition. Still operating with ships acquired at low cost. Some have gone into specialized transport fields.

Question. Will technological breakthrough obsolete proposed expansion program?

Answer. Obsolescence a continuing problem. Maritime Administration could well spend more for research and development. Still, our new ships are as good as any.

Question. (Edgar M. Kahn). Will Congress require greater safety on foreign-flag cruise ships?

Answer. Last year I stated *Yarmouth Castle* was unsafe—3 months later it burned to waterline. If international conferences do not improve standards, United States should act to protect citizens.

Question. (W. K. Potts). Until more restraint on maritime unions, isn't it premature to obtain more ships?

Answer. Unfortunate work stoppages sometimes due to interunion squabbles. Public has right to expect responsibility. I don't think seagoing wages are too high. We cannot expect Americans at sea to take less than those ashore.

Question. (Robert H. Fouke). Long-term policy for adequate merchant marine?

Answer. 1936 Merchant Marine Act still good. We've never used it. We talk of spending $2 billion for supersonic aircraft with 75 percent Government money—should do same with merchant marine.

Question. What effect on merchant marine of C–5A cargo aircraft?

Answer. Bulk movement must come by sea—98 percent of southeast Asia supplies go by sea. This might drop to 95 percent.

Question. Airfreight cost of 3 cents per ton per mile (anticipated for C–5A) undercut cost of sea transport?

Answer. Still only 5 to 1 ratio. Brings costs closer together. Time factor may make difference. Yet takes too much fuel to keep aircraft in air.

Freedom's Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our task in Vietnam is not only to achieve a victory over Communist aggression, but to convince the people that freedom not domination is the natural state of man.

The President's trip to Hawaii dramatized, in the words of the Chicago Sun Times, "not only the U.S. determination to achieve an honorable peace in Vietnam, but also the recognition that a political and ideological campaign to win the people of South Vietnam away from communism must be carried out."

Massive social and economic assistance programs will be necessary, the newspaper asserts, and it pointed out that for more than a decade the Communists have laid the groundwork of their effort to takeover South Vietnam.

> The Communists work at the grassroots level, with the farmers and villagers. They meet simple needs with simple answers. And when all else fails the Communists use a familiar tactic, terror, to achieve dominance.

The Sun Times added that:

> The United States must meet this challenge where the Communists conduct their campaigns, in the countryside.

I found this to be provocative, and I believe that others can benefit from its concise analysis. With this in mind I submit the editorial to the RECORD, to be printed therein:

> FREEDOM AGAINST COMMUNISM
>
> President Johnson's trip to Hawaii dramatizes not only the U.S. determination to achieve an honorable peace in Vietnam, but also the recognition that a political and ideological campaign to win the people of South Vietnam away from communism must be carried out.
>
> To win that battle President Johnson has promised South Vietnam's Premier Ky that his programs of civil reform will be bolstered by massive U.S. programs of social and economic assistance.
>
> Such programs are essential. The Communists have had 11 years in which to lay the groundwork of their effort to take over South Vietnam no matter which way the military struggle goes. Their approach is deceptively simple; it says, over and over, that communism is a better way of life. The Communists work at the grassroots level, with the farmers and villagers. They meet simple needs with simple answers. And when all else fails the Communists use a familiar tactic, terror, to achieve dominance.
>
> The United States must meet this challenge where the Communists conduct their campaigns, in the countryside. If the effort is to be successful it must recognize that it is dealing with a culture and with people which more often than not place greater value on a simple plow than on a tractor, something the Communists have long understood. The United States must institute programs that are designed to convince those it seeks to influence that freedom and not domination—by Communists or by colonists—is the natural state of man. It will be a harder job than winning the military war in Vietnam, or the peace. But part of *the battle is already won—the need has been recognized.*
>
> The rest of the job will be difficult. The South Vietnam Government is weak. About 75 percent of the nation, outside of Saigon, is either in the hands of Comunist guerrillas or "neutral"—not under Saigon's control and under pressure from the Communists. President *Johnson's visit with Saigon's leaders* should give them the prestige they badly need to extend their authority and influence.
>
> The battle in Vietnam is not only for territory; it is, as always, for the minds of men. Victory is essential if the United States is not to be faced with the same fight in many other areas, including Latin America.

Cornelia Gyulahazi Becomes a Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 24, 1966, Cornelia Gyulahazi became a U.S. citizen. Miss Gyulahazi is employed in the Washington, D.C. office of Maupintour, a worldwide planned travel agency, with headquarters in Lawrence, Kans. A company newspaper, the Maupintour Echo, asked Miss Gyulahazi about her feelings and thoughts on the day she became a citizen. I commend her inspiring and well-written response to my colleagues in the Congress. It follows:

> Thank you very much for your letter and congratulations on the occasion of my having been sworn as citizen of the United States. I have sworn to support the Government, to keep up the Constitution and even to take to arms in case of necessity for my new country. And I assure you I meant deadly earnestly every word of the oath.
>
> Still, I confess, in a way I had a little uneasy, aching feeling. I was brought up in a very patriotic way. My mother was always a belligerent patriot and also my father, although in a more bashful way, felt by no means less attached and ardently about his fatherland. I will always remember two of my teachers who saturated by thinking and feeling with pride for my nation, its history, achievements and literature and I was thought to be proud and happy to be Hungarian. I don't seen any reasons to change my feeling toward Hungary now, nor do I feel a traitor or a rat leaving the sinking ship as some of my friends said I was when I left to come here. They said everybody should stay at home and work for freedom at home, but I am sure, that I can do more for Hungary in supporting the U.S. Government as by being at home and working for a government that I and most of the Hungarians loath, just to be able to earn my daily bread and the strict necessities of life. As to do anything for freedom at home? How can one fight as private citizen against a state which is employer, police force and god at the same time? I am convinced if ever Hungary will regain independence, it will be for the valiant fight the United States (so often misjudged, misunderstood and criticized by the whole world and even by her own citizens) puts in for the freedom of the whole world.
>
> Living in this country for more than 5 years now and knowing it better day after day, I believe it is the greatest country in the

world today, I believe it is a model according to which the other nations should try to build their own in the future. I am convinced that the Constitution is a masterpiece of the concerted work of geniuses and I know I will be her loyal citizen as long as I live.

Cornelia.

Estes Kefauver Union of the Free Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, two of the leading citizens of Memphis, Edward J. Meeman and Edmund Orgill, were among the first to support the late Estes Kefauver in his first race for the Senate in 1948. In this month's issue of Freedom and Union, Clarence Streit recalls the support each also gave the idea of Atlantic Union.

This idea has led to a new award to be given every 3 years "to the person who has best served the cause of democracy by effective efforts to bring about the Union of the self-governing peoples of the world who guarantee the freedom of choice and action of the individual, in the spirit of Estes Kefauver who advanced this cause effectively, persistently, and nobly."

Under unanimous consent, I include the article.

[From Freedom & Union, February 1966]

TWO EDS THAT THINK AS ONE

The latest proof of the wonders that can be worked when two men in a U.S. city—a crusading editor and a business leader—think and work together came in the U.S. Senate Caucus Room January 17. There and then, at the reception sponsored by the Estes Kefauver Memorial Foundation, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY announced that the Edward J. Meeman Foundation has put up $50,000 to endow a triennial "Estes Kefauver Union of the Free Award" of $6,000.

The Vice President introduced Mr. Meeman to prolonged applause from the crowd of Kefauver devotees who filled the hall. He explained that the award would go every 3 years "to the person who has best served the cause of democracy by effective efforts to bring about the union of the self-governing peoples of the world who guarantee the freedom of choice and action of the individual, in the spirit of Estes Kefauver who advanced this cause effectively, persistently, and nobly."

Behind this hangs a heart-warming true story of two Eds who thought and worked as one for Federal Union of the Free, with astonishing results on city, State, National, and Atlantic government through the past 20 years. One wonders what great fruits their continued union will bear in the years ahead. One can be sure it will go on working wonders—if only because of the continuous incentive the new award gives men and women everywhere to make effective efforts, in any of the many ways that are needed in so vast an undertaking, to unite the free, in the persistent, noble spirit that characterized Senator Kefauver.

You have guessed the name of one of the two Eds—Mr. Meeman. He is the editor Ed—or rather, he is now editor emeritus of the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar. At its helm he made a lengendary name for himself through 35 years as an outstandingly able and courageous editor, in the great but now declining tradition of crusading, constructive journalism.

Born in Evansville, Ind., too poor to go to college, he got a job at $4 a week on the Scripps-Howard daily, the Press, when he graduated from high school in 1907. In 1921 Robert Scripps sent him to Tennessee to found the Knoxville News. He succeeded so well that it was soon a decisive factor in preserving the beauties of the Great Smoky Mountains as a National Park—and conservation remains one of Ed's lifelong passions. In 1931 he was promoted to editor of the Press-Scimitar.

I first came in touch with him in the early 1940's through his interest in Union Now, but did not meet him until 1947. He and others invited me to speak that November in Memphis, a city I had not yet visited. I agreed, reluctantly. I was hard pressed with work and thought I could use the time much better elsewhere. Thus began the most fruitful speaking engagement I have ever had, one for which I have blessed our guardian angel ever since.

It turned out to be a weekend program of half a dozen talks, starting with a lunch. About a hundred leading citizens had been invited to it by the president of the chamber of commerce. He was the other Ed—Edmund Orgill, president of Orgill Bros. Wholesale Hardware Co. I met both Eds at that same lucky luncheon.

LUNCHEON PLATE AND UNION NOW

In the course of a few thousand speeches I have heard a variety of introductions, but the most memorable was Ed Orgill's that noon. He held up a copy of the 1941 edition of "Union Now" and explained that "attorney Lucius Burch over there"—another of his guests who became my lifelong friend—had loaned it to him, and "kept at" him until he finally gave in and read it. * * * But he "wasn't going to get it back" for "I'm going to ask our speaker to autograph it after this luncheon, and then I'm going to keep it myself * * * even though he should have written this book differently. He should have started with what he put at the end of it as an annex, entitled 'My Own Road to Union.' I'd advise you all to do as I did—start with that sort of postscript, and then I'm sure you'll go back to his first chapter and read it all through, as I did."

There was placed at the plate of each guest a copy of "Union Now" as a gift from him. And this sort of thing, as I have had many occasions to know, is pure unadulterated Ed Orgill.

The weekend ended with one of Ed Meeman's famous Sunday steak dinners at his home in the country. It was, of course, preceded by the conservationist taking his guests on a hike through his surrounding forest, as an aperitif. (A teetotaler, he.) In the general discussion after the dinner, I learned that a number of those present, responsible for my being invited to Memphis had been thinking of organizing a "World Affairs Council" in the city. The aim was to broaden the interests of the people by bringing in speakers to discuss the pro and con of various issues in the foreign field, while the council and the audience remained neutral.

After the merits and demerits of this project had been battled back and forth with no visible progress toward a decision, host Meeman, who had said nothing, finally intervened. Speaking from the stairway where he had been standing, Ed said this:

"Let's stop horsing around. Instead of standing for nothing, let's stand for what we all believe in, and push it along. Let's form, not a world affairs council, but a Memphis chapter of Federal Union. I understand it takes only seven to start one, and there are enough of us here, if we agree, to form it right now."

That half-minute speech led to immediate action. Seven men signed up, and thus Memphis Chapter of Federal Union, Inc. (publisher of this magazine) began—with Ed Orgill as chairman. The seven soon came to prize the piece of paper they had signed.

Next spring one of them—Lucius Burch—told me that he and Ed Meeman admired Congressman Estes Kefauver as a man of exceptional courage, character, and interest in better free government at every level. I had met him and shared their view, though with much less basis for it. They wanted him elected to the Senate that November, but felt that his only hope of defeating the candidate of Boss Crump of Memphis—whose machine they also wished to break—was to get Ed Orgill's active support for Kefauver. Here lay the problem, for Ed was a conservative who did not like liberal Kefauver's opposition to the Taft-Hartley bill curbing labor unions.

The only thing that could get Ed Orgill to back Kefauver, Lucius rightly thought, was for Estes to back Atlantic Federal Union, which had become his No. I concern. Lucius had persuaded Estes to read "Union Now" from "kivver to kivver," as he put it, and it had convinced him. But Ed still balked, and did so for weeks thereafter. Private assurances of the candidate's support of Union of the Free were not enough for him, and he declined even to commit himself in the event of a public assurance. On the other side, various Kefauver advisers feared that a public commitment would be fatal in so uphill a race. The deadlock was broken by a characteristic Kefauver decision.

In announcing formally his candidacy for the Senate on June 5, 1948, Kefauver included this Federal Union plank—although he still had no commitment whatever from Ed Orgill:

"I have studied the matter very closely. I am convinced that the one real way that we can have peace in the world is to join in a kind of federation with the other freedom-loving peoples. * * * I feel that the statesmen of these democracies should work toward this program, just as the statesmen of our Union worked toward building 13 States into the Federation which grew into the great United States of America. * * * It is going to take work, a lot of prayerful thinking, and moral and religious regeneration. But it is not only possible. It must be done." [1]

Thereupon, Ed Orgill promptly joined Ed Meeman and Lucius Burch in a Citizens Committee of Seven for Kefauver which he promptly set up—and which included two other believers in Atlantic Union. Led by one Ed's characteristic drive and the other Ed's shrewd press support, they "went to town" in a way that put fresh meaning in that tired phrase in Memphis.

Result: Boss Crump suffered his first defeat in 28 years. His machine was so effectively broken that within a few years another project dear to the heart of Ed Meeman and Lucius Burch was achieved: The commission form of city government was established in Memphis with Ed Orgill as its first mayor.

Meanwhile, with one Senator elected on an uncontested Atlantic Union plank, another project had been achieved. Federal Union Inc. being an educational organization could not take part in political campaigns or lobby for any legislation. A number of its members, including the two Eds and others, thought the time had come to get an Atlantic Union resolution in Congress and an independent political committee set up to back it.

Before Senator Kefauver was sworn in, he had driven in his car with Ed Orgill, Lucius Burch, Walden Moore and me to the farm of Owen J. Roberts, Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, near Valley Forge and asked if he

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

would lead in organizing such a committee. The Justice promptly agreed, and led so energetically that early in 1949 the Atlantic Union Committee had been created with him as president.

THE BEGINNING OF A LONG FIGHT

By July 1949 the first resolution to call for a convention of democratic nations to explore how far they could unite by "the principles of free Federal union" had been introduced in Congress by Senator Kefauver, with impressive support in both Houses. Thus began the long fight there for this goal.

Senator Kefauver was chief sponsor of the second resolution in 1951, and of the third in 1955. In 1959 he thought it better strategy for the cause for him to step back and support Senator Hubert Humphrey as chief sponsor of the much weaker resolution introduced that year. This resolution was approved by Congress, and led to the Paris Atlantic Convention of 1962, whose main recommendations have remained pigeonholed by the State Department.

Meanwhile, Senator Kefauver's crime investigations had brought him national fame and led to his heartbreaking 1952 and 1956 campaigns for the Democratic nomination for President. They also led to his winning of the 1956 vice-presidential nomination in a photofinish with Senator John F. Kennedy—and the distinction of being the only one who has yet defeated a Kennedy. Then there was the titantic fight he won for a stronger Pure Drug Act, which the New Yorker celebrated in a series by Richard Harris, since published as a book. Meanwhile, there was Senator Kefauver's role as one of the founders of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, in whose annual sessions thereafter he became recognized as an international statesman.

There were any number of surprising, far-reaching results in all levels of government and political life from the fact that two Eds in Memphis began to think and act as one for Federal Union of the Free in 1947, and have never ceased to. Nor did the fruits end with the untimely death of Senator Kefauver in 1963—least of all as regards Atlantic Union.

For one thing, the Senator's soul has gone marching on in Congress where another battle is coming up this year. It results from the introduction of the strong Atlantic Union resolution in both Houses October 18—initiated in the Senate by two Kefauver cosponsors in 1951—Senators Eugene McCarthy and Frank Carlson.

For another thing, the Senator's death led the two Eds to join in getting the Estes Kefauver Memorial Foundation set up with a target of $775,000 to be raised to forward his ideals, and theirs—with Ed Orgill as finance chairman—and tireless fundraiser.

And so it came to pass that Ed-O flashed into the Ed-M half of this two-Edded head the idea that Ed-M's Foundation ought to help Ed-O's Kefauver Foundation by earmarking $50,000 to finance a $6,000 award every 3 years to encourage folks for everafter to work as Estes did for Union of the Free. Ed-M tells me that at first he rather reared back at this brain wave. Editors are less accustomed than businessmen to handing out such big chunks as $50,000. But then, it seems, the imaginative powers [2] which made Ed-M so big an editor took over and knocked him, happily, into Ed-O's corner. At any rate, that's the way—as Walter Cronkite might sometime say—it seems to me.

Thus it came that the Kefauver Memorial Foundation sponsored the caucus room reception as an occasion for making public the Meeman Foundation's contribution of the Kefauver Union of the Free Award.

There Ed-M stressed that "effective efforts" for Union of the Free need not be confined to the political field—they might be in the economic or any other area. He also explained afterward that his foundation has not yet decided when the first award will be made; it might possibly be given later this year for efforts already made to unite the free, or in 1967. He emphasized that his foundation would be glad to get nominations for the award from anyone at any time; they should be sent with a typewritten statement setting forth the effective efforts the nominee has made for Union of the Free, to the Edward J. Meeman Foundation, in care of Press-Scimitar, Memphis, Tenn.

Ed Orgill announced that the Kefauver Foundation has now raised $647,921 of its $775,000 goal, and that another of its projects—the addition of a Kefauver wing to the library at the University of Tennessee, to house the Senator's papers—will be dedicated in June. Yet to be financed are a number of scholarships and a series of annual lectures on Union of Free by outstanding speakers. Ed, who has been a member of the board of Federal Union, Inc., since 1948, believes these are projects which should especially interest his fellow federal unionists, and fellow members of the Board and Advisory Council of the International Movement for Atlantic Union. Certainly he would especially welcome gifts of any size from them. They should be sent to the Kefauver Memorial Foundation, Inc., University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and are deductible from taxable income.

One of the newspaper reports of the reception dwelt fondly on the fact that it was held in the caucus room where the Kefauver crime investigation had been followed through the country by TV. For my part, I thought of the hearings held in that huge room by the Senate Foreign Committee in 1950 on the Kefauver Atlantic Union resolution. I recalled particularly the day when the Senator fired a barrage of questions at the two State Department officials who were opposing it, and showed what a sharp cross-examining attorney he could be. This revealed a new side of the Senator's personality to me—but that's another story.

This story is about the marvels that followed when two Eds began to think and act as one, in their middle-sized city on the Mississippi, in the heart of America * * * began their truly effective efforts for Union of the Free. It seems to me they ought to be the first to get the award they have now set up for others.

Anyway, the best of this story remains untold. That strength lies in union is an old, old saying. But who can say with what new power freedom will be endowed now that, at long last, the first award has been set up to encourage people to work hard to give their own individual liberty this proverbial strength—by effective efforts for Union of the Free?

---

[1] Except for this statement, which proved decisive, Atlantic Union was not a big public issue in the campaign. Kefauver did not duck it, but contrary to expectation Boss Crump did not attack him for it; he ignored it. Instead, he ran full page ads warning voters that Kefauver was like " pet raccoon" who would filch something from you when you weren't looking. It was this that led to Kefauver's resounding entry into Memphis, wearing the coonskin cap that thereafter became his campaign emblem, and turning the tables with the reply, "I may be a pet raccoon, but I'm not Boss Crump's pet raccoon." Ed Meeman says that this vote-winner originated with one of his star reporters, Dick Wallace, who later became Senator Kefauver's administrative assistant—and so interested in Atlantic Union that, after serving as Secretary of the Atlantic Convention in Paris in 1962, he left politics for his present post, Director General of the Atlantic Council of the United States, and coeditor of their Atlantic Community Quarterly.

[2] It should long ago have brought Ed Meeman a Pulitzer Prize. I know of no other editor of a daily paper with his imaginative skill in transforming a national or international story into one of direct local interest. As an old newsman myself I have been eye-openingly impressed by his techniques in keeping his readers interested, through both general and local news columns, in such matters as Atlantic Union, which most of his colleagues seem to think is too hard to interest them in. Since once remote issues—witness Vietnam—no longer can be neglected without costing far more in life and money than gangsters do, it would seem that the Pulitzer judges should pay less attention to rewarding crusaders against local corruption and more to the Ed Meemans, who can dramatize even the epic struggle of a yeast germ in a tub of soggy dough.

President Johnson's Plan for Broadening the Attack on Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's recommendations for broadening the Federal attack on water pollution have been warmly welcomed all over the Nation.

As one who represents a district bordering terribly polluted Lake Erie, I was most encouraged by the fact that the President took special note of the deteriorating conditions of this lake. To preserve it will require huge investments of money, and I hope that the Governors of the States bordering the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin will apply to have it designed as a demonstration project under the new program when—hopefully—Congress approves and the President signs the bill into law.

The President's proposal for attacking the pollution problem on an entire river basin makes sense. Obviously, it does not do much good if one industry abates pollution if an upstream municipality does nothing to halt its pollution.

The President's recommendations for more funds, stricter enforcement, stepped-up research and transfer of the Water Pollution Control Administration to the Interior Department certainly deserves the most serious and sympathetic attention of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective and well-informed writers on the complex subject of water pollution is Mr. Gladwin Hill of the New York Times. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include here an article he wrote for the Times of February 25:

The Clear Water Fight: President Casts Himself as Referee, Wielding a Big Carrot and a Big Stick

(By Gladwin Hill)

Los Angeles, February 24.—For generations the American public has been engaged in a great wrestling match with itself—on the one hand polluting the Nation's waterways to a sickening extent, on the other hand deploring the results. Pressures for reform have regularly been countered by the inertia of those with vested interests in pollution, ranging from the myriad stockholders in filth-producting industries to citizens who balk at paying taxes for adequate sewage treatment facilities.

President Johnson has now cast himself in the role of the big referee to break up this schizophrenic struggle. His message to Congress yesterday, outlining the most far-reaching antipollution effort to date, was in essence a six-word exhortation: Stop fooling around with this thing.

THE 1965 ACT A COMPROMISE

Less than 5 months ago Congress enacted the National Quality Water Act of 1965, which was hailed, even by President Johnson, as a great advance.

It increased by 50 percent, to $150 million a year, the authorization for Federal grants to localities for sewerage construction. And it told the States that if they did not draw up reasonable clean water standards by July 1967, the Federal Government would step in and do it.

But this legislation was a compromise, hammered out after months of debate before congressional committees. Numerous spokesmen for industries, States, and localities had opposed thorough-going reform, using such pleas as poverty and States rights.

President Johnson's exhortation to Congress to have another, and more conclusive, go at the problem, was characteristically accompanied by both a big carrot and a big stick.

AID AND ENFORCEMENT

The carrot included assurances that river-basin areas that shaped up quickly would receive more friendly Federal collaboration and bounty from a new $50 million subsidy fund. The stick was a set of proposed enforcement measures that will be regarded in many quarters as Draconian—allowing the Federal Government to attack intrastate pollution (where up to now it has had to defer to State Governors) and even allowing private citizens to file Federal suits against polluters.

The enforcement proposals will evoke opposition from the same quarters as before. Cleaning up the Great Lakes alone is estimated as entailing a $20 billion outlay, largely by industry and municipalities. Informed observers would be surprised to see the proposals sail through Congress this year.

But the very enunciation of the proposals provides salutary pressure for the States to expedite clean-up steps. And the President conspiculously kept an ace up his sleeve.

TAX PROPOSAL

He paid elaborate respect in his message to his Science Advisory Committee and its report of last November on restoring the quality of our environment, but he pointedly withheld mention of one of the Committee's major recommendations.

This recommendation hangs as a threat over all those involved in water and air pollution. It is a proposal that careful study be given to a system of taxing pollution sources in measured proportion to the contaminants they discharge into the public domain.

To many involved in pollution, a tax of this sort could be far more costly than voluntary cooperation in local, State, and regional cleanup programs.

The most tangible of the President's proposals was that the newly established Water Pollution Control Administration be transferred from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of the Interior, where so many other national water activities are centered. This is an administrative measure that automatically takes effect in 60 days unless Congress disapproves it, which appears unlikely.

MEANING OF MOVE

The transfer will mean a shift of 1,530 Government workers—253 in Washington, 266 in the Public Health Service's Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati, and the rest scattered over the country. It will magnify Water Pollution Control from a small agency in a department with a $9 billion budget, and proportionately diverse activities, into a major division of a department with a $1.7 billion budget.

A number of water pollution experts canvassed today agreed that apart from this, the shift in itself will not presage any radical change in the agency's activities—that the agency's effectiveness will depend largely on the caliber of the staff.

Now that the departmental transfer has been tentatively effected, an appointment to the agency's $25,000 a year directorship is expected soon.

L.B.J.'s Goal: Checkmate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Detroit News of February 28, 1966, on the Vietnam situation:

THE WORRIED AMERICAN AND VIETNAM—L.B.J.'s GOAL: CHECKMATE

The disquiet in this Nation over the Vietnam war is not confined to those critics, old Senate hands or youthful demonstrators, who oppose our active involvement, or to those whose slogan is, "Let's bomb the heart out of the Reds and get it over with."

Millions of Americans who support the President in his determination to keep our pledge and halt Communist aggression feel frustrated, have nagging doubts and raise such questions as:

How long will the conflict continue? Is it a step to a wider, or nuclear war? Can we achieve our simple goal—to help the South Vietnamese, secure and independent, plan their own future without coercion? If so, how much will it cost in lives and money, and are we going about it the right way?

The final question President Johnson himself posed in replying to the worried American at the Freedom House dinner: Is it worth it?

In World War II such questions were not asked. The aggression was directly against ourselves, the war was unlimited and our goal was announced unequivocally: unconditional surrender. The issue over Vietnam is not so clear cut.

For instance, Admiral Nimitz is reported before his death to have commented to a newsman: "I fear the war will result in a stalemate like Korea, but we must continue to keep our commitments."

The worried American is asking why all the blood, tears, and sweat that may lie ahead if Vietnam winds up as a stalemate? The answer to that is that Korea was no stalemate. The North Koreans set out to seize the south. The U.N. forces stopped them. It became checkmate, not stalemate. The Reds found out they couldn't win. They cried "enough," and today, 16 years later, South Korea is still free.

If the South Vietnam conflict winds up similarly, that again will be checkmate. Checkmate should always be the goal in limited wars. And, despite the warhawks, what is so novel or unsatisfying about such a goal? During the limited peace we've lived with in the postwar era, we've fulfilled many similar goals. We checkmated potential aggression in the Formosa Straits, West Berlin, and in the Cuban missile showdown without firing a shot. This time the aggression is real, not potential, but the result we aim at is no different.

It is true this Nation has had litle experience with limited wars. The British fought them for generations. But in this nuclear-stalemated age, when an aggressor, lacking nuclear power, elects to fight the type of war he fights in Vietnam, one has to meet him head on—although bound by the confining rules that the horror of nuclear warfare clamps on us all.

If the pressures at home, political or emotional, pacifist or hawklike, inhibit Mr. Johnson from fighting the sort of limited war that is necessary in Vietnam, and if the American people haven't the fortitude, patience and will to sustain him in his resolve to keep it limited, then all of us are on the slippery slope where all conflict becomes nuclear. And if that happens, one such war will be sufficient.

Nor is escalation up to the President alone. It is the responsibility of the Reds also. Some critics hold that only the L.B.J. finger is on the escalation trigger. Yet no amount of argument about which side is guilty of promoting counterescalation gets us anywhere.

The President is not playing a solo hand. It takes two to make a war, as it takes two to make a peace. We at least know which of the two started this war and which of the two lays down conditions that block an honorable—as opposed to a face-saving—cease-fire.

How long will the war last? Like escalation, that is up to the Reds, too.

Is it worth it? The answer there is simple. We are today fighting the first war we've been called on to fight as a direct result of our postwar treaties and commitments. All those treaties have aimed at halting Communist aggression. This time, in blood, America and freedom are being actively challenged. If we duck the obligation that lies on us all, however dire the cost, the credibility of every alliance we've made with every nation since World War II is shattered.

The Reds would get the signal. So, too, would our allies and the neutrals.

Invocation by Mrs. Samuel Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, today I had the pleasure of attending a luncheon of the National Council of Jewish Women. The invocation was offered by Mrs. Samuel Brown and was so impressive that I thought I would share the sentiments expressed with my colleagues, and under unanimous consent I include her invocation in the Appendix of the RECORD:

INVOCATION BY MRS. SAMUEL BROWN, MARCH 1, 1966

As we bring to a conclusion these 2 days in which we have met with one another grant us O Lord the wisdom and the understanding to work together for responsible action so that we can bring to fulfillment the dream of an America in which all citizens enjoy its blessings. May we persevere in the conduct of our daily lives to a commitment to the ideals and principles of the National Council of Jewish Women, and to an understanding of the more demanding role of the individual volunteer in our society today. We pray for guidance to help us carry out our belief that the ills of society are not the laws of nature, but instead can be changed by men, for we know there is no security for any of us unless there is safety for all, nor is there well-being for one unless there is concern for the welfare of all people. Amen.

Kansas Legislature Resolution on Interstate Taxation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of House Concurrent Resolution 507 adopted by the Kansas State Legislature. The Kansas Legislature has expressed well the need for States to meet and resolve problems which they face rather than have the Federal Government enter into areas which are reserved to the States.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 507

Concurrent resolution memorializing the U.S. Congress to discontinue further consideration of H.R. 11798

Whereas the U.S. Congress is presently considering H.R. 11798; and

Whereas although we recognize that as methods of business change to meet new situations our tax laws must keep pace with this progress, after serious deliberation we have reached a unanimous conclusion that H.R. 11798 will not materially aid in keeping pace with such progress but will constitute an unwarranted, unnecessary and undesirable intrusion into the tax and fiscal jurisdiction of this State and our local governments and will be destructive of the principles of federalism enunciated by our Founding Fathers; and

Whereas H.R. 11798 in its present form contains certain provisions which would result in different tax treatment of comparable business operations thereby creating inequities, and which would compound rather than resolve tax administrative problems, as well as provisions which are not sufficiently clear and certain as to their effect on business and governmental revenues and administration; and

Whereas we believe that this State has voluntarily and in good faith achieved substantial progress in relieving the burden of taxpayers carrying on business in two or more States by:

(a) Adopting the Uniform Division of Income for Tax Purposes Act, recommended by the national conference of commissioners on uniform State laws;

(b) Adopting provisions whereby credit is given against the State's use tax for sales or use taxes paid in another jurisdiction on transactions by which the property involved was acquired; and

Whereas the legislature of this State is based upon a formal study, presently considering an amendment to the State constitution which would permit the adoption of the U.S. income tax base as the State tax base on a current and prospective basis subject to the necessary adjustments thereto; and

Whereas although progress has been made, we recognize that there are further areas in which tax compliance problems may be simplified by the adoption by the States of uniform statutory provisions and regulations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the Kansas Legislature respectfully urges the U.S. Congress to discontinue further consideration of H.R. 11798 and give the States sufficient time in which to accomplish a resolution of problems in the area of State and local taxation of interstate business by which simplification, clarification, and uniformity could be achieved thereby assuring that such actions would be taken in an effective manner and with due consideration of practical administrative procedures and the economic impact upon the States and their political subdivisions; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is directed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each of the members of the Kansas congressional delegation.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house and was adopted by that body January 31, 1966:

CLYDE HILL,
Speaker of the House.
L. D. HAZEN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the Senate February 8, 1966:

JOHN CRUTCHER,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

The Late Honorable Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the magnificent memory of ALBERT THOMAS will resound for years to come in this Chamber because the echo of his voice and the footprints of his life's dedication are immortal.

Not only his colleagues but people from all walks of life approached ALBERT for help with problems of major and minor significance—and each of them received a courteous audience and a helping hand. For ALBERT THOMAS, despite the high position he had attained, remained a kindly man whose patient guidance and thorough understanding endeared him to countless numbers of people who join me in mourning the passing of a "very dear friend."

We are taught that each of us is born with certain talents and the responsibility to multiply those talents. There is not the slightest question in my mind but what ALBERT's race was well run and that his life's work was eminently well done.

My heartfelt sympathy is extended to Mrs. Thomas and the two children. They, too, have suffered a great loss. But I hope they will find consolation in the fact that ALBERT THOMAS left them a cherished heritage that few of us can hope to approximate. His rule of life might well have been taken from the words of the poet, Edgar Guest, who said:

Somebody said that it couldn't be done
  But he with a chuckle replied
That "maybe it couldn't" but he would be one
  Who wouldn't say so till he'd tried.

Long Beach-Yokkaichi Sister City Activities Fulfill Informal Diplomacy Requirements at Their Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pleasant and rewarding community actions by a number of the Nation's cities is that of a sister city relationship with some city in another country of the free world. When vigorously pursued, the value of these relationships is high.

Such a relationship exists between the city of Long Beach and Yokkaichi, a similar port city in Japan. This sister city relationship is one of the most outstanding and active there is. Great credit is due the sister city committees of both cities for making it so. Recently the Japan-America Society of Southern California cited Long Beach for its remarkable achievements within its sister city affiliation.

These are recounted in a letter to the society by Robert H. Metzger, executive secretary of the Long Beach-Yokkaichi Sister City Committee. I have asked that the letter be reproduced below since it may be of value to other cities as an outline for the pursuit of their own sister city activities:

THE PORT OF LONG BEACH,
Long Beach, Calif., February 4, 1966.

Mr. KATSUMA MUKAEDA,
Executive Secretary, Japan-America Society of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. MUKAEDA: The Long Beach-Yokkaichi Sister City Committee has received a letter from you announcing the annual anniversary banquet and Sakura debutante ball on February 12, to be sponsored by the Japan-America Society. You also invited our committee to prepare an outline of activities and exchanges between our two cities during the calendar year 1965.

In January, in a magazine similar to Life, five pages of photographs, both in color and black and white, and accompanying text, told the story of the affiliation of the two cities, Long Beach and Yokkaichi.

In May the Long Beach Symphony Association honored our sister city of Yokkaichi with a formal dress dinner dance Geijutsu-Sai. The glamorous affair was attended by 400 people in the International Ballroom of the Lafayette Hotel. Authentic Japanese entertainment was provided by the Japanese-American Citizens League, Long Beach Chapter. For the occasion, Yokkaichi had sent 60 woven baskets with accompanying cherry blossoms made of paper, which, when assembled, became the very beautiful table decorations for the dinner party. These decorations were sold to guests of the dinner, and the proceeds, amounting to $200, were sent to the Children's Orphanage of Yokkaichi.

On August 2, Mr. Ryuichi Hoshizaki, Yokkaichi schoolteacher; Mr. Yukinori Nanno, boy student; and Kimiko Hashimoto, girl student, arrived in Long Beach for a 3-week visit. Previous arrangements had been made by the Sister City Committee to house the three guests in separate homes in Long Beach.

While they were here they made an official call upon the Long Beach City Council; attended high school track meets; were guests of service club luncheons; participated in the official dedication of the Mikoshi Shrine; attended the Harbor Department's annual Consular Corps dinner party, attended the shows and activities of the International Beauty Pageant; were official guests of honor at a picnic sponsored by the Japanese-American Citizens League; made sightseeing and educational tours of the city and the port; attended the Long Beach-Yokkaichi Sister City Committee meeting; took part in the annual "Wedding of the Waters" ceremony at the harbor; attended high school summer classes; made inspection tours of all city departments; made trips to the mountain areas and stayed overnight in the Boy Scout and Girl Scout camps, and, as members of their own foster families, made numerous trips throughout the Southland to the usual tourist locations.

Long Beach is now preparing to reciprocate by sending a teacher and two students to Yokkaichi this summer.

An August 5, the late Mayor Hirata of Yokkaichi and his wife, and an official delegation from that city arrived in Long Beach. The official purpose was to formally deliver and present the official gift from the city of Yokkaichi to Long Beach, a beautiful portable Mikoshi shrine. This group also attended the port's annual formal dress consular corps dinner party. Mayor Hirata, along with Mayor Wade of Long Beach, rode in the official lead car at the head of the international beauty pageant parade, which was witnessed by at least a half-million people. Following the car was the Mikoshi shrine, carried by a large contingent of Japanese Navy sailors, along with the ceremonial drum and other paraphernalia. These contingents preceded the official float of Miss Japan, who was a contestant in the beauty pageant.

The official Yokkaichi delegation were guests of the annual dinner party sponsored by the executive secretaries of Long Beach.

Other activities enjoyed by the delegation were sightseeing trips throughout the city and port, attendance at the sister city committee meeting, attended the shows and performances of the international beauty pageant where Mayor Hirata was formally introduced by the master of ceremonies and asked to stand in the audience and be recognized with floodlights, guests of honor of service clubs' luncheons, and special guests at private citizen home receptions and parties.

Mayor Hirata received a commemorative plaque from Harbor Commissioner James Craig from the Long Beach Council of Boy Scouts, in recognition of Mayor Hirata's work in the Scout movement in his city.

Mayor Wade and Mayor Hirata officially presided at a special dedication ceremony for the Mikoshi shrine at its permanent place of exhibit, which is in the rotunda of the Long Beach Municipal Arena. The dedication, attended by a large number of citizens, was preceded by the national anthems of Japan and the United States, played by the Long Beach Municipal Band.

While Mayor Hirata was in Long Beach last summer, he was asked what sort of a gift can Long Beach send to our sister city in Yokkaichi. Mayor Hirata suggested an oil well pump which he believes represents the city and the port, inasmuch as the city of Yokkaichi is a petrochemical industrial port city.

The Long Beach-Yokkaichi Sister City Committee was instrumental in obtaining a full-size working model oil well pump and its accompanying valves, gages, and tank reservoir from the Signal Oil & Gas Co. The pump was put into perfect working order with an electric motor, sandblasted, cleaned, and repainted, and shipped to Yokkaichi. It was also accompanied by a 3-foot-high model oil well derrick which runs by electricity, and with the accompanying descriptive text in Japanese, illustrates how an oil well is drilled into the depths of the earth to reach oil.

In November, an official delegation from Long Beach, including Councilman Robert Crow, acting mayor; Councilman Pat Corbett; Councilman and Mrs. William Graham; Long Beach Harbor Commission president, W. A. Harrington, and Long Beach Harbor Commission vice president, H. E. Ridings, Jr., traveled to Yokkaichi for the purpose of formally delivering and dedicating Long Beach's gift to its sister city. With pomp and ceremony, Mayor Hirata and his city officials formally dedicated the gift before a large audience of Yokkaichi citizens. The Long Beach delegation was royally treated for 5 days before returning home.

Acting mayor, Mr. Crow, took with him personally a large scroll provided by the students of the Stephens Junior High School in Long Beach. The scroll contained a message of welcome both in Japanese and English, and was signed by the entire student body of nearly 900 children.

While the official party was in Yokkaichi, Harbor Commission President Harrington conferred upon Mayor Hirata the coveted title of honorary pilot of the port of Long Beach. The official symbol for this title is a handsome ship's wheel clock. This was probably the last official honorary degree that Mayor Hirata received just prior to his death a few days following.

Mr. John Hasegawa, the port's official representative in Japan, travel to Yokkaichi to formally represent the city and port at the civic funeral of Mayor Hirata.

Continuing throughout the year was a program of pen pal letters guided by the International Committee of the Downtown Kiwanis Club.

The Jordan High School of Long Beach has adopted a high school in Yokkaichi and frequently exchange many items of greetings and culture.

The California State College at Long Beach and the Long Beach city schools have sent over 300 school textbooks which are presently located in the Long Beach corner of the municipal library of Yokkaichi.

In closing, it has been a pleasure to not only participate in all of the activities mentioned above, but it also is a pleasure to recite them once again for you and your society.

It goes without saying, that Long Beach is very active in its sister city affiliation. We take pleasure in the preparation of all of the activities, and look forward to many years of continued success.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT H. METZGAR,
Executive Secretary, Long Beach-Yokkaichi Sister City Committee.

Wilson Back From Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of February 28, 1966:

WILSON BACK FROM MOSCOW

British Prime Minister Wilson accomplished nothing spectacular during his visit to Moscow—and yet it was worthwhile. There is validity in the argument that occupants of No. 10 Downing Street are in a position—akin to that of the Canadians—to make a special contribution as spokesman for the alliance led by the United States. In some ways, because of the cold facts of power, that contribution will usually be a subordinate one. But occasionally there are things that the United States cannot say or do but which can be said or done—to U.S. advantage—by a British or Canadian leader.

In trying to arrange a pattern of meetings with Soviet Premier Kosygin, Mr. Wilson has been following in the steps of his Conservative predecessors in the premiership. Like him, they felt there was a helpful role between the giants for Britain to play, without prejudice to Britain's commitment to the United States.

Foes and critics of the United States err all too often in misinterpreting American intentions—whether the outcome of loyalty to a commitment on the one hand or, on the other, American self-restraint and sincerity in the search for peace. President Johnson has had in Europe few more unwavering and eloquent exponents of his policies in Vietnam than Mr. Wilson and Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart. We are sure that Mr. Wilson will have made clear to the Soviet leaders that American intentions and purposes in Vietnam are not base.

Further, in the search for a settlement in Vietnam, a contribution has certainly been made by Lord Chalfont's talk with the North Vietnamese representative in Moscow—a discussion which might have been impossible now if sought directly between a United States and a North Vietnamese representative. Eventual full-scale negotiation with North Vietnam remains the overall aim; and against this background we welcome, too, the Swiss Government's ably worded message to President Ho Chi Minh beckoning him to a conference table in Geneva.

The other area where patient diplomacy behind closed doors is still needed to smooth away hitches and prejudices hitherto blocking progress is the proposed treaty to control the spread of nuclear weapons. Moscow has been adamant so far about anything likely (in Rusian eyes) to leave the door open for Germans to get their hands on such weapons. What the Russians have not properly understood is that governments and peoples within the Western alliance have reservations on this very point, too. The Britons certainly have. So let us hope that Mr. Wilson, as a Briton, was able to assure Mr. Kosygin that Washington was well aware of what was felt in both halves of Europe on this very point.

Summit meetings between American Presidents and Soviet Premiers should be rare, held only when there is likelihood of something significant being accomplished by them. But such accomplishments can be brought about only if there is quiet and businesslike communication preparing the way for them. Above all, there is a continuing need to get behind the curtain of perhaps inevitable public utterances and public posturing to discover what is in fact behind it. To the extent that he has done this—or helped Mr. Kosygin to do it—Mr. Wilson has performed a service for us all.

Worthington Needs a Doctor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, with the rising draft call, and the increased need for medical doctors in the armed services, many small communities are having difficulty obtaining the services of a general practitioner.

One such community is Worthington, Mass., located in the beautiful western portion of the great Commonwealth in the First Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent in the Congress.

A community of 643 persons, Worthington is prepared to offer a completely furnished suit of offices, examining rooms, and laboratory free of charge. Modern equipment is also available free of charge. The practice yields a gross income of $12,000 to $14,000 with a growth potential up to $25,000.

Knowing that many young doctors are being called into the armed services, Worthington has drawn up an impressive prospectus which is being distributed not only to young internists, but also to doctors over 50 who may want a change of pace and would like to work in the relaxed atmosphere of the country.

I would like to conclude my remarks by inserting at this point an article which further explains the problem confronting the people of Worthington and their resourceful means of solving that problem.

The article follows:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Feb. 21, 1966]

WORTHINGTON SEEKS DOCTOR IN MAIL CAMPAIGN

(By Lois Ashe Brown)

WORTHINGTON.—"What this community can offer a doctor" is the subject of a prospectus drawn up for the Worthington Health Center by Dr. Carl S. Joslyn, a former director and president of the center.

Now retired from the Springfield Welfare Department, Dr. Joslyn has volunteered his time to this undertaking. In addition to writing the prospectus, he has compiled a mailing list from a directory of doctors who are nearing the end of internships or for those over 50 who may be interested in a change of pace, and copies of the prospectus has been mailed to them.

WHAT POSITION OFFERS

The cover bears a pen and ink drawing of the new brick and frame health center on Old North Road. The drawing was contributed by local Artist George W. Humphrey. The three major attractions for a doctor in Worthington are listed as "fully equipped suite of offices, established practice with good growth potential and ideal living conditions for his family."

By way of explaining what the Worthington Health Association can offer a doctor, the prospectus says, "Through this nonprofit organization, the residents of five rural towns in western Massachusetts have combined their resources in order to obtain for themselves the best possible medical care. We already have on our staff a dentist who has been with us for the past 8 years and an optometrist who has been on our staff for 14 years.

"The physician who had been serving us was called to Germany for a family emergency."

According to the prospectus, the physician meeting Worthington's needs would fit the following description:

"He would like the advantages of country living and would be willing to put up with the disadvantages.

"He would prefer general practice to practice in a specialty.

"He would be able to qualify for a license to practice in Massachusetts.

"He would want to practice independently, rather than as an employee of an organization."

Further, it advises, "To get the kind of a man we want, this organization is prepared to offer the following inducements: A completely furnished suite of offices, examining rooms, and laboratory for his use, free of charge; modern equipment for the diagnosis and treatment of patients, also available free of charge; a going practice yielding a gross income of $12,000 to $14,000 a year with a growth potential up to $25,000, and the opportunity to conduct his practice with the same freedom he would have if he were using facilities of his own.

NEW BUILDING

"The offices for the use of our physician, dentist and optometrist are housed in a new building of brick and frame construction on the main road in Worthington. Office accommodations available for the physician include a large waiting room, a receptionist's office, a consulting room, three examining rooms, (two adult and one pediatric), a laboratory, an X-ray room, a dressing room and a utility room. All of these rooms, except that intended for X-ray work, are completely furnished and equipped. Actual purchase of the X-ray apparatus has been deferred until the doctor's wishes in the matter are known. Adjoining the X-ray room, which is leadlined, is a darkroom for the development of X-ray film.

The prospectus then gives a more detailed description of the equipment for a doctor's use at the health center and stresses the "freedom of practice." "In no sense," it says, "are the doctors at the health center employees of the association. Their relationship is, rather, that of lessors or tenants who pay a nominal rental ($1) for the use of its facilities."

Hospitals in Pittsfield, Northampton, and Westfield are then described in some detail, and the distance and roads leading to each are explained. The advantages of living in the Hampshire Hills are outlined along with a listing of the cultural opportunities offered. Educational advantages and housing accommodations are described, plus the assurance that every possible help will be extended to a doctor wishing to settle in Worthington.

The prospectus advises any interested doctor that he may call or write Donald I. Thompson in Worthington for an appointment. Hopes are high that somewhere soon, a copy of this prospectus will fall into the hands of just the right doctor for the Worthington Health Association. Meanwhile, the health center is being served by area doctors on a temporary basis.

Report From Saigon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it has to be pointed out over and over again that the aggressors in Vietnam are the Communists and that in addition they are the ones who are escalating the war.

The tide has turned, however, and as the following report from Saigon by the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop, indicates the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese allies are losing what support they did have within South Vietnam by their vicious behavior.

Mr. Alsop's article appeared in the February 21, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune and follows:

IF WE WERE THERE

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—In this ugly war, the South Vietnamese and Americans still have a lot of problems to solve—many of which have been handmade in Washington. But still another look at the war here teaches the lesson that General Westmoreland ought to thank God he is not Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap.

The inflation of the enemy's regular forces, by invasion from the north and press gang conscription in the south, is the prime challenge to the American-Vietnamese leadership. (When people at home gabble about "escalation," incidentally, they should bear in mind that it is the enemy who is doing the escalating.) But this is almost trifling compared to what the Vietcong commanders now have to worry about.

The best place to begin a list of the enemy's worries is the drastic change in the war's pattern during the last year. Only a year ago, above all, intelligence concerning the Vietcong was needed just as urgently as more troops to fight the Vietcong. But now the intelligence pours in at such a rate that the United States and Vietnamese high commands have had to organize a regular assembly line processing system for the masses of data.

In a single week in February, for example, no less than 1,000 Vietcong and North Vietnamese prisoners of war and military defectors had to be interrogated on the assembly line. And more than 7 tons of captured documents were also in the works.

Just one Vietcong prisoner of war or defector used to be a 9-day wonder here. But in that first week of February, there were close to 500 prisoners (many of whom were really voluntary defectors, for hiding on the battlefield until discovery by our troops is the easiest way to escape from the constant espionage by which the Vietcong hold their weaker units together.) The payoff can be seen in the battle results.

In the big Masher-White Wing operation up in Binhdinh, General Westmoreland had ample warning from intelligence of an enemy concentration in divisional strength, which was meant to be employed in a drive southward. He mounted a brilliant spoiling attack, which not only aborted the planned enemy drive southward, but also spoiled the gizzard out of two enemy regiments and is now spoiling a third regiment.

Vietnamese operations rarely get reported nowadays, but in the same period they have ben equally successful. The count of Vietcong battalions located, pinned down, and very severely mauled in the obscure delta fighting has already reached five this month.

Another very striking change in the pattern is the number of enemy dead now regularly left on the battlefield. Only a year ago, it was rare to find any.

In the starlight operation last summer, when the old battlefield discipline still held, the Vietcong dead were dragged with pork butchers' meat hooks to hidden burial trenches.

Now, in contrast, the gruesome body counts run to very high figures. The harvest guarding operation in Phuoc Tuy Province, jointly undertaken by Vietnamese, Korean, and American troops, has made no headlines and has indeed hardly gotten into the papers. But besides rescuing many thousands of tons of rice from the Vietcong, this single operation has already produced an enemy body count above 600—which means the equivalent of another regiment knocked out of the ring.

Nor are these indicators, grave as they are, the most painful and basic matters of concern for General Giap. The inflation of the North Vietnamese and VC regular forces is obviously intended to create a new balance in the war, and thus to secure a decision this year—probably as a result of the faintheartedness that is so freely displayed by so many people in Washington who would surely know better if they knew anything at all about the war.

But the price of this inflation has been inconceivably high. One can itemize. First, the old promise to take only voluntary contributions and levy no taxes was ruthlessly broken in 1964. The tax rates, already substantial, were then doubled and in some areas even tripled in 1965. It is now common to find poor peasants who were given land by the VC, but have fled the VC areas because they cannot pay their taxes. The refugee flow continues and the VC tax base therefore continues to shrink.

The VC promise that all military service would be strictly voluntary has also been flagrantly broken. In the spring of 1965, universal conscription was enforced by such press gang methods that in many villages, boys only 15 years old were marched off with the other recruits. In central Vietnam and one or two other areas, the reserves of manpower available to the VC have already shrunk almost to zero. And whenever they get the chance most conscripts desert.

Yet if one may judge by the experience of November, December, and January, the inflation of VC and North Vietnamese regular units is still being obstinately pressed forward. Foreseeably, this continuous increase of regiments that must be supported and supplied with replacements will end by imposing far too heavy a burden on the VC infrastructure in the countryside.

Something must eventually give somewhere and give in a big way, too, if General Westmoreland is only enabled to keep the pressure on. That is really the main point to note about this war.

Tribute to the Honorable Albert Thomas of Texas

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my deep regret and sorrow at the passing of ALBERT THOMAS.

History demonstrates that this House is a sound judge of men and their character. The respect, admiration, and devotion of the Members of this body are the surest test of greatness. During his 30 years of service in Congress, ALBERT THOMAS met that test. The sincerity of emotion which has marked his passing is but a final confirmation of ALBERT THOMAS' monumental achievements. ALBERT THOMAS firmly believed that the U.S. Congress must fulfill its role vigorously and responsibly.

His burden was great, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, but his competence and dedication have earned him a prominent place in the annuals of our Nation.

It has been truly said that there could only be one ALBERT THOMAS and that we are much the lesser for his passing. But it is also true that his stirring example of courage and compassion will serve as an inspiration to all those aspiring to serve this Congress and the Nation.

Speech by Representative Bob Dole, of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE SKUBITZ
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, recently Congressman ROBERT DOLE of the 1st District of Kansas addressed the members of the Norton County Soil Conservation District at their 20th annual meeting. His remarks mirror the pride, concern, and significance which we Kansans attach to the various programs of soil conservation in our State.

Because of the wholehearted devotion our farmers and the State and local units of Kansas government have given to these programs, the Dust Bowl days of the thirties are a thing of the past. Nearly 24 million acres of our State are blanketed with basic soil conservation plans. Kansas has 23 small watershed projects in the works, 18 more on the drawing boards, and 72 applications for watershed development assistance are on file. In my district alone there are 72 rural water districts at latest count.

BOB DOLE's remarks to the people from Norton County recount the past achievements in glowing terms. But this is not merely the satisfaction of a job well done and a time to stop and reflect on the merit of our laurels. As Congressman DOLE points out, there is much more to be done, and in many ways we have just begun. BOB's speech is a significant and important one, and with permission granted I place it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and others who might be interested.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE BOB DOLE, OF KANSAS

(Delivered before the 20th annual meeting of the Norton County Soil Conservation District, Norton, Kans., February 19, 1966)

I am happy to be here with you at this 20th annual meeting of the Norton County Soil Conservation District.

In 1946, the farmers and ranchers of Norton County began a new era of cooperative effort to control erosion and flooding on the land, and to develop the soil and water resources of the county.

Today, 626 Norton County landowners and operators are district cooperators. Of these, 596 have basic conservation plans on 236,000 acres of land. These cooperators, I understand, represent 58 percent of the farmers and ranchers in the county.

You have realized noteworthy accomplishments in the 20 years the Norton district has been in existence. I understand that 33 percent of the land in Norton County is adequately treated from a conservation standpoint. Your district ranks third highest in Kansas in the construction of terraces with 5,800 miles completed—70 percent of the conservation need.

Statewide, 105 organized soil conservation districts blanket Kansas. District cooperators number more than 87,000. Nearly 24 million acres of Kansas land is covered by basic soil conservation plans.

The State of Kansas has come a long way since the days of the Dust Bowl when the great need for soil and water conservation became dramatically evident across the Great Plains.

More than 2,100 Great Plains conservation program contracts have been completed in the State, embracing over 1,660,000 acres of land. I see that more than 67,000 acres of cropland will be converted to grass under Great Plains contracts, and that more than 140,000 acres of rangeland will be improved.

I note that soil surveys, basic to proper land-use planning and development, have been completed on more than 31 million acres in Kansas, over 60 percent of the State.

Local initiative and participation has been active in seeing to the completion of 5 projects under the pilot watershed program established in 1953, and in the many small watershed projects developed under Public Law 566, approved in 1954.

Kansas is one of the Nation's leading States in watershed project applications, planning, and construction. Kansas has 23 small watershed projects completed or under development, and four of these are multiple-purpose projects for municipal water supply and recreation, in addition to watershed protection and flood prevention. An additional 18 projects have been authorized for planning assistance.

Just as most of the soil conservation districts in Kansas have, admirably, broadened their conservation programs for better land-use planning and development to meet updated needs, so small watershed projects should be designed to take full advantage of their potential to serve a variety of needs in the watershed.

The small watershed project, I believe, offers the best opportunity for soil and water resource development within the soil conservation district. It is a basic program, designed to meet particular area needs. These projects are inspired and initiated by local people, and developed largely through local effort. The multiple purpose watershed project best serves the rural and urban demands upon the area's soil and water resources.

I think we Kansans can be proud of the interest in soil and water conservation thus far shown by the State and local governments.

A recent amendment to the State soil conservation district law makes State financial assistance available to districts, and the 1963 State Water Plan Act provides for further State participation in water conservation programs.

The Kansas Legislature has appropriated $120,000 for watershed planning in each of the past 4 fiscal years, an increase from $90,000 appropriated in fiscal years 1961 and 1962.

Total State appropriations for soil conservation work in fiscal year 1966 amounts to $345,071. The value of local government contributions to help carry out the program of the local soil conservation districts in the current fiscal year is approximately $187,500.

These highly encouraging developments at the State and district levels are benchmarks that establish the progress being made in meeting soil and water conservation needs. We know that there is much more to be done.

For example, 236 of 305 small watersheds in Kansas have been found to need works of improvement. Yet, only 72 applications for watershed development assistance have been approved by the State and forwarded to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The 23 watershed projects under operations represent fewer than 10 percent of the needed projects in Kansas.

In Norton County, a total of 15 Great Plains contracts cover 6,700 acres of land. This represents only a beginning in a most important area of conservation here on the central plains.

While we may be proud of the 24 million acres covered by basic soil conservation plans in Kansas, this acreage represents less than half of the State's total area, and only 2,382,000 acres are covered by plans fully applied.

A shortage of technicians to assist landowners and operators develop and carry out conservation plans is partly responsible for this backlog. I believe more help can and should be provided by State and local agencies and organizations, in support of the substantial Federal effort.

The Federal commitment to soil and water conservation programs as a matter of deep national interest depends upon dynamic and farseeing State and local initiative and participation.

Congress, over the years, has displayed an admirable bipartisanship in supporting sound soil and water conservation development as a benefit to all the people.

I am proud to have supported much noteworthy legislation in this area of national concern. Last year, Congress passed, and the President signed into law:

The Water Resources Planning Act, which authorizes the President to establish river basin planning commissions and a Water Resources Council;

The Water Quality Act, which establishes a new water pollution control agency and authorizes additional funds for pollution control efforts;

The Rural Water Facilities Act, which makes possible the planning and building of community water supply and sanitation facilities in rural areas;

The Water Resources Recreation Act, which establishes a uniform policy for fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation in Federal water projects.

This, and other Federal legislation, has indicated the strong bipartisan support Congress is prepared to give sound resource conservation programs. But, I believe, and I think you will agree, that the soil and water conservation job will be done—in the Norton Soil Conservation District, in the State of Kansas, and in the Nation, only with wholehearted State and local cooperation.

This broad support is particularly necessary and justified because watershed protection and development serves the urban community as well as the rural countryside.

The watershed project that prevents a flood in the valley may provide a reservoir for municipal and industrial water storage; a site for swimming, boating and fishing; or a refuge for waterfowl.

Land under conservation plans that is not needed or suitable for growing crops may be converted to grass and trees and used for recreation or wildlife conservation, for the benefit of both the urban and rural resident.

I am told that 40,000 visitor-days of recreation have been provided by watershed projects in Kansas since the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 made conversion of land to recreational purposes, as part of small watershed projects and on private land-holdings, more readily possible.

Also, 900 income-producing recreation enterprises established by nearly 300 landowners and operators benefit the rural economy and satisfy the growing urban need for more outdoor recreation opportunities.

Kansas is very much a town-and-country State, and we must strive to build a meaningful and mutually beneficial relationship between town and country living.

Kansas had only 107,000 people in 1860, and over 90 percent of these residents lived in rural areas. By 1960, the State's population had grown to more than 2 million, and rural residents accounted for only 39 percent of the people.

The total land area of Kansas still is 90 percent in farms and ranches, but the 15-percent increase in population between 1950 and 1960 represented urban growth. There has been a dramatic shift in numbers of people from the farm to the city in Kansas, as elsewhere in the Nation.

Soil and water conservation directly affects the growing urban development and the complex needs associated with it. Nearly 2,000 nonfarm landowners and operators in Kansas received technical assistance through soil conservation districts in fiscal year 1965.

There is a leading role to be played by soil conservation district leaders in this dual town-and-country responsibility. It is for you at the district level to promote sound conservation measures wherever possible.

The evidence is clear that the soil and water conservation message has spread in Norton County and throughout Kansas.

But you conservationists are evangelists, just as the late Hugh Bennett, the first administrator of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, was an evangelist as he sought—with outstanding success, I may add—to impart to the Nation's landowners and operators, to Members of Congress and to State legislators, and to officials and leaders in both public and private life the urgent need to bring dynamic soil and water conservation measures to the land.

And as evangelists you will not be content with a message half told, with a job half done.

I am convinced that no group in the Nation deserves higher praise than you soil conservation district supervisors and cooperators—for your dedication, your determination, and your accomplishments.

And that is why I am sure you will not be satisfied until every farmer, rancher, and other rural landowner—in Norton County and in the State—becomes an active participant in soil and water conservation district programs; until every acre of Kansas land is under a conservation plan—for the benefit of the agricultural economy, for the wise and necessary marshaling of our precious soil and water resources, and to assure sound land use planning and development in the growing urban corners of the State.

Your continued dedicated efforts are needed by the people of Norton County and the State of Kansas. Your efforts deserve the support required to spread the message and the good works of soil and water resource conservation throughout the land. You are assured of my continued, unwavering support of this most worthy endeavor.

President Presents Powerful Case on Vietnam Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at the National Freedom Award ceremonies in New York recently, President Johnson reaffirmed our determination to halt the onrush and spread of communism in Vietnam.

The Washington Post on February 25, 1966, commented that the President's address was "powerful and persuasive." I have unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, believing it to be of broad general interest to my colleagues and to the Nation.

The editorial follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

The President made a powerful and persuasive defense of his policies in Vietnam in his address at the National Freedom Award ceremonies in New York Wednesday.

He disposed of the allegation that our objectives are unlimited with a flat "No." He dealt with the repeated expressions of anxiety about deliberate escalation of the war by voicing his own opposition to mindless escalation. He dealt with the hawks who have complained that not enough has been sent to General Westmoreland. He responded to the criticism that we fight alone by citing our allies. He made it plain we will not deliberately widen the war. He again emphasized the pacification program in which social and economic aids will parallel military efforts. He made it clear that we will not impose a coalition government—or any government on the South Vietnamese. He vigorously defended the peace offensive. He wisely put no time limit on American support to South Vietnam. He reviewed again the long train of commitments that brought us to South Vietnam. He closed with the stirring words of President Kennedy: "We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

It was time that the President restated our ends and reaffirmed our determination. It is not to reproach the critics but only to state a fact of life to say that the ongoing debate over policies in South Vietnam has created an impression of irresolution and indecision. Whether it has given any aid to the enemy or not, it probably has given them some comfort. And it has helped confirm the favorite illusion of the Vietcong—that the United States is another broken and bankrupt France that can be driven out of South Vietnam by the collapse of morale at home.

It will not be sufficient to attack this illusion with occasional reassertions of purpose. By act and word we must make it plain, again and again, that we are ready for a long and hard struggle to preserve the right of the South Vietnamese people to determine their own government. The peace offensive and the internal debate no doubt have revived North Vietnam's hopes of imminent American default. It must be made clear to Hanoi that these hopes are false hopes.

The Milwaukee Journal Commends Expansion of the Excellent Headstart Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a February 19 editorial the Milwaukee Journal joined in the general acclaim that has been won by Project Headstart and commended President Johnson for his decision to expand this highly successful facet of the war on poverty.

The Journal pointed out some of the heartening results achieved through Headstart programs in Milwaukee and other communities throughout the Nation. It also noted the need for continuing efforts to assure that the educational momentum given to the Headstart youngsters is not lost as they progress through school.

The editorial:

A Good Headstart

One shining success of the war on poverty is Project Headstart. This is the program that prepares 4- and 5-year-olds from poverty stricken families for kindergarten and first grade—children who may not even know their names, may never have seen a picture book or learned such simple things as colors.

In his address to school administrators at Atlantic City the other day, President Johnson gave top priority to a doubling of Headstart funds for next year so that more than 700,000 children may be served. Recently, Sargent Shriver, Director of the antipoverty program, made an additional $30 million available for this year so that this summer programs will not have to be cut below last summer's level when 561,000 children were reached.

How effective has Headstart been? On Staten Island a test to measure intellectual ability showed a 14-month gain for Headstart children over those who were not in the program. University of Texas researchers found Headstart children entering first grade to be more proficient in learning, more intellectually curious, better adjusted to the classroom than non-Headstart children. One California test showed a 4- to 12-month gain in intelligence test performance by children during a 6-week Headstart program.

Physical examination revealed correctable defects. Among 1,442 Headstart children tested in Boston, two cases of congenital heart disease were found that required open heart surgery, and two cases of active tuberculosis.

Evaluation of Project Headstart in Milwaukee has shown that children drawn from disadvantaged homes make tremendous advances—as much as a 10-percent increase in achievement tests, for example. Their parents benefit, too, because Headstart makes every effort to involve adults.

During 8 weeks last summer, 690 Milwaukee children attended Headstart classes, and the program is continuing. In the school semester just ended, 624 children were prepared for kindergarten classes they have now entered. About the same number are enrolled in second semester Headstart classes.

While Headstart helps get children of the poor off to a better start, there is no assurance it enables them to keep up. Evaluation of this will continue. The belief is, however, that additional effort will be needed if Headstart children are to be kept from losing interest, falling victim to frustration and dropping out of the educational stream in which they made so good a beginning.

Jobless Pay Push

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of controversy has arisen concerning H.R. 8282, the unemployment compensation reform bill. In an effort to clarify some of the issues which have arisen in connection with this bill, I shall endeavor to present information during the next few weeks which might serve to clarify the various sections of these proposed amendments. In this connection, I insert in the Record an article from a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal which deals with this legislation:

Jobless Pay Push: Even as Idleness Falls, Congress Seeks Wider Benefits for Unemployed—Big Reform of Unemployment Compensation Would Raise Taxes Paid by Employers—Can't Fix Roof in the Rain

(By Arlen J. Large)

Washington.—Amid sunny prosperity Congress is soon to put up a broader umbrella against future storms of unemployment and recession.

Joblessness is now at a 9-year low, so there's scant traffic these days to the State-Federal window that pays unemployment insurance benefits to those looking vainly for work. It's an incongruous backdrop indeed for the probable passage this year of an unemployment compensation reform bill providing:

"Federal standards—the first ever—governing the size of jobless benefits the States must pay, forcing most to lift their maximum weekly benefits.

"A standby mechanism for stretching the duration of benefits during recessions—perhaps 50 percent beyond present limits.

"And higher taxes on employers to pay for it all."

The final package could emerge still fatter, depending on the legislative twists and turns in the weeks ahead. Anyway while falling far short of the ambitious goals of the Johnson administration and organized labor, the coming changes will represent the first significant congressional overhaul of the unemployment compensation system in its 30-year history.

"CAN'T FIX ROOF IN RAIN"

If times are so good, why is Congress doing anything at all?

"You can't fix the roof while it's raining," says Chairman Wilbur Mills to colleagues on his House Ways and Means Committee. His group, which held weeks of hearings on the subject last year, is due to start closed-door meetings next month (March) to devise the actual shape of the package.

It's characteristics of the careful Mr. Mills to prefer to legislate in the calm atmosphere of affluence, rather than a recession crisis. But statesmanship aside, there are wheels within wheels: A lot of cold cash is at stake in the coming collision between employer groups who must pay the cost of new jobless benefits and labor unions whose out-of-work members will be on the receiving end. Interestingly, each camp sees some advantage for itself in revising the system now.

"If anything's going to be done, I think it's to our advantage to have it come to a head now," says Stanley Rector, director of Unemployment Benefit Advisers, Inc. The Washington-based organization, sponsored by some 400 major corporations, has fought for years against union efforts to federalize the unemployment compensation system. Mr. Rector reasons that Congress will reject many of the administration's benefit-liberalization proposals in a year when labor shortages loom as a key problem.

LABOR SEES BETTER CHANCE

As for labor, the AFL–CIO now sees a chance of winning a basic sweetening-up of the system that has proved impossible to pass during a recession emergency. During the slumps of 1957–58 and 1960–61, recalls an AFL–CIO strategist, "We just couldn't get Congress interested in anything but improvising something to meet the immediate situation." Certainly another goal behind labor's push for action this year is its humiliating Senate defeat on repeal of State right-to-work laws. "After their licking on 14(b), they're going to be more interested than ever in getting a juicy unemployment compensation bill," says a Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee.

As in the past, this year's fight centers on imposition of "Federal standards" for State-administered unemployment compensation benefits. The battle already is taking some interesting twists.

State officials for years have allied themselves with employer groups in opposition to Federal rules governing the amount and duration of benefits. Late last month, however, a special conference of officials who administer State employment security programs made a significant concession. Meeting in Phoenix, the group abandoned its former stance against a Federal standard on benefit amounts and agreed to accept a requirement that the maximum weekly benefit be at least half the average wage paid within the State; by most accounts, the officials made their proposal after hearing that Representative Mills himself desired it.

WOULD RAISE MANY PAYMENTS

This maximum would be well below the two-thirds ceiling sought by the administration, but it still would require 33 States, including New York, New Jersey, Michigan, Florida, and Texas, to raise their top payment. Maximum weekly benefits now range from $30 in Mississippi to $65 in California; nationally the average benefit payment is about $37 a week.

"Conference action at Phoenix simply removes any doubt as to there being a Federal benefit standard in the prospective Ways and Means Committee bill," the Unemployment Benefit Advisers group glumly reported to its industrial sponsors. This organiaztion now is preparing a proposed standard, technically different, to offer as an alternative to the 50 percent of average wage yardstick. (The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, however, continues to stand fast against any Federal benefit standard at all.)

Chances are bright, too, for another "Federal standard" that's embroiled in a curious controversy. This standard—in effect requiring States to give unemployment-insurance tax credits to companies showing good employment stability—already is in the law, and it's being fiercely defended by employer groups. The administration bill seeks repeal of the requirement; instead it allows States to base an employer's tax on factors other than his "experience rating."

This repeal proposal has brought torrents of mail to Congress from employers. The present "experience rating" system, employers argue, gives them an incentive to keep their taxes low by challenging unjustified unemployment benefit claims of former employees. Removal of the Federal rule, it's said, could let unions and employers with bad job stability records team up in State legislatures to repeal the "experience rating" tax credit.

Some Ways and Means Committee members suspect Labor Secretary Wirtz isn't really serious about this proposal, but is only having his little joke at the expense of employer opponents of "Federal standards" for jobless benefits. Certainly union officials, who privately see little hope of the Federal rule's repeal, are trying to score propaganda points with the proposal. AFL–CIO President George Meany wisecracked at last year's committee hearings: "We hope those employers who feel so ardently about States rights will support this proposal to give States more latitude than is permitted under the rigid requirements of the present act."

STATES GUARD PREROGATIVES

The experience rating rule now is one of the few important Federal standards in the unemployment compensation system. States vigorously have guarded their freedom to determine how much to pay whom, and for how long. For example, in nearly all States the maximum duration of benefit payments is 26 weeks or more, but there are varying eligibility rules for getting the maximum. (Eligibility generally depends on how long a worker has held a job.) In Hawaii, all applicants can draw up to 26 weeks of benefits if needed; in Georgia, only 19 percent of the claimants could qualify last year for the maximum duration.

Employer taxes to finance the system also vary from State to State; in 34 States, employers pay rates ranging from less than 1 percent to as much as 7 percent (depending in part on a company's job stability rating) on the first $3,000 of workers' annual earnings. In the 16 other States, the taxable wage base is higher, ranging up to Alaska's lofty $7,200. In addition to taxes paid to the States, all employers pay a 0.4 percent tax on the wage base to Uncle Sam; this money goes for administering the program.

The Johnson administration, organized labor, and some State Governors (Brown, of California, Rolvaag, of Minnesota, Smith, of West Virginia) contend the system has become confusing and outdated. States compete with each other in skimping on benefits, it's charged, to keep employer taxes down to lure industry. Only eight States, the critics note, have devised standby systems to continue helping those who exhaust their regular benefits during recessions.

Congress itself was called upon to patch together emergency extended benefit plans during the 1957–58 and 1960–61 slumps. Now there's a rather broad consensus that a nationally tailored program for benefit extensions should be authorized by Congress to cope with future trouble.

MASSIVE OVERHAUL

But beyond that point the consensus stops. The administration last year proposed one approach: a massive overhaul of the entire unemployment compensation system, coupled with an automatic, federally financed plan for extending benefits for 26 weeks after a worker had exhausted his regular State entitlement. The Federal unemployment adjustment benefits would be financed partly through an increase in the Federal tax rate to 0.55 percent from 0.4 percent, and an increase in the taxable wage base to $6,600 a year ultimately from $3,000 now; the rest of the money would come directly from the Treasury.

Also, the administration asked for Federal standards governing regular State benefits: maximum payments ultimately equal to two-thirds of a State's average wage (though no worker would get more than half of his own former pay); at least 26 weeks of compensation; a requirement for States to make all jobseekers eligible for payments after 6 weeks of unemployment (canceling some State rules against any payment to men who voluntarily leave their old jobs); and extension of coverage to nearly 5 million workers who aren't now eligible. (Included would be employees of even the smallest businesses, of nonprofit organizations and of big farms.)

Employer response to the Labor Department proposal has been explosive. State chambers of commerce have been conducting rallies all over the country, where the bill has been denounced so much that many businessmen now know it by its number, H.R. 8282. One after another, business witnesses last year grimly warned the Ways and Means Committee that the measure would raise labor costs, trample existing programs tailored to individual State needs and make it easier for deadbeats to stay on the unemployment dole.

CUTBACKS EXPECTED

The effect of business opposition has been to assure that the House will cut back the administration bill sharply. The only important Federal standard Mr. Mills is considering is the State administrators' proposal of a 50 percent of average wage weekly benefit ceiling. As for an extended benefit plan to be used during recessions, the Ways and Means members seem to be leaning toward a proposal also authored by the State administrators. This would provide 13 weeks of extra benefits if unemployment in a State rises to a certain trigger point; the plan would be jointly financed by a participating State and Uncle Sam, requiring a small increase in the Federal tax rate and an ultimate boost to $4,200 of the taxable wage base.

Any such bill emerging from the House is bound to be unsatisfactory to organized labor, which expects to see the measure fattened considerably by the Senate. Democratic Senator McCarthy, of Minnesota, and other liberals on the Senate Finance Committee predict they will have enough votes to win some kind of Federal standard governing duration of benefits, and make other additions to the House bill as well. Senate liberalization of the bill, however, would still have to win concurrence from Representative Mills.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of our Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, who so faithfully served the House of Reprsentatives for 16 years. My association with Dr. Braskamp had been but a brief 3 years, but I had come to rely on his devotion to our spiritual needs, which was marked by a distinct capacity to raise our level of vision of the tasks and responsibilities thrust upon us and to broaden our outlook. His daily prayers inspired us to rely on balanced judgments, steady hands, and awakened conscience, and to pray and work for the good of our fellow men. He had given us courage and steadfastness to face our duties with new-hope. He was an intimate, respected member of our family and will be sorely missed.

My deepest sympathy goes to the members of his family in their great loss.

Famine Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Salt Lake Tribune points out in a recent editorial:

> The aim of President Johnson's new food-for-freedom program is to limit American food aid to nations which make a determined effort to improve their own food supply.

The paper says:

> From now on agricultural self-help will be required of any country receiving assistance.

It adds that—

> This is essential for, as the President warned, "the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all the acres, of all the agriculturally productive nations will not meet the food needs of the developing nations."

The editorial has some timely warnings which concern virtually all of mankind, and I therefore suggest that it be made a part of the Record:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Feb. 23, 1966]

U.S. Plan To Fight Global Famine Peril

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and other ranking administration officials are seeking congressional support this week for President Johnson's recently announced food-for-freedom program.

It is an ambitious—and costly—program to counter a famine problem which, many experts contend, may reach the proportions of a global catastrophe within the next 10 or 20 years. Indeed India is already facing a food crisis which could cost the lives of 10 or 12 million this year. It has been estimated India must import 15 million tons of grains to prevent famine—and it is by no means certain that much grain can be made available. The United States, with its granaries emptier than they have been in years, cannot by itself meet India's needs.

Even if India's 1966 crisis is somehow met, there will be other crises in India and in other countries where population growth is exceeding growth in food production year after year.

Richard W. Reuther, director of the food-for-peace program, told a recent foreign policy conference in Salt Lake City that food output is increasing at the rate of 1 percent a year, while population is increasing at a 2-percent rate.

WE ARE FALLING BEHIND

"We are falling behind in the battle against famine," he declared.

In the face of a chance for the world at last to achieve freedom from hunger, it is a discouraging fact that there are more hungry people every day.

The world's population growth has reached fantastic proportions in recent years. Demographers point out that it took hundreds of thousands of years for the world to reach a living population of a billion people by 1850 A.O. The second billion was added in 75 years, the third in 35 years.

The world is now rapidly adding the fourth billion which, at present rates of increase, will be here by 1980. It will take only 10 years after that to add the fifth billion—provided, of course, that the almost certain massive starvation does not claim hundreds of millions of lives.

Partly the answer is to increase the food supply—and it can be substantially increased if the underdeveloped nations can be induced to modernize their agricultural practices and policies.

NEW FOOD AID POLICY

This is one aim of Mr. Johnson's new food-for-freedom program. He proposes to limit American food aid to nations which make a determined effort to improve their own food supply.

In the past American aid—more than $12 billion worth of food in a decade—has led many nations to accept a state of chronic dependence on American food shipments. They neglected their own agriculture, continued archaic methods of land tenure and farming, failed to halt crop waste, use improved seed, tools, and fertilizer, provide better marketing methods and attack simple peasant inertia.

From now on agricultural self-help will be required of any country receiving assistance.

This is essential for, as the President warned, "the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all the acres, of all the agriculturally productive nations will not meet the food needs of the developing nations."

Unless drastic action is taken to close the now ever-widening gap between food supply and increased population the world faces a food crisis that could be a greater challenge to civilization in this century than the atomic bomb.

Urgency Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on pollution "indicated he means business on cleaning America's dirty waters," the New York World Telegram and Sun notes in a timely editorial.

The paper believes that "his sense of urgency will be welcomed by most Americans. As the President pointed out, every river system in the country is suffering. More and more communities have become concerned and are taking action on their own."

The editorial asserts that "we have passed the point where we merely want to prevent any more damage to our water environment. Now we are eager to correct the abuse of decades."

Because the editorial sheds light on such an urgent and important issue, I am offering it for reprinting in the RECORD.

CLEANING UP THE ABUSE

President Johnson's message on pollution yesterday indicated he means business on cleaning America's dirty waters.

He wants whole river systems salvaged. He wants the Federal clean-water effort organized in one agency. And he wants some teeth written into Federal law to stop offenders.

His sense of urgency will be welcomed by most Americans. As the President pointed out, every river system in the country is suffering. More and more communities have become concerned and are taking action on their own.

But there is a clear role for the Federal Government in helping to clean rivers and watersheds which spread over many municipalities and several States.

The President sounds a helpful note when he recommends that the water resources work being done by several Federal agencies be pulled into one. This move could save a lot of bewilderment for city and State officials who will be dealing more and more with Washington in the expanded effort.

Last month, the Senate Subcommittee on Pollution called for spending $20 billion over 5 years to improve our water. This is surely an ambitious and expensive program, but a necessary one.

Indications are that the country is ready, even impatient, for the massive job.

We have passed the point where we merely want to prevent any more damage to our water environment. Now we are eager to correct the abuse of decades.

Oder-Neisse: A Demarcation Line or a Frontier?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an article by Dr. Stanley M. Stein on the subject of the Oder-Neisse line.

Dr. Stein is a scholar who specializes in the area of the Soviet Government and politics. However, he has also devoted considerable study to the historical aspects of Poland's western frontier. His thoughts and conclusions on this latter subject, supported by citations from official documents and pronouncements of political leaders over the past two decades, place the issue of the Oder-Neisse line, it seems to me, in a proper perspective.

For this reason, I feel that Dr. Stein's article deserves attention and I commend it to the consideration of my colleagues.

ODER-NEISSE: LINE OR FRONTIER

(By Dr. Stanley M. Stein)

There are some problems in history which in terms of time and location fall into a narrow sphere and, being confined to a few events, can be explored in one or two concrete sentences. There are others which embrace a whole range of phenomena spread over several centuries and, upon the very first contact with them, give the impression that they relate to limitless subjects whose diversity and wealth of contact are overwhelming. To this category of tremendous problems, whose evolution has determined the shape of affairs in central and eastern Europe over a period of almost a thousand years, belong the one concerning relations between the two traditional opponents, Germany and Poland. Its roots go back to the earliest appearances of the Polish state on the stage of history. It can be traced right through the historical destinies of both nations, through periods of grave tension and of comparative relaxations, and there is no sign that it may lose any of its grim actuality in the near future.

Is there still any likelihood that the Oder-Neisse demarcation line will not remain Germany's eastern border? Did the victorious powers of 1945 really want a Germany within those former frontiers? How many of West Germany's allies today favor the restoration of her prewar frontiers and her prewar power? More important, is the return of former German territories an end that a reasonable person should now seek to advance? Is it perhaps high on the agenda of a responsible world politics?

The population of the East German territories has paid the debt of the entire German nation. Neither the Germans nor the Poles were consulted about the decisions taken in this respect, which were made by Great Britain, the United States, and Russia. It is a hypothetical question what Poland would do if she herself were powerful victor and had to decide what compensation she would receive from Germany.

The Europeans both west and east are following with greatest concern the revisionistic tendencies emerging in West Germany. A very large section of the German nation have not renounced their claim to the Oder-Neisse territories; in other words, they do not recognize the need to make reparation for what happened during the Second World War, and refuse to heed any suggestion that Poland should retain those territories, which are now a vital necessity to her. Of course, understanding and sympathy should be shown for the people who were born in those regions and long to return to their former homelands. But that is a matter of personal sentiment and lies outside the sphere of politics.

For the last 150 years, German-Polish relations covered a period of incessant conflicts in which Germany strived to destroy Poland, and Poland defended herself resolutely and, in the end, not without some measure of success. Poland emerged from this conflict in a terrible state of ruin. But Germany during a thousand years of expansion suffered the loss of territories acquired at Poland's expense.

The "official policy" of the Bundesrepublik Deutschland, of both government and opposition, has for 16 years nourished ideas and hopes in a wide section of the population that are quite completely unrealistic. At various press conferences the German Bundeskanzler has reiterated "our old legal standpoint" which is, after all, laid down in the Potsdam Protocol to which Russia, too was a signatory—namely, that the German eastern frontier will not be finally settled until Germany is reunited and a peace treaty has been concluded with an all-German government. There is, however, no mention of how it will be settled. To put it quite plainly, the "frontiers of 1937 are still valid," i.e., as they were before the Hitler aggression.

Is such an interpretation borne out by historical facts, or does German policy in Bonn on this question run the danger of self-deception which could, after all, cause people to doubt the sincerity of its legitimate aim: German unity?

II

At the end of the Second World War the entire Polish nation was shifted westwards, not of her own accord, but by virtue of a decision made by the victorious allies. On February 22, 1944, Sir Winston Chruchill informed the House of Commons that he had agreed at the Teheran Conference held in November 1943, "That Poland should obtain compensation at the expense of Germany both in the north and in the west." The unconditional surrender that was demanded of Germany meant, he said, that, "There will be no question of the Atlantic Charter applying to Germany as a matter of right and barring territorial transferences or adjustments in enemy countries." It is also no secret that the Western Powers did not wish to oppose the Soviet claims to eastern Poland, since the Soviet Union had between 1941 and 1944 borne the main burden of the war against Germany; they felt they could not deny to Stalin what Hitler had promised him in 1939, especially as the border along the Bug River largely corresponded with the so-called Curzon line which Western "experts" had after the First World War themselves recommended as an "equitable" eastern frontier of Poland.

When one member of the British Parliament expressed his doubts over the wisdom of this step, the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Eden, said it should be remembered that, "Germany has forcefully removed populations from vast tracts of territory, millions of people, and in many cases they are now dead." The realistic British mind was already aware of possible developments which were later confirmed at Yalta. We have a document in the form of a letter dated November 2, 1944, sent by Sir Cadogan, then permanent Under Secretary at the Foreign Office, to Mr. Romer who was Foreign Minister in the Polish Government in exile, in London. The letter contains an official obligation by the British Government to advocate at the peace conference the changes of the Polish western border to the extent discussed in Moscow. * * * "You inquired whether His Majesty's government were definitely in favor of advancing the Polish frontier up to the line of the Oder to include the port of Stettin. The answer is, that His Majesty's government do consider that Poland should have the right to extend her territory to this extent." The British obligation is free of any reservation whatsoever. It is even reinforced by a promise to support the new frontier, "Even in the event of the U.S. Government finding themselves unable to agree to the changes." And the President of the United States, F. D. Roosevelt, suggested the expulsion of the Germans in a letter to the Polish Government in exile on November 17, 1944. He stated inter alia: "If the Polish government and the people desire in connection with the new frontiers of the Polish state to bring about the transfer to and from the territory of Poland of national minorities, the U.S. Government will raise no objections and so far as practicable will facilitate such transfer."

Sir Winston Churchill put it even more bluntly when he advocated on December 15, 1944, "The total expulsion of the Germans from the area to be acquired by Poland in the west and in the north * * *. Expulsion is the method which, so far as we have been able to see, will be most satisfactory and lasting. There will be no mixture of populations to cause endless trouble, as has been the case in Alsace-Lorraine."

On February 25, 1945, the British opposition leader, Mr. C. Attlee, expressed his agreement in the House of Commons. And again on March 1, 1945, Mr. Attlee, said at the House of Commons once again that: "I want to see this Polish question in the general picture of Yalta * * *. We have to look at these things from the point of view of the future of the people of Europe. You have to try to unravel a tangle that has grown up through the 18th century. There have been unprecedented movements of populations. I suggest that we should not always be thinking that it must necessarily settle down into the position of the past. One thing however is quite certain. If you ask who is responsible for these movements, this terrible thing that has smitten Europe, there is no doubt at all that it is the Nazi Germany, and the people of Germany who actively supported them and, in a lesser degree those who have acquiesced, and who have been quite satisfied as long as things went well. I do not suggest that you can draw an indictment against a whole people, but neither can you relieve of responsibility a whole people * * *. Therefore if it is necessary to take some German soil, to make it up to the Polish people, I shall not complain—and I do not think that the Germans have a right to complain."

In an address to Congress on March 1, 1945, President Roosevelt interpreted these decisions as follows: "The decision with respect to the boundaries of Poland was a compromise * * *. The limits of the western border will be permanently fixed in the final peace conference. We know, roughly, that it will include in the new strong Poland quite a large slice of what is now called Germany." Hence the alteration of the German eastern frontier and the expulsion of the Germans had already been decided upon in principle as the victorious powers met in Potsdam. Five weeks earlier they had, in the Berlin Declaration of June 5, 1945, assumed "supreme authority with respect to Germany." The allied commanders in chief emphasized that this did not effect "the annexation of Germany" and that the allied government will hereafter "determine the boundaries of Germany."

Thus, although the statement of June 5, 1945 refers to "Germany within her frontiers as they were on December 31, 1937" (the only document that makes such reference), it did not expressly define the future frontier, but merely traced out areas intended for military occupation. "Germany, within her frontiers as they were on December 31, 1937, will, for the purpose of occupation, be divided into four zones." In Potsdam, on August 2, 1945, this division was amended to the extent that the German territories, transferred to Poland, "should not be considered a part of the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany, within her borders as they were in 1937." The "supreme authority" accorded to the Allied Control Council at Potsdam; i.e., "in matters affecting Germany as a whole" extended only as far as the Oder and the Neisse. Poland, therefore, did not become an occupation power, nor was she given a seat on the Control Council. However, the following declaration was formulated in the Potsdam Protocol under the heading "Poland," and contained an express reference to the decisions reached at the Crimea Conference: "In conformity with the agreement on Poland reached at the Crimea Conference the three heads of government have sought the opinion of the Polish provisional government of national unity in regard to the accession of territory in the north and west which Poland should receive."

"The three heads of government reaffirm their opinion that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should await the peace settlement. The three heads of government agree that, pending the final determination of Poland's western frontier, the former German territories east of a line running from the Baltic Sea immediately west of Swinemunde, and hence along the Oder River to the confluence of the western Neisse River and along the western Neisse to the Czechoslovak frontier, including that portion of East Prussia not placed under the administration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in accordance with the understanding reached at this conference and including the area of the former free city of Danzig, shall be under the administration of the Polish state and for such purposes should not be considered as part of the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany.

"The conference has agreed in principle to the proposal of the Soviet Government concerning the ultimate transfer to the Soviet Union of the city of Koenigsberg and the area adjacent to it * * * subject to expert examination of the actual frontier."

Although the settlement with regard to the former German territories to the east of the Oder and the Neisse agreed upon at Potsdam seemed in form to be of a provision nature, this was in contradiction not only to the events leading up to the agreement, but indeed, also, to the attitude of the signatories themselves, who were under no illusions. In a nationwide radio broadcast on August 9, 1945, President Truman explained to the American people that, "Certain compromises about Poland had already been agreed upon at the Crimea conference. They obviously were binding upon us at Berlin. The territory the Poles are to administer * * * will provide a short and more easily defensible frontier between Poland and Germany. Settled by Poles, it will provide a more homogenous nation." Thus, although President Truman uses the definition accepted at Potsdam and mentions the territory the Poles are to administer, he speaks of the decision as of a settlement of Poland's frontiers in the sense of international law.

Yet it was the same Truman who, as present documents show, did not want to commit himself definitely at Potsdam, after the first signs of discord between Moscow and Washington had already become visible. President Truman especially was annoyed because Moscow had in the meantime begun to install a Communist regime in Warsaw. Sir Winston Churchill and his men, however, felt that any delay in reaching a final settlement would only serve to consolidate the Soviet position in Poland. Above all, however, the alleged provisional nature of the Oder-Neisse border was contradicted by Chapter XIII of the Postdam Protocol, which ordered the expulsion of millions of Germans from those territories. This fact cuts short all the discussions on the interpretation and the legal apsects of the frontier changes at Potsdam. The population transfers which then occurred make the decisions irreversible and render void any attempts at putting them in doubt. The state of things in which the transference of Germans from Poland could not be reversed was accepted by the Americans both de facto and de jure.

The 12th meeting of the Control Council under the chairmanship of Marshall Zhukov, Generals Clay, Robertson, and Koeltz confirmed the transfer plan.

The decisions made at Potsdam on the transfer of the German population had in them nothing precocious or sudden. On the contrary, they were the object of detailed studies and cautiously long considerations by the great powers and the statesmen of the particular countries. These investigations took into account the experiences with German minorities in the interwar period and during the war.

In his now "famous" speech in Stuttgart on September 6, 1946, Secretary of State Byrnes changed the tone. He said that at Potsdam the heads of government had agreed to support the Soviet desire for the transfer to Russia of northeast Prussia, but not the cession of East German territories to Poland. The extent of the area to be ceded, however, must be determined when the final settlement is agreed upon. However, at the same time he emphasized that Poland had requested a revision of her frontier in the north and west, and that the United States would support a revision of this frontier, in Poland's favor.

Several days later the Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov replied: "No one can take it into his head that the transference of Germans from these territories as well as the settlement of Poles on the territories was accepted only in the nature of a transitory experiment * * * The mere thought of such experiments with millions of people is incomprehensible, not to mention the cruelty both to the Poles and the Germans themselves." All this indicates that the decision signed by Attlee, Stalin, and Truman at the Potsdam Conference had already determined Poland's frontier in the west, and merely required rubber-stamping at the international conference regarding a peace treaty with Germany.

The growing partition of Germany, the cold war and the whole problem of Stalinism in Eastern Europe pushed any thought of such confirmation far into the future.

Dr. Kurt Schumacher, former leader of West German Social Democratic Party, said in 1947 that the frontiers of 1937 have been "gambled away by Hitler's adventure." His compatriot, Mr. Jakob Kaiser, Christian Democrat Union, still represented the view at that time that the "Poles will of course receive German eastern territories as compensation." Yet both these West German politicians felt that at last part of the lost territories could be "regained."

When the measure of de-Stalinization of the fifties started off the process of disintegration within the Soviet bloc, there was yet another change in the attitude of the Western Allies:

1. In 1956 Mr. John McCloy advised the West German Government to consider "whether it would not be expedient to renounce any claim to a part of the former German territories so as to bring the reunification of East and West Germany closer."

2. On March 25, 1959, Charles de Gaulle advocated German reunification, "On condition that the present frontiers in the north, south, east, and west are not called in question." The French Prime Minister was more specific. On August 13, 1959, he said that, "The status quo—which should be maintained—also includes respect of frontiers, and thus applies to the so-called Oder-Neisse line as well." Mr. Roger Garreau, former French Ambassador, in 1962 said that all the milieus of the French public are unanimous in their support of the Oder and Neisse frontier. To question the validity of the frontier means to provide most dangerous events not excluding a universal war.

Again, unveiling the outline at his February 4 press conference, the general reminded the Germans of some unpleasant facts. Among them were: That they must accept their 1945 frontiers as final, that reunification without strings is impossible, that their country is divided as a result of the war they unleased in which 40 million people were killed and 10 million exterminated in concentration camps, and that reunification can only come when the fears of Germany's neighbors are put to rest.

3. In the summer of 1959 the American Vice President, Nixon, during his talks in Warsaw, assured the Polish Communist Party leader that the United States had no intention or desire to support any revision of the Oder-Neisse frontier.

4. Mr. Gordon Walker, the former British Foreign Secretary said in a television broadcast before the general elections, "The Labor Party is of the opinion that the problem of frontiers on the Oder-Neisse cannot be solved until there is a general settlement of relations. We have stated, however, that we found it hard to imagine that in the events of a settlement the frontiers on the Oder and Neisse would not be recognized. That is our view, it is the view of the present British Government, and of practically every government in the world."

5. The Chinese, in whom many leading politicians in Bonn and indeed many West Germans place their hopes, refer to the Bonn standpoint as "the dream of a lunatic" (Hsinhua, April 1964).

III

In 1955, the population of the discussed region reached the figure of about 6,940,000 which represents 25.5 percent of the total population of Poland. Today there are over 8 million Poles living there. Nearly 4 million of the Poles today were born there. These men and women, now inhabitants of the new lands, were forced to leave their homes and make a new life for themselves just as were the Germans from western Poland. They have lived and started their new life toiling and building for over 20 years now.

The integration, the fusion of those territories into the Polish sovereign territory has been an accomplished fact. All this was accomplished without outside help and despite the greatest material losses suffered by Poland owing to German depredation and senseless destruction. The present German-Polish frontier is an important contribution to the overall economic balance of Europe and Poland in particular.

History has lessons to teach us. We should bear them in mind as we shape a new life, and not delude ourselves that the character of nations and their methods of political actions change spontaneously from day to day, as it were. Such changes do arise but under the pressure of external circumstances; yet these stem from the situation of a given nation and from the durability of its political system. The United States certainly has no intention or desire of wasting the fruits of the victory to which she so greatly contributed. But intentions are of less account in the conduct of a policy than the situation which it produces.

There is one thing on which virtually all Poles agree, whether they are in Poland or in exile and whether supporters or opponents of Mr. Gomulka, that the Oder-Neisse territories belong to Poland. They are not inclined to listen to any argument regarding the Oder-Neisse line. The Poles know that, outside Germany, there is no government or power that has any serious doubts about the present state of affairs. They still, however, remain bound to communism. For the Polish Communists the Russian alliance is a matter of taste as well as of survival; for the rest of the country, probably the overwhelming majority, it is a matter of necessity.

Even if the Russians were to offer Poland freedom to abandon communism, which they show no sign of doing, fear of Germany would remain. The Poles and the rest of the Europeans cannot easily forget the horrors of the German "short visit" and must seek a guarantor for the Oder-Neisse frontier. What is more, they are strengthened in their determination by the leading spiritual force in the country—the Catholic Church.

German policy must take account of this will of the Polish nation. To renounce the use of force is not enough, if at the same time hopes are nourished of returning to those territories by West German politicians. For how is a return, without resort to force, feasible if the inhabitants of those territories refuse to be reasoned with and if what they already possess has long been guaranteed to them by the whole world?

The West-German revisionists are perfectly well aware of the fact that all nuances in the wording and in the juristic interpretations of the Potsdam protocol, which could be used in their unscrupulous campaign, lose all significance in the face of the Potsdam decisions to remove all the German population from Polish territory. The political leadership of the Federal Republic have lacked the civil courage to tell their people that the lands east of the Oder-Neisse are gone. Under these circumstances any propaganda within West Germany for the return of these lands by peaceful methods seems mere nonsense.

Is there realistic prospect that, in the coming years, any non-German state—U.S.S.R., United States, Britain, France—will place high in the cycle of its own desires the return of those territories to Germany?

Should, then, the frontier be recognised? If this means the formal act of signature, not even the Poles insist on that condition today. The chief problem confronting German policy at present is how to make its undertaking not to use force credible—with all the consequences involved. One of these is the sober, if painful, recognition of what really happened at Potsdam, and of what has since taken place in world public opinion and in the Oder-Neisse territories. But it involves in particular the willingness to stop spreading false hopes and to honestly ask oneself the question which many people—not only the Poles—put to themselves: If not by force, then how?

On a Theme From Kennan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Alsop presents in the following column from a February 23, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune what must be a logical sequence of events if the United States follows the policy advocated by George F. Kennan at the recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee's hearings. Mr. Kennan admitted that the effect on Thailand if the United States withdraws in Vietnam would be unfortunate. As Mr. Alsop points out "unfortunate" is a gross understatement.

The article follows:

ON A THEME FROM KENNAN

(By Joseph Alsop)

BANGKOK.—Nearly 16 years ago, George F. Kennan, working at fever heat, dashed off the first draft of a famous policy paper. On the basis of the arguments therein set forth, President Truman made his magnificently courageous Korean decision, and a long chain reaction of Asian disasters was thus averted, albeit at heavy cost.

If one can trust the transmitted version of Kennan's recent Senate testimony, he has by now forgotten just about all the arguments he assembled for presentation at the Korea meetings at Blair House. But with regard to this country, he is at least quoted as admitting than an American retreat and surrender in Vietnam would have an "unfortunate" effect.

"Unfortunate" is a pretty mild word for the reality. The Chinese Communist Foreign Minister, Chen Yi, has quite openly described Thailand as next on the agenda after Vietnam to at least one Western visitor in Peiping. And the preparations for an assault on Thailand's independence are quite plain for anyone to see.

In order to grasp the nature of these preparations, it is first of all necessary to grasp the basic facts of Thailand's geography. Briefly, the mountainous northeastern part of the country and the southern Provinces on the Malay Peninsula are both fairly inaccessible from the center, and both regions have non-Thai populations.

The northeast, with its Lao and Vietnamese inhabitants, and the extreme south, with its Malays, have, therefore been selected as the prime targets by the Communist planners in Peiping and Hanoi. In the southern Provinces, a base was provided by the Communist guerrillas who fled into the Thai jungles after the failure of the assault on Malaya. In the northeast, the Vietnamese who fled to Thailand during the French war also offered useful human raw material.

A good deal has already been published about this Communist effort in Thailand. But its coldly calculated character has never been well conveyed. In the southern Provinces, for instance, secret jungle camps were organized, where recruits from the villages were intensively trained by the refugees from the Malayan war.

Many scores of recruits from the northeastern Provinces were also conveyed in secret into the parts of Laos controlled by the North Vietnamese Army (from which solemn treaty obligations, of course, required the North Vietnamese troops to be totally withdrawn 4 years ago). A hundred or so of the most important agents were even taken by sea to Hong Kong, and thence into China, for advance training.

In this manner, quite serious though still limited guerrilla movements have by now been organized in both the target areas. The ruthless terrorism that is such a characteristic feature of "liberation" movements has begun on a considerable scale. In short, the pattern is clear, down to the last detail.

As of now, it is not an especially alarming pattern, since the Thai Government has organized energetic countermeasures. But let the United States take the advice of George Kennan and his friends. Let the Vietnamese war end in a retreat and a surrender. Then any one with the smallest knowledge of Asian affairs can foresee that the effect in Thailand will be quite dramatically "unfortunate."

To be sure, Senator Fulbright's antiadministration witnesses do not seem to have included many persons with any knowledge whatever of Asia. If one may judge from this distance, a good specimen witness was Prof. Hans Morgenthau, whose errors of basic historical fact concerning southeast Asia have been so crude and glaring that his pose as an expert is in the nature of a comic turn.

Yet the double standard that now prevails is still a bit bewildering. Think, for instance, of the outcry that would be heard from people of Morgenthau's stamp if the CIA were discovered to be attempting in North Korea, or even in North Vietnam, anything comparable to what the Chinese and North Vietnamese Communists are quite openly attempting here in Thailand.

Even more bewildering, one must add, is the total carelessness of consequences and the flat refusal to face unpleasant facts. For these preparations for an attempted takeover in Thailand, please remember, are undoubted, well established facts. And there can be no doubt that the shock of an American retreat and surrender in Vietnam would open the door wide for this attempted Communist takeover.

Chicago's Antipoverty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues what I consider to be a highly significant statement on the war against poverty in Chicago. I refer to an article appearing in the February 2 edition of the Chicago Sun-Times, entitled "Antipoverty Units Report on Seven Innercity Programs."

The article described a progress report recently submitted by four outstanding private agencies on seven programs conducted under their auspices as part of Chicago's antipoverty effort.

The four agencies are the Boys Clubs of Chicago, the Chicago Federation of Settlements, Chicago Youth Centers, and the YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago. Together these distinguished organizations administer 7 massive antipoverty projects serving 38,725 impoverished residents of Chicago's innercity neighborhoods. Included are job training, preschool, special tutoring, work-study, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and neighborhood resources programs.

The article points out that of 1,384 staff members who operate the projects, 1,073 are residents of the poverty neighborhoods, and that over 5,000 volunteers are contributing their time and efforts to make the project succeed.

The article reports:

> A panel of hired and volunteer workers who live in the poverty areas agreed that the poor have an active participation in the projects at both policy and program levels.

Of particular interest, in light of accusations made by certain critics of the Chicago program, is the observation that—

> George Yozall, personnel manager of Inland Steel Co., who served as chairman of a federation committee that screened job applicants, said there has never been political interference with hiring.

Mr. Speaker, this article would seem to carry a clear message to all fair-minded readers, and I insert it at this point in the Record:

ANTIPOVERTY UNITS REPORT ON SEVEN INNER-CITY PROGRAMS

Four private agencies made a progress report Tuesday on seven programs in the war on poverty.

At a press conference in the Sheraton-Chicago Hotel, the agencies reported they have spent $3,541,867 in Federal and private funds, serving 38,725 persons in the seven Chicago inner-city projects.

The programs are being operated by 1,384 staff members—357 professional, and 1,027 nonprofessional—of whom 1,073 live in poverty areas. There are an additional 5,087 volunteers.

SEEK ADDITIONAL FUNDS

Joseph Clemens, executive director of the Chicago Boys Clubs, who was spokesman for the four agencies, said they are seeking an additional $3 million to $4 million to carry on the projects for 1966. Applications for Federal grant renewals have been filed with the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity.

The four agencies are the Boys Clubs, the Chicago Federation of Settlements, Chicago Youth Centers and the YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago.

These are the projects they have undertaken or expanded under Federal financing:

Jobs: This is a project of the Boys Clubs, the Youth Centers and the YMCA working with a Federal grant of $332,163. It currently has 829 young men and women in job training. In the 3 years it has been in existence, first under private sponsorship and now with Federal help, the project has given 4,437 young people training and job assistance.

Streets: Taking its name from its aims of socialization, training, recreation, education, employment and technical services, this is a project of all four agencies. It is working with a grant of $1,194,433 and is serving 12,500 young people.

Learn: This is a preschool program for children 3½ to 5 and is run by the youth centers, the federation and the Y. Working with approximately $500,000 it is serving 1,424 children.

SHARE: Standing for student help with adult related education, this is a Y-sponsored tutoring program involving 2,000 young people and adults, currently financed with $94,108.

CWS, or college work-study: This project of the Boys Clubs and the Y provides part-time work to help students of low-income families through college. More than 100 students are working 15 hours a week and are paid with Federal funds disbursed by the schools they attend.

NYC, or Neighborhood Youth Corps: This program is administered by all four agencies and provides, with a Federal grant of $784,481, work for unemployed young people between the ages of 16 and 21. It currently serves 424 persons.

DNR, or development of neighborhood resources: With a grant of $648,217 and administered by the federation, this project is presently serving 23,000 persons. In the words of Mrs. Hazel S. Boswell, a DNR worker, the program teaches the poor "now to file complaints with the building department, to stand up in court with landlords. We're working to find an answer to rats and roaches, too."

POOR HAVE ROLE

Also at the conference, a panel of hired and volunteer workers who live in the poverty areas, agreed that the poor have an active participation in the projects at both policy and program levels.

George Yozall, personnel manager of Inland Steel Co. who served as chairman of a federation committee that screened job applicants said there has never been political interference with hiring.

Teenage Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an interesting editorial from the Reading, Pa., Times regarding credit and young adults:

TEENAGE MONEY

If you're a graybeard or younger you can recall as a teenager having two bits in your pocket and treating "Sweetie" to a swell time over an ice cream soda—calling it a big date.

Today, a teenager with less than two pieces of paper money to rub together is almost broke.

From a standard of national economics, the teenage spenders pump about $11 billion a year into the goods market. Of course, it's mainly daddy's money, but that's beside the point for the moment.

There are serious thoughts today about whether youngesters are being adequately taught when to halt a spending spree.

Some high schools teach consumer education, but only a trifle of it. Evidence of increased bankruptcies among young adults points out that young people are not aware of the pitfalls of credit buying, or even cash buying.

Esther Peterson, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs, is a worried woman:

"My concern about consumer education, however, is heightened by the fact that while children are big spenders today, they will be far bigger consumers tomorrow, as heads of families."

So what is Mrs. Peterson doing about it? She is urging more high schools to step up teaching of household economics in much the same way as the National Defense Education Act was the end result of panic over Russia beating the United States in the first space venture.

The infusion of the new math and new science into high school curriculums will continue to pay off for generations.

But it's scary to imagine those little Einsteins riding around on motor scooters, listening to transistor radios advertising the latest styles of this and that at "new, low prices."

Teenage spending habits may be presently good for the economy, but it's those same habits which lead young adults on small incomes to disaster a few years later in life.

Legislative Program of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Congressional Record, I would like to set forth at this point the legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, adopted by the State legislative committee at a meeting on Saturday, January 8, at the Hotel Piccadilly in New York City.

The report of the committee follows:

Legislative Program of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State, Adopted at a Meeting at New York City on January 8, 1966

The State legislative committee of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State at a meeting held Saturday afternoon, January 8, 1966, at the Hotel Piccadilly, 227 West 45th Street, New York City, called for active and positive leadership of Democrats in the assembly and State senate, with full responsibility to all the people of the State to assure reelection in 1966.

Demand a bipartisan committee in State and New York City to set up a long-range tax program for 25 years and not the yearly rush for expediency.

We urge the legislators to support the following proposals, which we consider important to the welfare of the people of this State.

The Affiliated Young Democrats pledge ourselves to devote every effort to the enactment of the following program.

We have always stated clearly and without equivocation our position on the vital issues, and we do so now.

"Raise drinking age to 21 years; primary election for all State officers; adopt new code of New York City Air Pollution Control Board for cleaner air; more housing; permanent personal registration be made Statewide, with two changes, (1) must vote at two consecutive national elections, (2) do not have to reregister if move in same county; vote at 18 years; stop turnstile justice by recodifying the status as it relates to juveniles, with the unison of Federal and State laws; more vocational camps, rehabilitation and training centers; favor two voting days for National elections, first Mondays and Tuesdays in November; more State aid to education; extend ban on racial discrimination in housing and protection against slum landlords; create more judges; legalized off-track betting by referendum; raise minimum wage to $1.50 an hour; mandatory free tuition at all State and city universities and all community colleges; outlaw boxing; permanent spring primary election day in June; stronger code of ethics; presidential preference primaries; legislature to at last ratify the 15th amendment; preserve our great natural resources; program to discourage drop-outs in schools; State aid to public museums; create statewide recreation department; bonus for Korean veterans; increase teachers' salaries; more and better aid to the aged and mentally ill; favor 3-day weekend plan to celebrate all holidays, except religious holidays, on Monday; help migrant workers; stronger law against dope peddlers; and finally, we strongly urge, again, that a printed record of all the proceedings verbatim of the 1965 State legislature be made, and be made available to the public, as the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio have."

The above legislative program for 1966 will be introduced in the State legislature by their 22 Members in the State Senate, of which the chairman is Senator Samuel L. Greenberg of Brooklyn, and their 47 members in the assembly, of which the chairman is Assemblyman Daniel M. Kelly of New York County.

Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the Affiliated Young Democrats, addressed this important State legislative committee meeting and Richard H. Weis, chairman of the committee, presided.

Canada Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our Canadian neighbors will celebrate the 100th anniversary of their confederation next year. I hope that this important event will stimulate greater interest in Canada here in the United States an enable our two countries to solve the problems that arise even between neighbors with the great community of interest we share with Canada.

The managing editor of the Boston Globe, Thomas Winship, has rendered a service in this regard in an article which appeared on February 27, assessing Canada on the eve of its centennial celebration. He thoughtfully interprets problems of foreign policy, economic relations and the indefinable qualities of mutual respect which contribute to productive mutual relations.

With a number of colleagues here in the House, I joined last September in a statement urging the United States to make greater efforts to make our relations with Canada a model for the whole world. Mr. Winship has made a good start in bringing modern Canada to our attention. I ask unanimous consent to include his article in the Congressional Record.

The article follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Globe, Feb. 27, 1966]

Canada Today: A Report on Eve of Confederation's 100th Birthday

(By Thomas Winship)

Ottawa.—Canada becomes 100 years old next year and has decided the best way to prepare for that grand event is to stop feeling sorry for itself.

This is just as well, for our young northern neighbor is in a state of high ferment. The mood of Canada is a conglomeration of healthy and unhealthy national problems, now all very much on the surface because its leaders are telling the world about them. Some of them:

Canada is troubled about Vietnam and is in a more awkward bind over the issue than is the United States, if this is possible.

Canada is in a trade squabble with the United States—so nettling that it has become maybe the top political issue of Canada.

The quiet revolution in the French-Canadian Province of Quebec, representing a rebellion against the Anglo-Saxon Federal rule of Ottawa and elsewhere, has all kinds of overtones of the Negro revolution of our South, of De Gaulle nationalism and of the emerging nations of Africa. This is shaping up as one of the great stories of North America.

Canada's little brother complex, everyone-takes-us-for-granted attitude, gets more under Canadian skins as their boom economy becomes increasingly muscular.

Canada, always self-conscious about its vast uninhabited, cold and rather dull acres of land, is coming to realize what a sensational asset it has in owning the greatest mineral-rich frontier in the Western Hemisphere. The resources development of the Canadian northland is the Oklahoma City romance story all over again.

And finally, next year its greatest city, Montreal, celebrates the centennial of the confederation of Canada with an international world's fair. The city hopes to show itself off to some 30 million visitors, mostly from the United States. Montreal possibly is the most successful example of big city renewal on the east coast.

Last week the Globe joined seven other newspapers from Washington, New York, Detroit and other points for 4 days of talks in Ottawa with top officials of the Government. We also spent a day in Montreal learning about the World's Fair—Expo 67.

VIETNAM, FOREIGN POLICY

The Canadian Government is uneasy about Vietnam on several counts. Prime Minister Lester Pearson's regime always has had a neutralist bent. Publicly Pearson has politely, if not loudly, supported the U.S. effort in Vietnam. Privately, the Government and the vast majority of Canadians, so the official polls say, think the United States has no business in Vietnam.

The Pearson government is uneasy about Vietnam also because it knows the United States is less than happy with Canada's passive support (no Canadian troops are in Vietnam nor are any contemplated). But officials say their policy really is quite strong in relation to Canadian public opinion.

Another point of embarrassment is the violent anti-American job the Canadian Broadcasting System is doing on the war. The viciousness of the CBC attack on the United States, with a barrage of GI horror photos and eyewitness accounts, is particularly unhappy for Canadian officials when they remember that the Government subsidizes CBC to the tune of $65 million a year.

American visitors are frequently given another reason for Canadian passivity on the Pacific war. Canada is a member of the International Truce Commission for Vietnam. An aggressive role would destroy its effectiveness in the trucemaking effort, Americans are told.

Another sore point from the U.S. Government's view is Canada's failure so far to join the Organization of American States. Many in Ottawa think it is just a matter of time before Canada joins, but the stumbling blocks in the past have been disenchantment with our Santo Domingan policy, Cuba, and fear of more financial commitments in Latin America should it join OAS.

This is what must be said, with great emphasis, in regard to Canada and Vietnam: Prime Minister Pearson and his Secretary of External Affairs, Paul Martin, are giving great imagination and time to the peace effort and, second, no one can doubt the sincerity of their well-mannered disenchantment with U.S. handling of the Vietnam war.

If there was a theme that dominated talks with Americans in Ottawa last week it was "guidelines." Canadians, normally so phlegmatic, go into a terrible state at the mention of them.

Briefly, the guidelines, imposed by Executive order from Washington, ask U.S. companies with foreign (including Canadian) subsidiaries to hold to a minimum their American dollar investments and to return to the United States as large a share of income and undistributed profits as possible.

These were imposed 2 years ago by President Johnson in a successful effort to reduce our balance of payments deficit.

The Canadians have been successful in convincing Washington to cancel some of these guidelines because Canada does so much importing from the United States that the former is reducing, not increasing, the U.S. balance-of-payments problem.

Most eloquent spokesman against the guidelines in Minister of Finance Mitchell Sharp, a handsome redhead.

Canada is particularly sensitive about any such curbs of U.S. dollars and credit in Canada because the country is seventh in the world in manufacturing and exactly one-half of Canada's manufacturing is owned by U.S. firms.

But what really peeves the Canadians is that these guidelines are voluntary and are vague. Outright regulations, above board, would be easier to deal with and it would be easier to gage their effect.

There is no end to fears Canadians have about these economic guidelines.

"Presidential arm twisting across the border."

"A man in Washington sending orders through the parent company telling the subsidiary across the border what he can and cannot do in Canada."

"A blow to our national pride."

"This gives substance to all the anxiety about U.S., dominance following U.S. investment."

"Resentment over the U.S. guidelines is the greatest unifying force we have in Canada today."

Some U.S. Commerce and Treasury Dept. officials who evolved these regulations would counter by saying: (1) Everyone would rather have "guidelines" than regulations that carried penalty provisions; (2) Some exceptions were made to Canada, and (3) There have been some irregularities in the past in Canadian securities and some people were hurt by them.

QUEBEC VERSUS CANADA

A quarter of Canada's total population, coast-to-coast, the Great Lakes to the Hudson Bay and Alaska, are French-Canadians living in the Province of Quebec.

The French of Quebec have been feeling their oats the past 5 years, and there are no signs that their spirit of independence is waning. The French of Quebec versus the Anglo-Saxons of Ottawa is what the Canadians call "The French Fact."

First of all, this visitor had to be reminded that the central government of Canada is not nearly so powerful as our Federal Government; that the provinces are far stronger than our 50 sovereign States.

Against this background, the Province of Quebec, under a liberal government, is undergoing a dramatic modernization on all fronts. It is fighting the Ottawa government every inch of the way; demanding a greater share of the tax revenue, insisting that it handle its own social welfare programs and insisting that an end be put to Anglo-Saxon dominance of both big jobs in Government and big jobs in private business.

Many call it the "quiet revolution," but Quebec's liberal premier, Jean Lesage, says he prefers to call it a "fast revolution." The economy is in high gear; schools, long under a heavy church hand, are improving under a new generation of clergymen.

The Quebec movement was and is fed by a strong intellectual group from the universities. Some are pushing even harder and are insisting that the only solution for French Canadians is to secede from Canada. This, the separatist movement, is a serious fact of Canadian politics and no one, write most students of Canadian history, believes they hold real strength.

This is how serious the stir in Quebec is held by one of its respected intellectuals, Claude Ryan: "The Quebec First point of view must not be dismissed too lightly. It rides upon the new wave of nationalism which has swept so many colonized people in recent years.

"It has the advantage of logic and clarity. * * * It also finds negative support in the numerous abuses which are still heaped every day upon French Canadians by their old economic masters."

Looking to the future, Ryan concludes: "A dialog is now in progress in most influential circles of both Canadas. The dialog has merely begun. It has yet to come to grips with specific difficult issues which still divide English and French Canadians. No new tangible consensus is yet in sight. But the high caliber of many of the men who have chosen this course is in itself an encouraging omen for the future."

ECONOMY AND THE FRONTIER

Except for the Maritime Provinces, most of the figures that spell boom are present in Canada. The airplane and sophisticated technology have done for the chilly wastes of Canada what the covered wagon did for the West.

The natural resources development chapter is a fine one. Overall, Canada's gross national product is running at a 10-percent gain, compared to our 7 percent, and Canadian unemployment is at an alltime low.

Some touches on the Canadian frontier economy:

A railroad has finally been completed into Churchill Falls on the Hamilton River in Labrador. Here will be built a 10-million-horsepower electric power complex capable of producing the biggest single source of cheap power for eastern Canada and New England.

Calgary is becoming the oil center of the world, a transplanted American city.

In northern Alberta are oil sand deposits richer than Arabia's.

British Columbia is developing more and more immense low-grade copper mines.

The potash fields in Saskatchewan are burgeoning.

Without airplanes and electronic devices for mine detection the Canadian frontier boom would not be the business drama it is today.

The total U.S. direct investment in Canada today is $12 billion, $9 billion in South America, and $8 billion in Europe.

MONTREAL'S WORLD'S FAIR

Then you move to Canada's great seaport city—Montreal on the St. Lawrence. The city's pace should be noticed by New York and Boston.

Its redevelopment program is further advanced relatively than any city on the east coast. Its new subway opens this year. Next year Montreal reaps the benefits of the World's Fair and in 1972 it hopes to win the Olympic games. That's not hay.

If Boston has any serious hope of wooing the World's Fair to Boston Harbor, a delegation should practically be in residence studying the Montreal effort.

The Montreal fair will locate on two islands in the middle of the St. Lawrence and directly in front of the city. The islands have been doubled in size by some ingenious fill work from the bottom of the river. The fair management thus has produced 1,000 acres for the exhibition. Boston has talked about 400 acres (not enough) on its beautiful islands in the harbor.

Montreal fair operators are grateful to have the New York experience—generally considered a disaster—from which to learn. They are locating the big attractions on perimeters of the grounds, rather than clustering them. High speed subways connect all points on the grounds and run directly from parking lots and downtown. A computer at the entrance tells you in advance where the big crowds are—so you can avoid them.

Out of the Fair, Montreal is reaping $130 million in capital contracts, acres of new park land, an exotic new waterfront apartment complex on one of the fair islands, an aquarium, a bridge, a subway tunnel and several office buildings.

The city, in addition, expects 400 million extra tourist dollars from the 30 million visitors it expects in the 6 months from April 28, 1967, to October 27, 1967.

The directors of operations of the Montreal World's Fair is DeGaspe Beaubien. He knows Boston well and is a brother-in-law of Boston lawyer Gael Mahoney. He told us:

"During my years at Harvard, about the only mention I heard of my country was the morning report: 'There's a cold front coming down from Canada.'"

Not so any more.

It takes a lot of understanding living next to big brother who means so much more to you than you do to him.

Canada is growing bigger and apparently plans to make big brother more Canada-conscious, one way or another.

Thirty Republican Congressmen Call for Draft Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, most of us in Congress support American efforts to stem the tide of Communist aggression in a faraway land. Today we authorized $4.8 billion for additional military support in Vietnam. Yet, to me, the most important cost of this war is the human cost. When young men are drafted into the service, their private lives, their education, and their careers are seriously interrupted—at the least. Their lives are given at the most. There can be little doubt but what the draft is one of the greatest intrusions on individual freedom in America today. There can also be little doubt, in the words of George Washington, "that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a proportion of his property, but even his personal services in defense of it." Nevertheless, when the intrusion into private life is so great, this country cannot afford a selective service system that is inequitable and inefficient. I have long had my doubts about the equitability and efficiency of our system, and intensive research did not set aside those doubts. Twenty-nine Republican Members of Congress, listed below, joined me today in the following statement calling for an immediate investigation of the draft. I commend it to all my colleagues, in the House of Representatives and the Senate, for their serious consideration:

A Statement by 29 Republican Members of Congress

(By Robert F. Ellsworth of Kansas, Robert T. Stafford of Vermont, John B. Anderson of Illinois, Mark Andrews of North Dakota, James F. Battin of Montana, Alphonzo Bell of California, Laurence J. Burton of Utah, William T. Cahill of New Jersey, Barber B. Conable, Jr. of New York, Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri, Paul Findley of Illinois, Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, Charles E. Goodell of New York, William H. Harsha of Ohio, Frank Horton of New York, Hastings Keith of Massachusetts, Theodore Kupferman of New York, Clark MacGregor of Minnesota, William S. Mailliard of California, Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. of Maryland, Joseph M. McDade of Pennsylvania, Chester L. Mize of Kansas, F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, Albert H. Quie of Minnesota, Ogden R. Reid of New York, Howard W. Robison of New York, Donald Rumsfeld of Illinois, Herman Schneebeli of Pennsylvania, Richard S. Schweiker of Pennsylvania, J. William Stanton of Ohio)

There should be an immediate congressional investigation of the draft and the methods used to persuade our allies to supply manpower to Vietnam and southeast Asia. The contemplated hearings before the House Armed Service Committee take on added significance every day.

The search to provide manpower to fight the war in Vietnam should be equitable and efficient. We are concerned that it is neither.

1. There is mounting evidence of gross inefficiency in the National Selective Service and Defense Department administration of the draft. According to figures supplied by General Hershey to a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, there are 545,902 men between 19 and 26 now classified I–A. Of these, 117,825 have not yet been examined and another 279,676 are "not available" for the draft because their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline between local draft boards and Army induction centers. The Congress should examine this redtape jungle immediately.

2. From among current I–A classifications and those new I–A classifications expected through present procedures, and after physical and mental examinations, Selective Service System estimates show that a pool of 444,793 men will exist to meet induction and enlistment quotas through June 30, 1966. A congressional inquiry should examine whether the contemplated reexamination of present deferments is necessary to supplement the I–A pool to meet draft requirements.

3. While there are some prescribed limits on age and mental and physical capacity, there does not appear to be a clear order of priority in which the administration is considering calling the various manpower groups for service. It is imperative that the administration, through the Department of Defense and the Selective Service System, establish an equitable procedure by which the I–A draft pool should be filled. A congressional inquiry could help establish that order of priority.

4. General Hershey testified before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor that local draft boards will in the future determine the availability of college students for the draft after taking under advisement all pertinent information including class rank and results of an optional qualification test, similar to the one used during the Korean conflict. The first tests will be offered in May. General Hershey agreed that this type of test inevitably works to the advantage of sicence students and to the disadvantage of liberal arts students. The congressional inquiry should examine thoroughly the equitability of current and contemplated Selective Service regulations.

5. On April 18, 1964, the President directed the Secretary of Defense to undertake a study of the Selective Service System and to provide precise recommendations on how the service manpower needs of the Nation could best be met. According to the Defense Department the study has been completed and is in Secretary McNamara's office. But the report has not been made public and General Hershey has testified that he has never seen it.

6. A recent report of the Comptroller General of the United States concludes:

"The Army, Navy, and Air Force were using the services of about 9,000 enlisted personnel in nonmilitary activities, such as officers' and noncommissioned officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, golf courses, and commissary sales stores, rather than employ civilians."

This report considered only the most flagrant inefficiencies in the use of existing manpower by the services. It is ridiculous for the Department of Defense to insist upon drafting young men to be hurried into combat when it is not making maximum efficient use of the trained personnel it already has.

7. At the present time Korea, Australia, and New Zealand are supplying combat personnel to the United States-South Vietnamese military effort in Vietnam. Other countries are providing some noncombat personnel. The congressional inquiry should examine carefully the efforts made by the administration to secure both combat and noncombat manpower contributions from our allies. It should consider and recommend new means of securing expanded allied contributions.

All of these are proper subjects for a broad-ranging congressional inquiry. The administration may soon seek to increase substantially the number of U.S. forces in southeast Asia. Therefore the congressional investigation must not be delayed. We can no longer afford a haphazard approach toward the supply of personnel in support of the objectives of the United States in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Correct Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun Times is convinced that the course the administration is following in Vietnam is "the only correct one," and it hailed the clarification given the issues by General Taylor.

The newspaper points out:

> There are certain principles at stake in Vietnam and the United States is committed to upholding those principles.
>
> General Taylor pointed out that even though the United States will have to increase its forces in South Vietnam the limited objectives it seeks are being won. He said, speaking as a military expert, that North Vietnam's capacity to escalate the war is limited and may have reached its limit.

Mr. Speaker, because we are all interested in getting as much opinion on this subject as possible—and because this editorial is lucid and concise—I am offering it for publication in the Record.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 21, 1966]

Vietnam Dialog

Last week one of the severest critics of the administration's Vietnam policy met one of the chief architects of that policy, the former ambassador to South Vietnam, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, head on in hearings conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The dialog between General Taylor and Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, was, at times, acrid. But the clash between the two did much to clarify the U.S. position in Vietnam, a clarification that has been needed.

General Taylor reminded the Senate committee that the United States does not intend to invade North Vietnam, bring down its government, drive for "unconditional" victory over North Vietnam or provoke war with Red China.

The United States, said General Taylor, is fighting a defensive action to halt an attempt by the North Vietnam Communists to take what is not theirs to take and to uphold the right of the people of South Vietnam to self-determination. In pursuing those two objectives the United States can, simultaneously, deny to Peiping an opportunity to use South Vietnam as a training ground for similar subversion and revolution in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

These objectives have been set forth before on many occasions. It is time they were said again. There are certain principles at stake in Vietnam and the United States is committed to upholding those principles.

General Taylor pointed out that even though the United States will have to increase its forces in South Vietnam the limited objectives it seeks are being won. He said, speaking as a military expert, that North Vietnam's capacity to escalate the war is limited and may have reached its limit.

Senator Morse disagreed violently with everything General Taylor said. That is his privilege and it served a purpose. The Nation has been the beneficiary of the vigorous debate and those who listened with an open mind should be persuaded that the course the United States is following is, all thing considered, the only correct one.

Statement by L. Eldon James

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House of Representatives and a member of the American Legion, I had a unique pleasure this morning and a privilege that chance will probably bring to relatively few of my colleagues.

This morning I was able to introduce to our House Veterans' Affairs Committee a man whose counseling voice has been close to me for 20 years and who is now the voice of the 2½ million members of the American Legion.

L. Eldon James, who will serve as national commander of the American Legion throughout 1966, lives in Hampton, Va., and—aside from being one of my close friends and neighbors—he is one of my most prominent constituents. I have known the commander of the American Legion for 20 years, and I can assure you that he brings a highly developed sense of patriotism and a deeply felt set of convictions to the leadership of the world's largest veterans organization. He is a man who has always taken responsibilities seriously and I was frankly proud to be present this morning to hear my friend and constituent review the American Legion's legislative goals for 1966.

Veterans affairs have been a continuing concern to the U.S. House of Representatives, and the interests of the veteran have always ranked high among our Government's priorities. The Veterans' Affairs Committee and the membership of the House generally have, therefore, always been deeply interested in the American Legion's own legislative recommendations.

Today, Eldon James came to Capitol Hill to ask Congress to join with the American Legion in developing solutions to the many rehabilitation problems facing our Nation's disabled and needy veterans.

It is clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that our Nation's commitments in Vietnam must be reflected in the field of veterans affairs. Eldon James' views on his organization's legislative requirements will most certainly be of deep interest to my colleagues. I only wish every Member of the House could have been present to hear his statesmanlike presentation before the Veterans' Affairs Committee this morning. But for the benefit of my colleagues who could not be present, I insert his statement in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. James' statement follows:

STATEMENT BY L. ELDON JAMES, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished committee, there is no way I can adequately express to you my appreciation, and the appreciation of over 2½ million members of the American Legion and approximately 1 million members of the Legion Auxiliary, for the understanding you have shown; for the devotion you have and for your determination in establishing the legislative policy of our Government in the field of veterans affairs. The American Legion has always found this committee receptive where the interests of the needy and disabled veteran, his widow, and orphan are concerned. I believe the cooperative relationship that has developed between our organization, your committee, and your highly competent and energetic staff has been outstanding.

For 43 years now Legionnaires have met in Washington to consider problems in the field of veterans affairs. Today, as we appear before you, over 1,500 members of our organization have gathered here in our Nation's Capital to participate in our annual winter conference. This conference will also be considering matters of vital interest to our country in the fields of national security and foreign relations. Some special matters, such as the desirability of opening up eligibility for membership in our organization to veterans serving during the Vietnam period, will also be discussed. Many of the representatives are present here in this room today. Certainly we want to express our thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, to the members of this committee, and to your staff for giving us this time and for making available these facilities and for accommodating this large crowd.

One of the major concerns of our conference here in Washington this week is what we refer to as rehabilitation matters. Through the means of this conference, practicing service officers of the American Legion, who work day in and day out with the hard realism of specific cases of disabled and needy veterans, will exchange ideas and will try to find solutions so that inequities may be corrected. Through such efforts as this we are continually uncovering conditions that require legislation. Based on such work as this we come to you from time to time seeking legislative changes.

A major nonbusiness event—in fact, I might call it a social event—of our conference will be the annual banquet held in honor of the Congress. It will take place tomorrow night at the Sheraton-Park Hotel. Many of you and your wives have accepted our invitation and we look forward to visiting with you at that time and have you visit with your constituents who will be here in sizable numbers.

I have referred briefly to your staff. It is a real temptation to me to call them by name and express to you our deep sense of obligation to them for their diligent work on our common goals. I will not mention names for fear that I might omit some deserving member of your staff. In fact, each of them has our eternal gratitude. I commend you for retaining such skilled and understanding individuals.

Down through the years this committee has done a magnificent job of maintaining and improving the veterans benefits program. An inventory of your accomplishments would be far too voluminous to even outline here. The most recent dramatic accomplishment was the enactment of the Veterans' Readjustment Benefit Act of 1966. I believe it is of more than ordinary significance that this veterans legislation was the first piece of major legislation to be enacted by this session of the 89th Congress. Certainly this fact reflects your committee's understanding of our country's concern and gratitude for those who bear arms in defense of our country.

With your permission, I would like now to direct our joint attention to five specific areas in which we believe further legislation concerning veterans affairs is warranted.

I. WARTIME BENEFITS FOR VIETNAM PERIOD VETERANS

The first is in the area of wartime benefits for veterans in our armed services during the Vietnam era. At our national convention in Portland, Oreg., in 1965, resolution No. 125, adopted by the convention, mandated our organization to sponsor and support legislation to provide a program of wartime benefits for those who have served on or after August 5, 1964. These benefits would be similar to those provided to veterans of other wartime periods. This position was reasserted by resolution No. 22 of our national executive committee last fall. The Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, on which this committee did such wonderful work, provides many needed benefits in a very fine legislative package. We feel, however, that there are certain deficiencies that should be corrected.

For example, Vietnam period veterans should be made eligible for war compensation rates; death and disability pension; and burial allowances, to cite only some. The American Legion bill, H.R. 12186—which, incidentally, you, Mr. Chairman, so graciously introduced for us—would provide for our Vietnam period veterans, benefits now available and granted to other wartime veterans. As an aside, I might say this. I know that you, Mr. Chairman, have recently been to Vietnam. I believe, twice. I was there myself for 6 short days last October. My brief experience there does not make me an expert but I was convinced by everything that I saw that our military personnel in Vietnam are doing a magnificent job. As a minimum, they deserve to know that Americans back home recognize that they serve well the cause of freedom under what must be described as full wartime conditions. All the members of our Armed Forces are today subject to exposure to maximum risk in defense of our system of government and could be called to the shooting front at any time. Our legislative policy in the field of veterans affairs must reflect that this country recognizes these facts and the service the members of our Armed Forces perform.

In the field of educational assistance, we believe this committee should consider again the adequacy of rates provided in the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. We know that it is not the intent of this act to completely subsidize the cost of the veteran's education or training. We are aware that if the veteran has to contribute something from his own resources, his interest in obtaining an education may be greater. Induction into the military service has in so many instances disrupted the veteran's attempt to gain an education, while others not called into service have been permitted to complete their education without interruption. I think the question of adequacy of rates for education benefits to veterans may be well illustrated by drawing the comparison with those who received training in the war on poverty program. In the latter, our Federal Government is paying at the rate of $375 a month, while the monthly educational assistance for veterans under the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act is $100 per month for a single man. We cite this example not as a criticism of any program but only as a suggestion that the educational assistance rates could stand a modest increase.

II. EXPANSION OF BENEFITS FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES AND DEATH

The second area in which we believe legislation is needed is improvement in the benefits for service-connected disabilities or death. Our Government's obligation to those who have incurred a service disability, or to their survivors where death has resulted, is one of the highest priority. Presidential pronouncements on this subject go all the way back to at least Mr. Lincoln. We would seek legislative modifications to correct several inequities that now exist. For example—

1. Under present law, the rate paid for total disability is $300 per month. Partial disability should be compensated by a portion of $300 equal to the percentage of total disability the person actually suffers. Under present law this is not true, for a person with 50-percent disability does not receive $150 a month, the equivalent of 50 percent of $300, but actually receives only $113 per month. We believe logic and sound reasoning suggest a change is needed.

2. Veterans with a rated disability of 50 percent or more receive, in addition to their compensation, supplementary allowances if they have dependents. Under present law, if that veteran's disability is reduced to anything under 50 percent, he is no longer entitled to supplementary compensation because of his dependents.

For example, consider this case which is typical of many others: Veteran X has a 40-percent rating, for a below-the-knee amputation, and a 10-percent rating, for arthritis of the spine. These ratings combine to 50 percent and, under present law, he receives an additional allowance for his wife and three children. VA examines him, concludes that the arthritis is no longer disabling, and reduces his rating to 40 percent. Not only does he lose his 10-percent compensation, he also loses all allowances for his family—as though they had disappeared. The veteran does not understand this, nor do we. We believe logic and sound reasoning suggest a change is needed.

3. Steps should be taken to increase the rates of death compensation payable to widows, children, and dependent parents. They were last increased in 1952.

4. The dependency and indemnity compensation program for dependent parents needs improvement. We are aware that H.R. 168, as originally reported by this committee, did provide for higher income limits. We understand the Veterans' Administration has this matter under study. We would urge that the study be completed as soon as possible and that survivors be awarded increased benefits necessary to meet the increased cost of living.

III. IMPROVEMENT OF THE DEATH AND DISABILITY PENSION PROGRAM

Legislation is needed in order to improve the death and disability pension program. The American Legion for years has supported the principle that entitlement to receive death and disability pensions should be determined by a test of individual need. We have consistently supported the principle that the standard of need for a war veteran is and should be higher than the test of indigency for public assistance. For this reason, we support the enactment of legislation to improve the pension program in the following ways:

1. Substitute a two-step table of rates and income limitation for the present three-step table;

2. Increase the maximum annual income limitation by $600;

3. Expand the list of "incomes" that may be excluded from determinations of annual income;

4. Restore the provision that would permit recoupment of amounts contributed to retirement plans before payments from them are considered income; and

5. Permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay a pension to a wife or child when the veteran disappears and was, at the time of disappearance, receiving or entitled to receive disability pension. With reference to the question of need, there have been many discussions of the level of annual income below which poverty is considered to exist. Some have set the figure at $3,000; others believe it should be higher. We are convinced that the existing income limitations controlling payment of disability and death pension are too low.

In addition, we have been struggling to find some solution to the unfortunate result which occurs when a pensioner receives a small increase in his outside income, say from some retirement plan, but he suffers a large decrease in the amount of VA pension payable. We believe our proposal to substitute a two-step table for the present three-step one, and to increase the income limitations by $600, would go a long way toward insuring that pensioners in financial need would continue to receive adequate allowances from the Government.

IV. APPROPRIATION OF SUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF VA PROGRAMS

Appropriation of sufficient funds to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to effectively carry out the veterans' benefits programs is essential. We are aware of the need for economy in Government. Failure on the part of Government to meet its obligations to the needy and disabled veterans, who in their own individual ways have accepted their responsibility to Government, is not the way to accomplish it.

I will not trespass upon the time of this committee to recite facts or statistics to prove the economic soundness of veterans' programs in the past. Through your support you have underscored their importance. Sound business practice will dictate that any program worthy of continuation must be adequately supported by proper staff, equipment, and facilities. No matter how wonderful a program may look on paper, it is ineffective until staff, equipment, and facilities are available and are blended together to produce an effective result. In other words, gentlemen, if our programs are to be carried out, you must see that adequate funds are appropriated. We take confidence for the moment in the President's budget for this purpose. We believe it does reflect our Government's proper concern for its obligation to those who have served in uniform.

V. THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Our national policy on veterans affairs should be molded by the Veterans' Administration under the direction of the President and established by the Congress. The dangerous tendency of the Bureau of the Budget to usurp these powers should be terminated. We recognise the need of a central agency such as the Bureau of the Budget, and the functions it must serve in assisting the President in the preparation of the budget and the administration of fiscal programs. This agency has a role to play in the efficient operation of Government. However, we feel compelled to call to the attention of this committee the growing tendency of the Bureau to exercise autocratic authority in molding top-level policy where our veterans programs are concerned. We believe it is essential that the Congress not permit its responsibility and its authority to slip away by default in this vital area of Government administration. To underscore the critical nature of this situation, we need only refer back to January 13, 1965, when 31 Veterans' Administration facilities were ordered closed. Reliable information available to us indicates that this unfortunate major policy determination came directly from the Bureau of the Budget. The wisdom and determination of this committee, other committees of the Congress and the Congress generally, all responsive to our efforts and similar efforts of like-minded people throughout the land, fortunately resulted in at least a partial reversal of that unwarranted decision. We cannot afford to discount the seriousness of this usurpation of authority merely because a partial reversal resulted. Although there have been no recent dramatic efforts of which we have any knowledge, we feel sure the philosophy has not changed. We were gravely concerned over the Bureau efforts to force the Veterans' Administration to reverse a long-standing position by compelling the VA to accept responsibility for conducting within its system a hospital program for merchant seamen, commercial fishermen and certain other nonveterans. No matter how we look at such an effort, the result is that the Bureau of the Budget in this instance is attempting to establish the national policy with respect to the hospitalization of veterans. We do not believe such action is in accordance with the intent of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, or the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, as amended. We urge that the Congress take such steps as may be necessary to curtail and limit such action on the part of the Bureau of the Budget in its efforts to originate and influence policies.

Mr. Chairman, members of this committee, I have discussed briefly the five major legislative objectives of our National Rehabilitation Commission as determined by our policy bodies, commencing with our 1964 national convention. As this committee knows, these legislative proposals mandated from the delegates to our national convention will remain in force until the adjournment of the 89th Congress. We respectfully seek your well-considered attention to these problems. As has been the practice of my predecessors, I have taken the liberty of attaching to my statement a résumé of those resolutions that seek legislative action. I request, Mr. Chairman, this addendum be made a part of the record.

Mr. Chairman, members of this committee, on behalf of the American Legion, we want you to know that we are so very grateful for the opportunity you have given us this morning to present our views on these important matters of mutual concern to all of us. As you so well know, it is in the interest of the disabled and needy veteran, his widow and his orphan, that we come to you on matters affecting veterans benefits. Your record is a clear demonstration of your enlightened concern for those who have borne the burden of our national defense and those who bear it at this very moment. We salute your effort and pledge our continuing and untiring support in their behalf.

REHABILITATION RESOLUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION THAT REQUIRE LEGISLATIVE ACTION

POLICY

A. Burial benefits

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 46 (Rhode Island) seeks legislation to increase the VA burial allowance from $250 to $350 (H.R. 2657).

B. Burial allowance when interred in a national cemetery

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 467 (New York) requests we oppose those legislative proposals which would reduce the VA burial allowance payable on the burial and funeral expenses where a deceased veteran is buried in a national cemetery.

C. Burial flags

1. The 1966 convention Resolution 158 (Ohio) requests that the American Legion continue to support legislation to provide that the burial flag issued by the VA shall be 5 by 9½ feet.

Accomplished administratively. The Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration has advised us that the agency is implementing the intent of this resolution through administrative regulation.

D. Reduction and closing of VA facilities

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 19 (Florida) urges that the American Legion continue to record its protest against the closing of facilities; that the President, the Congress, and the Administrator of the VA establish and maintain a VA hospital system of not less than 125,000 beds and not less than one regional office in each State; that the VA hospital system be restricted to the care of veterans and those members of the Armed Forces mutually agreed to; and that we use every means at our disposal to fore-

stall the closing of additional facilities (H.R. 202).

This resolution (which affirms, in part, 1965 spring NEC Resolution 31) was partially accomplished by Public Law 89–311 which authorized the Veterans' Administration to operate not less than 125,000 hospital beds.

2. The 1965 convention Resolution 100 (Minnesota) urges the Congress of the United States to take whatever action is necessary to reopen those domiciliaries ordered closed, and to provide additional facilities to accommodate those veterans in need of domiciliary care.

3. The 1965 convention Resolution 420 (Texas) endorses H.R. 202 and S. 969, bills to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals and the closing of such hospitals.

E. Activities of the Bureau of the Budget

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 101 (Minnesota) seeks enactment of legislation to curtail the power of the Bureau of the Budget; and urges that the Congress of the United States and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and not the Bureau of the Budget, set the policy for operation of the VA.

F. Wartime benefits for those serving after August 5, 1964

1. The 1965 fall NEC Resolution 22 seeks legislation to provide for veterans who serve on and after August 5, 1964, a veterans program comparable to that provided wartime veterans (H.R. 12186).

G. Commissary and other privileges

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 478 (Alabama) urges legislation to provide that children of veterans who died in service in the performance of duty have the same privilege now available to children of retirees of the Armed Forces of using commissary, ship's service, medical, and other facilities when available.

H. Recoupment of readjustment pay

1. The 1965 spring NEC Resolution 8 urges legislation to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, to provide that a member of the Reserve component involuntarily released from active duty shall receive the full amount of disability compensation to which he may be entitled in addition to lump sum readjustment payment (H.R. 10268).

I. Increased VA travel allowance

1. The 1965 spring NEC Resolution 14 urges the President of the United States to issue an amendment of the existing Executive order to authorize the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to pay a mileage rate commensurate with the expenses incurred by beneficiaries while traveling under an authorization of the VA; and, failing in this request, seeks legislation to accomplish this change (H.R. 12300).

J. Marriage dates

1. The 1964 convention Resolution 49 (Florida) requests the Congress of the United States to amend section 103(a), title 38 U.S.C., to liberalize the eligibility of certain widows to VA benefits by adding to the existing criteria the provision that the purported marriage shall be deemed a valid marriage if a child were born of the marriage (H.R. 3804).

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL

A. VA hospital and outpatient treatment

1. The 1964 convention Resolution 407 (Minnesota) requests the Congress of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget to provide all finances necessary for the Veterans' Administration, at all times, to provide the highest type and degree of medical and hosiptal care.

2. The 1965 convention Resolution 27 (Alaska) requests support of legislation to provide treatment in contract hospitals for veterans in Alaska who require hospital treatment for non-service-connected conditions when the use of VA or other Government hospitals is not considered practicable (H.R. 9033).

B. Increased salaries for VA medical personnel

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 477 (Alabama) urges an increase in the salaries of physicians, nurses, and other key administrative personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the VA so that they are commensurate with or comparable to salaries paid individuals with similar qualifications in industry, medical schools, and community hospitals.

CLAIMS AND RATING

A. Recoupment of severance pay

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 516 (Virginia) urges legislation to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make payment of a portion of disability compensation for the same disability for which severance pay has been given when the Administrator determines that recoupment at the full monthly rate creates an economic hardship in an individual case (H.R. 12736).

B. Certain veterans' benefits for retired armed services personnel

1. The 1965 spring NEC resolution 16 urges the President of the United States to amend Executive Order No. 10122 so as to create entitlement to the benefits of paragraphs 29 and 30 of the VA 1945 schedule for rating disabilities for those members and former members of the armed services permanently retired for physical disability or receiving disability retirement pay; and, failing in this request, seeks legislation to accomplish this change.

C. Extending children's age limit for educational benefits

1. The 1965 fall NEC Resolution 23 seeks legislation to extend to age 23 the time up to which certain children may be eligible for VA benefits.

The full intent of this resolution was satisfied by the passage of Public Law 89–311, dated October 31, 1965.

COMPENSATION PROGRAM FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OR DEATH

A. Presumption of service connection

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 50 (Rhode Island) seeks legislation to provide that a chronic functional psychosis manifested to a compensable degree within 3 years after wartime service shall be deemed to have been incurred in or aggravated by such service (H.R. 12724).

B. Statutory and special awards

1. The 1964 convention Resolution 34 (Kentucky) requests legislation to provide that disability pension be payable in addition to the statutory award payable under 38 U.S.C. 314(k) to those veterans with a service-connected loss of use one one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception (H.R. 5509).

2. The 1964 convention Resolution 93 (Philippine Islands) requests legislation to provide that payments of disability and death compensation to Commonwealth Army, recognized guerrilla, and new Philippine Scout veterans and their dependents shall be at the rate of $0.50 for each dollar otherwise authorized (H.R. 3807).

3. The 1964 convention Resolution 128 (Ohio) seeks legislation to provide that any veteran who has a service-connected loss or loss of use of one kidney shall be entitled to a statutory award (H.R. 5511).

4. The 1964 convention Resolution 175 (Nebraska) requests legislation to provide that any veteran who has suffered deafness in one ear the result of a service-connected disability and who has suffered deafness in the other ear not the result of service and not the result of his own willful misconduct shall be entitled to disability compensation as though the bilateral deafness were incurred in or aggravated by military service.

The full intent of this resolution was satisfied by the passage of Public Law 89–311, dated October 31, 1965.

C. Increase disability compensation rates

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 295 (Tennessee) requests continued support of legislation to increase and equalize the rates of disability compensation and to provide additional compensation for dependents for those veterans rated less than 50 percent on the same basis as such compensation is now payable to those veterans rated 50 percent and higher (H.R. 7567 and H.R. 7569).

2. The 1965 convention Resolution 419 (Texas) requests continued support of legislation to improve the dependency and indemnity compensation for dependent parents by increasing the rates and raising the annual income limitation (H.R. 7570).

3. The 1964 fall NEC Resolution 6 requests we seek legislation to increase the rates of death compensation payable to widows and dependent parents entitled under laws in effect prior to January 1, 1957; and, to amend the provisions of title 38, United States Code, to improve the dependency and indemnity compensation program for dependent parents (H.R. 7568 and H.R. 7570).

PENSION PROGRAM FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OR DEATH

A. Basic entitlement

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 159 (Ohio) requests legislation to accomplish the following amendments to title 38, United States Code:

Amend the table of rates and income limitations applicable under subsection 521(b) to unmarried veterans to provide that if a veteran's annual income does not exceed $1,800 the rate of pension shall be $100 a month, and if his annual income is more than $1,800 but does not exceed $2,400 the rate of pension shall be $80 a month.

Amend the table of rates and income limitations under subsection 521(c) applicable to married veterans or veterans with children to provide that if a veteran's annual income does not exceed $2,400 the rate of pension shall be $105 a month, and if his annual income is more than $2,400 but does not exceed $3,600 the rate of pension shall be $80 a month, with $5 a month to be added to these rates for each additional dependent.

Amend the table of rates and income limitations under subsection 541(b) applicable to widows without children to provide that if a widow's annual income does not exceed $1,800 the rate of pension shall be $65 a month and if her annual income is more than $1,800 but does not exceed $2,400 the rate of pension shall be $55 a month.

Amend the table of rates and income limitations under subsection 541(c) applicable to a widow with one child to provide that if a widow's annual income does not exceed $2,400 the rate of pension shall be $80 a month, and if her annual income is more than $2,400 but does not exceed $3,600 the rate of pension shall be $65 a month.

Amend paragraph (4) of section 503 to provide for exclusion of not exceeding $10,000 in aggregate face amount of (a) payments under policies of U.S. Government life insurance or national service life insurance, (b) payments of servicemen's indemnity, and (c) in the case of claims for death pension, payments under policies or contracts of private or commercial life insurance.

Amend paragraph (6) of section 503 to provide for exclusion from determinations of annual income 10 percent of payments to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs; provided, that where an individual has made contribution thereto, the exclusion under this paragraph shall not apply until there has been received an amount equal to his contributions.

Amend subparagraph 7(B) of section 503 to provide for exclusion from annual income determinations the expenses of the veteran's last illness paid before his death.

Amend section 503 to add the following to the list of items which may be excluded from annual income determinations:

(a) The unusual medical expenses of the veteran, widow, or child to the same extent as now applicable to income computation of dependent parents for dependency and indemnity compensation.

(b) The increase in monthly insurance benefits provided beneficiaries under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965.

Amend subsection 502(a) to provide that an otherwise eligible veteran be deemed permanently and totally disabled if 65 years of age or over and unemployed, or is suffering from active tuberculosis and is hospitalized for such disease.

Amend subsection 3203(d) so as to repeal the provisions which require the reduction of a veteran's pension to $30 a month after 2 months' hospitalization or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration; and restore the provisions of section 3203 of title 38 U.S.C. as were in effect on June 30, 1960, relating to pension payments to veterans while in a Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary home.

Amend chapter 15 to provide that a person receiving death or disability pension based on service in World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, shall have the right to elect or reelect to receive either under chapter 15 of this title or under those provisions of title 38 U.S.C. in effect on June 30, 1960 (H.R. 2658, H.R. 5510, H.R. 6408, H.R. 6409, H.R. 6410).

B. Exclusion of income

1. The 1964 fall NEC Resolution 7 requests legislation to provide that payments received by an individual from public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs shall be excluded from determinations of annual income for pension purposes until they equal the amount of his personal contributions thereto (H.R. 2655).

C. Pension payments when a veteran disappears

1. The 1965 spring NEC Resolution 4 seeks legislation to provide that where a veteran receiving pension disappears, the Administrator, in his discretion, may pay the pension, otherwise payable to the veteran, to his wife and children but that the payment made under this amendment shall not exceed the amounts payable to each if the veteran had died of a non-service-connected disability (H.R. 9961).

D. Additional benefits for those in receipt of aid and attendance awards

1. The 1965 fall NEC Resolution 20 seeks legislation to provide medicines and drugs, additional care, equipment, and supplies to those veterans receiving pension based on the need for regular aid and attendance under the law in effect prior to July 1, 1960 (H.R. 12723).

INSURANCE

A. Extrahazard determinations

1. The 1964 convention Resolution 36 (Kentucky) requests legislation to provide that extrahazard determinations of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be, except for fraud, final and conclusive unless reviewed within 2 years after the date of his original determination (H.R. 3806).

B. Reopening of NSLI

1. The 1965 convention Resolution 32 (South Carolina) seeks continued support of legislation to reopen for a 1-year period the right to apply for national service life insurance for those insurable and service-disabled veterans of service between the inclusive dates of December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, and of June 27, 1950, and July 27, 1953, under policies providing for a premium charge which will include administrative costs (H.R. 5067).

2. The 1965 spring NEC Resolution 13 seeks legislation to provide that the Administator, at the end of one 5-year period of experience from the effective date of the insurance plans established under section 725(b), shall establish a fixed schedule of maximum premium rates and to provide that those policies of insurance continued after notice to the policyholder of the fixed rate of premium shall be on a participating basis (H.R. 10037).

3. The 1965 spring NEC Resolution 15 seeks legislation to authorize the VA to conduct medical examinations and special tests, when required, of a veteran applying for insurance under section 725(e), on a time-available basis, using the established schedule of fees for conducting such examinations for other Government agencies in arriving at the cost to be charged (H.R. 10034).

C. Modified life plan

1. The 1964 convention Resolution 446 (Massachusetts) requests legislation to provide a modified life plan of National Service life insurance.

This resolution affirms 1963 convention Resolution 68 (Massachusetts). The full intent of this resolution was satisfied by the passage of Public Law 88-664, dated October 13, 1964.

D. Total disability coverage

1. The 1965 spring NEC Resolution 9 seeks legislation to provide that service-connected disabilities may be waived for the purpose of meeting good health requirements under 38 United States Code 715 where veterans hold policies with total disability income provisions authorized by the Insurance Act of 1946, with a similar waiver of good health (H.R. 10036).

E. Federal estate tax on Government life insurance

1. The 1965 spring NEC Resolution 10 seeks legislation to amend 38 U.S.C. 3101 so as to specifically provide that proceeds of USGLI and NSLI not be subject to the imposition of the Federal estate tax (H.R. 10035).

F. Reinstatement of lapsed NSLI

1. The 1965 spring NEC Resolution 11 seeks legislation to provide for waiver of service-connected disabilities less than total, for reinstatement of lapsed NSLI policies of veterans of service between the inclusive dates of December 7, 1941 and September 2, 1945, or June 27, 1950 and July 27, 1953, if application therefor, with a remittance covering all missing premiums, plus interest, is received by the VA within 2 years from the date such policy lapsed, as is now provided for holders of USGLI (H.R. 1168).

G. Special one-time dividend

1. The 1964 spring NEC Resolution 12 seeks legislation to amend 38 U.S.C. 723(d) to eliminate the requirement that RS insurance must be converted or exchanged prior to September 3, 1963, for the insureds to share in the payment of the special one-time dividend (H.R. 9316).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A. Reviews by a civilian board

1. The 1964 convention Resolution 516 (District of Columbia) requests legislation to create an independent board, consisting solely of civilians, to be appointed by the President, for the purpose of reviewing all discharges less than honorable from military, naval, or air service, with full authority to replace any other than an honorable discharge, no matter under what circumstances issued, with any type of discharge it may deem to be just and proper, and that such board shall be responsible to the President only and free of any affiliation with any existing governmental department or agency (H.R. 9949).

B. Correction of service records

1. The 1965 spring NEC Resolution 5, seeks legislation to extend the delimiting date for applying for a correction of a military, naval, or air service record from October 25, 1961, to October 25, 1971 (H.R. 10267).

C. Retirement of members of the Armed Forces

1. The 1965 spring NEC Resolution 7 requests that the American Legion support H.R. 1077, a bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force of the United States.

Summary of Efforts To Solve the Jet Noise Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed my colleagues in the House on a number of occasions to sound the alarm that aircraft noise has become a national problem requiring Federal action. On May 13, 1965, I made a statement entitled "Jet Noise Opens the Floodgates of Litigation" in which I reviewed the pending lawsuits against municipalities which own or operate airfields. At that date there were more than 200 lawsuits seeking an aggregate of more than $20 million in damages on various grounds alleging the taking of private property without due process or alleging trespass.

On July 22, 1965, the Ohio Supreme Court ruled in a 4 to 3 decision—*State, ex rel. Royal* v. *City of Columbus*, 3 Ohio St. 2d 154—that homeowners are entitled to compensation if low-flying airplanes produce such an amount of noise so as to interfere with the proper use and enjoyment of their homes. The court based its decision in part on the case of *United States* v. *Causby*, 328 U.S. 256, 266, in which the U.S. Supreme Court stated:

> Flights over private land are not a taking unless they are so low and so frequent as to be a direct and immediate interference with the enjoyment and use of the land.

The Ohio court also quoted from the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Griggs* v. *Allegheny County*, 369 U.S. 84, where the Court stated:

> The use of the land presupposes the use of some of the airspace over it. * * * Otherwise, no home could be built, no tree planted, no fence constructed, no chimney erected.

Yesterday—February 28, 1966—the U.S. Supreme Court denied certiorari in the Columbus case, thereby leaving the opinion of the Ohio Supreme Court standing as a landmark decision in jet noise litigation. It should be emphasized that in the City of Columbus suit, the lower court found that—

> The glide angle height above the homes involved ranged from a minimum of 50 feet to 60 feet to a maximum of 90 feet.

There were 40 homeowners represented in the Ohio case.

By refusing to review the Ohio decision, the Supreme Court declined to establish a legal ceiling limit in jet noise litigation. We therefore have no guidelines as to whether future court decisions will extend the legal ceiling limit to 500 or even 1,000 feet.

With the constantly increasing number of airfields which will be servicing jet aircraft during the next 4 years and with the increasing air traffic, it is imperative that we in the Congress do something about jet noise—and that we do it now. I have urged congressional action since last May when I introduced H.R. 7981, to accelerate and coordinate noise abatement research, and H.R. 7982, to provide Federal reimbursement to local governments and to the airline industry for the implementation of techniques required to achieve a reduction in aircraft noise.

I commend the local officials and the many civic organizations in the Fifth Congressional District which have recognized and carried the fight for aircraft noise abatement since the first commercial jet plane landed at Kennedy International Airport in 1958. They have brought the issue to public attention but they need assistance—and I ask them to join with me to seek assistance from the highest level of government to find ways to reduce aircraft noise by an all-out research program and to reduce the impact which the Columbus case and other legal decisions will have on the private homeowners, the aircraft industry, and on local governments which own or operate airfields. I invite their comments on my bills so that we may be united in our efforts to achieve Federal attention.

In addition to Federal legislation, I have proposed that a Presidential commission be appointed to study and make positive recommendations for a crash program to alleviate the problem of aircraft noise.

During the period of adjournment, I visited Hong Kong and conferred with our air attachés and civil aviation officials. I saw a 10,000-foot runway which had been built directly out into the bay—not just an extension of an existing runway at the airport. Flights were brought in and takeoffs executed from this runway, avoiding a pattern of takeoffs and landings over existing homes. I am requesting the Federal Aviation Agency and other appropriate agencies to make a feasibility study, including the engineering and safety aspects, of the construction of such a runway at Kennedy Airport out into Jamaica Bay. Such a runway would avoid heavy populated areas such as Inwood, Lawrence, Cedarhurst, Woodmere, Hewlett, Valley Stream, Long Beach, Oceanside, Lynbrook, and other communities along the south shore of Long Island.

I urge my colleagues to review my bills H.R. 7981 and H.R. 7982, as well as some of the other proposals which I have suggested in this field. For the information of my colleagues, the following remarks have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

	Page
May 6, 1965: "Aircraft Noise Abatement"	9363
May 13, 1965: "Jet Noise—Opens the Floodgates of Litigation"	A2377
May 20, 1965: "More on Jet Noise: NASA Conference"	A2533
May 27, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part IV—NASA Research Program"	A2718
June 10, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part V—FAA Aircraft Noise Symposium"	A3037
July 8, 1965: "Jet Noise—Part VI—Hazard To the Nation's Health"	A3630
Aug. 12, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part VII—Report on Noise Forum"	A4520
Aug. 30, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part VIII—Novel Test Over Long Island and Correspondence With the President"	A4888
Sept. 15, 1965: "The Latest on Jet Noise—Part IX"	A5205

Local Resource Leaders Broaden Their Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, in the nearly 30 years since President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent each Governor a model soil conservation districts law, to urge the creation of local districts to save our resources from plunder, a highly effective body of local resource leaders has grown that has made significant gains in protecting and improving our land and water. Through the efforts of cooperators and locally chosen supervisors, and effective technical assistance by the USDA Soil Conservation Service, the work of the 3,000 soil conservation districts in the Nation has been outstanding.

We are now riding a new wave of conservation, necessitated by the twin pressures of population growth and industrial power. I am impressed by the ability of these conservation districts to take on broader responsibilities in the strengthening of our resource heritage in a dynamic and growing society.

There are several examples of broadened activity on the part of these local groups in my district in Michigan. Recently I toured the North Branch of Mill Creek watershed project in Lapeer, Sanilac, and St. Clair Counties. This project, sponsored by the conservation districts, along with other local units of government, is designed to prevent flooding, improve agricultural water management, and foster better land use in the watershed area.

I saw a dam going up to hold back floodwaters; deepening and widening of the stream channel; and improvement of bridges. I saw trees being planted on land that should be in trees; ponds developed for wildlife and recreation; and many other conservation practices being applied. I was told that this project already proved its worth during a severe rainstorm last year, when over 500 acres of small vegetables were saved from damaging floodwaters, a savings of some $50,000.

Farmers outside the watershed were forced to replant their crops later. When the project is completed, it is expected to return nearly $300,000 in benefits each year. Two other watershed projects are in operation in my district, and making good progress. I think we need to encourage more of these locally applied, grassroots projects, and strengthen Federal assistance to them.

Another example of broadened district activity is the assistance being provided by the Genesee district to the Genesee County Planning Commission in the development of a 4,000-acre recreation area that will meet the leisuretime needs of visitors from farm and city alike, as well as improve land and water use.

The central Lapeer and Genesee districts are providing townships and villages with basic soil and water resource information to enhance community planning.

I salute the continuing effective work of these districts, and honor their dedication to conserving, restoring, and strengthening our resources for the lasting benefit of all people.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses passed bills on supplemental military procurement authorizations and received President's message on domestic health and education.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 4145–4187

Bills Introduced: Seven bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2994–3000; S.J. Res. 141; and S. Res. 229–230. **Pages 4150–4151**

Resolution Reported: Report was made as follows: S. Res. 229, providing for payment of gratuity to survivor of a deceased Senate employee (no written report). **Page 4150**

President's Message—Domestic Health and Education: President transmitted message presenting his legislative recommendations in the fields of domestic health and education—referred to Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. **Pages 4145–4149**

Authority To Meet: Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet while Senate is in session on Wednesday, March 2. **Page 4145**

Appointments to Boards: Vice President announced the following appointments to various boards:

Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy—Senators McGee, Moss, and Allott;

Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy—Senator Dodd;

Board of Visitors to the Military Academy—Senators Ellender, Robertson, and Murphy;

Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy—Senator Kennedy (New York);

Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy—Senators Holland, Bible, and Boggs. **Page 4226**

Appointment to Joint Committee: Vice President announced his appointment of Senator Anderson to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. **Page 4226**

Interparliamentary Union: Vice President announced his appointment of the following Senators to the Interparliamentary Union to be held at Canberra, Australia, April 11–16—Senators Talmadge, Yarborough, Long of Missouri, Scott, Hruska, and Simpson. **Page 4226**

Military Procurement: By 93 yeas to 2 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with committee amendment (in the nature of a substitute) S. 2791, fiscal 1966 supplemental authorizations for military procurement, after first adopting Mansfield motions to table two amendments as follows:

By 92 yeas to 5 nays (motion to table Morse amendment to repeal P.L. 88–408, to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia); and by 94 yeas to 2 nays, motion to table Gruening amendment to bar use of any draftees in Southeast Asia except volunteers or unless consent of Congress is given.

Subsequently, by unanimous consent, Senate passed (with amendment consisting of the amended text of S. 2791) H.R. 12889, fiscal 1966 supplemental authorizations for military procurement.

Senate insisted on its amendment to H.R. 12889, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Russell of Georgia, Stennis, Symington, Saltonstall, and Smith.

S. 2791 was then indefinitely postponed. **Pages 4187–4234**

Asian Development Bank: Senate made its unfinished business H.R. 12563, providing for U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank. **Page 4234**

Authority To Report: Committee on Finance was granted until midnight Thursday, March 3, to file its report, with any minority or individual views, on H.R. 12752, proposed Tax Adjustment Act. **Page 4235**

D.C.—Correction: Daily Digest of Monday, February 28, showed on page D135 that Senator McNamara was appointed as a conferee on H.R. 647, providing for substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the D.C. by agreement of the parties. Senator McIntyre should have been shown as a conferee on the bill instead of Senator McNamara.

Nominations: Three judicial nominations were received. **Page 4236**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. **Pages 4226, 4228, 4233**

Quorum Call: One quorum call was taken today. **Pages 4187–4188**

Program for Wednesday: Senate met at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 6:33 p.m. until noon Wednesday, March 2, when it will call the calendar for several unobjected-to

Appendix

Public Libraries, Libraries at State Institutions, and Special State Libraries Need Federal Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this week I have introduced H.R. 13115, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966.

In the past two decades there has grown a tremendous need for better libraries. The population has increased rapidly, especially among the young. A greater number of people are reading, and they read more often. The number of students and individuals doing research has grown. Finally, we have had an "information explosion". There has been a great increase in the number of books and other information materials.

The American Library Association estimates that public libraries are lacking over 100 million volumes to meet acceptable standards. We have only half of the 12,000 professional library personnel required.

The bill I have introduced is an attempt to help the States and local communities meet their library obligations. The bill has four titles.

The first two titles are an extension of the present Library Services and Construction Act, which is due to expire June 30 of this year. Title I provides funds to the States for library services. The new bill will authorize for library services $60 million in fiscal year 1967, $80 million in fiscal year 1968, $100 million in fiscal year 1969, $120 million in fiscal year 1970, and $150 million annually there after.

Title II authorizes funds to the States for the construction and initial equipment of public library buildings. The bill provides $75 million for this purpose in fiscal year 1967, $100 million in fiscal year 1968, $125 million in fiscal year 1969 and 1970, and $100 million in 1971.

Title III establishes a 5-year State-Federal matching fund program to encourage State library agencies to develop cooperative library services and joint use of facilities involving public, research, college and secondary school libraries. Five million dollars is authorized the first year, $7.5 the second, $10 million the third, $12.5 the fourth and $15 million in fiscal year 1971.

Title IV has two sections. The first is designed to alleviate the deplorable library deficiencies which exist in State institutions, including prisons, reformatories, mental hospitals, training schools and orphanages. The second section will expand library services to State governments in such specialized fields as law, history, archives and legislative reference. The funds authorized for title IV are the same as for title III.

This bill will cost $160 million the first year, and the total authorized under all parts of this bill aggregates $1.18 billion over the next 5 fiscal years. This is a great deal of money, but anything less will not enable us to reduce the deficit between what our libraries need and what they now have.

I urge all those who favor an improvement in our library facilities to join me in support of this bill. The text follows:

H.R. 13115

A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966".

Sec. 2. Section 2(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", to promote interlibrary cooperation, and to assist the States in providing certain specialized State library services".

Sec. 3. Section 101(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1957, and for each of the next six fiscal years the sum of $7,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $25,000,000, and for each of the next two fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "June 30, 1967, $60,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $80,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $100,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $120,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each fiscal year thereafter $150,000,000,".

Sec. 4. Section 102 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

Sec. 5. Section 103(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4), by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6), and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that expenditures made for library services in the State in any fiscal year from funds derived from the State will not be less than such expenditures in the local library or library system under the plan preceding fiscal year, and that no funds will be provided for library services to any for any fiscal year if the State library administrative agency determines that the amount expended, or to be expended, for such library or library system during a fiscal year from funds derived from local sources is less than such expenditures in the preceding fiscal year; and".

Sec. 6. (a) Section 104(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "1963" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1965", and by striking out "section 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 103".

(b) Section 104(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the amount to which each State will be entitled under subsection (a) and the amount so estimated shall be paid in installments in advance or by way of reimbursement, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made overpayment or underpayment."

(c) Section 104(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "(1)", by striking out "to be effective until July 1, 1957" and by striking out paragraph (2) of such subsection.

Sec. 7. Section 201 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1964, the sum of $20,000,000, and for each of the next two fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967, $75,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $100,000,000; for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, $125,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $100,000,000,".

Sec. 8. Section 202 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "(but only in the case of a State allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964)".

Sec. 9. (a) Section 204(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "From such allotment, there shall also be paid to each State for each such period the Federal share of the total of the sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions during such period for administration of the plan of such State approved under section 203."

(b) Section 204(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after "in such installments" the following: "in advance or by way of reimbursement,".

Sec. 10. The Library Services and Construction Act is amended by inserting after title II the following new titles:

"TITLE III—INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

"Authorization of Appropriations

"Sec. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $12,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $15,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and maintaining local, interlocal, regional, State, or interstate cooperative networks of libraries.

"Allotments

"Sec. 302. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot $10,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $40,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

"Payments to States

"Sec. 303. (a) From the allotments available therefor under section 302, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 304 an amount, computed as provided in subsection (b) of this section, equal to the Federal share of the total sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions under such plan (including costs of administering such plan).

"(b) For the purposes of this section the Federal share for any State shall be 50 per centum of the sums expended under the plan, except that the Federal share for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be 100 per centum.

"State Plans for Interlibrary Cooperation

"SEC. 304. (a) To be approved for purposes of this title a State plan must—

"(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), (5), and (6) of section 103(a);

"(2) provide policies and objectives for the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and special information centers for improved services of a supplementary nature to the special clienteles served by each type of library or center;

"(3) provide appropriate allocation by participating agencies of the total costs of the system;

"(4) provide assurance that every local or other public agency in the State is accorded an opportunity to participate in the system;

"(5) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this title and in assigning priority to project proposals; and

"(6) establish a statewide council which is broadly representative of professional library interests and of library users which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"TITLE IV—SPECIALIZED STATE LIBRARY SERVICES

"Part A—State institutional library services

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $12,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $15,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and improving State institutional library services. For the purposes of this part the term 'State institutional library services' means the providing of books, and other library materials, and of library services to inmates, patients, or residents of penal institutions, reformatories, general or special institutions or hospitals including those for the aged, the handicapped, and the mentally ill, residential training schools, and orphanages, operated by the State.

"Allotments

"SEC. 402. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 401 for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot $10,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $40,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 403. (a) From the allotments available therefor under section 402, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 404 an amount, computed as provided in subsection (b) of this section, equal to the Federal share of the total sums expended by the State under such plan (including costs of administering such plan).

"(b) For the purposes of this section the Federal share for any State shall be 50 per centum of the sums expended under the plan, except that the Federal share for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be 100 per centum.

"State Plans for State Institutional Library Services

"SEC. 404. (a) To be approved for purposes of this part a State plan must—

"(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (6) of section 103(a);

"(2) provide policies and objectives for the establishment or improvement of State institutional library services;

"(3) provide assurance that all eligible State institutions will be accorded an opportunity to participate in the program pursuant to this part;

"(4) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this part and in assigning priority to project proposals;

"(5) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that expenditures made by such State in any fiscal year for State institutional library services will not be less than such expenditures in the preceding fiscal year; and

"(6) establish a council which is broadly representative of State institutions eligible for assistance under this part which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) No portion of any money paid to a State under this part shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any building or buildings, or the purchase of any land.

"Part B—State government library services

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 411. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $12,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $15,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and improving State government library services. For the purposes of this part the term 'State government library services' means the providing of books and other library materials and of library services to agencies and departments of the State government and to State government personnel requiring library services, including those agencies or individuals responsible for legislative reference and research history, law, or archival library services, and specialized professional or research library operations in the various departments and agencies of State government.

"Allotments

"SEC. 412. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 411 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $10,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $40,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 413. (a) From the allotments available therefor under section 412, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 414 an amount, computed as provided in subsection (b) of this section, equal to the Federal share of the total sums expended by the State under such plan (including costs of administering such plan).

"(b) For the purposes of this section the Federal share for any State shall be 50 per centum of the sums expended under the plan.

"State Plans for State Government Library Services

"SEC. 414. (a) To be approved for purposes of this part a State plan must—

"(1) meet the requirments of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 103(a);

"(2) provide policies and objectives for the establishment or improvement of State government library services;

"(3) provide assurance that all appropriate departments and agencies of the State government will be accorded an opportunity to participate in the program pursuant to this part;

"(4) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this part and in assigning priority to project proposals;

"(5) provide assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner that expenditures made by such State in any fiscal year for State government library services will not be less than such expenditures in the preceding fiscal year; and

"(6) establish a council which is representative of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the State government which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) No part of any money paid to a State under this part shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any building, or the purchase of any land."

SEC. 11. (a) Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act is hereby designated as title V.

(b) Sections 301 through 304 of the Library Services and Construction Act are hereby designated as sections 501 through 504.

(c) Section 502(d)(2) of such Act (as so designated by subsection (b)) is amended by striking out "or title II" and inserting in lieu thereof "title II, title III, or part A or B of title IV".

(d) Section 503 of such Act (as so designated by subsection (b)) is amended by striking out "or 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, 302, 402, or 412"; by striking out "and section 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, 303, 403, and 413"; by striking out "or 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, 302, 402, or 412"; by striking out "or 203", and inserting in lieu thereof ", 203, 303, 403, or 413,"; by striking out "or 201" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 201, 301, 401, or 411"; and by striking out "and 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, 302, 402, and 412".

Arab Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, there appears in the current issue of Prevent World War III—No. 67, winter 1966—published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 50 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., an article entitled "Their Brothers' Keepers?" This article draws attention to the plight of the Arab refugees in Jordan, Gaza, and Syria, who are being used by the Arab governments as weapons in their crusade against the State of Israel. It tells of the extensive warlike preparations being undertaken among the refugees by a Nasser-supported "Palestine Liberation Organization." Since the United States pays most of the costs of maintaining the refugees, all Americans have an interest in this article. It is more than just an exposé. It presents a plan for the settlement of the refugee problem which would benefit the entire Middle East and, by removing a point of conflict, the entire world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEIR BROTHERS' KEEPERS?

It would seem that, after 17 years, the problem of identifying those whom it is the aim of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) to aid, would be largely a dim memory. It is indicative of the nature of the Palestine refugee problem as a whole that this is not so. The question is still an open—and explosive—one It is not merely that it is at times difficult to distinguish between refugee and nonrefugee when they live in the same area. It is a problem as much as definition as of identification.

In his annual report for the year just over, the Commissioner General, Dr. Michelmore, spells out the "working definition" which is in use by UNRWA at the present time. It was not the aim of UNRWA to provide an unearned income to all Arabs who claimed previous residence in Palestine, nor was UNRWA set up to provide relief for life to those who were injured by the war that followed the U.N.'s action in the Palestine question. UNRWA was set up to provide temporary relief to those who lost their homes and livelihood when the Arabs attacked the newly proclaimed state of Israel. It was also to assist them to acquire new homes and skills to make them productive citizens in the areas in which they were settled. This was the purpose for which the agency was set up, and this was and is the basis upon which it lays a claim on the world community for support.

If, after 17 years of addressing itelf to the problem of aid and resettlement, we are still no nearer to the end of the problem than we were in 1949, there must be something radically wrong. To those who have studied the report of the Commissioner General, the cause of the stalemate is evident. In discussing the related problem of purging from the refugee rolls those who are currently ineligible, Dr. Michelmore reports on discussions that were undertaken with the "host governments"—Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt (Gaza Strip)—in order to gain their cooperation in the proposed rectification of the refugee rolls. He informs us that these states were willing to assist in the rectification provided that the rolls would be rectified jointly by the Agency (UNRWA) and the host country using as a "sole criterion of eligibility * * * the recipients must be formerly resident in Palestine before 1948, and now residing in the country concerned, who have suffered loss or damage as a result of the conflict in Palestine in 1948, and who are currently in need of rations or the descendents of such persons, being themselves in need of rations." (Annual Report of the Commissioner General, p. 11.)

The change involved in the definition would have created a permanent group of refugees who would not be allowed to settle in the Arab lands around them. Instead they were to remain permanently stateless, refugees forever dependent on the charity of the world community. This is indeed a diabolical way for a "host" to treat his "guests." Indeed, it is a shocking affront to the humanity of man to-man.

PRELUDE TO AGGRESSION

Since we do not feel that the Arab States are guilty of gratuitous cruelty in this respect, we must inquire as to the reasons for this display of callous disregard for the right of people to a modicum of human dignity, and to that measure of identity provided by a nationality, for example, Syrian or Egyptian. As is clear from their pronouncements, it is the aim of the Arab States to use the refugees as the shock troops in their hoped-for military campaign to crush Israel. To quote just a few of the more recent of these statements: On August 21, 1965, Damascus Radio reported that the Premier of Syria had received the leaders of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO—a group to which we will return) and he was reported, again by Radio Damascus Domestic Service, to have reaffirmed Syria's support for the "liberation" of Palestine. On November 6, 1965, Amin al Hafiz, Chairman of the Presidential Council of Syria, said, in speaking to the so-called Palestine Liberation Army (made up of refugees and their children):

"Sanguinary struggle only leads to Haifa and Jaffa. Redemption and vengeance only lead to Nazareth and Acre. Blood only washes away the shame of the calamity and opens wide the road of the return. Only organized and enlightened strength leads to immortal Palestine."

He also told them that they represented Palestine and that they were the vanguard of what he termed to be "liberation." He continued that they were required to fight and to "strengthen the spirit of struggle and vengeance among the rising generation."

In Egypt, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) has set up a radio calling itself the Voice of Palestine, which broadcasts messages of hate against Israel and appeals to the refugees to fight against Israel. In a country as tightly controlled as Egypt, this could only be done with the active connivance of the Government.

It is clear that the Arab States want to use the refugees both as a reservoir of manpower for the attack on Israel, and as a propaganda argument to gain sympathy for their cause in the world at large. In order to do this, there must be refugees, and they should be kept in camps under the most abject conditions possible, to gain the fullest propaganda advantage.

UNRWA is made to order for Arab propaganda. It is the UNRWA that maintains the camps and hence, any blame for them has fallen upon UNRWA and not upon the Arab States. At the same time, by offering to aid the Agency in the fair distribution of aid, and by providing their resources of information and their knowledge of their populations, the Arab States appear to be doing much to ease the burden of the refugees whom they loudly claim as their brothers.

However, the Arab propagandists are aware that, unless irridentist feelings, and anti-Israel feeling is kept at a fever pitch among the refugees themselves, they will soon tire of dreams and begin to look for ways to improve their lot where they are, i.e., to adopt the host countries as their homes (which UNRWA was set up to help them do). Should the refugees cease to consider themselves as refugees and being to feel like brothers of the Syrians or Egyptians, the Arab States would lose their chief propaganda points in their preparations for war against Israel. In short, without the refugees, the Arabs could not parade as liberators; they would stand forth as what they are—naked aggressors.

PREPARING THE MEANS

It was in order to hide their real aims that the Arab States encouraged the formation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the spring of 1964. The organization is dedicated to the forcible return of the refugees to what they refer to as occupied Palestine. In its issue of June 16, 1964, Near East Report noted the formation of the PLO in the following words:

"The establishment of the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization in Jerusalem last month may play havoc with the lives of the Arab refugees themselves.

"Led by President Ahmed Shukairy, the organization will try to act like a government-in-exile. It will seek recognition. It will prepare for war because it contends that the question can be solved only by arms.

"In this disruptive process, it will resist refugee resettlement and thus further postpone any program to absorb the refugees and normalize their existence."

The publication went on to describe the plans of the PLO in the immediate future. Among them were included the formation of commando units and military training camps for Palestinians with a view to creating a Palestinian army within 2 years which would serve under the United Arab Command then in formation. The PLO also was to foster a freedom movement among the refugees, lead in the rejection of any resettlement projects, and establish missions and information offices abroad. In addition, a broadcasting station, a news agency, and a national fund were to be created.

Thus, the PLO will provide the Arab States with new means to attack Israel. In addition, it will provide what the Arab States probably regard as "cannon fodder" for their planned "third round" with Israel. The PLO program will, of course, keep the refugees (who must contribute of their meager funds to support it) too busy to become resentful of their neglect by their so-called "protectors"—the Arab States. Indeed, it raises in them the tragically false hope that they will "return" to their former homes—homes few can remember. The PLO also provides through its pose as a government-in-exile some justification for the Arabs' argument that Palestine belongs to them and that they are the legitimate representatives of Palestine.

FOR "CANNON FODDER"

The Arab States, we have seen, are trying to prevent the settlement of the refugee question along the only lines which provide hope for peace in the Middle East in the near future. They wish to block the resettlement of the refugees in the Arab lands to which, with the help UNRWA was set up to provide, they can make great contributions. The Arab States wish to use the refugees both as "cannon fodder" and as propaganda material in their unending aggressive activities.

The whole question came to light recently when the United Nations General Assembly's Special Political Committee took up the question of the report of the Commissioner General of UNRWA and, by natural extension, the whole problem of the Palestine refugees. The debate saw the Arabs move that the PLO be recognized as the representative of the refugees and that the organization be heard. The Committee, as had been its practice in the past, agreed to hear from Palestine refugees, but would not accept the PLO as their official delegation, hearing them only as individuals.

When the debate turned to the substantive questions raised; namely, the continuation of UNRWA as it is operated now, the Israeli delegate, who has a natural concern in this matter, raised the question of the propriety of a United Nations agency providing support for people actively engaged in an attempt to subvert and overthrow by military means a member state of the United Nations. In his report, the Commissioner

General spoke of the increase in the irridentist sentiment among the refugees since the formation of the PLO, but he does not mention that the PLO is actively recruiting an army with which to attack Israel, nor does he mention any effort by UNRWA to take action against this belligerent act directed against a neighboring state.

UNRWA'S DUTY

It would seem then that UNRWA by its inaction must stand accused of providing passive support for the PLO and, indeed, since it has not cut off support to those refugees receiving military training, nor to those who spend their time recruiting and indoctrinating the refugees, UNRWA may actually be acting as the supply and commissary section of what the PLO grandiosely calls the Palestine Liberation Army.

We must give serious consideration to the questions raised by the report and by recent events in the Near East. In the case of the PLO and its military arm, the world community must call upon UNRWA to do all that it can to end its support of aggression aimed at a peaceful member of the United Nations. In this connection, we must note with approbation the statement of Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, U.S. representative on the Special Political Committee. During the debate in the Assembly on the report of the Committee, he stated that the United States felt the practice of providing rations for those undergoing military training by the PLO was "inadmissible and must be corrected." This is a step in the right direction. However, it is only a small step. It does not in any way provide the necessary force of conviction which would make UNRWA halt this vicious practice.

We feel that the U.S. delegation should have made crystal clear the U.S. Government's opposition to this practice of feeding an army in training, and further, that the United States should have cut off its funds until it received firm commitments from the Arab countries that the practice was terminated. The U.S. taxpayer should not be placed in a position of subsidizing aggression. Also, all those who are concerned with the refugees as human beings, and not as a means to an end, must make their voices heard and they must insist that UNRWA carries out its mandate more efficiently to make the refugees self-supporting, self-respecting members of the world community and of the Arab States to which they belong by the ties of culture, faith, language, and history.

In the course of their resettlement in Arab lands, UNRWA can do much to bring those lands into the richness and productiveness which they deserve and which they now lack. As one example, Libya plans to build 100,000 new homes at an estimated cost of $1 billion, over the next 5 years. The Libyans are looking for foreign workers for projects related to this one. Why not show their solidarity with, and concern for the refugees by hiring them to do the job, rather than importing Moroccans, Algerians, and Egyptians as now planned? If UNRWA can do these things, it will have handsomely justified the time, money, faith, and selfless efforts that has gone into the cause of aiding the Arab refugees over the years.

AMERICA'S DUTY

The Arab States must be put on notice that the world will no longer tolerate their shabby treatment of those whom they themselves caused to lose their homes through a senseless, useless, bloody war against the State of Israel, and against the U.N. resolutions which authorized the creation of that State.

The Arab States must also be told that the United States will no longer subsidize the campaign of hate that they are mounting in the refugee camps, aimed at our ally Great Britain for its Balfour Declaration, and at the United States itself for its recognition of the State of Israel. Let us show the Arabs that we are not taken in by their propaganda, and let us once again show the world that we are committed to peace and brotherhood by putting a stop to this running sore in the Middle East, the misuse of the refugees, thus creating a group of people whose only emotion is hate.

If the Director of UNRWA cannot obtain the full cooperation of the host countries for the creation of sound conditions in the camps, he should resign to make room for someone who has the courage not only to implement without delay the decisions of the U.N. Assembly, but also to take a firm stand against indoctrination of the Arab youth through hate propaganda, and against the recruiting of soldiers for aggressive purposes.

If the United States will continue to permit such a situation to persist, this country takes upon itself a great responsibility for unavoidable outbursts which will follow.

Speech of Andy Borg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, each year, in the historic city of Alexandria, Va., a patriotic parade is held on February 22, George Washington's birthday, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

One of the highlights of the celebration is a luncheon at which the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is the principal speaker.

The national commander in chief this year, Andy Borg, of Superior, Wis., made a truly outstanding address. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the full text of his speech, so that my colleagues and all who read this RECORD may know the sentiments he expressed:

In times of stress the commemoration of Washington's birthday should have special significance for all Americans; that, because George Washington was not only the Father of his Country, but one of the most notable examples in the annals of man of selfless devotion to the service of country in times of peril and crisis. Standing as we do today at a crossroads of world history with a massive Communist confrontation, waging a war in the Orient that will eventually involve 400,000 or more Americans, in uniform in the field, and hundreds of thousands on the homefront, we may derive much inspiration and patriotic vigor by some pertinent observations and serious reflection on Washington—leader and symbol of freedom.

What one major quality is most characteristic of his triumphant career? It is believed that the majority of the students of the life and influence of Washington would agree with Weems, his first biographer, that "Duty was the ruling principle of his conduct." That is it. His dream of a united and powerful nation, and his extraordinary sense of duty constantly moved him to rise above all provincial conflicts, selfish ambitions, and personal and party dissentions. In fact had not his fervent belief in cause and his high sense of duty combined to rise superior to every setback and discouragement there might never have been a United States of America.

The Founders built strongly and well. Today, as Americans, we take pride in being the world's oldest democracy, living under the world's oldest written constitution, and operating under the world's oldest Federal system. And for this rich and varied heritage of ours we should humbly thank Almighty God for the vision, inspiration, and character that were common characteristics of such patriots as Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, and others. Statesmen all—bold and resolute in war, courageous and enterprising in peace, gallant, loyal gentlemen. However, George Washington was first and probably will remain the most renowned of our soldier-statesmen.

After defining tradition, the competent historian Bruce Catton said: "The greatest of all traditions is the simple tradition of freedom. From our earliest days as a people, this tradition has provided us with a faith to live by. It has shaped what Americans have done and what they have dreamed. If any one word tells what America really is, it is that one word—freedom." Washington, freedom leader, noble progenitor of precious heritage and tradition, said as to civil and religious liberty:

To the United Baptist Churches in Virginia and other Protestants, George Washington wrote: "Every man ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience."

To the Catholics in the United States he wrote in 1789: "I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that our fellow citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the establishment of their Government."

To a Hebrew congregation in Rhode Island, he said: "All, possess alike, liberty of conscience. The Government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance."

And a fact often lost sight of or not generally known—Washington wrote in his will: "Upon the decease of my wife, it is my will and desire that all the slaves whom I hold in my own right shall receive their freedom."

It took a bloody Civil War to decide the fate of human slavery in the United States, but one can clearly see that Washington deeply believed that no democratic form of government or republic could long exist without civil and religious liberties. Washington ever took definite positions that conformed with his heartfelt conviction as to freedom and dignity of the individual, whether he be rich or poor, high or low.

One of the outstanding examples of Washington's intellectual honesty and courage manifested itself at the Constitutional Convention. In the dark political years from 1783 to 1788, the Continental Congress was, in many quarters, despised and discredited; in fact it was once driven from Philadelphia by a small number of riotous soldiers whom neither State nor city authorities could control. In this period, Washington presided over the Convention that was striving to draft a Constitution for the United States.

Things were not going well. Washington listened attentively as the various delegates proposed dangerous compromises and half measures; then, at a point in the debate, a solemn and fateful moment, he arose and said: "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Probably another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God."

This led to the greatest constructive work of statesmanship in freedom's long and bloody struggle—the drafting of the Constitution of the United States, called by Gladstone: "The most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." Washington spoke as his conscience dictated and then appealed for the support of his colleagues. No half measures. Deeds instead of words.

Theodore Roosevelt once when referring to our two greatest Americans—Washington and Lincoln, said: "What counts is the application of their principles to the conditions today." It is well for us all from time to time to read Washington's *Farewell Address* and other words of advice. In 1782 at another crisis, Washington wrote his friend James McHenry that, "If we are wise let us prepare for the worst." And at another trying time he spurred the people by reminding that, "We must not despair, the game is in our hands; to play it well is all we have to do." Historians generally agree that only Jefferson and Franklin had anything approaching Washington's influence on the minds and political decisions of the citizens.

Today as more of our fellow Americans don uniforms; today as more American youth move toward the jungles of Asia, and its seas and its skys; today as more will be expected of us on the home front, could there be a higher incentive or nobler goal than that given by Washington to his starved, unpaid Continental Army—"Remember officers and soldiers, that you are fighting for the blessings of liberty."

No one knew better than Washington the price that must be paid to gain and to hold liberty and to pursue happiness. As the fight continues throughout the earth and the great battle for Asia enters a critical stage, it may take generations of intense and sporadic conflict before creeping communism is contained. Yet it will come if we cling to the traditions of Washington and the founders in the future as we have in the past—if we hold fast with the abiding faith of him we honor.

We, the 1,300,000 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, also honor Washington as a veteran because the General will ever live in our history as the first and most notable American veteran. All of us known of his physical and mental suffering in the dark and tragic days at Valley Forge. How his mighty will, patience, and belief in cause prevailed. When he finally returned to his beloved Mount Vernon he had been in the service of his country for 8½ years. Before leaving his troops he told the war-weary men who had just won what became our political birthright: "You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the liberty and independence you possess are the work of joint counsels and joint efforts of common dangers, sufferings and successes." His love for those who had loyally supported him was touchingly demonstrated at the farewell dinner given by his officers at Fraunce's Tavern, New York, December 1783.

It has been called by Tebbel, the historian, as "one of the few supremely emotional moments in the life of this most controlled of men." Washington lost his supreme composure as he looked for the last time on his devoted staff. "Much has been written of his aloofness, of the marble idol who had none of Lincoln's humanity, yet he was moved to public tears on the really great occasions of his life; namely, when he was given command of the Continental Army, when he resigned his command, when he was inaugurated as President; and as he prepared for his last farewell."

Perhaps in the last hours on his deathbed at Mount Vernon he recalled his youth of long ago, the precepts he learned from his mother, and of the time at the age of 13 when the schoolmaster asked that he write in his copy book 100 maxims of conduct and behavior, one of which, in the light of history must have been a beacon ever guiding his great spirit in the crisis of life. "Labor to keep alive in your breast the little spark of celestial fire called conscience."

After the end, Lear, his faithful secretary, wrote the President of Congress a sad letter of the events that closed with a paragraph that is a simple epitaph itself: "His last scene corresponded with the whole tenor of his life. Not a groan or complaint escepaed him in extreme distress. With perfect resignation, and in full possession of his reason, he closed his well spent life."

It is impossible to summarise in a few words the character and accomplishments of our greatest American. However, in essence it was ably done by contemporary, who, in designing an inscription for his tomb, concluded the summation of his achievements with these phrases:

"Magnanimous in youth
Glorious through life
Great in death."

Nothing nobler could be said of any man.

Aid to Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the latest issue of Prevent World War III, No. 67, winter 1966, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 50 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., contains an article entitled "Aid to Nasser—Ad Infinitum." This article shows clearly that the Nasser government is a major danger to peace in the Middle East, and details Nasser's efforts to hoodwink the United States into granting him more aid. The article also raises some fundamental questions about the handling of our aid program, particularly in the area of supervision—or lack of supervision—of the uses to which our aid is put.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent article printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID TO NASSER: AD INFINITUM

Over the years, the society has had repeated ocassion to comment upon the activities of President Nasser and his Egypt. These observations have generally fallen into two major categories: Nasser attacking the United States, and Nasser attacking his neighbors. The agile President of Egypt manages at times to do both in one act, which certainly sets some sort of standard for those who would emulate him. After each attack on his neighbors, Nasser piously avers that he has done them a service, that he has "protected" them from some horrible danger—usually "U.S. imperialism," or a variant such as "British imperialism." In this connection, the case of Yemen comes to mind as one of the most recent examples. However, we have only to think back a few years to the "United Arab Republic" of Egypt and Syria to find another major case in point. In both instances, the end result has been Nasser protecting his partner out of all that he owns.

In the intervals of these activities which are a form of land-based international piracy, Nasser has engaged in two divergent kind of propaganda campaigns. In one he viciously attacks the United States as the prime cause of all the troubles in this world, and particularly, of being the agent of a "neocolonialist" attempt to keep the former colonial peoples of the world subjugated. This rather paranoid line of reasoning is, at best, disingenuous.

ETERNAL WISHFUL THINKING

The other major propaganda war is directed at the United States at the times when the question of continued aid to Nasser is before our State Department. At these times, Nasser appears suddenly to become the mellow old leader of Egypt whose only concern is the care of his people, and who is running over with gratitude to the United States for having saved the Egyptian people from starvation (and, incidentally, his Government from overthrow by the hungry masses) by its generous aid. He is, in short, a sort of combination of the Pharaoh with a social conscience, and a client seeking further handouts. However, this campaign is quickly shelved as soon as Nasser is convinced that the United States is sufficiently mollified to provide the food needed to fill the stomachs his army travels upon.

For example, in the summer 1964 issue of Prevent World War III (No. 64), we carried a lengthy article under the heading, "Nasser Has Peaceful Intentions" (U.S. State Department), in which we reported the feeling being expressed by our State Department that Nasser had dropped his warlike attitude and would be a good boy from then on. The article also pointed out Nasser's then current aggressions and expressed our hope that our State Department would not repeat the appeasement policy which led to World War II.

As anyone knows who is familiar, even in the most casual way, with the news of the day of the past year and a half, Nasser has not been a "good boy." He has continued to foment trouble, not only in the area of the world adjacent to Egypt, which would be bad enough, but also in areas which are far from his borders and from his immediate concern.

And yet, here we are, again subject to the same propaganda campaign, being assured that Nasser has turned the corner and will become a peaceful citizen of the world at last. Apparently, in the State Department's Middle East section, if nowhere else, "hope springs eternal * * *."

Nasser, it must be admitted, is a master of the astute use of propaganda. He is capable of turning a defeat in his political adventuring into a victory of his propaganda forces, of course, with the help of the "wishful thinkers" in the U.S. State Department. As we all know, a propaganda victory may often be at least as valuable as a military one. As a case in point, let us take Nasser's operation in Yemen.

NASSER DEFEATED

On August 27, 1965, Hedrick Smith, reporting in the New York Times on Nasser's agreement with King Faisal on the withdrawal of Egyptian troops from Yemen, says that this was viewed "as a carefully masked admission of failure for the Egyptians." Smith went on to say that Nasser was wrong to think Yemen was "ripe for a Nasser-style revolution, and wrong to presume that the Saudi monarchy was so weak and inflexible that it could not resist his thrust into the Arabian Peninsula." Smith went on to say: "It is the admission that, no matter how many troops he sent to Yemen, he could not guarantee the republic or kill the monarchy that is so costly to Mr. Nasser, the revolutionary, and so precious to Faisal, the monarch."

In other words, Nasser has been beaten in Yemen and has had to withdraw. Thus far, there is nothing to hail in this transaction, and much to criticize; i.e., that Nasser, who lost relatively little in perpetuating the long agony of Yemen, has been allowed to cut those losses and return home to bide his time for another chance. He has "run away, to live and fight another day."

But now, the propaganda machine moves into action rewriting the events in a more favorable light. No longer is Nasser merely a defeated pirate, he is an enlightened apostle of peace in that troubled corner of the world. He has pressured President Salal of Yemen to talk over the future of his country with the government which Salal overthrew (and it is known that Nasser had no small hand in the overthrow).

For this, Nasser is hailed as a peacemaker, and our State Department again finds evidence that Nasser will do no more harm. By the way, Nasser bitterly attacked the U.S. operation in Vietnam on the same day (August 31, 1965) that the State Department was assuring us that he was a great friend of the United States and a great peacemaker.

NASSER COMES BACK

Meanwhile, here in the United States, Nasser, whose previous grants under Public Law 480 (the food-for-peace program) were about to run out, began to bargain with the U.S. Government for further grants. They had to go slowly as Congress, then ending its session, had written precautions into the program and into the foreign aid act in order to prevent aid from going to an aggressor state. It was apparent that Congress was no longer willing to accept the idea of Nasser eating our food and then using the money freed by our food, to buy a club with which to hit us over the head.

Into this atmosphere came the disclosure that several years ago Nasser diverted the corn we had sent to feed hungry Egyptians, and sold it East for hard currency which he needed to buy arms. This cynical act, it would seem, should have debarred Nasser from more aid, at least in the form of commodities, but the State Department went on with negotiations anyhow. Then it was reported in the New York Times (Washington, Nov. 4, 1965) that Nasser had purged himself of his act of bad faith by buying about $6 million worth of U.S. corn and paying for it in dollars.

The State Department announced that this removed the stain on Nasser's record. Does this mean that we should now forget all about the diversion? Are we to assume that the State Department will sell our aid and our recognition? Is our national pride really that cheap? We, as Americans, hope not. Instead, we must assume that, as usual, the State Department has fallen all over itself to aid Nasser merely because they feel that Nasser can do no wrong.

On November 2, 1965, usually reliable sources reported that the Department of State had submitted to the President a recommendation for resumption of large-scale aid to Egypt. It is noteworthy that this was done after Congress had adjourned. Apparently, the Department of State was afraid that Congress would take even stronger action than it had done on this question earlier in the year. Lately, too, many Members of Congress have called the attention of the President to the expressed sense of Congress, and to the State Department's action ignoring the will of the legislature.

CONGRESSMEN ARE RIGHT

For example, Representative Farbstein read into the Record a letter which he sent to the Secretary of State on this very problem. He said, in part:

"The proponents of food sales to Egypt maintain that it increases our influence in the Middle East. According to their theory, we acquire more 'leverage' in Cairo by making the Egyptian Government dependent on or, at least, appreciative of our good will. But history makes clear that the theory is faulty. After years of dealing with the Egyptians, it appears incontrovertible that the more generous we are to them, the more hostile they become to us and our Middle East policies.

"By selling food to Egypt for soft currency, we allow the Cairo government to divert its resources to stir up trouble. It uses the arable land to grow not food for its people, but cotton which it sells to the Russians and Chinese. It then uses the hard currency it acquires, to buy arms with which to threaten peaceful neighbors. Our aid enhances Nasser's strength and his prestige at home and abroad. Our programs have clearly helped to perpetuate his power. Since it now seems at its lowest ebb since Suez, I feel it would be particularly shortsighted to renew our assistance program at the current juncture." (Congressional Record, Nov. 15, 1965 p. A6658.)

In the Senate, Senator Case said:

"The Congress has made very clear its opposition to such a step (resuming aid to Egypt—ed.) by prohibiting aid to the United Arab Republic unless the President explicitly determines that it is 'essential to the national interest.'

"It is difficult for me to see how that determination could be reached in the case of the United Arab Republic at the present time. On the contrary, President Nasser's actions and policies in the Middle East would seem to point to the opposite conclusion.

"Elsewhere, the United Arab Republic continues its efforts to undermine American policies and positions, from Libya to Vietnam, from Cyprus to the Congo. But it is in the Middle East that Nasser's will to power poses the greatest threat to peace and stability, and where any aid he received from us could only strengthen his position and capacity for mischief."

Senator Ribicoff said, in part:

"We are told that Egypt has forsaken foreign adventure. The Congo is cited, so is the withdrawal from Yemen. We should not be impressed with these examples. The cause of the Congo rebels was a losing cause, Nasser cut his losses. The settlement in Yemen was not a voluntary peace, Nasser went to Jidda because a fanatic group had pinned down 60,000 of his best troops, far from home in a bloody war of attrition."

If these Members of Congress can see through Nasser's propaganda smokescreen, it is a wonder that the State Department, which spends far more time on the question of interpreting Nasser's words and actions, remains blind. As shown above, Nasser has again apparently taken in the State Department with his propaganda, and we are again feeding his people while he hatches plans contrary to U.S. interests. This seems to be the pattern that has been followed in the past. It is high time we stopped aiding a regime which, with its very act, advances causes inimical to U.S. interests.

PERTINENT QUESTIONS

With this view, we would like to pose the following questions to the State Department, and plead with them for an answer:

1. Is it not a fact that the Nasser regime in Egypt continues to build up its arms at the expense of its domestic development?

2. Is it not a fact that the Nasserite propaganda network is directed against the West in general and the United States in particular under the pretense of fighting imperialism?

3. Is it not a fact that Cairo is seeking to undermine the strategic position of one of our major allies, Britain, in south Arabia?

4. Is it not a fact that the Egyptian regime is exerting continuous pressure against a number of Mid-Eastern states so as to jeopardize our oil interests?

5. Is it not a fact that Nasser's ties to the Communist bloc have been strengthened during these years of massive aid, when the State Department has alleged that U.S. aid would weaken those ties?

We feel that forthright answers to these questions will place us in a position to understand the performance of the State Department in this area of our foreign relations.

NEVER ANSWERED

We are asking these questions not for the first time, for we have had numerous communications with the State Department over the years. Among others, we wrote an open letter to Secretary Rusk some time ago in which we said in part:

"Of even more fundamental concern to security-minded Americans are the persistent efforts on the part of some State Department officials to conceal the anti-U.S. policies pursued by Nasser, aiming at the destruction of America's position in key areas of Africa and the Middle East. Our taxpayers have been asked to support the Nasser government to the tune of approximately $1 billion on the specious grounds which the above mentioned unnamed U.S. officials reiterate in defense of aid to Nasser. These officials allege that aid to Egypt bolsters U.S. influence over that regime; that such aid has moderated Nasser's aggressive proclivities; that such aid keeps the situation in the Middle East quiet and that it has blocked 'Soviet penetration' in the Middle East.

"If U.S. aid has allegedly accomplished all or some of these admittedly worthwhile goals, certainly the American people are entitled to a concrete accounting of these achievements. In previous correspondence with the State Department, the society, too, has been assured that aid to the Nasser government is accomplishing these objectives. For instance, 2 years ago, the State Department assured that within 1 month Nasser would withdraw from Yemen."

But did Nasser withdraw 2 years ago?

AID REMAINS UNJUSTIFIED

One of the arguments recently used by State Department officials, in order to prove that President Nasser is behaving better, was to say that he had stopped helping the Congolese Communist rebels. We can only call this argument nonsensical because everyone knows that the Communist rebellion disintegrated last summer.

On the other hand, it has been published that some of the Congolese Communist leaders, who had taken refuge in Cairo, are still on Nasser's payroll.

We could easily dispel many of the other arguments used by our Government spokesmen in order to justify aid to Egypt.

It has also been said that continued aid would enable us "to have some influence on some of the actions of the Egyptian Government." The American taxpayer is entitled to know in what instances the State Department has succeeded in influencing Nasser's actions. It is true that Egypt is paying for the damage done to U.S. property—but why did they permit it to be destroyed in the first place?

We could go on and on with this discussion, but our definite opinion is that, inasmuch as the State Department must prove to the President that aid is in our national interest, only unequivocal answers to the above could lead to the determination that aid to Nasser is really in America's interest. We do not believe that there has been any fundamental change in Egyptian hostility to the United States and to U.S. policy throughout the world. Our Government should only consider giving aid to President Nasser if they get assurances that Egypt will undertake to live at peace with all its neighbors; that it will abandon its preparations for conflict and the arms race which is such a great burden to the economy of all peoples in the Near East.

It will suffice to cite here what Congressman James H. Scheuer had to say recently on this problem. He pointed to Nasser's recent references to the "inevitability of war with Israel" and his call for the expulsion of President Bourguiba from the Arab League as indication of "his firm rejection of any new policy of moderation and accommodation to the facts of life in the Middle East, and a vigorous restatement of his fanatical and aggressive posture vis-a-vis a neighboring state."

Congressman SCHEUER said that it would not be in the interest of the United States to resume aid to Egypt unless there was a reduction in Nasser's belligerence toward his neighbors, until he opened the Suez Canal, until he made a real effort to meet Israel at the conference table, unless he showed that he was committed to the West or, at the minimum, to real neutrality, and unless he does not intend to use surplus food shipments to facilitate a further arms buildup.

We, of course, are in agreement with Congressman SCHEUER's statement because it reflects the opinion of all thoughtful Americans; and we also agree with what Congressman SEYMOUR HALPERN said recently on this subject. He called for an end to all U.S. aid to Egypt "until it limits its arms buildup, until it discontinues its illegal and immoral intervention in the affairs of other states and until it proves our assistance is truly applied * * * to aid the recipient nation's economic development and social progress."

In conclusion, we do not doubt that the present Government of Egypt is the principal danger to peace in the Middle East and that to aid that Government is to support those forces which are working to overthrow that small measure of stability which that area has achieved the last few years.

Tribute to Maj. Carl S. Miller, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I know that each of us in our respective districts have received the sad news of some of our close personal friends who have given their lives for our country in Vietnam. We have had several deaths in our congressional district.

On January 29, in Vietnam, Maj. Carl S. Miller, Jr., of Ridgely, Tenn., was killed in action. His father is Mayor Carl S. Miller, Sr., of Ridgely, and his wife is a native of Robertson County, Tenn.

On January 30, Mrs. Miller received a letter from Maj. Charles Singletary which tells of Major Miller's contribution to this great Nation of ours. I feel that this letter should be brought to the attention of the Congress. The letter follows:

JANUARY 30, 1966.

DEAR MRS. MILLER: Yesterday the world lost a truly great man in the death of your husband. The situation over here in Vietnam has uncovered many heroic men but only a select few of them could really be described as great. Carl Miller was one of those few.

My reason for desiring to write to you and join in your grief over Carl's death is that I feel there are some things concerning Carl's last days that you very much deserve to know. I realize that it is painful for you to be told of some of these things but for your future memories of him and for a better idea of some of the things which I'm sure Carl modestly failed to share with you, I feel compelled to write you. If there is anything else about Carl's life over here or any of the conversations or contributions he made for which you or his parents would like additional information, I would count it a privilege to be able to research this for you.

I first met Carl a little over 2 months ago. It was at that time that I joined the 114th Aviation Company. In my initial period of training, Carl was sort of a father to me. In this connection we had many long talks concerning tactics, the war, our philosophies concerning our jobs, and our families. I not only got to know him through these talks and discussions with the many others who held him in very high esteem, but I had daily opportunities to observe Carl in the strain of combat conditions. Carl was more than just highly effective in his job—he was outstanding. He often made the remark to me, "Chuck, anybody can go out and kill a bunch of people any day of the week, but my job is to see that not one 'friendly' is killed and that all possible efforts are made to prevent unnecessary casualties."

As you probably know, Carl's position as leader of the gun platoon gave him tremendous killing power. At his command thousands of rounds of ammunition with devastating power could spill forth in a matter of seconds. On the otherhand, he could arrest this power with the press of a mike button and one short (and sometimes unpopular) radio transmission. Many times I have seen him under the pressure of these life or death decisions for 12 to 15 hours in a row. He took his responsibility with a great deal of awe and humility. As he probably told you, he had several opportunities to "graduate" professionally to higher grade positions. These positions were ones with a great deal less vulnerability but, as he expressed to me several times, he felt that he could do the best job of curtailing unnecessary and indiscriminate killing while at the same time maintaining the most effective unit. He was absolutely correct in this feeling.

Carl probably didn't tell you that in his capacity as the leader of the Cobras many times it involved him in flying low level over potential enemy positions in an attempt to develop the situation. The Vietcong are very deceitful. They will intermingle among the terrorized civilian populace and frequently the only possible way of discovering them is when they pick up their hidden weapons and fire at aircraft. If these people go undiscovered, they will impose tyranny and persecution among the people they hold within their grips and they will continue to promote the war which exists in Vietnam. More closely related to us in aviation, these people are quite dangerous because if left undiscovered they will shoot down our lift helicopters at their most vulnerable positions.

Carl could probably have accomplished his job of protecting the lift helicopters by just ordering his platoon to machinegun any suspected enemy positions but in the process he would have inevitably killed many civilians. However, Carl always chose the harder right instead of the easier wrong. He spent many hours flying low and slow close to enemy positions hoping to draw fire upon himself rather than have fire come in upon the "slicks" or on the other aircraft in his platoon.

Nor was Carl reckless or unprofessional in the accomplishment of his job. He took every precaution to preserve his own crew and never needlessly exposed them. His great respect for human life and his consideration for others caused him to choose it far better to lose his own life in an effort to save others. It was in just such a manner that Carl was killed.

Yesterday, I was the leader of the slicks so I was able to hear and observe most of what was going on. Carl was particularly concerned about the fire his platoon had drawn in preparing the first landing zone. In fact, he told me to orbit the flight several times while he continued to attempt to draw fire upon himself so that we would not fly into an ambush. It would have been a simple matter to have eliminated any doubt by just raking suspected houses and woodlines with machinegun fire but Carl chose to go close for a better look to avoid killing any of the peasant villagers. Finally, Carl called us in. We went into the landing zone without incident. We left station and were going to pick up the second lift when I heard Carl telling his other ships over the radio how to continue to develop the situation. Several were receiving fire and wanted to supress the area. Carl restrained them. As we were returning with the second lift, Carl was continuing in his mission to protect us. It was then we first learned that Cobra Lead had been hit. To his platoon, to whom he was devoutly devoted, he transmitted on his way down, "So long, Cobras. It's been real nice working with you."

As far as I know, he remained conscious for 3 or 4 hours thereafter. He was immediately evacuated to Saigon by medical helicopter and was given every conceivable medical treatment but died on the operating table. When the news came back to us over the radio that Carl had died, we were all very stunned. There had been a glimmer of hope when we learned that he arrived at the hospital alive but with the notice that he had died we all realized how fortunate we were to have had the privilege to have known such a great man.

Some of the things which I like to think back on are times like last Christmas. Carl spent his time distributing the dolls and other things you sent to poor orphan children. He had a very tender heart and compassion for his fellow man. He paid particular attention to the families of our officer club helpers. They all admired him for his kind and considerate outlook on life.

One tactical incident stands out very vividly. We were up by Moc Hoa on an operation. The Vietcong infiltrate from Cambodia rather openly in this area. They thrive off of the fact that we just aren't able to cover the area thoroughly. About the only thing we are able to do to curtail infiltration of weapons and ammunition is to harass those individuals we catch smuggling them on. It is well known that any time we can go up there we can catch them bringing in supplies.

At any rate, Carl's platoon was having quite a successful operation this particular day. They were able to capture many weapons, documents, and supplies and had dealt a blow to some of the smugglers. Carl discovered to his shock that a mother with several small children and an infant baby was down among the smugglers—probably the wife and family of a VC. Without any regard for his own personal safety, he immediately landed and made arrangements for their evacuation. They happened to have been placed in my helicopter for evacuation. My crew chief noticed a tear in the blouse of one of the small girls. By closer examination he discovered she had been hit in the fleshy part of her back by one of the many bullets whizzing through the area. We rushed the little girl to the staging area.

Carl helped with the arrangements for an ambulance. Although the girl had not been badly wounded, Carl took time out of his busy schedule to fly up the next day to check on her and to comfort her family. He brought gifts for the children.

I could go on writing all day about the deeds of this dedicated and compassionate man. Your loss is truly a severe one and only the comforts that God gives with time will heal and drive away your sadness. I know that your family life was very close because of the many times that Carl talked of you and his desire to be with you. The wall of his room was covered with the pictures of you and your children. He lived a circumspect life which gave irrefutable testimony of his faithful devotion to his family. That he will never be able to live on the farm he loved so much saddens me but I must console myself with the knowledge, "He is no fool who gives what he can never keep to gain what he can never lose."

Yesterday, after the operation was complete, I was assigned the task of waiting for the command post group near a small Vietnamese village. As I sat by my helicopter still stunned and brooding over the death of Carl, quite a few little Vietnamese children came up to the helicopter. I was in no mood to play with them but as I stared rather blankly into their lonely and somewhat hopeless faces it suddenly dawned upon me that this pointed to the thing that Carl had given his life for; that these children, for whom he had deep compassion and concern, might have a little better world to grow up in; that the spread of communism and tyranny might not continue to eat away at the small glimmer of hope they have to grow up in a peaceful world. I believe with all my heart he did not die in vain.

May God be a very precious comfort to you in your deep loss. My prayers go out to you and your family.

Respectfully,

Maj. Charles Singletary.

The Photo Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Art Buchwald is one of the outstanding satirists of his day. His column "Capitol Punishment" I think is enjoyed by many of the readers of the Post. His column entitled "The Photo Contest," published on March 1, is especially timely and humorous. The column follows:

Capitol Punishment: The Photo Contest

(By Art Buchwald)

The best photograph to come out of last week's news showed President Johnson hugging Hubert Humphrey at the airport on the Vice President's return from his trip to the Far East. In the photo, the two men are saying something to each other, but nobody was close enough to hear exactly what was said. This had led to a great deal of conjecture on the part of the Washington press corps, and a contest is now being waged at the National Press Club as to what Mr. Humphrey's first words were when he got off the plane.

Here are some of the entries that have already been submitted.

The Vice President's first words to the President were:

"I promised $50 million to Afghanistan by mistake."

"How did you like that chicken coop remark about Bobby? I thought it up myself."

"Please don't make me testify in front of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee."

"I know this sounds silly, but I invited a Pakistan cameldriver to visit me when I got back to the United States."

"I think I picked up a bug in India."

"Tell Lady Bird I brought back the Thai silk she wanted."

"Don't let on to the customs people, but Muriel is over her $100 tourist allowance."

"Is there anything I should know about our foreign policy since yesterday?"

"I was picketed in Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. Do you think I've got enough to write a book?"

"Averell Harriman didn't pick up the check once during the entire trip."

"Don't look now, but Jack Valenti's taking your car."

These were the entries as to what the Vice President said to President Johnson. Now here are some of the things the newspapermen thought Mr. Johnson could have said as he hugged Mr. Humphrey.

"Wipe that grin off your face, or everyone will think you had a good time."

"I've got bad news for you, Hubert. Bobby and I have made up."

"I was wondering when you were going to bring my plane back."

"If anyone questions you, we agree with George Kennan and General Gavin."

"Senator Fulbright has been asking for you."

"You left your lights on in the office."

"What were they saying about me in Korea?"

"Don't squeeze so hard; you're hurting my scar."

"What did you buy for Dean Rusk?"

"You didn't run across a good chef in the Far East, did you?"

"I cut your budget."

"As a hog caller, you certainly turned out to be a bust."

"Don't look now, but Senator Morse is watching us on television."

"Now I hope you're satisfied with this trip, and I don't want to hear another word out of you for 6 months."

These were only a few of the entries that have been submitted.

They are still pouring in. The winner of the contest gets to spend a week in Saigon, explaining to General Ky what Gen. Maxwell Taylor really meant when he said he supported Bobby Kennedy.

Corncob Pipe Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that the corncob pipe capitol of the world is located in my district. The home of Buescher's Cob Pipes is in Washington, Mo., on the banks of the Missouri River where the corncob pipe had its beginning in 1869. From modest beginnings, Buescher's has expanded to a daily production of 12,000 pipes which are distributed to some 7,000 sales outlets across the globe.

Buescher's recently donated 1,800 pipes to the Army for distribution in Vietnam. Arrangements for shipment of the pipes were handled through Lt. Col. John C. "Corncob" Hughes, a much-decorated Army officer who has smoked Washington corncob pipes for over 15 years. Colonel Hughes was recently made an honorary member of the Corncob Pipe Club of Washington while on a speaking engagement there shortly before he returned to Vietnam.

I am happy that many of our soldiers will now have the equipment to carry on the great pipe-smoking tradition established by such varied personalities as France's military hero, Marshal Foch, former mayor of New York, Fiorello La Guardia, Mark Twain, and Mrs. Andrew Jackson who has been styled "The First Lady of the Corncob Pipe."

I know that many of my colleagues can also attest to the unique pleasure afforded by Missouri's fine cob meerschaums.

A Youth Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as often as time permits, I make it a point to read essays and speeches that are products of young Americans and important enough to be inserted in the Congressional Record. In an era when many young people are troubled and confused by false doctrines and distasteful fads that seek to contradict established moral and social norms, a thoughtful composition by one who appreciates his natural inheritance is always refreshing and inspiring.

Robin Thurau, son of a Lutheran minister in Kittanning, Pa., won the American Legion Award in the eighth grade, has been president of his high school class for the past 3 years, and was elected president of the National Honor Society. But his highest recognition, he is sure, was in being selected to represent the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the U.S. Senate youth program in Washington last month. I have unanimous consent to have the thoughts of Robin Thurau preserved in the Congressional Record.

The Advantages of a Democratic Government

Every type of government which exists today has its advantages and its disadvantages, but a democratic form of government has more advantages by far than any of them.

The Soviet Union, one of the world's great powers, has a Government quite the opposite of our own. In contrasting these two types of government the form of government enjoyed in this country clearly emerges as the one that provides the greatest blessings to its people. And, after all, for what reason does government exist than for its people?

In the Soviet Union the Government, or state, is the all-in-all. The people are puppets, things, and are considered expendable. The Russian people are not permited to speak out in criticism of their Government. If they do, they have no guarantee of a trial but are considered an enemy of the state and are imprisoned or even liquidated. The people are isolated from the rest of the world and subjected to propaganda all the time, hearing it on their radios and reading it in their papers.

By way of contrast, in the United States it is the people who are the power. They decide, at the voting booth, who will govern them and, at the same booth, they express their approval or disapproval. They have the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances. They have the right to worship as they please and to write and speak as they please. They have the right to assembly. They have the right to trial by jury.

To anyone who may be dissatisfied with our form of government I recommend that he spend several days in our Nation's Capitol. There the word democracy comes alive. One quickly senses that government exists for the benefit of the people—all the people. One also realizes that the legislators feel a sense of accountability to those who elected them. It is difficult to see how power could become absolute and therefore corrupt in our form of government. Though it's far from perfect (what human relationship is?) yet I am convinced that our form of government does, indeed, promise and safeguard the greatest blessings to our people. Now I understand what Lincoln meant when he talked of our government—"of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the Record the prize-winning article of Carole Pozzi, of Reno, Nev., submitted to the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the occasion of their annual Voice of Democracy contest:

Voice of Democracy

(By Carole Pozzi, Reno, Nev.)

Once every 10 seconds a new life is given to the world and is cast into the moving stream which is the force of history. Sooner or later, as all human beings have done since the beginning of time, each individual begins his search for a faith, each turns to something higher than himself—a body of ideals which promises to give meaning to his life.

Democracy starts with one individual, one unit, one soul. It asserts that this individual has a special dignity and worth. Once the individual is aware of his own worth, he tends to respond to the finer urgings of his inner self. Since democracy is nourished by the strengths and the weaknesses of all its members, the healthier these individuals are, the healthier the democracy will be.

It is a strange fact that there are in the world today two totally different social systems, both of which call themselves democratic. Each side has millions of followers who claim that their system is the one that can solve the problems that beset mankind. Each offers a promise, each offers hope, and each has the power to capture the imaginations of men and women to whom life has brought little but grief or care or fear.

More than 100 years ago Karl Marx, who was the founder of one of these two systems, said that the world was being divided into two hostile camps. It is now apparent that his prophecy has come true, though not in the way Marx foresaw.

The two sides are now engaged in the same struggle he predicted; yet between what is right in one, and what is wrong in the other, there is a wider gulf than any which has ever separated the forces of humanity.

Between these two camps, and indeed, even within them, there are many people who seek the truth about democracy. At a time when many words have lost their meaning, there is no simpler answer to give. It is not easy to state with certainty what democracy really is or what it can do.

People make democracy. It is their handiwork and it belongs to them. Through the centuries they have fashioned its meaning, making grave mistakes at times, as people will, and at other times achieving remarkable progress. Men have known democracy in attempts to meet together in villages and agree upon a common purpose. They have known it in their efforts at world organization. Yet democracy's story is incomplete, and will remain so as long as an individual remains to add his own contribution to its growth.

If we searched for an exact definition, the chances are that the answers we received would be nearly as many and as varied as the people who tried to define democracy for us. Even if someone would succeed in setting down a formula covering the vast range of its capabilities, there would always be someone else to point out the exceptions to disprove this rule.

The word "democracy" usually refers to a form of government, but democracy is also a way of life. True democracy recognizes the rights of all men and states that all persons are equal before law.

Democracy asserts that man possesses certain qualities which set him apart from animal. It states that man is a thinking, reasoning creature, endowed by his creator with certain rights. The individual is important because he is a human being, and each man—regardless of his race or rank—is entitled to the same respect and the same consideration that are due all other men. A democratic government is not allowed to grant special favors because of a person's birth, wealth, race, or religion.

Democratic practices have been devised by individuals, for individuals, through centuries of trial and error. They are being tested and modified every day, to fit new needs and aspirations of humankind. The solid core of faith which is shared by all who believe in this democratic way of life is man's belief in the dignity of man, the belief that "each one counts as one."

Like man himself, democracy is far from perfect. Yet there is an optimism about democracy which carries people forward, beyond temporary successes and failures.

Eulogy of Albert Thomas

SPEECH
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Members of this body who have served for many, many years in the House of Representatives with Albert Thomas have set forth his outstanding characteristics.

The leadership on both sides of the aisle, men who have worked with him on many difficult and controversial problems that were very important to the Nation, have extolled his virtues and have told of his great ability.

Although I only had the privilege of serving with him on the Committee on Appropriations for 4 years, he provided many examples of leadership that will never be forgotten. It is generally conceded by all who served with him that no chairman of a subcommittee had greater capacity to handle a bill on the floor or to develop it for presentation to the entire membership of the House. He went out of his way to try to understand the problems of younger members of the committee as well as of the House and I was one of the continuous beneficiaries of his thoughtfulness.

As many others before me have stated, I considered him a personal, a good, and a warm friend whose name and record will never be forgotten and to his family I express my deepest sympathy for the great loss that they, too, have suffered.

It's Time To Speak Up for Our Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have devoted a great portion of my time and energy to improving our system of criminal justice.

Last year I was pleased to sponsor the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. Our objective in that legislation was to bring modern technological developments to the aid of the peace officer in his everyday efforts to prevent and combat crime. I have spoken many times on the need to actively support our police officers in their difficult and dangerous tasks.

We must never forget, however, that the judiciary is an equally vital component of our machinery to insure law and order. It does no good to support the police officer and simultaneously degrade the courts because an orderly, secure and peaceful society depends on both.

I do not advocate that court decisions be approached with complete subservience, void of all criticism. Neither do I favor blind agreement with every action of the police. But I do insist that both the police and the courts should be evaluated in an atmosphere of respect for their basic integrity and an appreciation for the complex and urgent problems which they confront. Attacks on the morality or patriotism of our judicial officers have no place in efforts to achieve a just society.

It is easy to attack, but far more difficult to defend. Mr. John Sutro, president of the State bar of California, recently delivered an excellent address to the Los Angeles County Bar Association. Mr. Sutro is an outstanding attorney, and his remarks demonstrate his thorough understanding of the law and the Constitution. I wish to associate myself with Mr. Sutro's views and to recommend them for the close study of my colleagues:

It's Time To Speak Up for Our Judges

My comments today could be characterized as a discussion of the obvious, more than an investigation of the obscure. Day after day we hear and read of one attack after another on the courts and judges of our State and Nation. These attacks are a far cry from the kind of constructive criticism of a decision by lawyers and scholars that judges welcome. They are not based on fact or logic and many are vicious and vituperative. I submit that it's time to speak up for our judges.

Theologian Reinhold Niebuhr stated: "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary." Our Republic was established by men of moderation and wisdom. They were men who had good cause to be suspicious of all-powerful central authority. They were men determined to insure that our Government would be protected by those checks and balances which are the fabric of the Constitution of the United States. Since *Marbury* v. *Madison* it has been clear that the court is the interpreter of the Constitution. Thus, it is the adjuster of governmental powers. The executive and legislative branches are subjected to judicial review to prevent the unconstitutional exercise of power.

Each of the three branches is indispensable to the functioning of our Republic. But it is clear that the judiciary has a very special responsibility, for the pursuit of justice is the heart of our Government. Each of us as a member of that profession which for generations has been entrusted with safekeeping the fires of justice also has a very special responsibility to see that the courts and judges of our State and Nation receive the high respect of the people, for such respect is essential to the fulfillment of the judiciary's vital mission.

Practically each week there are personal attacks on the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court because of some decision the Court announced on Monday. The great mass of attacks on the courts is comprised of hate tracts, irate letters to editors, and sizzling speeches by activists of all political persuasions, who make apparent by the espousing of their causes that they are not among the most enlightened of our citizenry.

We are all familiar with the intensity of the personal attacks which have grown out of the Escobedo and Dorado decisions. These attacks were directed not as much at the reasoning of the justices but more at the men themselves as persons who live in ivory towers engaging in hairsplitting legal gymnastics. That is the kind of attack I submit is unjustified; it certainly is not constructive. No doubt there are many of us who regret the courts could not have reached a different result in these cases. I think it fair to assume that many of the justices would have preferred a different result, but have in mind these men have each taken an oath to uphold the Constitution. Each is aware of his responsibility, and I for one am confident that this responsibility is foremost in the mind of each justice when he writes an opinion. Each of us, of course, may with all propriety disagree with the reasoning of the courts and it has been my experience that judges welcome constructive criticism.

Americans are basically a law-abiding people. They know that it is important to play by rules of the game. At a baseball game they may shout, "kill the umpire." But they know that if they really meant what they said there would be no game. Most Americans understand that we must comply with decisions of the courts even if we do not like them. This compliance is not so much because the law may be supported by force. Rather, it is because as law abiding people, we respect the law.

Most people overlook shouts of "kill the umpire" as just part of the game. But there is reason to believe that most people do not so lightly dismiss the broad brush personal attacks which are indiscriminately made on courts and judges. It is the old adage, if you hear it said often enough, sooner or later you will believe it to be true. People don't know which court or which judge is being attacked or why. They are led to believe, having been told again and again, that there is reason to view courts and judges with general distrust and disrespect.

There are indications that my concern about the average man's view of courts is not unduly alarmist. During recent months and years, there have been increasing evidences of distrust, disrespect, and disregard of orderly processes. In the place of orderly processes have come mass demonstrations and other techniques of force. Too many Americans are showing a lack of respect for law and reason. Young people join picket lines to coerce government. Unruly demonstrators strike public officials. We are no longer shocked when we read of such use of force. We have grown accustomed to marching demonstrations, violations of law, and the reconciling of differences in our streets rather than in our courts and legislative halls.

Mr. Justice Burton once stated that "the judiciary is the keystone that holds in place the governmental arch. With its keystone an arch has extraordinary, lasting strength; without it the whole structure collapses." The confidence of the people is all that keeps the keystone in place. Each of us has a responsibility to see that confidence in our judges and in the orderly processes of our courts is reestablished among the citizens of our State and Nation.

A judge cannot defend himself. His popularity or unpopularity is of no proper concern to him in the performance of his judicial duties. As officers of the court it is our responsibility to defend our courts and judges when they are subjected to improper attacks.

The times in which we live present many burning issues. Most periods of history do. The social readjustments made necessary by some of these issues will be carried out. We lawyers must recognize and assume the obligation we have to assure that those readjustments are carried out through the processes of the law, rather than through the processes of the street. The organized bar and the lawyers who comprise it are not spectators of the judicial process; they are officers of the court and have the duty to support the judges and courts of this State.

The care of justice is not entrusted to the weak. Fortunately, no generation of lawyers has yet lost the desire to achieve what President Kennedy once described as a "world of law and free choice, banishing the world of war and coercion."

Constructive criticism of the decisions of our courts, as I said a few moments ago, is welcomed by the judiciary and contributes to the development of the law. No one will agree with every decision of every court and you and I are each entitled to and should voice our reasoned analyses to explain why we come out differently.

Disagreement with a court's decision, however, does not justify a personal attack on the judge. No matter how unpopular a court's decisions, there is no justification for baseless charges that those decisions were made dishonestly, or with bias against the losing party. Those who criticize judges and courts must live up to the obligation which is theirs to report fairly the position and reasoning of those whom they challenge. Distortion and ad hominem attacks should never be tolerated.

The line I am attempting to draw is that line between responsible criticism and irresponsible personal attack designed only to bring public disrespect upon our courts and judges. The courts are entitled to count on the lawyers to speak out against that sort of irresponsibility whenever it arises. As Edmund Burke so well stated, "Evil grows because good men do nothing about it."

I think I can safely say that our Supreme Court is most conscious of the problem of straightening out the tangle of legal problems left in the wake of Escobedo and Dorado. Just like each of us, I am confident that each of our justices agrees with Mr. Justice Holmes when he said, "At the present time in this country there is more danger that criminals will escape justice than that they will be subjected to tyranny." It is the difficult burden of the courts to strike that elusive proper balance between the constitutional rights of the accused and the rights of a society which must be protected from violence.

There are pressures on courts to depart from the traditional notions of judicial self-restraint. There are many who demand that all deficiencies in our society be cured immediately in the courts. As worthy as may be some of the objectives, there are reasons to resist these pressures. To put the courts on the front line of change is a risky business. It is tampering with the checks and balances of our system. Especially in the area of constitutional law where there will be retrospective application of changes, there would seem to be great merit in reserving the judiciary for the role of observing and adjusting the results of social reorganizations established initially in the private dealings of individuals or in the legislative halls. If the courts go too far down the path of judicial legislation, the courts open themselves to the full barrage of attack usually reserved for legislators. It then becomes more difficult to expect public restraint in criticisms.

On the other hand, we lawyers must do our part to educate the public to the fact that to some degree it is perfectly proper for courts, in one sense, to "make law" as well as to "interpret law." Prof. Arthur Corbin once stated that it is judicial legislation which "gives to judicial office its highest honor." Few people realize that, the legislature on occasion enacts only the skeleton of a law and leaves to the courts the work of completing the law on a case-by-case basis. As lawyers, we are all aware of the usefulness of this device, and we have an obligation to communicate that usefulness to those who deal in absolutes and attack the courts for transcending their bounds by "making law."

With respect to the current controversies in the field of criminal law, we lawyers must explain that our system of criminal justice is accusatorial, not inquisitorial. Investigative officers are obliged to obtain evidence of crime by constitutional processes. As lawyers we should make it known that the constitutional protections of the Bill of Rights are not limited to the courtroom. Courts must also examine the procedures by which evidence is obtained before allowing it to be used against the accused. The Bill of Rights must protect everyone or it protects no one. It was Felix Frankfurter who stated: "The history of liberty has largely been the history of the observance of procedural safeguards."

And, important, too, lawyers must challenge those who oversimplify and then distort the decisions of our courts. Those who attack decisions should be made to state their reasoning. The time has come for the attacks on judges to be answered.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter once pointed out that "Any problem can be solved if only one principle is involved, but * * * unfortunately all controversies of importance involve * * * an interplay of principles."

Our duty, as I see it, is to instill in the public the wisdom of that terse statement.

As a final note, I trust that those judges who have been bearing up so well under attack can draw some personal consolation from the observation of Sir Winston Churchill that: "Nothing in life is so exhilarating as to be shot at without result."

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a very penetrating speech on democracy. Miss Rose Marie Hoye, a young lady from my Sixth Congressional District of Iowa, is the proud State winner in the highly competitive annual Voice of Democracy Contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies' auxiliary.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this speech to be indeed refreshing and, for those who have doubts as to our teenagers, I would suggest that this speech by a 16-year-old provides concrete evidence of the solid fiber of our youth. I am most proud to salute Rose Marie Hoye from Storm Lake, Iowa, for her eloquent contribution in making democracy live. I also take this opportunity to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies' auxiliary for a highly meritorious project.

The speech follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Rose Marie Hoye, Iowa Voice of Democracy winner)

A tiny seed of loyalty, righteousness, and patriotism conceived in the womb of a mother nation, and the explorations of curious men and the dreams and desires they hoped to fulfill are the founders that brought me into existence.

I am the country with the big shoulders. I am the country with the productive factories, the waving fields of grain, the network of highways and railroads stretching across my plains. I am the hope and life of almost 200 million people; I am America; I am democracy.

War, rebellion, and hate were excluded from my infant life by an overprotective mother country who destroyed all harmful ideas before they could bloom in my mind. But life can only be learned through experience and so began the story of my history.

With each passing generation, my wants and needs grew until I rebelled against my mother country and later on against myself. In all this I found a great amount of pain—and peace.

During the decades of sufferings and hardships that were to follow, my soil became richer, my industrial life stronger, my cities larger, and my people greater leaders.

Now that I have reached the zenith of my maturity and I look back at the results of my seed, I behold the greatest product of my harvest—my American youth. It is at this point that I wish to call upon one of these youth to act as my spokesman. Listen now to the message this teenager has to give.

It is 1966. I have known this land for 16 years, and I hope to live and give to others in future years the gift of life in this country. My personal life is not known to many at present, but what I am doing now is the foundation of what others will become acquainted with when I am fully grown. Although I live in a small town, that town provides me with opportunities to develop into a potential voter through participation in civic activities, group action, and youth projects.

My life is like a puzzle. My parents are definitely the largest and most important part of that puzzle—busy, as they are, molding their children into young Americans, human beings of dignity and pride. Together we make up a family, the basic unit of society, without which this country of mine would fall apart.

Opportunity in America knocks at every door for those who want to take time to look for the key. The key to this door is education. My school plays an all-important role in my life. Without the education that it offers me, my hopes of bettering my country in the future would be demolished; with sufficient education, on the other hand, I can choose from any number of careers of professional fields. Education gives me and all other youth the chance to grow through active participation; to build a life of positive, moral virtue. In so doing, I am contributing in great measure to the growth of my community.

Like thousands of other teenagers, anxious to express their hope in their country, I am able, through education, to take a closer look at my American heritage; to become better informed on matters of local, State, and National issues; to have opinions and to be ready to express them. For within the boundaries of what other country are the dreams of youth fulfilled so quickly?

As I look into the future, I can predict that the fruits of my country will be many and rich, provided we, her youth, sink our roots deeply into her soil and live according to her democratic principles. For in her youth will American live on and her dreams will become realities and her fears will be vanquished.

Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution calling for the establishment of a select House committee to investigate urban problems and the policy and administration of Federal urban aid programs. A further aim of the select committee would be consideration of the worth, structure, and jurisdiction of a proposed House standing committee on urban affairs.

This is the hour for the establishment of a select committee to investigate urban problems and aid programs and the optimum congressional committee means of dealing therewith. Only last fall, the Congress helped create the new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. Now, we must look into needed change in the congressional committee structure.

This new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs presently enjoys a jurisdiction approximately paralleled in the House of Representatives by the jurisdiction of the Housing Subcommittee. I think we can safely say, however, that the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs will be absorbing new urban-related functions in the near future.

The Housing Subcommittee has certainly been up to the challenge of dealing with a jurisdiction increased to include mass transportation, but the strain of extending this jurisdiction to include air pollution, highways or the like would be excessive. The Housing and Urban Affairs Department may soon be expanding its jurisdictional scope in these or similar directions.

A select committee on urban problems would be able to look into the optimum jurisdiction and structure of a committee to deal with the same scope of problems as the Housing and Urban Affairs Department. A second advantage of such a select committee is that it could provide the wherewithal for a continual investigation of the initial operations of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, which Department is presently undertaking the administration of ambitious new programs as yet ambiguous in scope and thrust.

I believe that the select committee should include members from the following four committees—Banking and Currency—Housing Subcommittee—Public Works, Government Operations, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Approximately half the 13-member select committee should be drawn from the Housing Subcommittee.

Law and Order Without Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, over the years there has been a continuing dialog on the question of how far government—Federal, State, and local—may extend its law-enforcement arm in trying to protect the community before it impinges on the constitutional rights of the individual. Particularly when people become afraid and a crisis develops, they cry out for government action whether or not it clamps down on individual rights. This is what is happening today over the crime crisis.

The chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, Hon. David L. Brazelon, made a significant contribution to this debate on Washington's birthday, in a speech at the 1966 Florina Lasker Civil Liberties Award luncheon of the New York Civil Liberties Union. His thought-provoking address, entitled "Law and Order Without Justice," emphasizes the importance of understanding the social and economic backgrounds of persons who become involved in street crimes of violence.

These are the crimes, he stated, that we are really worried about. He cautioned, however, that—

> Meting out more punishment in such cases is like giving harder and harder lessons in algebra to a student who has shown his inability to absorb even the basic lessons.

Any meaningful solution to the current crime crisis, Judge Bazelon feels, must necessarily be related to solving pressing social and political questions.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Judge Bazelon's thoughtful words to my colleagues in the Congress, and to the public. I therefore insert the text of his address at this point in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW AND ORDER WITHOUT JUSTICE

(By David L. Bazelon, chief judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit)

I am delighted that you invited me to speak to you. I want to talk about current law-enforcement proposals which I think would seriously infringe our civil liberties—proposals due to fear about the rising tide of crime. This fear may not always be rational. But whether or not criminal behavior is really more prevalent now than in the past, the pragmatic truth is that anything that can upset so many people so seriously can properly be described as a crisis. If there has always been a crime crisis, this does not make it less serious.

The President has expressed his determination to "do something about it." He has established a National Crime Commission and a District of Columbia Crime Commission. The Office of Criminal Justice, the American Law Institute, the ABA Committee on Minimum Standards of Criminal Justice, to name only the better known organizations, all are attempting in one way or another to respond to the public fear. There is danger that the response will be cheap and easy answers at the expense of civil liberties.

It seems to me that the first step toward wisdom in this matter is to determine who the offenders we fear are; where they come from in our society; and why they act the way they do. For the purpose of this inquiry, I find it helpful to divide crimes into four categories.

The first category I would call white-collar crime—such offenses as bad checks, tax evasion, stock fraud, mail fraud, and bankruptcy fraud. These crimes certainly do not frighten us into barring our doors at night and keeping our women and children off the streets. Against this type of crime, the sanctions of the criminal law are reasonably effective. Just give one man a 6-month jail sentence and all the members of his country club rush in to pay their taxes. No doubt the Benthamite notion that the criminal calculates pain against pleasure has some validity in this area. Bentham's system was a middle-class device more or less applicable to many middle-class crimes.

The second category of crime I describe as organized crime. I define this broadly to include all the criminal activity that stems from the link between the underworld, including corrupt labor unions, and political and business interests. This political and economic corruption presents a serious problem today. Exposure by honest and energetic government is the best antidote. In any event, these are not the offenses that cause us to lock our doors in fear for our immediate physical safety.

The third category of crime I call crimes of passion or bad blood that take place within a family or amongst friends. These crimes are often beyond the reach of sanctions and ordinarily present few problems of detection. In any event they, too, are not the cause of our present fears.

The fourth category I would describe as street crimes of violence. This is what we are really worried about. It is the stranger who may come out of the night to rob us, ransack our homes, rape, maim, or kill us. This is what the public refers to when it demands an end to crime in the streets. This is why the President created the crime commissions and why the organized bar groups moved into action.

From my 16 years' experience on the bench, I would say that almost all the perpetrators of this fourth category of crimes come from the bottom of the socio-economic-cultural barrel—from among the ignorant, the ill educated, the unemployed and often unemployable. Because they are often deprived of what we call a moral upbringing, our code has little meaning for them. And they have little incentive to observe it, since they are virtually excluded from the advantages of our economic and cultural life. Crime is just one of a cluster of social ills—family breakdowns, mental disorders, unsupervised youths, school dropouts, alcoholism, and drug addiction—which beset this group.

We are also aware that the crimes we are really worried about are committed in great part by young persons. More than half of those arrested in our cities for larceny and burglary are not yet 18 years old. We know where these offenders live. We know where they were educated—or were not educated. We know what kind of jobs they have—or would qualify for if they could find them. We know so much about the conditions of their existence, in fact, as to make us marvel that so relatively few in their groups resort to crime.

Because the conditions of the offender's life so clearly contribute to his criminal behavior, the effectiveness of law enforcement and punishment measures is at least doubtful—although, of course, we might be able to bludgeon these people into line. But as Dick Gregory said a few weeks ago: "If Americans want law and order without justice, they are going to have to have one cop per Negro in America."

The high rate of recidivism among offenders from our ghettos, in the face of harsh sentences, attests to the failure of punishment. And the law's deterrent effect is far removed from the juvenile delinquent who risks years in jail by snatching a woman's purse; calculation of potential pains and pleasures is not for him.

It seems that the people we are talking about simply do not understand the lessons of punishment, and that giving them more of the same—more punishment—is like giving harder and harder lessons in algebra to a student who has shown his inability to absorb even the basic lessons. Only an incompetent teacher—one of ill will or very limited resources—would go about destroying a student in such a fashion.

We must understand that any real solution to the crime crisis will be related to pressing social and political questions such as Negro rights, medical care, poverty, industrial automation, unemployment, and the quality of urban housing.

There are great gaps in our knowledge about the causation of behavior, criminal or otherwise. Yet we have considerable information from psychiatry, sociology, physiology and other disciplines about the relationship between societal conditions and individual behavior. We are not justified, either morally or practically, in ignoring what we do know, either because there is much more to know or because the problems appear so complex that they cannot be quickly solved—or solved at all without drastic economic and social change.

The typical response of organized bar groups to street crimes of violence is to urge more and more repressive enforcement measures. The sad fact is that the influence of these groups led the President to create two commissions on law enforcement without naming a single behavioral scientist on either of them. This is hardly a promising way to challenge the conditions which breed the violence that confronts us.

Certainly, there is need for more effective law enforcement—more and better trained police, better communications, scientific detection methods, regulation of gun sales, and so on. I am also for a bigger and better fire department to fight a raging fire. But effective measures for catching and punishing these offenders will not remove the causes of their behavior, any more than the world's best fire engine will prevent fires. The factors which produce criminals among our economically and culturally impoverished will continue to produce them, and faster than we can condemn them and stuff them into human warehouses.

Our present preoccupation with law enforcement steals our attention from the roots of the problem. And since law enforcement is such a limited tool, its workers are pushed to stretch it by proposals which bend, twist, and shave constitutional rights as the "necessary" solution to the crime problem.

It may be surprising that the police see the answer to crime in removing restrictions on their activity. But it is deeply disturbing that such proposals come also from quite different sources, sources where one should expect to find an appreciation of the limitations of law enforcement as a cure for crime and an ability to weigh the clamor of the moment against the enduring values of our democratic society.

It is not at all clear that these current proposals would make detection and enforcement more effective. But it is quite clear that they would deprive our ghetto population of fundamental rights. As far as I am aware, most proponents of these proposals refuse to face this ugly fact.

One of these proposals would substitute a station-house police officer for the judge or magistrate after an arrest to warn the subject of his rights and to screen out cases of unjustified arrest. This would place the mouse in the protective custody of the cat. It is a departure from the division of responsibility which has kept the "awful instruments of the criminal law" from the hands of a single functionary.

The proposal acknowledges that a suspect who can afford counsel has a right to contact, retain and consult him during interrogation. What is so disturbing is its failure to provide counsel for those who cannot afford it or are too ignorant or inexperienced to realize how badly they need it. This would deny counsel to those who are most likely to be detained and interrogated and who have the greatest need for his assistance.

The reason for the omission is not very subtle. It appears in a very recent statement of the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, who is, of course, the representative of the Department of Justice. According to the New York Times, he said, "if (suspects) * * * get a lawyer as soon as they are brought in, that amounts to the end of interrogations."

He said this in response to a proposal by our Neighborhood Legal Services project to have its telephone number included in the advice given to indigent suspects with the information that a lawyer would be provided immediately, day or night. He said this notwithstanding the fact that established Government policy in our national antipoverty program favors providing legal services in poor areas.

The left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing—or worse, ignores it. What he was saying, in effect, is that although the rich may employ counsel and avoid interrogation, the poor will not be told where they can get a lawyer lest they too avoid interrogation. When I left Washington, the Department of Justice had not disavowed it. In fact, it had become clear that the police will not be authorized to volunteer this information unless the Supreme Court so requires.

And they still call it the Department of Justice.

I have nothing to say about the legal questions presently facing the Supreme Court. But the way the underlying moral question seems to have been answered in Washington shocks me. The powers that be are saying they will do everything they can to prevent arrested persons from getting the kind of information and assistance a lawyer would provide. I find such institutionalization of ignorance thoroughly repugnant.

I have been accused of wanting to bar any questioning of any accused at any time. For the record, let me say that this is not true. I would allow brief questioning at any time and place, after the person questioned has been fully advised of his rights and given full opportunity to assert those rights—rights intended for all, poor and ignorant as well as rich or intelligent. What I would not do is rely on the police to provide that full advice.

As a substitute for the advice of counsel, the proposal would establish elaborate provisions for warnings by the police. But these are illusory protections. As Justice Black said in *Von Molke* v. *Gilles*, "The Constitution does not contemplate that prisoners shall be dependent upon Government agents for legal counsel and aid, however conscientious and able those agents may be. Undivided allegiance and faithful, devoted service to a client are prized traditions of the American lawyer. It is this kind of service for which the sixth amendment makes provision."

Denial of counsel in the interrogation room poignantly illustrates the impact of many of these proposals on the poor. The Attorney General recently said on TV that "our historical concern with rights of defendants * * * [has] been concerned with protecting the innocent, largely, and to some extent with forbidding police practices which simply was [sic] felt were wrong in a civilized society." But, said the Attorney General, "the focus has suddenly changed in this debate from protecting the innocent to an argument of equality that says whatever the rich defendant has the poor defendant should have, and there's been rather a tendency to forget about whether there's innocence or guilt involved."

I would remind the Attorney General of the presumption of innocence; when the police are questioning a suspect, we don't know "whether there's innocence or guilt involved." It is to answer that question that we have trials. We don't arrest people we think are innocent, but we don't decide upon arresting a man that he is guilty. Moreover, I would willingly argue that one of the practices that are simply "wrong in a civilized society" is discrimination between rich and poor in the administration of criminal justice. The Bill of Rights was not designed solely to promote efficiency—conviction of the guilty and acquittal of the innocent. It was designed also to protect other values unrelated to, and sometimes inconsistent with, mere efficiency—such as privacy, decency, and equality.

We need to clarify what we mean by equality for the poor in the criminal process. We do not mean "equality of outcome." We ask only equal availability of all constitutional safeguards such as the privilege against self-incrimination, the presumption of innocence, the right not to be arrested without probable cause—and the right to counsel.

The Attorney General seems to divide these constitutional safeguards into two categories—those which protect the innocent, and those which preserve other values not necessarily related to guilt or innocence, such as the privilege against self-incrimination and the privacy protections of the fourth amendment. He would allow the poor only the first sort of safeguards. But if constitutional safeguards are important—and I think they are—every member of our society should have the benefit of all of them.

We have had other crises. And there have been efforts to curb our liberties in response to those crises. But as the Supreme Court said, in the context of a domestic crisis far worse than any we confront today: "These great and good men (who drafted the Constitution) foresaw that troubled times would arise, when rules and people would become restive under restraint, and seek by sharp and decisive measures to accomplish ends deemed just and proper. * * * The Constitution * * * is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances."

Professor Kamisar has aptly said: "The issue is not whether we should give the poor and ignorant so many points because they are poor and ignorant; but whether, because they suffer from these deficiencies, we should deprive them of rights and privileges. * * *" The poor are also the ignorant. If ignorance precludes one from exercising his rights, then for practical purposes he has no rights. As Justice Goldberg said in Escobedo, "We have * * * learned the * * * lesson of history that no system of criminal justice can, or should, survive if it comes to depend for its continued effectiveness on the citizens' abdication through unawareness of their constitutional rights."

I suspect that such proposals do not stem from any particular desire to discriminate against the poor. Rather, they may only reflect an opinion that our society can "live with" certain constitutional rights and privileges only if enough of its members fail to assert them. The effect of many proposals would be to institutionalize the inability of the poor and the ignorant to benefit from their rights vis-a-vis the police. The issue really comes down to whether we should further whittle away the constitutional protections of the very people who need them most—the people who are too ignorant, too poor, too ill educated to defend themselves.

But the proposals I have discussed have not been presented in this light. They have been presented as mere extensions of legitimate law enforcement techniques made necessary by the crime crisis. The danger is that the segment of the public raising the hue and cry about crime is beginning to support these proposals and may succeed in forcing their adoption.

More stringent enforcement of laws and more severe treatment of offenders have the superficial attractiveness of a simple answer to a troubling problem. Since the vocal members of the public are generally those who, in Professor Amsterdam's words, "imagine themselves always as potential victims of crime, never as potential victims of police investigation," they think any loss of rights is unlikely to affect them. They are probably correct, at least to begin with.

When we talk about arrests for investigation, lengthy police interrogation before arraignment, and the like, we are not talking about things that happen to you or me. We don't get arrested without probable cause and interrogated without counsel, because, to put it plainly, we don't "look" as if we would commit acts of violence and we do look as if it might not pay to trifle with our rights. Nor do we live in neighborhoods where the police make "dragnet" or wholesale arrests. Most of the people who do suffer such abuses are poor.

Often the police are the only part of government they ever see. Their persistent complaints of police brutality, whatever their factual basis, prove that the police and consequently the government have a deplorable image among the poor.

The debate over civilian review of complaints against the police is similar, in many ways, to the debate over providing counsel at the police station. Just as opponents of the right to counsel seem to be saying that our society can "live with" the privilege against self-incrimination only if most suspects are denied the information necessary to use it, opponents of civilian review seem to be saying that we can "live with" the limitations imposed on the police by the Constitution only if no outside agency checks to see whether they are observed.

This recalls the saying in the 1920's: "Prohibition is better than no liquor." Prohibition of unconstitutional police action must actually prohibit. Respect for law can be engendered in the people with whom the police deal only if the police obey the law. A law-abiding policeman need never fear civilian review. His morale should not be lowered by the airing of citizen complaints; rather he ought to be encouraged by the increased community respect which can be expected when the public sees that the police are required to obey the law. A society whose citizens have rights must enforce these rights. Civilian review should not be denied for fear that it would require the police to operate within constitutional limits.

The Civil Liberties Union has played and has still to play an important role in protecting constitutional rights. You may well make it a part of your task to remind people that hopes for simple solutions of the crime problem are illusory and that, as Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark said last summer: "[C]ourt rules do not cause crime. People do not commit crime because they know they cannot be questioned by police before presentment, or even because they feel they will not be convicted. * * * In the long run, only the elimination of the causes of crime can make a significant and lasting difference in the incidence of crime." He also said, "Society can be protected without impairing the rights of the individual. Indeed it cannot be protected if those rights are impaired. The task is to boldly attack the causes of crime." We hope he convinces his associates soon.

A Marine's Reaction to Vietcong Participation in Peace Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a fine letter from a constituent who is now serving in the U.S. Marines. Although I have decided to protect his identity, his message is certainly worthy of serious consideration by all Members of Congress, particularly those serving in the U.S. Senate.

The letter which follows is commended to the attention of all Members:

February 19, 1966.

Hon. Sam Devine,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I was in your office last summer while in Washington (deleted) and we talked for several minutes about our Government's position in Vietnam. Pursuant to that, I have enlisted in the Marine Corps and am now stationed here at Camp Lejeune undergoing advanced infantry training.

Today I read the enclosed article from the Sunday Star concerning the comments of Senator Robert Kennedy. In 1 day this article has become a major issue here. It is for this reason that I am writing this letter.

There are several thousand marines in training here; many with wives and children, some away from home for the first time; all soon to be heading in the same direction: Vietnam. They left their individualism at Parris Island and became an integral part of a strong fighting team—coated with honor, pride, and bravery. All are aware of the job to be done—why it must be done and we are now learning how to do it. The high temper of the spirit among the marines is surpassed only by their willingness to refund our coveted liberties and freedoms anytime, anywhere, against any enemy.

Now we have a prominent U.S. Senator asking for a coalition government with the Communists, recognizing the National Liberation Front. The big question here is, Why? Why must we fight and sometimes die in Vietnam and then turn around and give them any part in the formation of a government? If we negotiate on those terms now, it will only be a matter of time before history will surely repeat itself in some other country either in southeast Asia or another hot spot in the world. Then the marines along with the other services will again be called on to defend our commitments. Why can't we stop the Communists now, instead of playing hide and seek among the rice paddies?

I, along with any of my fellow marines, would be ready at a moments notice to lay our lives on the line for our country, not because it is the honorable thing to do, but out of sincere love of country, pride, and our desire to maintain those freedoms that our forefathers have so bravely fought and died to preserve. Now we ask you, why must we bow to the "red line" in Vietnam, and commit ourselves to a coalition government which would certainly not serve the interests of the South Vietnamese people, and would certainly be short of our pledge to them that President Johnson has so often stated. Thank you for your time in this matter. I am looking forward to hearing from you soon.

CAMP LEJEUNE, S.C.

Let Us Stand Up and Be Counted for Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received from a constituent, Miss Aldora Babcock, of Waverly, Iowa, a most interesting letter in opposition to present U.S. policy toward the friendly Government of Rhodesia. She speaks from experience, having spent time in Rhodesia.

In conclusion she says:

> Our position in Africa needs Rhodesia; our interests are clearly on the side of the Ian Smith government. Let us stand up and be counted for sanity.

I agree, and I commend her letter to the attention of my colleagues:

WAVERLY, IOWA,
February 6, 1966.

Congressman H. R. GROSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It comes with sickening sense to see how the Western powers, whether through ineptitude or by conscious design, are taking the first steps—by the economic sanctions they have imposed against Rhodesia—to throw that ruggedly realist little country to the wolves. That our U.S. State Department should take no more knowledgeable a line than to join in the "kill" with the British Labor Government is the most nauseating pang of all.

Our policy, as it stands, is an affront to an intelligent, humane, and responsible people who, out of background, are naturally like-minded allies with us; for they are a people who are similarly Western oriented in their outlook, cherish the same Anglo-Saxon heritage of free, self-governing institutions, the same Christian tradition, and whose ideological position in today's cold-war-dominated world is the same as ours.

I have been to Rhodesia and I know something about the aggressively realistic, self-reliant, and proud spirit of this modern-day, 20th-century state in the heartland of onetime darkest Africa. In the high standard of living achieved and the almost breathtaking technological advance registered (here are gleaming skylines of modernistically styled concrete and glass skyscrapers, department stores stocked with an amazing array of up-to-the-minute consumers goods, hydroelectric development projects transforming the countryside—and all this brilliant success story achieved, moreover, in the space of less than three-quarters of a century); the Rhodesians have done the incredible.

And what is it but white settler initiative and know-how and white capital that have spurred this march of progress and built up this modern-minded democratic society and forward-moving economy? While one would hardly claim that the initial motivations that impelled that first pioneer column were anything much other than an alert self-interest, it was as such, one can say, and according to those times, an enlightened self-interest, a rugged individualism that was to shape a way of life that was to benefit all classes and lift them—and this includes the native peoples as well—to progressively higher levels of well-being. Indeed, here in the central African bush, Rhodesia today stands out as a solid little enclave of modern civilization and the rule of law in what is otherwise the wider frame of indigenous backwardness and chaotic turbulence.

Americans, at least, should be impressed by the Rhodesian achievement, for Rhodesia's history closely parallels our own American epic. Here, too, rugged pioneers, by dint of hard work and sound principles have tamed and settled a wild land and built up a society whose constitutional framework provides potential recognition of equal rights and opportunities for all its multiracial peoples. That the blacks of Rhodesia are not being "victimized by a white minority," as the Afro-Asians and the world's sympathizing "bleeding hearts" are screaming, is demonstrated by the fact that the Rhodesian black nationalist leadership acted at the time to endorse the new liberal constitution of 1961—its deferred enfranchisement timetable and all.

Indeed, the Africans in Rhodesia were known to be a satisfied people until outside pressures were brought to bear and the Communist-oriented black revolutionary movement began spreading its venom and stirring up racial hatred. In their native townships, their housing was good; social services encompassed need of every kind; education and economic advancement were made available, as much as was budgetarily practicable what with a backward people that multiplies like rabbits; the able and aspiring found helpful encouragement.

The Rhodesian black is not "unconscionably exploited," whatever the misguided liberals and moralists who pretend their hearts bleed for the "poor, repressed African," have been ballyhooing. And that this is the case has been confirmed again in the current Rhodesian crisis by the refusal of the blacks to strike and rebel, though there has been plenty of outside pressure. They have remained loyal to the government.

Self-respecting, of high intelligence buttressed by fine humane instincts and Christian conscience, the white Rhodesians are also, one must add, a people who are practically and forthrightly realist in their politics. They are not afraid to call a spade a spade. Those flaming battle cries of the liberals—"self-determination," "one man one vote," "majority rule"—and all the other pious pronouncements—they are honest enough to lose no time in debunking for the disarming speciousness and false idealism they represent. They know them to be unattainable ideals in the black people's present state of advance, and an experiment of dangerous precariousness if implemented in the present posture of the world.

And are they not right? Who profits if black majority rule comes too soon and, by reason of being too premature, flounders into chaos and collapse and Rhodesia becomes another of the world's trouble spots for the East and West, in their desperate cold-war confrontation, to contend over and try to bail out? The Rhodesians are not a Bourbon dynasty clinging to a vanished order of things. Theirs will be an actively functioning multiracial-based state ultimately, but with the transition to majority control geared to a slower, more conservative tempo—all to the end that a hard-won civilization will not face needless exposure to the wanton forces of disorder and demoralization now unleashed in the world. Is not here the counsel of commonsense?

That Rhodesia is the keystone to the West's position in Africa is not an overstatement. As Rhodesia goes, so goes all of Africa. If the leftist attack on Rhodesia succeeds, the black revolution will next turn to Portuguese colonial Africa, and then to South Africa, until the whole structure that European colonialism built up in Africa will have toppled irretrievably. Africa will be lost to the West and with all that that means in access to its resources, strategic bases, and shipping lanes still open.

A moment of truth, therefore, faces America, for even now the black commonwealth nations are planning more extreme measures against Rhodesia even to an invasion of the country, which, while it will hardly succeed, is bound to force Prime Minister Wilson's hand in the Machiavellian role he is playing—trying to walk the tightrope between a pro-Rhodesian British electorate and the Afro-Asian pressure bloc. Timely and decisive action by the American Government could do something to arrest the desperately descending spiral.

Therefore, I hope that Congress, under its delegated power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations," will take the initiative in this session to remove the trade embargo the Johnson administration has imposed against this robust, objectively realist little country that stands on its own feet and asks no handouts of anybody. I hope, further, that it will restate and give vitality to another long-time American principle—noninterference in the internal affairs of another state—to the end that Rhodesia will be left alone to solve its own problems and to work out the slower transition of its backward peoples to full citizenship that it believes to be right, unhampered by punitive international action.

Our position in Africa needs Rhodesia; our interests are clearly on the side of the Ian Smith government. Let us stand up and be counted for sanity.

Very truly yours,
MISS ALDORA BABCOCK.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, When Dr. Braskamp, our beloved Chaplain, died the House lost another one of its inspirations. It would be needless for me to say he was a devoted, able public servant because everybody knows that.

He had that happy facility, whether you were in bed ill or on your feet feeling fine, of making you feel better. He was truly one of God's great leaders. All of us will miss him much.

Our deepest sympathy goes to his loved ones in this, their hour of great loss.

Thirteen Million Sign for Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent article on the supplementary insurance provision of the Medicare Act designed to cover doctor bills. It is written by John Troan and appeared in the February 14 issue of the Cincinnati Post and Times Star. Mr. Troan interviewed Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball, and the questions and answers provide some valuable and clear information about the voluntary insurance.

Medicare Picture: 13 Million Sign for Insurance

(By John Troan)

Washington.—After months of foot dragging, Americans are flocking to sign up for the bargain-rate medical insurance offered by medicare.

Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball says about 13.5 million persons past 65 have now enrolled for this supplementary insurance, designated chiefly to cover doctor bills.

By the end of the initial enrollment period next month, Ball expects 80 to 90 percent of the 19 million eligibles—between 15.2 million and 17.1 million persons to have signed.

Following is a question-answer interview on this subject with the chief of the Social Security Administration:

Question. Commissioner Ball, how many persons have signed up for the supplementary medicare insurance?

Answer. So far about 13.5 million, 70 percent of those eligible. And there are still 7 weeks to go before the first enrollment period ends March 31, so I'm confident by the end of next month we'll have 80 to 90 percent of the 19 million enrolled.

Question. Who is eligible for this insurance?

Answer. Just about everybody over 65, regardless of whether or not he ever worked under social security and whether or not he intends to retire.

Question. How many have turned down this insurance?

Answer. Something over a million, or 6 percent of the total eligible. But many of those who have said no are changing their minds.

Question. What reasons do they give for turning it down?

Answer. Many of those who gives a reason say they can't afford it.

Question. How much does the supplementary insurance cost?

Answer. Three dollars for each individual past 65. The Government matches this premium, which means you're getting $6 worth of protection for $3.

Question. How is the premium to be paid?

Answer: If a person who is signed up is drawing a monthly social security, railroad retirement, or civil service retirement check, the amount will be deducted automatically from the check. Otherwise, the person will be billed by social security at regular intervals.

Question. What other reasons do people give for refusing the insurance?

Answer. Many have said—and this is generally a mistaken reason—that they don't want the supplementary insurance because they already have such coverage either through Blue Shield or Blue Cross or a commercial firm.

Question. But will the "Blues" and commercial companies continue such coverage after medicare takes effect?

Answer. That's just it, most of them have made it clear they aren't going to duplicate for the aged what medicare offers, and most are urging their policyholders to sign up. Some already have announced they are going to change coverage once medicare begins.

Question. That's next July 1?

Answer. Yes. That's when all medicare benefits except those pertaining to skilled nursing homes go into effect. The nursing-home benefits will not be available until January 1, 1967.

Question. Now medicare is divided into two parts——

Answer. That's right: Plan A, or basic hospital insurance, and plan B, or supplementary medical insurance.

Question. Plan A will—

Answer. In general, it will offer up to 90 days of care in a hospital for each spell of illness, with the patient paying the first $40 plus $10 for each day after the first 60. It also will offer home-health benefits—in a patient's own home—following hospitalization. And in 1967, benefits in skilled nursing homes will be added.

Question. And plan B?

Answer: Primarily, it will help pay doctor bills—whether the physician renders his services in the patient's home, in his own office, or in a hospital, nursing home, or other institution.

Question. Any exceptions?

Answer. The biggest exceptions are drugs and long-term nursing home care—beyond that provided by the basic plan. Nor will the supplementary insurance cover routine physicals, inoculations, examinations for eyeglasses or hearing aids, or cosmetic surgery.

Question. How about dental care?

Answer: It won't cover dental care generally. But it will help pay for dental services in surgery on the jaw or other facial bones if this is required by accodent or disease.

Question. Any other coverage?

Answer: If a person is treated outside a hospital for a mental, psychoneurotic, or personality disorder, the insurance will cover half of the bill up to a total benefit of $250 a year for this purpose.

Question. Anything else?

Answer. If a person needs the services, in his own home, of a part-time nurse, a nurse's aid, a medical social worker, or a physical, speech or occupational therapist, the insurance will cover up to 100 visits a year by such health workers provided by a home-health agency.

Question. Isn't this home-health benefit the same as that offered "free" by the basic medicare plan?

Answer. It's similar. But to draw a home-health benefits under the basic plan, the patient must first be hospitalized. To draw the benefits under the supplementary plan, there is no hospital requirement. Furthermore, if a patient needs home-health care after discharge from a hospital he can draw 100 visits a year under the basic plan plus 100 under the supplementary.

Question. What else does the supplementary insurance cover?

Answer. Diagnostic tests, including X-rays and laboratory tests, in addition to those offered by the basic plan; radiation therapy; surgical dressings, splints, casts and so on; rental of such medical equipment as oxygen tents and wheelchairs; artificial limbs, artificial eyes, braces.

Question: How about artificial teeth?

Answer. No. The plan won't pay for false teeth, hearing aids or eyeglasses.

Question. Does it cover the full cost of the benefits?

Answer. No. First of all, the patient is responsible for all services not covered by the plan—such as drugs and ordinary dental bills. In addition, the patient is responsible for the first $50 of medical expense he incurs each year for services in which the supplementary insurance does apply.

Question. Does the insurance pay the balance?

Answer. It will pay 80 percent of the remainder—80 percent of what's left after the patient takes care of the noncovered expenses and the $50 deductible.

Question. Will a doctor's full fee be figured into this?

Answer. Medicare will pay up to 80 percent of what is determined to be a "reasonable charge," based on customary and prevailing fees in the area. If a doctor bills medicare directly, the "reasonable charge" must be his full charge. If he bills the patient, the doctor may charge anything he wishes but the patient will be reimbursed by medicare for no more than 80 percent of the "reasonable charge."

Question. When should a person sign up?

Answer. Those who were 65 before January 1, 1966, must sign up before the end of the first enrollment period March 31.

Question. If they don't?

Answer. They'll have to wait for the next enrollment period, and pay a higher premium when they do sign up. For instance, if a person who reached 65 before January 1 doesn't enroll by the end of March he won't have another chance to sign up until October 1967; his insurance won't take effect until July 1968, and his monthly premium will be $3.30 rather than $3.

Question. How and where do I sign up?

Answer. If you still haven't been contacted, get in touch with your nearest Social Security office immediately.

The Disappearing Halves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, an interesting commentary on the increase of unofficial coin collectors in our Nation appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel on February 26, 1966.

The new collectors are not concerned particularly with the age of the coins, rather they are saving any quarters, nickels, or half dollars which were minted before 1965.

This editorial brings to mind the assertion of Thomas Jefferson that our national debt should not be left to be paid by the next generation.

The conclusion of the article gives one of today's answers to Jefferson's proposition:

Since we also are passing along most of our national debt to grandchildren and great grandchildren, some Americans may have got the idea this (saving silver coins) is one way to help them out.

I insert the entire editorial at this point in the Record:

The Disappearing Halves

Miss Eva Adams, Director of the U.S. Mint, has reported to a congressional committee that 400 million of the Kennedy half dollars have disappeared.

She said the public seems to be hoarding these coins but she doesn't understand why because, according to her, for many, many years to come the coins will have no special value—there are too many of them.

But we also note there has been a heavy hoarding of the old half dollars, with Benjamin Franklin's image on them. And apparently a lot of the old-fashioned quarters are being stashed away.

This leads to some observations, of which Miss Adams surely is aware:

Americans can be quite sentimental about some things. They are especially sentimental about a popular young President who was assassinated. His image is on those half dollars.

Moreover, Government officials may preach about the coins having no extra value in years to come. They may be right. But we suspect a great many Americans simply do not believe this.

As a matter of fact, the half dollars now being minted are only 40-percent silver, compared to the 90-percent content in the old ones. New quarters and the dimes soon to be produced will be made of copper and nickel.

In the marketplace, the new coins are worth their stated values only because the Government says so. But the old coins are worth almost as much as their stated values in silver. The principal reason for minting the new coins was the shortage of silver. Anyone who thinks Americans can't add doesn't know them very well.

It has not been uncommon in the past for many of us to hide away a few coins for the grandchildren or great-grandchildren on the theory they would have rare-coin values by that time. Since we also are passing along most of our national debt to grandchildren and great-grandchildren, some Americans may have got the idea this is one way to help them out.

The Marines' Riverine Warfare Technique in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting developments in the fighting in Vietnam has been the emphasis on river warfare. The Marine Corps, with its naval tradition, has placed particular emphasis on this form of warfare. Because of the fairly far reaching implications of this new development—a throwback to procedures we knew more clearly in the civil war. I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following article by a distinguished naval expert, Mr. L. Edgar Prina, of the Washington Star, which appeared originally in the Sunday Star of January 23, 1966.

The article follows:

Marines Seek Doctrine for Riverine Warfare

(By L. Edgar Prina)

Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, is freshly returned from an inspection tour of Vietnam more convinced than ever that the United States and its allies must substantially improve their ability to wage what he calls "riverine warfare" if they are ever to pacify the country.

What is "riverine (river) warfare," a term which is very likely to be more and more discussed? The Marines define it as warfare which encompasses, "all operations conducted in a river environment," including "river navigation, crossing, defense and offensive in a delta, security of and along a river, patrolling and logistic support along a river route of communication."

Anyone familar with the geography of Vietnam knows how vitally important, even dominating, are its waterways, the big Mekong and Red River systems and the many other smaller ones. As in virtually all underdeveloped countries, rivers are the principal arteries of communication and commerce in Vietnam.

The Marines know the importance of the inland waterways firsthand. All three enclaves presently occupied by elements of the 3d Marine Amphibious Force in Vietnam—Da Nang, Chu Lai and Phu Bai—are located in or near river delta areas.

PERFORMED HEROICALLY

Unhappily, too many miles of river and adjacent territory in South Vietnam are in the hands of the Communist Vietcong guerrillas. In addition to exploiting these arteries for military purposes, they tax the peasants and farm folk for using them—often taking a substantial amount of the food and goods in transit as payment.

The Pentagon has given lipservice to the idea of the importance of riverine warfare. But neither the men, money, materials, or brainpower has been devoted to the creation and outfitting of forces which could seize control of these waterways so that they could be used by our side for offensive operations against the guerrillas and for spreading government authority to new areas of the country.

This is not to say that the allies have done nothing. The South Vietnamese Navy has a River Assault Group (RAG), which attempts to keep some waterways open. It is a jury-rigged outfit which, while some of its units and U.S. advisers have performed heroically, is not one to do much more than scratch the surface of the potential. The RAG is a descendant of the old French Dinassaut (Division Navale d'Assaut) concept to provide armed transport and fire support along the rivers of Indo-China.

NEW RIVER BOAT

The U.S. Navy is going to make a contribution to the river effort by complementing the Vietnamese RAG with 120 new high-speed patrol boats. The first of these 31-foot, diesel-powered craft are expected to be on their way to Vietnam within the next several weeks.

Armed with .30- and .50-caliber machineguns, the American-manned boats were built strictly for patrol and not for assault or gunfire support missions. Their water-jet propulsion systems (they have no propellers) will permit them to operate safely and speedily even in shallow inlets and backwaters.

The Navy is also building a new gunboat, the PGM-84 class, but it is to be used primarily for coastal operations.

A smaller craft, called Swift, is already in the war zone, but it, too, is engaged in coastal surveillance, checking on Communist smuggling and infiltration. Six of them are stationed at Phu Quoc Island, in the Gulf of Thailand. Fifty feet long and, as their name suggests, capable of high speeds, the Swifts presumably could be used to handle some tasks on the rivers.

The naval high command, however, has not fought for the river warfare mission. As a matter of fact, except for a few energetic, relatively junior admirals, the Navy has shown precious little interest in it.

Greene, a leader in the effort to convince the Navy and the Defense Department of the opportunity to take a forward step by developing an aspect of counterguerrilla warfare which has been long neglected, concedes that U.S. military doctrine with respect to tactical operations on and along a river is inadequate. But he has done something about it.

Recalling how a group of bright, young field grade officers at the Marine Corps Schools in Quantico, Va., helped develop the landing force doctrine in the 1930's, a doctrine which served as the underpinning for our amphibious operations in World War II, the Commandant late last month fired off a new project directive to the coordinator, Marine Corps Landing Force Development Activities at Quantico, calling for creation of a doctrine for the conduct of riverine warfare.

HAVE CROSSING DOCTRINE

Greene's directive put the problem this way:

"What can be done to provide the 3rd Marine Amphibious Force and others with a doctrine for tactics, techniques, organization, and materials to continue operations in the riverine environment which their amphibious landing has located them, without degrading their capability to conduct amphibious operations?"

The coordinator won't have an easy time. He will have to come up with answers concerning the kinds of river craft and vehicles which will be needed; the relationship between the weapons and vehicles; river charts and reconnaissance methods; an evaluation of riverine environment and marginal terrain; a system for providing integrated mobility and firepower and logistic support.

The Marines have a river crossing doctrine. If the coordinator can develop one for operations along and on a river, it could be a major contribution to a successful prosecution of the war in Vietnam.

And, if the future is as grim as the present, it might be needed in counterguerrilla operations in other parts of Asia and in Africa and Latin America, the underdeveloped areas Communist China seeks to exploit in its grandiose strategic plan for encircling the northern half of the world.

Texas Senate Resolution 21

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today, March 2, is Texas Independence Day. It is an historic day for Texans as well as men of liberty everywhere.

The same profound and intensive concepts of democracy and liberty that prompted the fathers of Texas to declare the State's independence some 130 years ago brings forth this expression of support for the Nation's efforts in opposing those who would deprive other people of their rightful claim to independence.

By the authority of Resolution 21 of the Senate of the State of Texas, the esteemed members of that legislative body have given unfaltering support to President Lyndon B. Johnson's policy in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

This overt action by the Senate of Texas is a patriotic endorsement for taking the only course that this Nation can follow.

I am proud that my own State has seen fit to stand behind the President and the country in this matter. I, furthermore, wish to commend Senator Dorsey Hardeman, of San Angelo, who introduced the measure before the senate, for his awareness of issues relating directly to the basic freedom of people everywhere.

I insert this expression of liberty in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 21

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That it hereby express its full support of U.S. policy in Vietnam pursuant to the 1954 Southeast Asia Treaty, negotiated by the Eisenhower administration; and be it further

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That it express its gratitude as well as its admiration, for the courage, bravery, and sacrifices of American troops and their allies from Australia and South Korea, in resisting the forces of communism seeking to engulf the free world within their evil embrace through armed aggression, as well as by subversion; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States; to the Secretaries of State and of Defense; to Gen. William Giles Westmoreland; and to the Presiding Officers of the House of Congress, under the seal of the Senate of Texas by the Secretary of the senate.

Preston Smith,
Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

Attest:

Charles Schnabel,
Secretary of the Senate.

Lennox, S. Dak., Wins in Cleanest Town Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN REIFEL
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, for the third straight year the city of Lennox, S. Dak., has competed successfully with far larger communities in the National Cleanest Town Achievement Awards Contest.

This progressive city of 1,400 citizens in Lincoln County was one of 12 finalists among a total of 155 entries in the contest sponsored annually by the National Cleanup, Fixup, Paintup Bureau. In 1963 it won first place among cities up to 5,000 in population. It was a runner-up in the 1964 contest.

Although Lennox did not win the top award this year, its final standing is a tribute to the progressive, cooperative, and proud citizens of this community. They are proud not only of this award but also of the community in which they live. They demonstrate to all the small towns of this Nation what can be achieved through aggressive, forward-looking leadership.

Much of the credit for this award and past years' awards belongs to the distinguished mayor of Lennox, the Honorable Fred Courey, who already is planning for Lennox's entry in next year's contest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I insert an article appearing in the Lennox Independent, one of South Dakota's most outstanding weekly newspapers, announcing this award in the Appendix of the Record.

Lennox Adds Another Trophy to Collection; Is Third-Year Winner

The accomplishments of this little city in the southeast corner of South Dakota have in recent weeks provided a great deal of publicity for the State and our own community.

National recognition through winning another trophy in the national Cleanup, Paintup, Fixup contest and attendance by Lennox men at the awards presentation in Washington, D.C., resulted in statewide news coverage as well as TV and radio reports emanating from the Capital City.

Among the top two trophy winners in its category, Lennox won in competition with cities of under 25,000 population, for the year around program of civic improvement.

Participation in this national contest itself stems from interest generated more than 20 years ago when local businessmen began sponsoring ads in the Independent urging residents to carry on the annual cleanup campaign.

For as far back as one can remember, however, the people of Lennox have attached a great deal of importance to the "city beautiful" evidenced by public gardens, tree planting, building repair and street improvements, for example.

The entry was one of 12 chosen from the 155 to compete for the Trigg trophy. In 1963, the city of Lennox was awarded first place, and in 1964 received second place in the contest among cities up to 5,000 in population.

Federal Maritime Commission Reports to House Antitrust Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, during the 87th Congress, in House Report No. 1419, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary filed its report on an intensive investigation into antitrust and monopoly problems in the U.S. shipping industry. The subcommittee's report examined in detail a number of practices in the shipping industry that were the source of problems under the shipping statutes, and in addition involved problems in their relationship to policies of our antitrust laws. The subcommittee's report contained recommendations to the Maritime authorities for implementing action that would serve to resolve some of these problems.

On July 10, 1964, the Federal Maritime Commission, through its Chairman, John Harllee, submitted a status report, as of June 16, 1964, of the actions that had been taken to implement the subcommittee's recommendations. On January 7, 1966, Chairman Harllee forwarded a supplemental report, as of December 22, 1965, of additional actions that had been taken by the FMC. These reports, and Admiral Harllee's letter, reflect efforts by the FMC to administer the Shipping Act of 1916 in a fair and effective manner with particular regard for the protection of the public interest.

In order that all the Members of the House may be acquainted with the actions taken by the FMC to implement the recommendations of the House Antitrust Subcommittee, I submit for incorporation in the Record, Chairman Harllee's January 7, 1966, letter, together with the status report of June 16, 1964, and the supplemental report as of December 22, 1965.

Federal Maritime Commission,
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1966.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In furtherance of our responsibility to keep your committee fully informed of those activities of the Commission which affect the functions and interests of the committee, I am forwarding herewith an advance copy of the Annual Report of the Federal Maritime Commission for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1965.

I am also enclosing a supplemental report showing the Commission's further implementation of the recommendations made by the Antitrust Subcommittee on the Judiciary contained in House Report No. 1419, 87th Congress, 2d session, dated March 9, 1962. This report brings up to date the prior report sent you with my letter of July 10, 1964, copy attached for your ready reference.

You can be assured of the Commission's continuing interest in administering the Shipping Act, 1916, in a fair and effective manner, but with particular regard to the protection of the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

John Harllee,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired),
Chairman.

Federal Maritime Commission,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1964.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Federal Maritime Commission feels it appropriate to report at this time on the recommendations of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. Accordingly, the enclosed report reflects the status of all of the recommendations of the subcommittee made in House Report No. 1419, 87th Congress, 2d session, dated March 9, 1962.

The Commission's progress in carrying out the subcommittee's recommendations is reflected in the promulgation of rules, institution of formal proceedings and factfinding investigations, and otherwise conducting activities to achieve the objectives of the recommendations. Some of these proceedings and actions have been completed, while others have been initiated and are in active processing at this time.

The Commission is fully appreciative of the significance of the subcommittee's recommendations to the effective and efficient administration of the regulatory statutes and is resolved to pursue these recommendations to their conclusion.

To this end, I have made them an integral part of the program of the agency instituted on March 9, 1964, a copy of which has been furnished to you. Accordingly, in submitting the enclosed report, I have included in column three, by page reference number to our program plan, those recommendations whose status reflected in column two requires continued attention or implementing action.

In addition to the foregoing, the Commission also desires at this time to advise you as to the disposition of the specific matters involving possible violations of the shipping statutes, which were uncovered by the hearings and activities of the subcommittee during the period 1959 through 1961. These matters, principally covering the activities and practices of common carriers by water in the foreign commerce of the United States and conferences of such carriers, totaled 247 of which 178 were referred by the subcommittee and 69 were selected for action by the Commission on its own initiative after review of the subcommittee's testimony, reports, and files.

The disposition of these matters has received the continuous attention of the Commission, within the capabilities of its limited staff and the enlarged responsibilities placed upon the agency through enactment of Public Law 87-254 and Public Law 87-346 in the fall of 1961. The action taken to date is reported herewith:

(a) Twenty-six matters have been referred to the Department of Justice for prosecution as violations of the shipping statutes.

(b) One hundred and eighty-two matters have been closed by administrative action of the Commission on the basis that they were (1) satisfied by rulemaking proceedings or by agreement of the party or parties to comply with the statutory requirements; (2) not subject to prosecution by the Department of Justice for the recovery of penalties since action was barred by provisions of Federal statutes and no regulatory purpose would be served by further administrative action of the Commission; and (3) determined, after investigation of initial and subsequently developed facts, not to be violations of the statutes or to be insignificant individual problems which have long since been resolved.

(c) Ten matters are the subject of formal proceedings which are now in process.

(d) The remaining 29 matters, upon which substantially all staff work has been completed, are pending the preparation of appropriate memorandums, of disposition which are scheduled for completion by August 1, 1964.

In conclusion you are advised that a number of these matters represented the basis for, and furnished the specific violations necessary for the Commission to conduct formal investigations and hearings and rulemaking proceedings, which resulted in the promulgation of decisions and rules providing not only remedial action with respect to specific violations, but also assuring a more effective administration of the shipping statutes in the future.

In this connection, for example, the Commission (a) instituted an investigation and hearing in the matter of an agreement between the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Robin Line, and others covering the fixing of rates in the South African trade; the decision in this case, decided on April 9, 1962, held that the parties had operated under an unfiled agreement subject to Commission approval under section 15, Shipping Act, 1916, and referred the matter to the Department of Justice for prosecution; (b) instituted an investigation and hearing in the matter of Hohenberg Bros., a shipper, and States Marine Steamship Co.; the decision in this case, decided on October 6, 1961, held that Hohenberg knowingly and willfully by unjust means obtained transportation at less than the applicable tariff rates, and referred the matter to the Department of Justice for prosecution; (c) as a result of a number of matters developed by the subcommittee's activities and newly enacted provisions of law, instituted rulemaking proceedings in a number of areas; e.g., (1) rules governing the admission, withdrawal, and expulsion provisions of steamship conference agreements; (2) rules governing self-policing systems; (3) rules governing the right of independent action in agreements.

I shall be very glad to furnish such supplemental information that may be desired and the Committee can be assured that I will keep them advised of our future progress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN HARLLEE,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired), Chairman.

Status report as of June 16, 1964—Recommendations of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., H.R. 1419

Recommendations	Status
B. THE CONFERENCE SYSTEM (Recommendations appear on pp. 386-388 of the report.)	
RECOMMENDATION 1	
(a) Both the MA and the FMC should make studies and take appropriate steps to resolve problems posed by foreign domination of U.S. waterborne foreign commerce, particularly of conferences engaged in such commerce. (b) Consideration should be given to changes in conference voting procedures.	The Commission instituted on Oct. 22, 1963, Factfinding Investigation No. 6: Investigation Into the Effects of Steamship Conference Organization, Procedure, Rules, Regulations, and Practices. The initial phases of this investigation are well advanced and hearings are scheduled to begin within the next 60 days. These initial phases have included the (a) contacting by correspondence of some 1,300 shippers and exporters and analyzing some 150 responses to determine shippers' problems with, and effect of, conference rates and practices; (b) interviewing some 20 representative shippers (planned interview of some 30 to 40 more shippers was curtailed due to lack of available travel funds); (c) conducting negotiations with Department of Commerce officials relative to the preparation of that agency's appearance and exhibits at the proceeding; (d) finalizing FMC plans as to its rate studies to be introduced at the hearings; and (e) determining methods, techniques and scope of the investigation including the procedure to be followed, areas of investigation to be exhausted and evidence to be introduced.
(c) Consideration should be given to encouragement of a greater number of U.S.-flag lines to operate on essential trade routes so that the American voting bloc would be increased.	Action directed to the Maritime Administration.
(d) Every conference be required to maintain a resident headquarters in the United States with authority to deal with shippers' complaints and information and rate adjustment requests.	This matter will be covered in a proposed rule on "Shippers' Requests and Complaints."
RECOMMENDATION 2	
There should be instituted studies of the overall structure of steamship conferences with a view toward consolidating or separating them so as to insure that services and voting structure will benefit the general public and the steamship industry.	The objective of this recommendation was a consideration in docket 1092. This proceeding involved the approval of a new conference in the Pacific Coast-Latin American trade, replacing 10 existing conferences. The new agreement is divided into 5 trade areas (3 outbound and 2 inbound), and only those carriers who provide service in the particular trade area may vote on rates and practices in that area. Thus, while the new agreement takes place of 10 existing agreements, it creates what amounts to 5 new conferences under a single administrative office. Factfinding investigation No. 6.
RECOMMENDATION 3	
(a) Studies should be directed to determine whether interconference agreements should be prohibited. If permitted should only be sanctioned when not detrimental to the foreign commerce of the United States.	The objectives of this recommendation will be considered in Docket 872: Joint Agreement Between the Member Lines of the Far East Conference and the Pacific Westbound Conference, a formal proceeding before the Commission. Factfinding investigation No. 6.
(b) The practice of having a single individual act as a chairman of a group of conferences should be prohibited.	Factfinding investigation No. 6.
RECOMMENDATION 4	
A thoroughgoing, intensive study of the structure and level of conference rates should be conducted which should: (a) Establish principles concerning elements to be considered in setting rates and judging their fairness. (b) Establish principles for determining impact of rates on domestic economy and export programs. (c) Adjust unfair descrepancies between inbound and outbound rates. (d) Give attention to relationship between rates from United States and rates from other countries to some world markets. (e) Inquire into manner in which ratemaking agreements and other practices discriminate against United States in connection with the transportation of Government-financed commodities.	Docket 1114: Investigation of Iron and Steel Rates Between United States, Europe, Japan, the Philippines, and Australia, instituted on June 3, 1963. Hearings have been held in New York, at which time 14 witnesses were called and San Francisco, where another 14 witnesses were called. Hearings in Washington are planned in early June 1964 at which time we anticipate calling 40 to 50 more witnesses. Orders pursuant to sec. 21, Shipping Act, 1916, served in November 1963 and January 1964 upon 8 outbound and 8 inbound conferences and 30 independent common carriers. In addition, letters requested the outbound conferences and independents adjust rate disparities between inbound and outbound rates on same or similar commodities. On Feb. 20, 1964, the times for response to all orders, except those served on 8 outbound conferences were postponed pending further order of the Commission. The 8 outbound conferences who were required to respond by Mar. 2, 1964, filed suits with the District of

Status report as of June 16, 1964—Recommendations of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., H.R. 1419—Continued

Recommendations	Status
(f) Effect of OCP rates upon geographic distribution of American industry and on American carriers in those trades. NOTE.—This recommendation has a direct relationship to recommendation 4 under the heading of "G. Federal Maritime Board" (see p. 398 of the Celler report). The latter recommendation provides that— The Commission should commence and pursue a general investigation of ocean freight rates for the carriage of principal commodities along the most important foreign trade routes of the United States. The Commission should establish standards and principles and determine, for example, whether any important freight rates are: (a) Unjustly discriminatory between shippers or ports in violation of sec. 17 of 1916 act; (b) Unjustly prejudicial to exporters of the United States vis-a-vis their foreign competitors in violation of sec. 17 of the act; (c) Operating to the detriment of the commerce of the United States in violation of sec. 15 of the act; (d) Unreasonably prejudicial or disadvantageous from the standpoint of any community or locality or class of commodity in violation of sec. 16 first of the act; (e) Discriminatory against American exporters to the extent that they are higher for outbound cargo than for inbound between the same ports in violation of sec. 212(e) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; or (f) Discriminatory as between federally improved ports in the United States and nearby ports in violation of sec. 205 of the 1936 act.	Columbia Circuit Court and the 9th circuit court for review of the Commission orders and for injunctive relief. The courts denied thg applications for injunctive relief. 1 case was dismissed on the Commission's motion and the remaining cases are pending briefs. (2 additional rate disparity cases have been filed for which injunctive relief has not been sought since they relate to the inbound trade.) Factfinding investigation No. 6: Insofar as conference rates are concerned. Factfinding Investigation No. 7: Investigation of Possible Violations of the Shipping Act, 1916, Resulting From Rates on Plywood, instituted on Mar. 24, 1964. Docket 1171: Investigation of Outbound Rates Affecting the Exportation of High-Pressure Boilers (Utility Type), Parts and Related Structural Components, instituted on Mar. 12, 1964. Docket 1155: Investigation of Imposition of Surcharge on Cargo to Manila, Republic of Philippines, instituted on Oct. 23, 1963. Docket 1174: Investigation of Freight Rates on Liquor and Distilled Spirits, North Atlantic-United Kingdom and Baltic Trade, instituted on Mar. 17, 1964. Docket 1083: Investigation To Determine Whether Rates in Hong Kong, U. S. Atlantic, and Gulf Trade Are So Unreasonably Low as To Be Detrimental to the Commerce of the United States, instituted on Dec. 10, 1962. Hearing held in New York on Apr. 21, 1964.
RECOMMENDATION 5	
(a) The FMC should effectively use its powers to prevent and punish conference abuses in their ratemaking power. (b) The FMC should issue regulations and appropriate sanctions spelling out its power to disapprove agreements because of the establishment of rates detrimental to the foreign commerce of the United States.	The objectives of these recommendations will be carried out by the Commission in the conduct of, and decisions rendered in, the formal proceedings, investigations and factfinding investigations covered in this report under recommendation 4 above.
(c) The Commission should closely police the rate filing provisions of law to assure scrupulous adherance to tariffs by conference lines and that tariffs are made available to the public upon request.	Tariff filing rules have been published as proposed rules.
(d) The Commission should prohibit the delegation, without agreement authority, of ratemaking authority to chairman or committees. (e) Study should be made of "emergency rates" to insure that they are not used as a pretext to discriminate.	It is expected that this recommendation will be fully covered in factfinding investigation No. 6. Factfinding Investigation No. 8; Project Rates and Practices Related Thereto, instituted on June 16, 1964, will substantially cover the problem raised in this recommendation insofar as project rates are concerned. However, additional study is being given by the staff to other limited areas of "emergency rates."
RECOMMENDATION 6	
The FMC should clearly and without ambiguity require that all rules, regulations, memorandums, correspondence and minutes that each conference distributes to its members should also be sent to the Commission. (a) Minutes should be maintained fully and accurately, and promptly furnished to the Commission. (b) Minutes should show not only final actions but also matters discussed but not acted upon. (c) Above should also apply to principal's meetings. (d) Minutes should be certified by Chairman as to their accuracy and completeness.	This recommendation is generally followed by the staff in the processing of agreements submitted for Commission approval, insofar as the submission of minutes concerned. In addition proposed rules are being developed and should be published in the Federal Register in the next 30 to 60 days. These rules will cover, essentially, each of the points of this recommendation.
RECOMMENDATION 7	
The FMC should establish general standards for all conference agreements and devise and publish a form containing all minimum requirements for those agreements.	The Commission in the approval of agreements process applies a set of criteria which must be met for particular types of agreements to be approved. Although these criteria and the minimum requirements contained therein have not been published, they have been furnished to specific conferences, as appropriate. In the category of dual rate contracts, the Commission followed the objectives of this recommendation by approving substantially uniform contract provisions with respect to those expressly required by statute; in addition some uniform clauses were approved for optional use by the parties to the contract.
RECOMMENDATION 8	
(a) The FMC should require prompt filing of reports of denials of membership in conference. (b) The Commission should study the extent to which membership fees and security deposits discourage outside lines from participating in conferences. If necessary these should be reduced by order of the Commission.	The Commission on Apr. 21, 1964, approved final rules on the "Admission, Withdrawal and Expulsion Provisions of Steamship Conference Agreements." These rules provide, among other things, for notice to the FMC of admission to, denial of, withdrawal from, and expulsion from conference membership. The rules also, require that "payment of an admission fee, payment of any outstanding financial obligations arising from prior membership, or the posting of a security bond or deposit—be made [in] expressed terms of the conference agreement, filed with and approved by the Commission * * *."
RECOMMENDATION 9	
The FMC should prohibit conferences from regulating the business activities of agents.	Docket 873: Investigation of Steamship Conferences Regarding Travel Agents—Commission held that conferences cannot prevent passenger agents from accepting bookings for nonconference lines. Also, pending docket 1159, in the matter of agreement 14–19 and clause 11 of agreement 14–1, Trans-Pacific Freight Conference (covering restriction on representation of nonconference vessels by member lines or their agents). This recommendation should also be a matter of consideration in factfinding investigation No. 6.
C. DUAL RATE AGREEMENTS	
(Recommendations appear on pp. 390 and 391 of the report.)	
RECOMMENDATION 1	
Additional protection should be given to nonconference operators either by administrative practice or, if need be, by legislation. If steps are not taken administratively to protect independent operators from obliteration, further legislative action should be undertaken to do so.	Recommendations 1 through 4 were considered by the Commission, in its deliberations of, and approval of, dual rate contracts, approved Mar. 30, 1964, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–346, enacted on Oct. 3, 1961. Under the Commission's approved contracts, shippers affiliated with signatory shippers are given greater freedom of choice as to whether or not they will themselves be bound by a dual rate contract or will remain free to ship via independent carriers (they would have had less freedom under the more restrictive form of contract offered by the conferences). This is because the Commission required that certain tests of control be met before affiliates were automatically bound to dual-rate contracts signed by parent or affiliated shippers. Continued evaluation of the dual-rate system will be made by the Commission, based upon experience of carriers, conferences, and shippers under the provisions of the new contracts. If required, the recommendations will be further implemented by issuance of Commission orders or by additional recommendations to the Congress. The Commission on May 7, 1964, reported to you on recommendation 2. This report advised that the Commission in its recent decisions on dual-rate contracts expressly required
RECOMMENDATION 2	
The FMC should study and report to Congress on the desirability of permitting contract shippers to cancel their contracts on 30 days' notice.	
RECOMMENDATION 3	
The FMC should establish minimal standards for dual-rate contracts beyond those set forth in Public Law 87–346 and should devise and publish a basic form contract to be used by all conferences.	

Status report as of June 16, 1964—Recommendations of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., H.R. 1419—Continued

Recommendations	Status
RECOMMENDATION 4 The FMC should make a study of the dual rates established by each conference to insure their reasonableness and nondiscriminatory nature. Special attention should be given to the discriminatory impact of the "spread" and of project and emergency rates.	that all contracts provide for termination by shippers upon 90-day notice; permit cancellation by shippers effective on the date of any rate increase; and that conferences give 90 days' notice of rate increases, except in case of war or other extraordinary conditions. The report further advised that prudence dictates that we gather additional experience from a fair trial of these provisions before recommending to the Congress the amendment of Public Law 87–346 to require that contracts permit cancellation by shippers on 30 days' notice. With reference to recommendation 4, you are advised that factfinding investigation No. 8: Project Rates and Practices Related Thereto instituted on June 16, 1964, will substantially cover the problem raised in this recommendation insofar as project rules are concerned. However, additional study is being given by the staff to other limited areas of "emergency rates."
D. SEC. 15 AND GENTLEMEN'S AGREEMENTS (Recommendations appear on pp. 300 and 301 of the report.)	
RECOMMENDATION 1 (a) Sec. 15 of the 1916 act should be vigorously enforced. (b) The Commission should make every effort to ferret out gentlemen's agreements.	The FMC follows, as a matter of policy, these recommendations with respect to approval and administration of sec. 15 agreements. Further, these recommendations are adhered to in its compliance and enforcement activities, within the limits of available staff, through the review of conference minutes, analysis of tariff filings, resolving of informal complaints, conduct of field investigations and maintenance of surveillance over the practices and activities of conferences and independent carriers.
RECOMMENDATION 2 (a) The FMC should use sec. 15 power broadly. (b) The Commission should consider the history of compliance of steamship lines and conferences with respect to the shipping laws in connection with granting or withholding approval of sec. 15 agreements. Further, this power should be exercised to insure agreement benefits go to the American public and not merely to the maritime industry alone.	The Commission's experience with respect to compliance by steamship lines and conferences with the shipping laws as gained from the formal proceedings, factfinding investigations and other actions enumerated heretofore should be of material assistance in carrying out the objectives of this recommendation and recommendation 1 above.
RECOMMENDATION 3 Department of Justice should prosecute sec. 15 violations irrespective of Commission action.	Recommendation directed to the Department of Justice.
RECOMMENDATION 4 The Department of Justice, the maritime agencies and the appropriate committees of Congress should study if sec. 15 should be broadened to include: (a) Agreements with persons not now subject to the act, viz: railroads, other common carriers, and certain categories of noncommon carriers. (b) Agreements with shippers' associations. (c) Agreements which cover or affect the foreign commerce of the United States generally but do not cover trade emanating from or destined for a port of the United States.	Answers with respect to recommendation 4(a) should be forthcoming from Factfinding Investigations No. 4 and No. 5: Terminal Practices in the North Atlantic Ports and Terminal Practices in South Atlantic Ports as well as a proposed factfinding investigation on OCP rates. No action to date.
E. MALPRACTICES AND SELF-REGULATION (Recommendations appear on pp. 392 and 393 of the report.)	
RECOMMENDATION 1 The FMC should take immediate steps to insure that effective procedural machinery is established by each conference to police violations of conference agreements. "Neutral body" system should be favored.	Rules issued on "self-policing systems" in form of General Order No. 7, dated Aug. 22, 1963, should meet the purpose of this recommendation. The rules provided that conference and other rate-fixing agreements contain a provision describing the method or system used by the parties in policing the obligations under the agreement, including the procedure for handling complaints and the functions and authority of every person having responsibility for administering the system.
RECOMMENDATION 2 Each conference system of self-regulation should require every member make available to the self-regulating agency its files and records.	No action to date. Rules would require modification to accommodate this recommendation.
RECOMMENDATION 3 Each conference self-regulating agency should be required by the FMC to report to it on each formal complaint. The report should include a description of the complaint, the finding of the agency or conference, the penalty imposed, and the state of compliance with the agency's decision.	Rules contain a reporting requirement that does not go as far as this recommendation. The rule provides for (1) reporting to FMC twice a year; and (2) a list of complaints and description of action taken thereon, excluding names of parties.
RECOMMENDATION 4 The FMC should retain the right to review the record of any adjudication by a conference self-regulating agency.	Rules do not set forth this as a requirement. However, the absence of rule does not preclude Commission from exercising jurisdiction and reviewing actions. The Commission will exercise its right of review of records in conducting its compliance checks and investigations of conference activities.
RECOMMENDATION 5 The Commission should make unrelenting independent efforts to uncover malpractices and violations of the shipping statutes—here and abroad.	The Commission, within the limits of available staff, devotes constant efforts to achieve the objective of this recommendation, through the review of conference meetings, analysis of tariff filings, resolving of informal complaints, conduct of field investigations and maintenance of surveillance and practices and activities, conferences, and independent carriers.
RECOMMENDATION 6 The Department of Justice should maintain scrutiny of malpractices and prosecute without delay.	Action directed to the Department of Justice.
F. PRESERVATION OF NONCONFERENCE COMPETITION (Recommendations appear on pp. 395 and 396 of the report.)	
RECOMMENDATION 1 The Commission should maintain extreme vigilance in its enforcement of secs. 14, 15, 16, 17, and 20 of the 1916 act, so as to insure that conferences by unlawful and predatory devices eliminate independent competition.	Within available staff, the FMC has increased its efforts to effectuate this recommendation through its increased surveillance activities, institution of formal investigations and hearings, factfinding investigations, and issuance of sec. 21 orders.
RECOMMENDATION 2 The Maritime Administration should administer the operating subsidy provisions of law so as to avoid discriminating against American-flag independent competition.	Action directed to the Maritime Administration.

Status report as of June 16, 1964—Recommendations of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., H.R. 1419—Continued

Recommendations	Status
RECOMMENDATION 3 The Commission should guard against efforts to make dual-rate systems so predatory in their operations that they eliminate all independent competition.	The Commission will in factfinding investigation No. 6 determine the effect of rate-fixing authority and practices of conferences upon independent competition and the foreign commerce of the United States. In docket No. 1109, the Commission for the first time approved a dual-rate contract for a single independent carrier, the Turkish Cargo Line. The approval of such contract for an independent carrier was not possible prior to enactment of Public Law 87-346. Also, recommendation was considered in the approval of dual-rate contracts pursuant to Public Law 87-346.
RECOMMENDATION 4 Maritime agencies should use their powers of regulation to encourage independent U.S.-flag and American-owned independents, and where their powers prove inadequate to do so, they should recommend appropriate legislation to protect the independents and to safeguard the interests of the American public.	The Commission follows this objective in its administration of the regulatory statutes. At such time as additional legislation is required appropriate recommendations will be made to the Congress. Also, the matter of independent operators will be of vital consideration in the pending factfinding investigation No. 6 and docket No. 1083.
G. THE FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD (Recommendations appear on pp. 397–399 of the report.)	
RECOMMENDATION 1 The Commission should establish both administrative procedures and internal regulations to underscore the need for devotion to the general public interest, objectivity, independence, efficiency, and sympathetic attention toward shippers' complaints on the part of all Commission personnel.	Docket No. 1156: Proposed Rule on Shippers' Requests and Complaints, published on Nov. 1, 1963, provides that the Commission shall disapprove any agreement after notice and hearing on a finding of failure or refusal to adopt and maintain reasonable procedures for prompt and fairly hearing and considering shippers' requests and complaints. The proposed rules further provide that each conference and other body with rate-fixing authority shall (1) file a statement with the Commission, outlining in detail, its procedure for handling shippers' requests and complaints; (2) submit reports of requests and complaints received, identity of request, disposition and if denied, reason for denial; (3) designate a resident agent (applicable to conferences and other bodies under approved agreements domiciled outside the United States) in the United States with whom shippers may lodge their requests and complaints; such agent shall maintain records of requests and complaints and disposition thereof filed with him; (4) include in their tariffs a provision where and by what method shippers may file their requests and complaints. On Dec. 15, 1963, Commission directed requests to conferences for the voluntary submission of comprehensive reports of requests and complaints received by them during period July 1, 1963, through Dec. 15, 1963. The Commission also issued sec. 21 orders on Jan. 2, 1964. 4 actions were filed with the courts by conferences upon whom orders were served; injunctive relief has not been granted by the courts and the cases are now pending briefs.
RECOMMENDATION 2 Appointment of members to the new Commission should be made with care. The staff of the Commission should be augmented by fully qualified personnel.	The Commission follows this recommendation.
RECOMMENDATION 3 The Commission should simplify the procedure for entertaining informal complaints. This should permit the Commission to informally correct misunderstandings and minor infractions without delay or prohibitive cost.	Informal complaint procedure has been streamlined. Delegation of additional responsibilities to district manager for the handling of informal complaints has been approved, which will resolve misunderstanding and minor infractions quickly and at a minimum of cost.
RECOMMENDATION 4 The Commission should commence and pursue a general investigation of ocean freight rates.	Covered in this report under recommendations B1, B2, and B3.
RECOMMENDATION 5 The Commission should exercise detailed and continuing supervision of steamship conferences.	The report indicates that specifics in this regard are covered in other recommendations of this report. The only additional point made was that the Commission should insure that its regulatory activities do not discriminatorily fall more heavily on American-flag lines than upon foreign lines. This point is recognized by the Commission in the day-to-day carrying out of its mission.
RECOMMENDATION 6 (a) The Commission should review all pooling agreements and other sec. 15 agreements to determine if they are active. Inactive agreements should be formally terminated. (b) Participants to all active agreements other than conference agreements should be required to file periodic reports showing tonnages pooled or otherwise affected, revenues earned and distributed, sailing schedules adapted, etc. The Commission should not permit such agreements to be employed by foreign lines to coerce American lines.	Action will be taken as to the review of agreements to determine if they are active and to terminate inactive agreements within the next 60 days. The undertaking of this project has been delayed because our limited staff has been required to devote its efforts to the processing of the increased number of agreements filed for Commission approval under Public Law 87-346. No rulemaking action instituted to date requiring periodic reports. However, the Commission requires that new pooling agreements, as a condition of approval, have a provision for the filing of annual reports.
RECOMMENDATION 7 To aid shippers and carriers to understand the Commission's policies and rulings, the Commission should publish in bound form all past decisions of the Commission and its predecessor agencies.	Vols. 3, 4, 5, and 6 have been delivered to the Government Printing Office; vol. 3 was printed and bound on June 26, 1963, vol. 4 was printed and bound on Oct. 25, 1963, and vol. 5 was printed and bound on Apr. 16, 1964. Vol. 6 has been forwarded to the GPO and should be printed and bound by June 15, 1964. Vols. 3 through 6 will cover decisions from 1948 through Aug. 11, 1961, at which time the Federal Maritime Board was abolished. The completion of this project would have been realized by the printing and binding of vol. 7 of the decisions of the FMC covering the period Aug. 12, 1961 to Jan. 1, 1964. This printing which was scheduled for early in fiscal year 1965, will have to be indefinitely delayed, unless the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate/House conferees restored the House Appropriations Committee reduction in our budget request for the fiscal year.
RECOMMENDATION 8 Consideration should be given to amend the Shipping Act as to— (a) Secs. 14, 15, and 16 should be amended to provide for penalties against conferences, conference chairmen, and officers and agents of conferences and carriers. (b) The Commission's power to obtain books and records and other information should be clarified so that the Commission has the right to obtain such records and information wherever located for preliminary investigation as well as for formal proceedings. (c) The Commission should be given power to suspend rates in the foreign commerce wherever there is substantial reason to believe that the rates are so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States.	This recommendation will be carefully considered by the Commission and the need for additional legislation and/or authority will be determined by the experience acquired through the formal proceedings, factfinding investigations, and other actions instituted, as covered heretofore in this report.

Supplemental report as of Dec. 22, 1965—Recommendations of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., H.R. 1419

Recommendations	Status
B. The Conference System (Recommendations appear on pp. 386–388 of the report.)	
RECOMMENDATION 1 (a) Both the MA and the FMC should make studies and take appropriate steps to resolve problems posed by foreign domination of U.S. waterborne foreign commerce, particularly of conferences engaged in such commerce. (b) Consideration should be given to changes in conference voting procedures.	The Commission instituted factfinding investigation No. 6 into the effects of steamship conference organization, procedure, rules, regulations, and practices upon the foreign commerce of the United States as shown in our previous report dated June 16, 1964. Hearings to receive shipper testimony regarding the desirability of the conference system have been held in New York, New Orleans, Chicago, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. An interim report was issued under date of May 25, 1965, which is primarily concerned with steps the Commission can now take to assist shippers, carriers, and conferences to deal with freight rate problems. Additional hearings have been and will be held dealing with conference voting procedures and the extent of any foreign domination of U.S. waterborne commerce.
(d) Every conference be required to maintain a resident headquarters in the United States with authority to deal with shippers' complaints and information and rate adjustment requests.	All ratemaking groups are now required by the Commission's General Order No. 14, which became effective July 9, 1965, to appoint resident representatives with whom shippers located in the United States may lodge their requests and complaints.
RECOMMENDATION 3 (a) Studies should be directed to determine whether interconference agreements should be prohibited. If permitted should only be sanctioned when not detrimental to the foreign commerce of the United States.	The objectives of this recommendation were considered in Docket 872: Joint Agreement Between the Member Lines of the Far East Conference and the Pacific Westbound Conference. A report of the Commission was issued July 28, 1965. Petitions for reopening and clarification were denied by the Commission on Nov. 1, 1965. The Commission found that supplementary agreements between the members of these conferences affecting rates, concurrence procedures, and other matters were held to constitute unapproved agreements which are required to be filed with the Commission for approval pursuant to sec. 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and ordered the parties to cease and desist from carrying out such agreements until filed with and approved by the Commission. The Commission concluded that it could not guarantee reapproval of the joint agreement if the various supplementary agreements are filed for approval, as the scope, contents, and procedures carried out under these agreements are uncertain. At the same time the Commission concluded that there is insufficient evidence in the record on which to base disapproval of the joint agreement.
RECOMMENDATION 4 A thoroughgoing, intensive study of the structure and level of conference rates should be conducted which should: (a) Establish principles concerning elements to be considered in setting rates and judging their fairness. (b) Establish principles for determining impact of rates on domestic economy and export. (c) Adjust unfair discrepancies between inbound and outbound rates (d) Give attention to relationship between rates from United States and rates from other countries to some world markets. (e) Inquire into manner in which ratemaking agreements and other practices discriminate against United States in connection with the transportation of Government-financed commodities. (f) Effect of OCP rates upon geographic distribution of American industry and on American carriers in those trades. Note.—This recommendation has a direct relationship to recommendation 4 under the heading of "G. Federal Maritime Board" (see p. 308 of the Celler report). The latter recommendation provides that: The Commission should commence and pursue a general investigation of ocean freight rates for the carriage of principal commodities along the most important foreign trade routes of the United States. The Commission should establish standards and principles and determine, for example, whether any important freight rates are: (a) Unjustly discriminatory between shippers or ports in violation of sec. 17 of 1916 act; (b) Unjustly prejudicial to exporters of the United States vis a vis their foreign competitors in violation of sec. 17 of the act; (c) Operating to the detriment of the commerce of the United States in violation of sec. 15 of the act; (d) Unreasonably prejudicial or disadvantageous from the standpoint of any community or locality or class of commodity in violation of sec. 16 first of the act; (e) Discriminatory against American exporters to the extent that they are higher for outbound cargo than for inbound between the same ports in violation of sec. 212(e) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; or (f) Discriminatory as between federally improved ports in the United States and nearby ports in violation of sec. 205 of the 1936 act.	The Commission's investigation of iron and steel rates between the United States and Europe, Japan, the Philippines, and Australia in docket 1114, referred to in our previous report, has been concluded and the report therein served Dec. 6, 1965. While the rates in question were found not to be unlawful, the Commission held that "under sec. 18(b)(5) [of the Shipping Act, 1916,] when a rate disparity in reciprocal trades, in similar commodities appears, and when movement of goods under the higher rates has been impaired the carrier quoting the rates must demonstrate that the disparate rates are reasonable." Other steps taken by the Commissionin connection with this recommendation are indicated below: Docket 65–45: Investigation of Ocean Rate Structures in the Trade Between United States North Atlantic Ports and Ports in the United Kingdom and Eire, North Atlantic United Kingdom Freight Conference, Agreement 7100, and North Atlantic Westbound Freight Association, Agreement 5850, was undertaken Dec. 9, 1965, on the basis of studies and analysis of information that the rate structure in the outbound U.S. trades were higher than the inbound rate structure in the same trade as contained in tariffs filed by the aforesaid ratemaking groups. Among other things, the Commission will determine whether any of the rates covered should be disapproved and whether any recommendation should be made to Congress to correct any discriminatory rates, charges, classifications, and practices pursuant to sec. 212(e) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Similar studies are in progress to determine whether formal investigation in other worldwide trades is warranted. Factfinding investigation No. 6 insofar as conference rates are concerned. Factfinding Investigation No. 7: Investigation of Possible Violations of the Shipping Act, 1916, Resulting from Rates on Plywood was instituted on Mar. 24, 1964, to develop information regarding these rates and their impact on the commerce of the United States. Following the institution of this investigation the plywood interests informed the Commission that they were negotiating directly with the steamship conferences for lower rates and requested the Commission to hold its investigation in abeyance. In view of this request the Commission has withheld its investigation pending the outcome of the industry rate negotiations. Docket 1171: Investigation of Outbound Rates Affecting the Exportation of High Pressure Boilers (Utility Type), Parts and Related Structural Components, instituted on Mar. 12, 1964. This investigation was instituted to determine whether the rates of the Far East Conference, the River Plate and Brazil Conference and the India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma Conference, on high pressure boilders, parts and related structural components should be disapproved or altered by the Commission. Hearings were held before a hearing examiner of the Commission, and the examiner's decision in the matter was served on June 29, 1965. Oral argument before the Commission was concluded on Oct. 7, 1965, and the matter is now pending decision by the Commission. Docket 1155: Investigation of Imposition of Surcharge on Cargo to Manila, Republic of Philippines, instituted on Oct. 23, 1963. The Commission instituted this investigation on its own motion to determine the lawfulness of surcharges on cargo moving from ports in the United States to Manila, Republic of the Philippines, under secs. 15, 16, 17, and 18(b)(5) of the Shipping Act, 1916. Respondents were Pacific Westbound Conference, Far East Conference, Hawaii Orient Rate Agreement, Pacific Star Line, Compagnie Maritime des Chargeurs Reunis, and Pacific Navigation System, Inc. The Commission found that with the exception of newsprint out of Searsport, Maine, surcharges imposed by the respondents on cargo from the United States to Manila were found not be be in violation of the Shipping Act, 1916. It was also found that respondents Maersk Line and Pacific Star Line, by imposing a surcharge on newsprint at Searsport, Maine, while they did not apply a surcharge at St. John, New Brunswick, Canada, have demanded, charged and collected a charge which was unjustly discriminatory between shippers and ports and unjustly prejudicial to exporters of the United States as compared with their foreign competitors contrary to sec. 17 of the Shipping Act, 1916. On Feb. 3, 1965, the Commission ordered elimination of this prejudice and discrimination. Pacific Star had canceled the objectionable surcharge prior to the issuance of the Commission's order. Maersk Line, a member of the Far East Conference, could not obtain exemption from the conference requirement to assess the surcharge. The Commission moved to have its order enforced by the court, but the court declined. The Commission again pursued the matter by issuing order to the Far East Conference under its docket 65–29, served Aug. 11, 1965, to show cause why Searsport should not be removed from the trading range of the conference agreement. But, the court has acted to stay the order pending hearing of the matter on its merits. The matter is now pending such hearing. Docket 1174: Investigation of Freight Rates on Liquor and Distilled Spirits, North Atlantic-United Kindom and Baltic Trade, instituted on Mar. 17, 1964. Prior to hearings in the matter, the North Atlantic-United Kingdom Freight Conference and the North Atlantic Westbound Freight Association so adjusted their rates as to remove any basis for investigating said rates. *By order of the Commission dated Apr. 9, 1964, the proceeding was dismissed as* to said conferences and carriers.

Supplemental report as of Dec. 22, 1965—Recommendations of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., H.R. 1419—Continued

Recommendations	Status
	Respondent independent carriers (States Marine Lines, Inc., Global Bulk Transport, Inc., and Isthmian Lines, Inc.) also adjusted their rates so as to remove any basis for continuing the investigation with respect to them. By order of the Commission dated May 26, 1964, the proceeding was dismissed as to said carriers. Later, the North Atlantic Baltic Freight Conference and the Scandinavian Baltic/U.S. North Atlantic Westbound Freight Conference so adjusted their rates as to remove any basis for continuing the investigation. Since all other respondents to this proceeding had been previously dismissed, this proceeding was discontinued pursuant to notice served July 17, 1964. Docket 1083: Investigation to Determine Whether Rates in Hong Kong/U.S. Atlantic and Gulf Trade are so Unreasonably Low as To Be Detrimental to the Commerce of the United States, instituted on Dec. 10, 1962. Hearings before an examiner of the Commission were held to determine whether any rate in this trade is so unreasonably low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States in violation of sec. 18(b)(5) of the Shipping Act, 1916. The subpena authority of the Commission was challenged by respondents and the matter is now pending the outcome of an appeal in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.
RECOMMENDATION 5 (c) The Commission should closely police the rate filing provisions of law to assure scrupulous adherence to tariffs by conference lines and that tariffs are made available to the public upon request.	On May 27, 1965, the Commission published in the Federal Register General Order No. 13 setting forth final rules governing the filing of tariffs by common carriers by water and by conferences of such carriers in the foreign commerce of the United States. These rules became effective July 1, 1965. On or after Jan. 1, 1966, all tariffs and amendments thereto must in all respect conform with the requirements of General Order No. 13.
(e) Study should be made of "emergency rates" to insure that they are not used as pretext to discriminate.	Factfinding Investigation No. 8: Project Rates and Practices Related Thereto was instituted on June 16, 1964. The report of the investigating officer was made on May 24, 1965. This report does not conclude that the use of project rates is detrimental to the commerce of the United States or contrary to the provisions of the Shipping Act. However, the report concluded that additional study by the Commission's staff may be desirable to consider the adoption of proposed standard rules governing the establishment of such rates in order to maintain surveillance over the present practices related to project rates and to resolve the possibility of any discrimination and preference between shippers.
RECOMMENDATION 6 The FMC should clearly and without ambiguity require that all rules, regulations, memoranda, correspondence and minutes that each conference distributes to its members should also be sent to the Commission. (a) Minutes should be maintained fully and accurately, and promptly furnished to the Commission. (b) Minutes should show not only final actions but also matters discussed but not acted upon. (c) Above should also apply to principal's meetings. (d) Minutes should be certified by Chairman as to their accuracy and completeness.	This recommendation is fully covered by a pending rulemaking proceeding in docket 1194. Proposed rules published in the Federal Register Aug. 6, 1964, elicited comments from more than 100 parties. Oral argument on the proposed rules was had on Oct. 20, 1965. On the basis of the filed comments and the oral argument, final rules are now being prepared for publication in early 1966.
RECOMMENDATION 7 The FMC should establish general standards for all conference agreements and devise and publish a form containing all minimum requirements for those agreements.	This recommendation is now being implemented by the preparation of a proposed rulemaking proceeding. The proposed rules will set guidelines and standards for the filing, format, and control of all agreements, including conference agreements. It will also contain various forms of agreements which will assure as much uniformity as possible and will permit speedy consideration by the Commission and its staff.
RECOMMENDATION 9 The FMC should prohibit conferences from regulating the business activities of agents.	In docket 873, decided Feb. 19, 1964, the Commission found that conferences cannot prevent passenger agents from acting as agents for nonconference lines when they are also agents for conference lines. On appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the court, in *Swedish-American Line, et al.* v. *Federal Maritime Commission*, 351 F. 2d 756, remanded the case to the Commission with directions "that either an adequately supported ultimate finding be made which warrants disapproval under the statute, or if no such finding can be made on the record, that the tying rule be approved as directed by 46 U.S.C. 814." Further action by the Commission is now beign studied.
C. DUAL RATE AGREEMENTS (Recommendations appear on pp. 390 and 311 of the report.)	
RECOMMENDATION 1 Additional protection should be given to nonconference operators either by administrative practice or, if need be, by legislation. If steps are not taken administratively to protect independent operators from obliteration, further legislative action should be undertaken to do so.	In considering new dual-rate systems and in reviewing approved systems, the Commission gives serious consideration to the impact of such systems on the independent carriers in the trade. We have already approved a dual-rate system for 1 independent and are presently considering the application of another.
RECOMMENDATION 3 The FMC should establish minimal standards for dual-rate contracts beyond those set forth in Public Law 87-346 and should devise and publish a basic form contract to be used by all conferences.	Also, it is anticipated that a final rule, setting forth guidelines, standards, and criteria for dual-rate contracts, with approved forms of contracts, will be published early in 1966. This project is being handled as a priority item.
G. THE FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD (Recommendations appear on pp. 397-399 of the report.)	
RECOMMENDATION 1 The Commission should establish both administrative procedures and internal regulations to underscore the need for devotion to the general public interest, objectivity, independence, efficiency and sympathetic attention toward shippers' complaints on the part of all Commission personnel.	On June 18, 1965, the Commission issued its General Order No. 14 covering the rules on shippers' requests and complaints. The rules provide that each conference and other body with rate-fixing authority shall (1) file a statement with the Commission, outlining in detail, its procedure for handling shippers, requests and complaints; (2) submit reports of requests and complaints received, identify or request disposition, and if denied, reason for denial; (3) designate a resident agent (applicable to conferences and other bodies under approved agreements domiciled outside the United States) in the United States with whom shippers may lodge their requests and complaints; such agent shall maintain records of requests and complaints and disposition thereof filed with him; (4) included in their tariffs a provision where and by what method shippers may file their requests and complaints. The rules have not been in effect long enough for the Commission to evaluate their efficacy.
RECOMMENDATION 6 (a) The Commission should review all pooling agreements and other sec. 15 agreements to determine if they are active. Inactive agreements should be formally terminated.	A thorough review of all agreements, beginning with No. 1 has been completed. It has been determined that all inactive agreements, other than a few, have been terminated. The few remaining are under study to determine whether or not they may also be terminated. Our current records can now account for every approved agreement.
RECOMMENDATION 7 To aid shippers and carriers to understand the Commission's policies and rulings, the Commission should publish in bound form all past decisions of the Commission and its predecessor agencies.	In addition to the information previously reported regarding publication of the Commission's decisions, vol. 7 covering the period September 1961 to February 1964 was published in November 1965. Additional volumes will be published as the need arises.

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received President's message on transportation.

Senate passed bill on Asian Development Bank and took up tax adjustment bill.

House passed judgeship bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 4433–4483

Bills Introduced: 12 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3001–3012; and S. Res. 231.

Pages 4439–4440

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 12752, proposed Tax Adjustment Act, with amendments (S. Rept. 1010);

S.J. Res. 18, requesting the President to designate the fourth week in April of each year as Youth Temperance Education Week (S. Rept. 1011);

S.J. Res. 133, designating February of each year as American History Month (S. Rept. 1012);

S. 1923, to amend the Bankruptcy Act so as to give the court supervisory power over all fees paid from whatever source (S. Rept. 1013);

S. 2177, 153, 1960, H.R. 3076, 5530, 5973, 7667, 10338, S. 1661, 2356, 1213, 2265, 2307, 2696, H.R. 1484, 1918, 2627, 3236, 4928, 4995, 5231, S. 146, 926, H.R. 2752, 2938, 2939, 3875, 4743, 6112, 9442, 10403, and S. 1375, private bills (S. Repts. 1014–1045);

S. 2153, authorizing payment of medical expenses of certain employees disabled from injury or illness not attributable to official work (S. Rept. 1046); and

S.J. Res. 103, proposing an amendment to the Constitution preserving to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof, without recommendation (S. Rept. 1047). **Page 4439**

Bill Referred: One House-passed bill was referred to Committee on the Judiciary. **Page 4433**

President's Message—Transportation: President transmitted his legislative recommendations respecting transportation and traffic safety and proposing the consolidation of certain agencies and functions in a Department of Transportation at Cabinet level—referred jointly to Committees on Government Operations and Commerce. **Pages 4434–4439**

Nevada Test Site—Employees: Committee on Government Operations was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 10722, authorizing payment of allowance to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site, and was then passed, after being amended by substituting for its text the amended language of S. 2271, companion bill, which had first been amended by adoption of its committee amendments, and an amendment by Senator Cannon to substitute certain language for the provision in the bill providing for the effective date of the provisions in the legislation. **Pages 4451–4453**

Gratuity: S. Res. 229, providing for payment of gratuity to survivor of a deceased Senate employee, was adopted.

Page 4466

Asian Development Bank: Senate passed without amendment and cleared for President H.R. 12563, providing for U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank. **Pages 4483–4491**

Taxation: Senate made its unfinished business H.R. 12752, proposed Tax Adjustment Act. **Pages 4493, 4505**

Taxation: H.R. 9883, to provide that undistributed taxable income made within 2½ months after close of taxable year to shareholders of certain small business corporations shall be considered to have been made before close of the taxable year, was passed with committee amendments and a Mansfield amendment providing that amendments shall not apply to sales or exchanges occurring before February 24, 1966. **Pages 4596–4603**

Tariff: Senate passed with committee amendments H.R. 6568, to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm kernels, and the oil crushed therefrom. Also adopted was a Mansfield amendment of a technical nature.

Pages 4603–4605

Nominations: Three civilian nominations were received. **Page 4605**

Appendix

D. Hiden Ramsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1966, North Carolina lost one of its most distinguished and valuable citizens, Mr. D. Hiden Ramsey, of Asheville. His death at 74 marked the end of the career of a scholar, a writer, an educator—a leader of men. A gifted speaker, his choice of words reminded one of Adlai Stevenson or Churchill.

D. Hiden Ramsey was a man whose advice I personally sought and found reliable. I respected his judgment and frequently quoted him. He was as eloquent in life as in his speeches and editorials. He loved young people and much of North Carolina's public school system and programs of higher education are monuments to his efforts and accomplishments.

Following are three of many editorials which have been written in tribute to Mr. Ramsey. The first two appeared in The Asheville Citizen-Times, Asheville, N.C., and the third in the Waynesville Mountaineer, Waynesville, N.C.:

Toll the Bell Gently—For a Man

All the words have been said, the tributes paid, the tears shed, the story ended.

For a time there will be an emptiness.

Hiden Ramsey walked tall in this town and through these hills and over this State—taller than he knew—and his path is marked in the memory of men he inspired and those he befriended.

He was in the classic sense a scholar, a perfectionist, a realist. His convictions were not lightly held nor easily altered. But he was, above all, a man of warmth, of strength, of human understanding.

And so a life runs out—a useful life, a purposeful life—and the rest is epilog * * * the woods, the hills, the trees, the written record.

Hiden Ramsey leaves to the living a world he helped enrich.

[From the Ashville (N.C.) Citizen]

D. Hiden Ramsey—Builder of the State

D. Hiden Ramsey was an extraordinary man. Born in Virginia, he came to Asheville as a boy and grew up here. He loved western North Carolina and throughout his life he devoted his energy and his great talents to the welfare of the people of the mountains.

His interest and abilities were many. Hiden Ramsey was a real orator. He had a brilliant mind combined with sound judgment. He had a fine sense of humor and was always "good company."

Hiden Ramsey loved books and had a deep interest in North Carolina history. He knew the wildflowers, the plants and the birds of the mountain region well.

As vice president and general manager of the Asheville Citizen-Times for many years he contributed much to the growth of the newspapers and to the lives of his fellow employees.

Hiden Ramsey's supreme interest was the education of the boys and girls of North Carolina. For this he labored long and steadfastly as chairman of the Board of Trustees of Western Carolina College, as a member of the State board of education, as first chairman of the North Carolina Board of Higher Education and as an active participant in the work of the Buncombe County Citizens Committee for Better Schools.

In his retirement Hiden Ramsey gave a remarkable series of lectures on North Carolina history at Asheville-Biltmore College. He also developed the plan for recruiting personnel for the health field which is known as "Health Careers for North Carolina." He was chairman of the Scholarship Committee of the McClure Fund at the time of his death.

Hiden Ramsey's splendid life is a clear call to all who knew him to put public service ahead of selfish interest. He always did.

[From the Waynesville (N.C.) Mountaineer, Feb. 21, 1966]

Hiden Ramsey a True Friend of Young People

Yesterday, an influential man, whose works of a lifetime will live for centuries through all North Carolina, was buried. D. Hiden Ramsey, leader in education and newspaper work of the State for many years, passed away Friday at 74. The late Asheville editor was an influential leader for those things which have helped make North Carolina what it is today.

Several months ago it was fitting that a library at Asheville-Biltmore College be named for him.

We first met and became associated with Mr. Ramsey back in 1931.

We, like all others, soon found this man had many fine qualities. Although he will go down in the pages of history of the State as a great advocate of education, and certainly an excellent newspaperman, we soon learned to look upon him in another role—one which is not too often mentioned when his name is brought up.

He was genuinely interested in young people, and their problems—problems beyond the educational field.

We fondly recall when he met with a group of young publishers during the days of 1931–32, and discussed with them the economics of newspapers. At that time there was a governmental agency which made loans to small businesses—quite a complicated procedure, wrapped in the usual redtape.

Some businesses readily requested and accepted the money. Others stood in awe, wondering about the future, and what involvement the "easy loan" would have on the given business.

Mr. Ramsey, in his eloquent manner, told the small group of fellow newspapermen in effect, "you will be better off to make it on your own—sacrifice, and work hard—rather than go for what appears to be manna from the treasury."

The advice went home. It made a profound impression.

Upon hearing of the death of this truly friend of young people, the incident came to mind. Then we began to think of those who attended that meeting and heard Mr. Ramsey's words of wisdom. Each one in that conference took the advise, except one. He followed what appeared to be the easy road, and in lieu of following the formula of working hard and sacrificing, he lived and operated his business on what appeared to be a feather bed of ease.

The only man in the group failing to weather the "depression storm" was the man who refused to take Mr. Ramsey's advice. The others came through with their business intact, and have gone on to expand many, many times over.

Mr. Ramsey's work and influence was not buried yesterday—it will live on, along with the memory of other great Tarheels.—W.C.R.

Leave France to Her Fate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the Tallahassee, Fla., Democrat, of Tuesday, February 22, 1966, was an editorial entitled "Leave France to Her Fate" which I find most thought provoking. I do not see how we of the United States can take lightly the poignant remarks recently made by Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

Apparently, as is stated in the editorial, "the old man's memory is dull" when all that this Nation has given is seemingly going to be unrequited; however, this we are already experiencing. The editorial is a commendable one and I believe it merits the attention of all the Members of Congress:

Leave France to Her Fate

French President Charles de Gaulle says any foreign troops which remain in France as part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization defense after April 4, 1969, must be under French command.

He doesn't like NATO. He doesn't like the fact that it is not commanded by a Frenchman; namely, De Gaulle. He seems to be especially irked that the NATO force is commanded by an officer of the U.S. Army.

"It is the will of France to dispose of her own fate," he told a thousand news reporters at a grand press conference yesterday.

OK. It will suit most Americans if our troops are pulled back from France. We have enough to do policing the rest of the world. NATO conceivably could get along without France despite its strategic position on the European continent.

But thinking back over the men we've lost, the money we've spent, and the trouble we've entangled ourselves in during the past 50 years on behalf of France, we sort of wish it had "been the will of France to dispose of its own fate" in 1917 and again in 1941.

If we hadn't rescued it from its fate in World War I, there would have been no France, and no General de Gaulle to lead the Free French force we financed, outfitted, and helped train in exile to join our men in storming the beaches of Normandy to rescue France in World War II.

The old man's memory is dull, his illusions lofty.

Statement Concerning H.R. 11322

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM GIBBONS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings on H.R. 11322, the Child Development Act, which the General Subcommittee on Education held on October 19 and 20, 1965, Miss Cornelia Goldsmith, executive director of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, testified in support of this legislation.

For some unknown reason, her written statement was not included in the record of the hearings as it should have been. I consider her remarks to be of such great value that I insert it in the RECORD in order to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT CONCERNING H.R. 11322, OCTOBER 20, 1965, ROOM 2257, RAYBURN BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Cornelia Goldsmith, executive director of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (formerly the NANE))

As a lifelong educator of young children under 9 years of age, and of teachers of such young children, I would like to commend Congressman GIBBONS, and Congressman PERKINS as well as the members of the Education and Labor Committee for their genuine and obvious concern for the young children of our country, for the content of the bill itself, for its timeliness and for this opportunity to present the views of the NAEYC at a scheduled hearing.

The stated purpose of NAEYC covering the nursery, kindergarten, and primary years, is to provide a medium for the development and advancement of sound group programs focused on the good education and well-being of all young children. We view these early years which are the entire focus of our association's work, as a psychological as well as educational entity or sequence. These early years require a consistency and continuity of development in regard to conceptual development, experiences, relationships with others (both with peers and with adults), the acquiring of a positive attitude toward one's self as well as toward others and toward one's achievements. This developmental sequence is essential preparation for the more organized school-life to follow. It is recognized today that these early years are the crucial key years in the development of all persons.

(See the attached statement of NAEYC's purposes and goals.)

The membership of NAEYC is open to all who are professionally or otherwise concerned with the broadly conceived educational needs of all young children and to promoting coordination and cooperation between public and nonpublic agencies, between the professions and between the national associations, toward this end.

Opening opportunities for skilled help from a child development specialist to both public and nonpublic school children, is highly commendable. In itself, this establishes a most important fact in the minds of the public: the Federal Government has genuine concern for all young children, regardless of race, religion, poverty, or wealth, whether or not a mother is ill or working, and regardless of the auspices under which children are being educated.

H.R. 11322, the Elementary and Preschool Child Development Act, is in accord with the basic principles and goals of our organization.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children is gratified to find in this bill:

A recognition of the fact that the young child and his parents are inseparable.

An emphasis on the importance of involving parents through joint efforts to help them find early solutions to their child rearing problems.

The needed stimulant toward developing coordination in the use of appropriate community resources.

An emphasis on an early preventive approach rather than on waiting for evidence of serious trouble before a costly and too often hopeless cure is attempted.

A recognition of the fact that Project Headstart and the community action program of the Office of Economic Opportuntiy have shown the readiness of the public to support programs for the young children of poverty families. This is being followed by increasing expressions of concern to have such programs available to all children and on a year-round basis. The young so-called preschool child is rapidly becoming a school-child.

The realization that an experienced and qualified child development specialist in close cooperation with the teacher who lives day by day with her group of youngsters, and in close cooperation with the parents of these same children, will be identifying not only the latent weaknesses and trouble spots, but also the potential strengths and assets that must be developed.

Relieving overburdened teachers and deeping their awareness will stimulate and encourage young people and experienced older people to prepare themselves for the new and challenging career of child development specialist. This will engender a new morale throughout the schools.

It is hoped that as the leaven of this bill begins to work, ways and means will be found to reduce class size for all young children to not more than 15 or 20 children. This in itself would transform the entire system of education throughout the country. The next legislative steps might then be taken to require all teachers of young children to become child development specialists.

The tremendous potential of our vast young child population might then be more fully realized. They are our greatest national resource. It has become patently clear that as a nation we are always able and willing to pay for what we value most.

The time is unquestionably ripe for the leaven which H.R. 11322 will provide. The NAEYC with its rapidly growing membership of 5,000, will stand ready, able, and willing to aid and support this bill in every way possible.

PURPOSES AND GOALS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN

The purpose of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (nursery, kindergarten, primary) is to provide a medium for the development and advancement of sound group programs, focused on the well-being of young children through their first 8 years. This was the stated goal of the National Association for Nursery Education when it was organized in 1931. Today's concept of early childhood education includes the nursery, kindergarten, and primary years as a psychological entity requiring consistency in the child's development of concepts, relationships, and positive attitudes toward himself and his achievements. This is essential preparation for the more organized school life to follow. It is recognized that these early years are crucial, key years in the development of all persons.

The National Association of the Education of Young Children is the only national group concerned solely with the education of young children, wherever they may be, in group situations. Its publications and activities fill a need not being met by any other group. The association makes every effort, within the capabilities of its resources, to cooperate with other kindred organizations.

The association has members in Australia, Bermuda, Canada, England, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, and Wales, as well as in all of our 50 States. There are library subscriptions in the above and others as well. The biennial conferences are always attended by visitors and members from many foreign countries. From 1966 on, such national conferences will be held annually.

As of October 1964 the name of the association was changed to the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Reflecting this change, the association's Journal also acquired a new title, Young Children. Both changes will provide a more realistic frame of reference for the association's objectives.

Membership in the National Association for the Education of Young Children is open to all who are professionally or otherwise concerned with the educational needs of young children. Requests for application forms and inquiries regarding membership and activities should be addressed to the National Association for the Education of Young Children, 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Inquiries regarding the association's Journal and publications should be addressed to the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Room 600, 104 East 25th Street, New York, N.Y.

There are more than 20 million children under 5 years of age in the United States, nearly twice the number that there are in the 20- to 24-year age group. Recent population trends, employment shifts, and changed family living patterns have created an unprecedented need for adequate care and education opportunities for the under school age child. A child is able to, and does, learn very rapidly during this early period. He masters a language, learns a sense or right or wrong in terms of the adults around him, and develops skills and concepts as well as a basic sense of trust or distrust about himself and the world of which he is a part.

It is highly unlikely that a child learns as much in any other 5-year period of his life, or that what is learned is more important. In the United States in the past, little thought has been given these educational needs, and practically no financial support given to these most important foundation years. It is to this neglect that the National Association for the Education of Young Children addresses its concerns.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children aims to further public recognition of the significance of these early years of rapid growth and development by:

1. Stimulating and coordinating the contribution of existing separate yet related organizations, such as those concerned with children of migrant workers, child care centers, church sponsored groups, cooperative parent groups, handicapped children, and other groups at all socioeconomic levels (advantaged and disadvantaged), by:

(a) Involving such organizations in conferences (regional and national); inviting their participation in the Journal and other association publications; providing participation in their activities as requested; and mutual consultation and discussion.

(b) Using the communications media such as commercial and educational television, radio, and popular and professional publications. The Journal will be used to interpret the meaning of good programs for young children to people at various levels of awareness and understanding.

2. Offering skilled professional consultation and evaluation to publishers of children's books, toy manufacturers, architects designing children's premises and facilities, manufacturers of children's furniture, clothing and equipment, directors of children's TV and radio programs, and others providing materials for children. Such services are rendered by:

(a) The executive director and association officers.

(b) Professional members who are recognized experts in particular fields of early childhood education.

(c) Committees of specialized professionals appointed to work with the executive Director.

3. Assisting individuals and a variety of groups working with and for young children through the stimulation of needed educational services and dissemination of information by:

(a) The establishment of a resource center for information, statistics, and research findings in the field of early childhood education under the direction of a fully trained and qualified executive Director.

(b) The encouragement of State and Federal departments and accredited institutions to improve and extend teacher training programs in early childhood education, child development, and mental health, wherever needed and currently unavailable.

(c) Sponsorship of national and regional conferences, institutes, seminars, workshops, to stimulate thought and action on behalf of good living for young children. Emphasis is placed on all aspects of child growth including physical and emotional health, family relationships, and intellectual development.

(d) Stimulation and possible sponsorship of research demonstrations and studies in the field of early childhood and the dissemination of findings to those working with and for children.

(e) Provision, through the journal Young Children and other publications, for the exchange of ideas and experiences between workers in the various related professions, throughout the country.

(f) Provision through "Young Children" and other publications, as well as through meetings and consultation services already described, for consideration of the cooperative roles of parents with professional workers.

(g) Giving needed attention to important environmental factors, i.e., community planning, budgeting for children, and community health and protection to assure the sound development of all children.

4. Serving young children through an expanded membership of workers at all levels and in all fields related to early childhood.

5. Promoting coordination and cooperation between agencies and departments concerned with children by:

(a) Communication and exchanges between separate local, State and Federal agencies and departments in the fields of physical and mental health, welfare, and education.

(b) Recommendation and follow-up of ways and means to strengthen and make more effective the work of the Federal agencies on behalf of young children.

6. Developing sound objective national standards for group programs serving young children, assuring essential and adequate protection, yet allowing variety appropriate to particular situations by:

(a) Emphasizing the multiprofessional nature of competent and qualified staff, of good programs, facilities, and equipment.

(b) Interpreting to the public the need, reasons for, and methods of achieving sound standards, appropriate to each particular situation and free of stereotyping.

(c) Emphasizing the significance of the early childhood years in the development of personality and the related importance of well-qualified and skilled teachers and directors.

(d) Stressing the leadership role of official certifying agencies in recognizing the importance and the uniqueness of the role of teachers and young children. This importance and uniqueness should be recognized in teacher selection as well as in teacher preparation and certification. Every teacher's insight into her leadership role is essential to the success of any program.

7. Supporting legislative measures, whether local, State, or Federal that will improve conditions for young children by:

(a) Keeping abreast of current and proposed legislation.

(b) Keeping the membership informed of appropriate, existing, and impending legislative measures.

Education shall not include the operation of a postsecondary institution or a vocational school.

Hawaii Mourns the Passing of Its Statehood Supporter, Adm. Chester W. Nimitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the people of Hawaii, like the rest of the Nation, are saddened by the passing of our national hero, Adm. Chester W. Nimitz. But we also feel a deep sense of personal loss, for it was at Pearl Harbor that Admiral Nimitz was headquartered from December 31, 1941 to November 24, 1945, as commander in chief of the greatest naval fleet ever amassed in the history of civilization.

All through those harrowing war years, Hawaii gave morale as well as logistical support to the mighty fleet and its brilliant leader who led them to victory with his now historic defensive and offensive tactics against the Japanese Navy. Hawaii shared with the commander of the Pacific Fleet his moments of anxiety as well as his moments of victory.

Admiral Nimitz was aware of the loyal, unwavering support that the people of the then Territory of Hawaii gave him, for in March 1947 he testified before the House Public Lands Committee as a stanch and important supporter of statehood for the Hawaiian Islands. In doing so, he helped immeasurably to erase the doubts which still remained in the minds of some who feared the large number of Americans of Japanese ancestry.

A grateful Hawaii immortalized our wartime naval leader by naming an elementary school, a high school, a highway, and the main gate at Pearl Harbor after him. And as a living, growing memorial to the admiral, 75 trees have been planted on both sides of Nimitz Highway to form a colonnade leading to Nimitz Gate.

I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article by Mr. Wayne Harada which reveals this close relationship between the late Admiral Nimitz and the people of Hawaii, and which appeared in the Monday, February 21, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser:

HE STOOD UP FOR AJA, BACKED HAWAII STATEHOOD

(By Wayne Harada)

Adm. Chester W. Nimitz ran the greatest naval war in history.

It was at Pearl Harbor—on December 31, 1941, at the beginning of the war—that his flag was hoisted aboard the submarine *Grayling*, signaling his takeover of the Pacific Fleet.

It was from Pearl Harbor that he took his vessels across the Pacific and on to victory.

And it was at Pearl Harbor—on November 24, 1945—that he relinquished his command.

Despite losses at Pearl Harbor and the shortage of vessels, planes, and supplies, he organized his forces and carried on defensive warfare which ultimately halted the Japanese.

As rapidly as ships, personnel, and material became available, he shifted from defensive to offensive warfare.

"It was a story of success unequaled anywhere," the Advertiser said editorially on September 3, 1945. "He left in his wake the most brilliant, utterly audacious chapter in U.S. history."

In Navy Day ceremonies October 27, 1945, Nimitz said "the first fruits of a glorious and hard-won victory * * * finds us with many problems.

"We must maintain occupying forces in troubled areas of the world to insure that we will not lose much or all that we have gained at great cost.

"There is a classic lesson for us in the defeat of maritime Japan. It is there for all Americans to bear because the United States is a maritime nation.

"Without adequate seapower we would not be the victors today. Without adequate seapower we cannot insure our children the fruits of that victory * * *."

Three thousand people cheered the admiral later that evening in the first reception and dance at the Royal Hawaiian Hotel since the outbreak of the war.

Nimitz was a vocal supporter of statehood for Hawaii. On March 11, 1947, he told the House Public Lands Committee that he could see "no objection from a military or naval standpoint of the Hawaiian Islands achieving statehood."

He said that before the war he had doubted the loyalty of the American citizens of Japanese ancestry.

"From my observations during World War II, however, I no longer have that doubt," he said.

"I had the opportunity to observe the people of the Hawaiian Islands and I have great admiration and appreciation of the wholehearted cooperation they gave the war effort," he testified.

"The citizens of the islands participated actively in the Army services of World War II and served with distinction. That includes many of Japanese ancestry."

When speculation of his retirement occurred late in 1945, Nimitz said he would not give up his career. He never retired.

But his ramrod bearing was giving way to a slump, and his face began to show the mark of time.

Today, a school and highway bear his name in Hawaii. Nimitz Elementary School was opened in the fall of 1954, and the old Pearl Harbor Road became Nimitz Highway on March 12, 1947.

The Pearl Harbor main gate was renamed the Nimitz Gate on February 24, 1960, in honor of the sea warrior on his 75th birthday.

Seventy-five trees were planted on both sides of Nimitz Highway, forming a colonnade to the gate—a living tribute to the admiral.

Steel and Its Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at the recent congressional breakfast sponsored by the American Iron & Steel Industries, Chairman of the Board L. B. Worthington, who is also president of the United States Steel Corp., delivered an address replete with information that can be of extreme value in arriving at some of the decisions that must be made on Capitol Hill in the months ahead.

Those of us who come from communities where steel and its allied industries have a vital economic role have long been aware of some of the problems about which Mr. Worthington speaks. We have experienced the impact of increasing imports of steel and steel products, and we recognize that a measure of equity is going to have to be inserted into our international trade policies if we expect our steel industry to continue to grow at the pace this Nation demands.

Certainly the turnabout that has America paying considerably more money for imports than it receives from its exports is of grave concern to every Member of Congress. It will be all the more difficult to get our balance-of-payments position back into proper adjustment unless the losses occurring through exchange of one of our basic commodities are quickly reversed.

I have unanimous consent that Mr. Worthington's address be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I hope that my colleagues will keep these remarks on file as source material in our quest for the policies and/or laws necessary to remove some of the disadvantages under which many American industries must operate in the field of international trade.

Also of particular interest is Mr. Worthington's report on steel's struggle to solve its air- and water-pollution problems. We are encouraged that new steel mills are equipped with facilities to curb pollution so effectively, and we look forward to continued progress in reduction of effluent at blast furnaces and in cleaning up the waters used at the older plants.

Mr. Worthington's statement follows:

REMARKS OF L. B. WORTHINGTON, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE, PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES STEEL CORP., AT CONGRESSIONAL BREAKFAST, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you Tom, and good morning everyone.

It's a real pleasure to welcome all of you to this first event of its kind for the steel industry. And the fact that we chose 8:30 a.m. as the hour of our get-together makes us all the more grateful that you are here.

As we look at the momentous challenges facing you Members of Congress during this 2d session of the 89th, we in the steel industry realize that we are deeply involved in many of them—Vietnam, inflation, the balance of payments, unemployment compensation, air- and water-pollution, abatement, foreign competition—just to mention a few. The thing that strikes me about all of these issues is that they have one common denominator. That common denominator is people. People are your major concern, and they are ours, too.

Let me put it this way. It is people who elected you to the important offices you hold. It is people who work in the steel industry, who produce the goods and services the steel industry uses, who invest in the steel industry, and who buy our products.

How many people? Over 700,000 men and women are employed by the 225 iron ore mining and steel producing and finishing companies of this country in 36 States. The income of over 1,200,000 steel company shareowners is affected by the financial and economic health of the steel industry. We are deeply conscious that people—hundreds of thousands of Americans—are at the base of our responsibilities, as they are at the base of your responsibilities.

When we talk of economics, of profits, of costs, or of Government restrictions—when we talk of balance of payments or foreign competition, we recognize, as you of course do, that all of these impersonal things vitally affect people, their welfare, their jobs, the quality of their environment, and their income.

We know that steel is not the central pivot on which the economy of the United States turns. The strength of our country is limited to no one industry. Variety and versatility are the hallmarks of our economy. But in every industrial country in the world, steel forms a base for many other industries. A healthy steel industry is and should be the concern not only of those in the industry, but those like you, involved in nurturing America's general welfare and defense potential. A healthy steel industry can also assure other industries that their favorite raw material—steel—will be available when they need it, in the amount that is needed.

It has been pointed out that the country that stands foremost in iron and steel production is the industrial leader of the world. We are glad to be able to report to you that the United States is still foremost in the production of iron and steel. In 1965 we produced over 131 million ingot tons which was a new record. This was 26 percent of the world's production.

Although we started Steel Century II in 1964, the steel industry is no decrepit, aging crone. It is young in outlook, inventive in its research and development, heavily involved in expansion and modernization, initiating dozens of new types of steels every year, converting many of its processes to new and more efficient forms—and making higher quality steels.

Let me be specific: In the last 10 years, at least eight steel companies have built new or greatly enlarged research laboratories manned by the finest scientific brains to be found. In the last 5 years, two entirely new steel mills have been built in the Midwest, and a third is in the building stage. In the last 2 years my company alone has introduced over a hundred new or improved products, including steel for functions ranging from bed springs to space capsules. In the past year, oxygen steelmaking, a recently developed process, accounted for 23 million tons of our Nation's steel production. In 1966, the industry expects to spend over \$2 billion on new and improved production facilities—a new record after having spent over \$13 billion in the previous decade.

The steel industry and its people are dynamic, imaginative, courageous and on the move. Despite high costs for labor and materials, we have confidence in our capacity to compete with any country, regardless of size or labor costs—provided the rules of the game are the same for all.

But there's the rub. The rules are not the same.

Last year 10½ million tons of finished steel mill products—about one-ninth of the total domestic market—were shipped in from abroad. So far as stainless steel is concerned, for 11 months of 1965, imported stainless steel cold rolled sheets accounted for 19.2 percent of the U.S. market; and stainless wire rod for 57.8 percent of the U.S. market. Much of this steel was sold at prices well below the prices of domestically produced steel mill products. If lower costs were the only reason our foreign competitors were underselling us in our home market, we might not like it, but we couldn't complain too much.

The fact is that a foreign steel producer, under normal circumstances, can enter the U.S. market only by offering steel products at prices substantially below our current domestic level. He functions under an economic system in which he is virtually compelled to maintain the higheest practical operating level regardless of his home market conditions. Then he must dispose of excess tons in the export market at whatever prices he can obtain regardless of costs. Pressures from his own government for dollar exchange or other reasons may also influence his entry into our markets.

In many cases, he is assisted in these disruptive practices by the availability of government tax rebates and other forms of export incentives. To us, such business conduct is clearly an unfair trade practice and we believe that, if the existing GATT rules are unable to deal with this situation, the time has come to press for appropriate changes in GATT. Needless to say, we receive no corresponding stimulus enabling us to invade the protected foreign markets.

When I say "protected foreign market," I refer not to tariffs alone—although, within the past 2 years, we note steel tariffs have been substantially increased in the Common Market countries and in the United Kingdom, bringing them closer to the already high Japanese tariffs. I refer more particularly to the highly imaginative—and highly effective—nontariff barriers which bar the entry of American steel to many foreign markets. Again, let me be specific: A net ton of standard two-inch butt-welded steel pipe shipped from the United States to France, in addition to French duties, accumulates stamp taxes and transactions taxes all of which amount to \$101.97; a similar shipment from France to the United States is assessed only \$6—the U.S. duty.

What is the people-impact of these heavy imports of steel in the United States? If we take the employment in the steel industry alone, our best estimate is that, had those 10½ million tons of steel been made in the United States, it would have meant over 70,000 additional high-paying steel jobs.

And if we take into account the employment impact in the steel supporting industries—industries such as mining, manufacturers supplying the steel industry, transportation, trade and a variety of services—the job total amounts to over 130,000.

Now it may be that some manpower analysts may take issue with our experts who developed these estimates. But whether the figure be 130,000 or more or less, there is no doubt that the importation of 10½ million tons of steel in 1 year has a decided impact on American employment.

This job impact is of concern not only to the industry but also to the union which represents the great majority of steel employees, the United Steelworkers of America. We believe the union feels as we do that the great and growing deficit in the balance of steel trade is a threat to the industry and therefore to the job security of union members.

But in addition to jobs, there is a further national interest at stake here. I refer to the impact of foreign steel imports upon our balance of payments—or perhaps I should say, more correctly, our imbalance of payments.

In a January 3 press release, Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said:

"Overall steel imports in the first 11 months of 1965 were up to 9.7 million tons, worth $1,096 million. The value of steel exports was down to $460 million, producing an 11-month steel deficit of $636 million, perhaps $700 million for the full year. In 1955–57 we had an average steel export surplus of $645 million. Thus the deterioration of our balance of payments due to steel over the last decade is $1.3 billion, probably as large as our entire balance-of-payments deficit in 1965."

Considering the importance of the people-impact combined with the national economic impact, we believe that the importance of equalizing the rules becomes manifest. We are prepared to play ball—and our 2 billions of dollars being invested this year alone is clear evidence of that—but if we're allowed three strikes while the other side is allowed five or more the outcome is obvious—we can't win.

For many years, the great majority of the steel industry have been proponents of maximizing foreign trade. But our devotion to continued liberalization of international trade is changing and there are those in our industry who have concluded that the situation is serious enough to warrant drastic action.

After all, as a nation, we believe in freedom to invest across national boundaries. But in the past 2 years our Nation has undertaken a temporary more-or-less voluntary restriction on investments abroad, because of our imbalance of payments. Perhaps some similar temporary arrangement to prevent unfair and unrestricted imports of steel may be desirable—and for the same reasons—while we seek a more permanent solution.

Two measures are pending in the Congress which have a direct bearing on the problem. In the Senate, the Hartke Resolution contemplates a thorough study of the steel import problem, to be made by appropriate government agencies. Through American Iron and Steel Institute, we have advised Senator Hartke of our interest in and endorsement of the sense of his resolution, and will be prepared to testify on it when hearings are called.

The other measure is the Herlong-Hartke 1965 Antidumping Act Amendments, which is helpful as far as it goes. It is quite possible, however, that more effective measures will be required to make the Antidumping Act a practical deterrent to dumping.

We do not now have all the answers, but we hope that, as proposals are made and hearings are held in this critical area of foreign trade rules, you will let us come back to you later in the legislative year, as individual companies and through the Institute, to suggest ways in which these problems can be solved in a manner consistent with the national interest. We are mindful of the fact that the Congress must, by mid-1967, review the entire field of foreign trade policy in connection with any possible renewal of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and we hope to be able to contribute to the development of that policy as it affects our industry.

In addition to foreign imports, there are other issues—people issues and economic issues that concern us. And let us bear in mind that economic issues and people issues are one and the same.

It was both a people issue and an economic issue when, in 1965, steel companies and the United Steelworkers of America were unable to arrive at a settlement. You may recall that the settlement was ultimately arrived at in the White House on the basis of heavy cost increases which the Council of Economic Advisers said were at the guidepost figure of 3.2 percent per year, but which our figures show to be substantially higher. We needn't go into a debate as to the arithmetic at this point, but we would like to draw your attention to an additional cost factor: As a result of amendments to the Social Security Act, including medicare, social security taxes on both employees and employers were increased substantially last month—almost 5 cents an hour for the steel companies. This is on top of the negotiated increase.

We are certainly not debating the merits of the 1965 social security amendments. But it is important to recognize that, no matter how desirable the objectives, a necessary byproduct is the addition of substantial costs to high wage industries such as steel, thereby further handicapping the industry in its international trade competition.

A pending measure before the Congress carried over from last year is H.R. 8282, a bill that would virtually federalize the State unemployment insurance programs. I could make many criticisms of this bill, but this is hardly the forum for a full discussion of it. I will point out, however, that this bill would greatly increase employer unemployment compensation taxes. Again our costs would be increased, our competitive position further worsened.

Another pressing problem is that increased steel production in the past 3 years has resulted in critical shortages of alloying metals such as molybdenum and of coating metals such as zinc. Congress authorized releases of these badly needed metals from stockpile surpluses from time to time, for which the industry is grateful. Currently, bills have been introduced by Representative Dent to alleviate the critically short supply of moly through additional stockpile release, suspension of tariff duties to encourage the flow of more Canadian moly into this country, and through the temporary curtailment of moly exports. It is hoped that these bills will receive sympathetic and prompt consideration from the Congress.

Another item on the legislative horizon (which may not come up for action this year) is a proposal, made to the President by a Cabinet-level committee to provide extensive and rigorous Federal regulation over private pension programs. Practically all steel industry employees are covered by private pension programs, some of which go back over 50 years. Pension costs are an important part of steel company employment costs. The proposals, according to our pension experts, would introduce undesirable rigidities into pension programs, which certainly will not serve to encourage the development of private pension plans. In fact, many of the proposals would have a contrary effect.

A subject close to your hearts and ours is the tough problem of enhancing our environment through air and water pollution abatement. We know the magnitude of the problem and share your concern about the impact of pollution on people and on resources. In the new steel mills, we believe the problem has been solved as thoroughly as modern-day science knows how. In our own Fairless Works, for example, I am assured that the water we return to the Delaware River is purer than the water we take from it. The same can be said, I am sure, of the newer mills built by other steel companies at Portage and Burns Harbor, Ind. Similarly, air-pollution abatement facilities in the newer mills are the finest we can obtain.

It is in the older mills that the real problem exists, for the enormity of the costs is breathtaking. As Representative Richard McCarthy, of New York, pointed out, it has been estimated that it would cost $25 billion just to halt the present pollution of the Great Lakes from all sources. Bringing it down to our own industry, a single steel plant of a medium-sized company is currently spending $11 million over a 3-year period for water pollution control facilities. It is generally known that an electrostatic precipitator for a single open hearth furnace stack costs upward of $1 million. These expenditures produce not a single ton of steel, nor a single dollar of profit.

Nevertheless I am happy to report that progress is being made. For example, in the Public Health Service hearings on the Mahoning River last year, an impressive picture was presented on behalf of seven steel companies of progress in water-pollution abatement. Blast furnace effluent was then being 75 percent treated, and was to be 100 percent treated before this year is out. Similar heartening progress was reported on other aspects of water pollution abatement.

Continued progress can be greatly facilitated by appropriate tax measures for investments required for air and water pollution abatement—investments required for environmental rather than production reasons. A combination of rapid amortization and adequate investment credits for such investments is clearly called for. Bills to this effect have already been introduced.

In our judgment these remarks about costs represent no disparity with my earlier expressed concern about people. When costs rise, profits fall. When profits are in jeopardy, jobs are in jeopardy, and people are in jeopardy. In fact, the most dangerous demagoguery is that which attempts to set property rights against human rights. For all of us recognize that the right to own property, whether it be one's own home or a share of stock saved for retirement, is one of the most precious human rights.

Steel industry profits loom large when stated in dollars, since production and revenues are stated in millions of tons and billions of dollars. In 1964, steel industry profits, in terms of percentage of net worth, were, however, among the 7 lowest of 41 industries analyzed by the First National City Bank of New York. The 1965 figures are not in yet, but despite a recordbreaking production year, we doubt that our industry will shown much change in our relative standing on that list.

Gentlemen, you have been patient. We hope you may recognize the strength and dynamism which our private competitive enterprise has made possible in the steel industry of the United States. And we also hope that you will recognize that we share a number of problems which, with your sympathetic consideration, we may be able to resolve in the interest of a strong, dynamic, competitive America from which people—your constituents and ours—will be the first to benefit.

I thank you.

National School Lunch and Special Milk Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have received hundreds of letters from constituents expressing opposition to the recommendation in the 1967 budget that funds be reduced for the national school lunch and special milk programs. One of the most appealing and well-written letters comes from a 16-year-old student, Patricia Johnston, of Hendersonville, N.C. The sincerity and eloquence, and I think, good judgment of this young student is impressive.

The letter follows:

Hendersonville, N.C.,
February 26, 1966.

Congressman Roy A. Taylor,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Taylor: President Johnson's poverty program confuses me. He goes on a trip to Appalachia, sees the terrible conditions of the people there, goes back to Washington making impressive altruistic noises, and then turns right around and cuts off Federal aid for school lunches.

Now this decision doesn't affect me or my brothers or sisters, because my father has a good position and gives us everything we need. However, I went to grammar school with children who didn't get shoes until it got too cold to go barefoot; and I know that the only decent meal they got was at school.

Doesn't the school have some responsibility to the child? Isn't it even partially the function of the school to help keep the child's body healthy as well as his mind?

I am only 16, and perhaps I am too young to understand all the whys and wherefores of Government goals for public good, but if there is anything you can do about this situation, please, sir, do it.

Sincerely,

Patricia Johnston.

Committee on Labor of Kansas House of Representatives Reports Concurrent Resolution Memorializing Congress Not To Adopt H.R. 8282

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I daresay that every congressional office is being inundated with letters with respect to the wisdom of adopting the proposal incorporated in H.R. 8282, to increase unemployment compensation coverage and benefits. In this regard, I feel that it is interesting to note the language of House Concurrent Resolution 505, reported out of the committee on labor of Kansas House of Representatives during the legislature's recent 1966 budget session. Although the budget session adjourned before there was time to take action on this resolution, I do feel that the resolution's language accurately reflects the sentiment in one of the States which would be affected by the proposals set forth in H.R. 8282.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert House Concurrent Resolution 522 in the Appendix of the Record.

The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 522

(Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to not adopt H.R. 8282, relating to the proposd eemployment security amendments of 1965)

Whereas the U.S. Congress presently has under consideration H.R. 8282 which proposes to increase the unemployment compensation coverage and benefits under the Social Security Act; and

Whereas although we realize that there may be worthwhile changes which could be effected in existing unemployment compensation systems, it is our considered opinion that H.R. 8282 does not present a satisfactory or desirable means for effecting any such improvements; and

Whereas H.R. 8282 represents an unwarranted, unnecessary and undesirable "federalization" of an area of social legislation which is more effectively and efficiently promulgated by each individual State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the Kansas Legislature respectfully petitions the U.S. Congress to not adopt H.R. 8282 proposing to establish increased unemployment compensation coverage and benefits. It is further urged that Congress permit each individual State to establish its own unemployment benefits, unhindered by Federal pressures or controls; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of State is directed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each of the members of the Kansas congressional delegation.

Youth, Education, Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Bristol Business & Professional Women's Club of Bristol, Tenn., is celebrating its 40th anniversary this year.

I wish to take this opportunity to salute the members of the club, past and present, and to offer them my sincere congratulations on the outstanding job they have done, and are doing, in serving the needs of their area.

I insert at this point in the Record an editorial, which was recently presented on WCYB-TV in Bristol, Tenn.-Va., commending the club for the unending dedication its members have given to the community. I join in this commendation.

WCYB-TV Editorial: Business and Professional Women's Club—Youth Education Service

An organization that exists and grows for 40 years as it consistently works and campaigns in public service—has the warm admiration and respect of the community.

It is so with the Bristol Business and Professional Women's Club, which this week is celebrating its 40th anniversary—nearly half a century working in behalf of youth, working for better education, working for scores of projects that have contributed to a better-rounded life for all of Bristol.

Mrs. May Ross McDowell, who lived then and lives now in Johnson City, came to Bristol in the fall of 1925 and helped organize and charter the Bristol club. Mrs. McDowell is justifiably proud of the record of her offspring, and she will be an honor guest at a celebration dinner this weekend.

Outstanding has been the labor of Bristol Business and Professional Women's Club in behalf of young people, college scholarships for local high school graduates, strong assistance to many youth agencies, firm support for the upgrading of public school education.

But there has been a variety of other efforts: Years ago a portable unit to isolate a tubercular patient near his home, organization of a mental health association, international relations forums, it has brought operas to the city, and its members have stimulated public discussion.

Eleven of its twenty-five past presidents remain active in the organization.

Mrs. Bess Newland is a charter member of the club and the only charter member who remains active. Four times she has served as its president. She is a former State Business and Professional Women's Club officer, a former substantial business woman, and her guidance and counsel are sought.

Sunday evening, February 27, the Bristol Business and Professional Women's Club will have a reception and dinner in celebration of its 40th anniversary.

The national Business and Professional Women's Club president, Mrs. Helen K. Leslie, will be the guest of honor and speaker, and a special tribute will be paid to Mrs. Newland, the one charter member who remains active.

The Bristol Business and Professional Women's Club has been a wholesome and stimulating influence for the city and for the several hundred women who have been on its membership rolls for the nearly half a century of club service.

Our best wishes for the anniversary weekend, and our commendation to a club that remains exciting and challenging in its work after nearly half a century.

South Dakota's Voice of Democracy Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, this year's South Dakota winner in the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary, is Miss Judyth Groeneveld, of Madison, a resident of my congressional district.

Miss Groeneveld will be in Washington next week to compete for one of five top scholarships offered as contest prizes.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert her winning essay on the topic "What Democracy Means to Me," in the Appendix of the Record.

What Democracy Means to Me

(By Judyth Groeneveld)

As an American teenager, I believe I am a part of the most fortunate group of young people in this world. Each morning I awaken to a day of security—three plentiful meals, an adequate supply of clothing for all occasions, and heat or air conditioning as climatic conditions may call for. I live in an average midwestern town where my parents own a modest six-room home. We have a telephone that we use as we desire, a television on which we watch any program we choose, and the proverbial two cars that we use at our discretion to travel on country lane, highway, tollway, or freeway as we please. Each Sunday I am free to worship in the church of my preference. My community provides me with 12 years of education. After my graduation from high school, I can attend the college of my choice and pursue any career I may choose. At the age of 21, I shall have the right to vote for any political candidate for any office, from the highest to the lowest, that my country offers.

I shall enjoy freedom of speech; no one can prevent me from expressing my opinions or my ideas.

I live in a true democracy. America has successfully achieved the impelling human wants, of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The duty of my generation is to preserve, protect, and perpetuate these privileges for posterity.

Let us analyze our challenge. The first democracies of the world were established by Mediterranean peoples more than 2,400 years ago. These people learned they could be free of dictators and could rule themselves when every group of every sort was able to communicate its needs, its hopes, and its ideals to every other group. They learned, as Thomas MacCaulay stated, "Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely." These early pioneers of democracy learned speaking skill was necessary in their juries and legislatures. They learned the effective meeting of minds was the tool with which man developed and maintained democracy. They learned it is as important to have the right to be wrong as it is to have the right to be right.

The progress of civilization also has taught us when man cannot utter a wrong opinion, he will not long have the right to utter a right opinion.

The doubletalk and threats of communistic countries have impaired the progress of world peace. Yet, through intelligent discussion, neutral nations, who once feared both communism and democracy, are gradually learning the difference between these two forms of government.

The Soviet Union maintains 3 million trained speakers in its shops, farms, factories, and government. These people are trained in what to think and what to say. Thus, to strengthen, protect, and perpetuate democracy, it becomes obvious we must have responsible leaders—leaders who can think intelligently and speak effectively. These leaders must maintain the type of government where every citizen has an equal right to voice his opinion, right or wrong, on public affairs.

It is the duty of every citizen in a democracy to educate himself so that he can listen, judge, and express himself intelligently. Otherwise, as passive puppets we may become a threat to our own democratic ideals—a threat to our own American heritage.

As an American teenager, I realize the future of our country will soon be put into the hands of my generation. Give us the chance to become responsible, intelligent leaders. This truly is what democracy means to me.

The Late Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, like other Members of this House, I am deeply saddened that Albert Thomas, of Texas, our good friend and most able colleague has gone to the only real "upper body" there is, where eventually all of us will meet.

Albert Thomas was not only an outstanding Congressman, but in addition, his warm greeting and kindly words had won from us the real affection as well as admiration that gives each of us at this time such a real feeling of loss.

When Al managed an appropriation bill on the floor, when we asked questions or when we critized the legislation before us, he always flattered us a bit, calling us genial and able friends and as a result there never was any hard feeling, only respect and kindliness.

Mr. Speaker, Albert Thomas without a doubt was one of the hardest working Members of the House, and I never expect to meet any more dedicated and skillful legislator. His service to the Nation will be sorely missed.

My wife shares my sense of loss and we extend to Mrs. Thomas and his family our deepest sympathy.

Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, members of the Committee on the Judiciary have represented the Congress at every semiannual meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration since its birth in Brussels in 1951. In fact, it was through the initiative of members of this committee that ICEM was conceived.

The 24th session of the Council of ICEM, which met in Geneva, Switzerland, on December 1, 1965, was attended by the Honorable William M. McCulloch, the Honorable Frank Chelf, the Honorable Peter W. Rodino, Jr., the Honorable Byron G. Rogers, the Honorable Harold Donohue, and the Honorable Clark MacGregor. The Honorable Edward M. Kennedy, representing the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, also attended.

It was indeed fitting that members of this delegation were afforded the opportunity to address the Council on December 1, 1965, the date that the new immigration law became effective. I should therefore, like to enclose statements of our distinguished representatives as well as a statement by the Honorable Abba P. Schwartz, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, who was the U.S. delegate to ICEM.

The statements follow:

Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—24th Session of the Council, December 1, 1965, Geneva

(Statements by Hon. Abba P. Schwartz, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Congressman Peter W. Rodino, and Congressman W. M. McCulloch, U.S. delegation)

Mr. Schwartz, U.S. delegation. Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, it is a pleasure to be present at this 24th session of the Council. First let me make some general observations on the activities of the Migration Committee.

As we all know, the Migration Committee is approaching its 15th year. Since it was founded in 1951, it has transported over 1,400,000 persons to oversea countries of resettlement, including more than 600,000 refugees. This record of accomplishment speaks for itself. It is one of which this Council should be proud.

We all recognize that economic developments in Europe since 1951 have necessitated certain adjustments in the program of the committee. However, ICEM's traditional role of providing assistance to refugees continues, in our opinion, to be the fundamental and certainly one of the most important elements in the operations. And, in this connection, I would like to emphasize my country's concern in the importance of maintaining liberal asylum policies for refugees, and for ICEM's essential role in facilitating the resettlement of refugees out of asylum areas.

For some time the U.S. Government, which historically has followed a liberal policy of asylum to refugees, has been deeply concerned about the deterioration of asylum policies in certain areas. We found it particularly significant that the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe at a recent meeting passed a resolution urging governments to adopt a more liberal asylum policy. It is equally significant that the International Council of Voluntary Agencies at a recent conference here in Geneva deemed it necessary to pass a similar resolution.

I would emphasize that if the doors of asylum are tightened or closed there will be no need for IEM to seek resettlement opportunities for refugees, nor will there be any need to seek material assistance for such refugees because, without a place of asylum, the future of the refugee is not in the country of asylum but in the country to which he is thrown back.

As Dr. Haveman pointed out in his opening statement to the Council, ICEM is the only international organization which has the responsibility for moving European refugees. It is vital that this mechanism be firmly maintained.

In connection with ICEM's traditional program on behalf of refugees, I know that this Council will be interested to learn that the new U.S. immigration law which becomes effective today makes permanent provision for the admission of 10,200 refugees annually under a broad definition of refugee. This refugee provision in our basic law is over and above the action which my Government is now taking in granting asylum to many thousands of Cuban refugees.

I was very interested in the discussion which took place in this Council on Monday or refugee problems, and particularly gratified to hear the statement of the representative of the Holy See and his announcement of a special contribution to ICEM for the benefit of refugees and family reunion cases.

The statement of the representative of Luxembourg regarding fundraising efforts in his country for the benefit of refugees is a further source of encouragement.

My delegation would also like to pay special tribute to the program which is being initiated by Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, to raise funds to finance the transportation of refugees by ICEM through the issuance of a special stamp bearing the Queen's signature. As Mr. Warren informed the Executive Committee last week, we recognize that this action by the Queen of the Netherlands is in the finest tradition of the Netherlands Government, and is just another expression of the concern of the people of the Netherlands for the fate of refugees. My delegation feels that it would be most appropriate if the moneys received from various fundraising efforts in the private sector were to be established in a special fund known as the Queen Juliana Fund, provided, of course, that this suggestion meets with the approval of the Queen of the Netherlands.

The extensive discussion which has taken place during this session dealing with the Director's efforts to improve and expand

ICEM's program for providing semiskilled workers for Latin America is also a matter of vital concern to my Government. It is my hope that all governments will agree in principle to the efforts which are now underway, and will also find it possible to provide the essential financial assistance which is required so that this program to benefit Latin America will be carried forward successfully.

Mr. Chairman, I know that many members of this Council are aware that, since the initial meeting of ICEM in Brussels in 1951, the United States has always included in its delegation distinguished Members of the Congress of the United States. Neither Mr. Warren nor I, who were both present at Brussels, recall that the U.S. delegation has ever included a more distinguished group of Members of our Congress than are present here today.

They are Congressman WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, Congressman PETER W. RODINO, of New Jersey, Congressman ARCH A. MOORE, JR., of West Virginia, Congressman CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota, Congressman BYRON ROGERS, of Colorado, and Congressman HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts, and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

The Department of State which bears the principal responsibility for the U.S. participation in ICEM attaches great significance to the presence of Members of Congress in our delegation, because they give added representation of the American people, and by their presence express the concern of the American people for the basic objectives of ICEM which are resettlement of refugees, reuniting of families, assistance to our sister Latin American Republics in selective migration, and the movement of national migrants to new homes overseas where they can enjoy a good and productive life.

It is especially gratifying to us that the Members of Congress in our delegation are with us today because this is a very important day, affecting not only the lives of many American families but of many nationals of other countries represented at this council session. This day, December 1, 1965, is important because our new nondiscriminatory immigration law becomes effective today. The Members of Congress who are present here are in great measure responsible for the enactment of that legislation.

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, had expected to be able to be present today. Unfortunately, he has been unavoidably detained in the United States and has asked that I convey to the Council his very best wishes for the success of this meeting. Together with members of our delegation who are present, Congressman CELLER worked energetically to bring about the enactment of our new immigration reform bill. In his absence, Congressman WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, is the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. He will address the Council later in the session.

Mr. Chairman, you may recall that in October of 1963 at a session of this Council I had the personal privilege of conveying to the Council a special message from the President of the United States. In that message President Kennedy asked that I bring, and I quote "to the attention of the Council the new immigration legislation which I recommended to the Congress. This would perpetuate our policy of effecting the reuniting of families and admitting refugees and immigrants without discrimination: matters which I know are of deep interest to the members of the Migration Committee."

President Kennedy in that message also said, "On previous occasions I have referred to ICEM's potential for assisting Latin American countries in selecting, recruiting and receiving the skilled and semiskilled immigrants who can contribute so much to the growth and development of the economy of these countries. I am confident that you will urge your colleagues in the Council to continue to develop and expand ICEM's efforts in this area which hold such promise for Latin America."

Mr. Chairman, it is not a coincidence that on this date, December 1, 1965, when our new immigration law is taking effect, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, is here with us. It is not a coincidence because Senator KENNEDY, like our late President Kennedy, has a deep and abiding concern for the fate of refugees and indeed for all disadvantaged people. Like the other congressional members of our delegation, Senator KENNEDY played a key role in bringing to reality the immigration legislation which President Kennedy referred to in his message of October 1963. It is now my very personal pleasure to introduce to the Council Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY (U.S. delegation). Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, my colleagues in the Congress of the United States, members of delegations, members of the public, this is the first time that I have attended a session of this Council. But I come here well acquainted with your work, a friend of your purposes, and an admirer of your achievements.

I am, as Mr. Schwartz has mentioned, chairman of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees. Since your founding in 1951, that subcommittee has suported the work of ICEM. We know the role you have played in helping almost 640,000 refugees begin their lives again in new countries. We are aware of your great contribution in facilitating the immense waves of national migration. My colleagues join me in saluting these achievements.

President Kennedy had high regard for this Council. He appreciated the unique and creative role ICEM has in assisting the developing partnership between Europe and the Western Hemisphere. Some of you may recall his speech in July 1962, calling for a declaration of interdependence among the nations of the Atlantic Community. He felt that all of our countries were on the threshold of their greatest growth—economically, socially, politically, spiritually. President Kennedy invited us to cross the threshold, to strengthen our partnership, and to build a prosperous community of independent nations.

ICEM is a child of this ideal—and an effective instrument to help in its achievement. I come from a country whose greatest treasure has been the courage, dreams and ambitions of millions of people who have left their native lands to find new opportunity for themselves and their children. ICEM is the modern symbol of that continuing migration. It is a beacon for the homeless. It is an affirmation by its member governments that freedom of movement is an indispensable part of human liberty and national progress.

I listened yesterday with great interest to the discussions in this Council of its programs to provide assistance for the economic development of Latin America through migration. Anyone who reads the Director's report on "the first 50 cases of selective migration in 1965" has to be impressed by the potential of this program. The human resources you make available are the foundation of the pyramid of development.

We can build schools but they will be useless without the teachers to instruct the children who need them. We can plan highways but they will not be built without the engineers who can create them. We can talk about land reform but it will not work unless we can find the technicians to teach the new methods of agriculture and irrigation. The Alliance for Progress and all of the other programs of assistance supported by the United States, the United Nations, and the other international agencies are given a better chance to succeed because of your interest.

I would make a modest suggestion. In both Montevideo and Madrid, you confronted the need for coordination of effort with agencies already in the field. You might benefit greatly by adding the Peace Corps—both the American and the International Peace Corps—to that list of consultants. They can give you the benefit of their invaluable experience in recruitment and personnel evaluation—and no other group has closer contact with the needs and possibilities of the people they serve.

My government has contributed generously to the ICEM program for specialized migration. I am confident that it will continue to do so. I hope the expanded program outlined by your Director will find the necessary support not only from the nations who are its direct beneficiaries but also from your other members who believe in its purposes and are encouraged by its results.

Mr. Chairman, today—December 1—marks a new chapter in the history of American immigration. This is the day that the new immigration law of the United States goes into effect. It abolishes the national origins system for selecting immigrants. Applicants will be chosen because of their individual merits and for reasons of equity—not because they happened to be born in a favored nation. This basic change was especially important to President Kennedy and President Johnson because they saw it as a test of America's democratic purposes. I am confident that a new era is well begun.

Significantly, the new law emphasizes the reunion of families. It also includes for the first time in a basic statute, permanent provisions for the annual admission of a specified number of refugees. I know these provisions are of special interest to ICEM—not only because refugees are an important part of your work but also because this act reaffirms America's concern that the doors of sanctuary be kept open.

When historians characterise this century they will certainly give the refugee a special place of honor. How can we measure the courage of a family that leaves its country, braves every kind of physical peril, that reaches out for a new home among new people whose language they may not speak and whose culture they probably do not share. Whether for the cause of individual freedom or for humanitarian concern, it is our duty to keep the paths of sanctuary open and to accept the responsibilities of resettlement. Thinking of those already among us and knowing that countless thousands are yet to come, I believe it is appropriate for all of us to maintain the best traditions of our countries by repeating our pledge of sanctuary and resettlement.

Many of your members have been countries of first sanctuary for refugees. With the exodus of Cubans, the United States becomes again a major country of first asylum. We have already welcomed almost 300,000 Cuban refugees. We have undertaken in partnership with the voluntary agencies a resettlement program costing millions of dollars. As you know, a new arrangement begins today which will probably bring many more thousands of refugees into our country. This is not alone a problem of the Western Hemisphere.

More than 20,000 Cubans have gone to Spain. Some 3,000 have then continued their journey to reunion with their families in America—and that has been possible through your administrative help and the good offices of the High Commissioner.

I take this opportunity today to urge your member Governments to reconsider their relationship to the Cuban refugee problem, to seek out and offer new possibilities of resettlement, to relate this overwhelming exodus of refugees to the humanitarian partnership we have built together in the postwar years.

And I might add here for the Cubans what has also been the universal lesson of all refugee movements in our countries—that their main objective is to become productive, self-sufficient, contributing members of the society which has given them sanctuary, when the final costs of refugee resettlement are added up, my guess is that the host country—not the refugee—will be the debtor. What a fine gesture it would be if your Governments and your national voluntary agencies took advantage of this Christmas season to give help and recognition to the Cubans, especially those in Spain.

Christmas 1965 will not be a season of hope for millions of our fellow human beings. Refugee problems frequently reflect political conflict and upheaval—and turmoil in Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, and the Western Hemisphere only promises greater burdens for the months and years ahead.

ICEM has had a heroic and historical role in helping men and countries adjust to the new world of the postwar era. No one knows better than you that the job is not done, that new challenges will continue to come. Some new answers are needed for old problems—and some new problems can be helped by old answers. We have shown the strength and effectiveness of our partnership—and I am confident that our partnership will continue effectively and creatively in the years ahead.

Mr. Schwartz (U.S. delegation). Mr. Chairman, I should like now to introduce another member of our delegation who is also a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, Congressman Peter W. Rodino, who has attended many sessions of this Council and who also participated actively in the enactment of our new immigration law.

Mr. Peter W. Rodino (U.S. delegation). Mr. Chairman, I join with you and the committee today, together with the members of our congressional delegation who I am sure feel as I do—a deep sense of personal satisfaction as well as a sense of modest pride—for, but a few hours ago as the clock tolled the first hour of December 1, 1965, in my country a new immigration policy became effective. And as a member of that subcommittee in which this new policy was conceived and as a dedicated proponent of immigration reform, which is in keeping with the tradition of my country, I am particularly proud to appear before this Council and stress the intent of this historic piece of legislation.

Although the measure is but a few hours old it has been developing, as programs must, over many years. And though casting the old national origins theory out of the window was long overdue, nonetheless, I offer no apology for none is needed for what the United States has done over the years in the field of immigration and refugees. For each new Congress since the closing days of World War II has enthusiastically enacted legislation to further the traditional policy of the United States in coming to the aid of the unsettled and the victims of world turmoil.

Congress progressively enacted special legislation to permit the reuniting of families and to help the refugees. These special laws supplemented the basic immigration law and provided for the admission, generally on a nonquota basis, of immigrants of different races and circumstances as well as the unfortunate who have been uprooted and displaced by political upheavals.

This performance in the field of immigration in the postwar period has been generous and sympathetic—a true expression of the human spirit that moves America. But today, at long last, the statute books proudly reflect in definite and concrete terms what has been long done in practice. Our new immigration policy is based now upon a system of selection designed to be fair, rational and humane, treating all humans alike, regardless of the accident of birth. Reunification of families is emphasized as the foremost consideration in our policy.

Under this system selection from among those desiring to immigrate to the United States will be based upon the existence of family relationship rather than upon the old basis of birthplace or ancestry. I would like to emphasize this change for it is a substantial departure from the old law where greater priority was given to those immigrants who possessed exceptional skills.

The Congress in adopting this legislation expressed its intent that it is not the desire nor the objective of the United States to entice or to lure those skilled persons who are so desperately needed to make the economies of other countries flourish. Our approach is not based upon selfish motivation. However, I do not intend to convey the impression that such skilled persons will not be welcome to the United States, but I wish to state again and to emphasize that the Congress is hopeful that each member of the family of nations will have every opportunity for self-development and we in the Congress will lend our support in that direction.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you and the member governments represented here can appreciate why we of the U.S. delegation feel today in this moment the sense of satisfaction and particular pride.

Mr. Chairman, I was first privileged as a member of the congressional delegation to attend the 19th session of the Council in May 1963. I need not remind the Council of the continued interest of the U.S. Congress in the activities and the continuation of ICEM.

Every session of ICEM has been attended by a congressional delegation and with each session after our trip home, we have been impressed by the great efforts of ICEM and its great accomplishments and it is the considered thought of the Congress that the machinery of ICEM must be maintained in a ready condition to meet not only the ever-present plight of refugees and the ever-present desire of the people to migrate but be prepared to meet any eventuality which the world may be faced with.

ICEM is an extremely important instrumentality in any farsighted plan to stimulate economic development in Latin America. This organization must be prepared to initiate programs or lend its activities to supplement other programs in this direction. I presented such thoughts on programing during previous sessions of the Committee and I cannot let this opportunity pass without reemphasizing the need for cooperation and stimulation of effort to assist our friends in Latin America in fully realizing and taking advantage of their vast natural resources. Given the opportunity, I submit, vast areas in Latin America can be resettled by those skilled persons who hold the key to agricultural production and the modernization of methods of production. This task has been emphasized during this meeting and its importance cannot be viewed without the greatest of interest.

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the opportunity afforded me to share my observations and to present, although briefly, the new immigration policy of the U.S. Government to the member governments of ICEM. Thank you very much.

Mr. Schwartz (U.S. delegation). It is now my pleasure to introduce to the Council Congressman William McCulloch of Ohio. Without his statesmanlike support, and that of Congressman Arch A. Moore, of West Virginia, and Congressman Clark MacGregor, of Minnesota, I doubt that the U.S. delegation could refer today with such pride to that enlightened immigration legislation. Congressman McCulloch is a friend and stanch supporter of ICEM who attended the Brussels meeting in 1951 at which this organization was established.

Mr. McCulloch (U.S. delegation). Mr. Chairman, members of the Council and friends of this great movement everywhere, at the very outset I should like to thank the chairman of our delegation for the very gracious remarks that he has made of me and of Arch Moore and of Congressman MacGregor. Without the work of all members of that subcommittee, who spent countless hours on this legislation, I certainly agree with the statement that there probably would not have been the right to make the new law which has become effective today.

Mr. Chairman, as the senior member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, I am particularly pleased to join in support of a tribute to this great organization. I have long been interested in its activities and in its magnificent results. Historically, my country the United States of America has ever responded to the needs of refugees from all lands with compassion, with understanding, and with sympathy. In the early years of our country, as a matter of fact in the earliest years of our country, and before even we were an independent country, we welcomed without condition lovers of liberty who so eagerly sought equality of opportunity in a great new land.

The needs of some of the people of the world for resettlement have materially changed in recent years but our Government and our citizens have continued to play a leading role in providing both material assistance and resettlement opportunities to refugees: in large part through special legislation well over a million refugees have been admitted to the United States of America since the end of World War II.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, of the leadership my country has provided for ICEM. I know that it is repetitious, but repetition sometimes serves a useful purpose, to recall the well-known fact that we have since 1951 done so much, and also to recall the part that the late great Tab Walter and the late great Chancey Reed played in writing the constitution for this organization. I know that they would both be pleased to see here, and have reviewed, that which you have done in these years.

The U.S. Congress, and now I speak only as an individual and for the Congress, in taking this initiative was prompted, among others, by the following principal considerations. First, to provide, outside of the United Nations, for the continuation of the humanitarian work in behalf of the refugees then conducted by the expiring IRO.

Second, to provide modern professionally organized methods under which orderly migration, professionally operated, would replace the antiquated, often inhumane, ways in which immigrants, after traveling in steerage from far away lands were dumped on the docks of the port cities of the world. Three, to serve the interests of our sister republics in the Western Hemisphere by enhancing their economic development through a supply of selected European manpower. It is our considered opinion that ICEM has been, and is continuing to discharge its responsibilities in accordance with its constitution. However, in our changing times the problem of European refugees is vastly different from that which confronted us at the end of World

War II. The unsettled conditions of the world, the existence of governmental systems based upon the denial of the free exercise of human rights, the denial of equal opportunity and the refusal to respect the dignity of the individual, all of these bear eloquent testimony to the continuing need for our united effort.

Mr. Chairman, may I properly paraphrase the words of one of only two honorary citizens of our great country, the late great Churchill, and say "We are not coming to Geneva, we had not come to Geneva and we are not working in behalf of ICEM in the U.S. Congress to preside over its decline and its dissolution. We want ICEM to live and to discharge fully the task that we have imposed upon it." It is with much pride too that we of the United States today, as has been so eloquently said by the Senator and by the Representative from the House, that we inaugurate a new immigration law, and it is my opinion that it will be administered in strict accordance not only with the letter but of the spirit in which it became law. It demonstrates once again, if further demonstration be needed among friends, the unselfish nature of our immigration policy.

As my good friend Peter said, "We no longer need so desperately, nor do we want to take those skileld people who wish to leave the land of their nativity, to go to lands where there is freedom and opportunity." No, it is not in our own self-interest that we have supported this great organization through the years, or that we finally and at long last enacted an immigration law, but it was a manifestation of that noble purpose which was ours for so long.

Finally, I should like to give a departing thought to the members of this council, again as an individual. It is my studied judgment that it is the purpose of at least the majority of the Members of Congress to see that you carry on this noble work in which you have been so successfully engaged.

Uncle Pork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that the mistakes made by the Economic Development Administration are becoming better known and are being more thoroughly discussed in the news. The following report by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak appeared in the Washington Post on March 1.

Their column follows:

INSIDE REPORT: UNCLE PORK

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Just 4 months old, the Economic Development Administration is showing distressing symptoms of the same malady that proved fatal to the late, unlamented Area Redevelopment Administration.

The malady is the political pork barrel syndrome that transformed ARA from an agency aimed at developing economically depressed areas into a political slush fund for Democratic Congressmen. The agency died, to be replaced by EDA.

It had been hoped that EDA would avoid becoming Uncle Pork by sticking to rigid formulas based on economic need, on a regional basis as much as possible. Moreover, there was high hope for its boss, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Eugene Foley, a bright and imaginative political comer who wrote an enviable record as head of the Small Business Administration.

However, Foley has been doing so much traveling around the country, singing the praises of EDA, that his agency has been slow getting off the mark. But far more significant, two incidents in New York now evoke the pork barrel syndrome.

On February 14, Foley traveled through economically depressed sections of northern New York State as the guest of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY. At day's end, he announced a $100,000 EDA grant to study possible broad-gage aid for the area.

The State's two big Republicans—Governor Nelson Rockefeller and Senator JACOB JAVITS—hit the roof. Foley's staff had not taken formal notice of a separate economic development plan prepared by the State government. Neither Rockefeller nor JAVITS had been informed of the Kennedy-Foley trip or the tentative development plan approved by Foley.

In a withering private letter to Foley, JAVITS called Foley's performance "partisan" and "demeaning to the Federal establishment," then stuck in the needle with this question:

"Am I to assume that you are available to accompany every Senator or Congressman who requests your presence on a tour of areas of his State or district for the purpose of making these announcements?"

Three days later, however, KENNEDY himself was out in the cold, along with JAVITS. Foley accepted an invitation to a February 17 meeting in Brooklyn arranged by local Democratic leaders. At the end of the meeting, Foley had another announcement: A $10 million grant might be available to turn the padlocked Brooklyn Naval Yard into an industrial park.

Shock competed with outrage. KENNEDY, JAVITS and Brooklyn's Democratic Representative EMANUEL CELLER had been carefully preparing a March 8 meeting of all interested officials to try to line up Federal aid for the Navy Yard project. Their immediate goal was not Foley's $10 million but a piddling $100,000 in planning money. KENNEDY, JAVITS and CELLER all were uninvited to the February 17 pork-fest. Nor was an invitation to the exclusive affair tendered to Republican Mayor John V. Lindsay.

Rightly or wrongly, this curious incident had anti-KENNEDY overtones for many politicians. Foley is a protege of Vice President HUMPHREY. The highest ranking Democrat at the February 17 meeting—City Council President Frank O'Connor—has been playing footsie with HUMPHREY.

In fact, EDA generally seems tied closely to the Democratic Party's Johnson-Humphrey wing. Its congressional lobbyist is Francis X. Dooley, a Connecticut Democrat who worked for Lyndon B. Johnson's ill-fated presidential campaign of 1960. He now is a lieutenant of H. Marvin Watson, Jr., the Texan who runs the Democratic National Committee from the White House.

A former staffer at the Democratic National Committee, Dooley does not hide his partisanship. When one Republican Congressman complained, Dooley replied baldly that the Congressman had enjoyed favors under President Eisenhower and now it was the Democrats' turn.

Even more surprising is the special switchboard installed at EDA (manned by a former employee of the Democratic National Committee) to screen congressional calls away from low-level professional staffers working on project applications. Although its avowed purpose is to protect the staffers from political pressure, some employees inside EDA suspect that it is a form of political control by the Foley-Dooley duo.

On the credit side, Foley has hired an outstanding planning staff of economists immune from wardheeling politics. But they alone will not save the EDA from trapping itself in petty partisan politics unless Gene Foley firmly decides he will not play Uncle Pork.

Civitan International at Mount Vernon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, each year many members of Civitan International gather at the Mount Vernon tomb of Gen. George Washington to present floral tribute to our first President on his birthday.

The International Civitan president this year is Dr. John R. Pate of Arlington, Va. Dr. Pate is a truly outstanding leader in my northern Virginia district whom I have known and admired for many years. It is therefore a particularly great pleasure to include the full text of the speech he delivered on this occasion in this RECORD, so that its message may reach my colleagues and patriotic Americans everywhere.

GEORGE WASHINGTON: A BUILDER OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP

(By John R. Pate, M.D., president, Civitan International)

In the history of the world, a very large part of what has been achieved can be traced to the work or to the influence of relatively few individuals—individuals who were dedicated, loyal, and so outstanding, as to set them apart from their contemporaries. Such a man was Gen. George Washington, to whom we here today pay our deep and abiding homage. He led us to victory, solidified us as a Nation and as the first President provided the leadership essential for successful and responsible statehood. He, more than any man, cast the mold that built this Nation. His forthright action and fearless leadership has affected the lives and fortunes of every American citizen from his day to ours.

True, he was a child of the Colonies—but in time, he became their father and gave us the incentive to become what we are now as a people. History records in his words his reverence for humanity and citizen responsibility, "When we assumed the soldier—we did not lay aside the citizen," thus indicating his high value for citizenship and a nation of people responsible, but free. He hated nothing more than tyranny. For him, freedom was what gave meaning to life, and he believed it as he believed in God. He truly believed in "humble folk who invariably pay for the deeds or misdeeds of men who lead them." Like his devotion to God, so was his devotion for rights of the individual.

Our Declaration of Independence to which George Washington subscribed, but did not inscribe because he was on the field of battle, gave our forefathers hope for a better world because of this inspiring, invaluable, and challenging document. This declaration which he saved for all time, states in part: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Efforts for fair and honset judgment and precise evaluation of this phrase must have been his, as it has been for many who have since defended it. Man, surely has an inalienable right to liberty but only so far as he does not infringe upon the same inalienable rights of his fellow man. The more quickly a man learns that to so infringe on the liberties of his neighbor is to endanger his own, the more assurance will one have of retaining his own inalienable rights.

As a good citizen, Washington loyally supported the meaning of the statement in the Declaration of Independence—"pursuit of happiness" and understood that actual happiness comes only with the awareness and acceptance of the responsibilities accompanying the "inalienable" rights. He, of course, agreed with Thomas Paine who in 1777 said, "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

The first President would have approved of service organiaztions and challenged them to join hands in sponsoring truth and promoting brotherhood around the world and to pursue the crusade against ignorance and human degradation. He would have followed the principles of helping people to help themselves—but he would have provided the tools to make it possible for all to develop their greatest potential and to become true, contributing, and reliable citizens. He thereby supported and participated in the building of good citizenship. The powerful influence of his character was of the greatest importance in creating and nurturing the desire that was to become our destiny. He took up arms for freedom and fought a war of principles and personified more than any man of his time the "spirit" that was America's. He guided the young Nation in establishing the foundation on which to this day, our structure as a Federal Union stands.

He understood and appreciated the duties of a loyal citizen. In a statement to the Connecticut Legislature on October 17, 1789, he said: "When my country demands the sacrifice, personal ease must always be a secondary consideration," and 17 days later wrote: "The love of my country will be the ruling influence of my conduct." It was his maxim—"that in times of imminent danger every true patriot should occupy the post in which he can render the most effectually" and as a true and noble citizen, he said that, "The consciousness of having attempted faithfully to discharge my duty, and the approbation of my country will be a sufficient recompense for my service."

His life well exemplifies the tenets of the Civitan Creed. At age 14, he surveyed his neighbors' fields, thus began using his hands to do the "work of the world." Having lost his father at age 11, his first real employment at age 16 for Lord Fairfax, of Virginia, provided the opportunity to demonstrate his trustworthiness and diligence and such a degree of competence that he received his commission of county surveyor in 1749 at the early age of 17. A military career beginning at 19 prepared him for the task of general and Commander in Chief of the Army of the United Colonies, 23 years later. Prior to the great 8-year struggle for American independence, he enjoyed life at Mount Vernon as a planter when he was not away serving his countrymen in a public capacity. It was, however, in such endeavors he learned "respect for the law and unqualified allegiance" to and love for his country.

As military commander, his "heart beat" for his courageous men and bled for their injuries and "throbbed with joy" at their every triumph. He constantly thought of their welfare and safety. He realized early in the struggle for independence that the best strategy for his weak, inexperienced troops was to harass the enemy rather than risk an all-out assault. In ensuing years, from time to time, he fell back slowly before superior forces, then struck unexpectedly. It was sound strategy. This provided time for rallying support and conditioning and training of soldiers.

His singular and unsurpassed organizing talents and unparalleled fortitude in the face of adversity during the bleak winter of 1777–78 at Valley Forge will ever brighten the pages of history. His brave and gallant men suffered so intensely from cold and hunger that he wrote to a Virginia friend and delegate to Congress that so many soldiers lacked shoes that "their marches might be traced by the blood from their feet." But he did not, even in those dark days, lose faith and hope. His "ears" heard their "cry" and his "eyes" ever sought "good men."

His influence kept order among soldiers who were frequently half-starved, ill-clothed and at times, one-fourth of the fighting strength on the sick list. Washington kept his courage through the long, weary years of the war for independence, years full of suffering and seeming defeats. He prayed daily to his God for guidance, for his "soul knew no fear." His spirit, even now, is ever present at Valley Forge's Freedoms Foundation—where patriotism is daily nourished by dedicated citizens. Without Washington, the Revolution might have failed almost at the start. His leadership was the inspiration and the power which brought our Nation its freedom.

His devotion to his family and love of children is truly another sign of his greatness. He constantly devoted efforts in behalf of others—especially those for whom he felt personal responsibility. He would have approved and supported the efforts of Civitan's projects in behalf of the handicapped. This, we believe, is shown by a letter to his brother-in-law, Burwell Bassett, written June 20, 1773, on the death of Martha Parke Custis. She was his 17-year-old step-granddaughter whom he called Patsy. The passage is as follows:

"Yesterday the sweet innocent girl entered into a more happy and peaceful abode than any she has met with in the afflicted path she hitherto has trod. She rose from dinner about 4 o'clock in better health and spirits than she appeared to have been in for some time; soon after which she was seized with one of her usual fits, and expired in it, in less than 2 minutes without uttering a word, a groan, or scarce a sigh. This sudden and unexpected blow, I scarce need add, has almost reduced my poor wife to the lowest ebb of misery."

As a devout member of his church he wrote a prayer for our country which begins, "Almighty God, who has given us this good land for our heritage." This prayer is so meaningful that it was incorporated into "The Book of Common Prayer" and is still used in churches throughout our land.

The chronological events in the life of Washington so point to his qualities as a good citizen and "builder of good citizenship" the immortal words spoken on the day of his funeral by John Marshall have ever since been associated only with him, "First in war first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." We, as "builders of good citizenship" can do no more than reverently repeat these words—and continually honor the Father of Our Country.

The Adjudication of Veterans' Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to the continuing improvement in the adjudication of veterans' claims. This improvement results from two public laws enacted by the 87th Congress.

Public Law 87–666 established a new appeals procedure. Under the old procedure a claimant who desired to appeal the denial of his claim to the Board of Veterans' Appeals merely signed a notice of appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The regional office then forwarded the file to the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

In most instances the veteran had never been informed of the facts found by the regional office and had not been informed of the reasons for the denial of his claim. Consequently, the issues were not stated and the so-called appeal was really more in the nature of a review by the Board of Veterans' Appeals. This system encouraged claimants who had been denied in the regional office to appeal to the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

Under the new system established by Public Law 87–666 a claimant whose claim had been denied in the regional office files a notice of disagreement. The regional office then reviews the claim, and if this review does not result in the withdrawal or allowance of the claim, then a statement of the case is prepared, a copy of which is furnished the claimant and his representative.

The statement of the case contains a summary of the material evidence, a statement of the applicable rules of law, and a statement setting out the reasons for the denial of the claim. The claimant then has 60 days in which to respond to the statement of the case. If the response of the claimant does not result in allowance of the claim by the regional office, it is certified to the Board of Veterans' Appeals in Washington.

The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs receives quarterly and annual reports from the Board of Veterans' Appeals on the status of appeals and claims referred to independent medical experts. The annual reports for the calendar year 1965 are included at the conclusion of these remarks and I believe they amply support the judgment of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Congress in the enactment of these two public laws. These reports show that 38,325 notices of disagreement were disposed of in regional offices during the year; that 2,004 of these were withdrawn; and that 30,887 statements of the case were issued. In 10,993 cases the appeal was abandoned when the claimant failed to respond to the statement of the case. Twenty-two thousand one hundred and ninety-four appeals were received by the Board of Veterans' Appeals during the calendar year.

It is significant to note that the new appeals procedure has substantially reduced the number of appeals received by the Board of Veterans' Appeals. This is because more claims are now being finally determined in the regional office without going through the costly appeals procedure. This is largely due to the fact that the claimant under the new procedure receives more complete information about the denial of his claim so that he recognizes the futility of proceeding further with it. This is shown by the fact that 10,993, or 35 percent of the claims, were abandoned in the regional office after the claimant received the statement of the case.

Under the old procedure, approximately 42,700 claims were appealed annually which is 20,606, or 52 percent, more than the number of appeals received in the calendar year 1965. In fiscal year 1961, 3,831 claims, or 8 percent, of the total appeals were allowed by the Board of Veterans' Appeals. Under the new system, in calendar year 1965 the Board of Veterans' Appeals allowed 2,939, or 12.9 percent, of the appeals it considered. In the calendar year 1965, the regional offices allowed 5,434 claims, or 14.2 percent, after the notice of disagreement had been received and allowed 1,677, or 7.6 percent, after receipt of the claimants' response to the statement of the case. In all, a total of 10,050 claims were allowed after the notice of disagreement was received. This constitutes 28.7 percent of the 38,325 notices of disagreement disposed of during the calendar year 1965.

Public Law 87-671 established a procedure whereby the Board of Veterans' Appeals might refer to independent medical experts outside of the Veterans' Administration claims which involve complex medical questions. In such cases the claim is first referred to the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration and, if this results in an opinion unfavorable to the claimant, the medical question involved is then referred to an independent medical expert outside the Veterans' Administration.

The statistics appearing at the conclusion of my remarks disclose that the Board of Veterans' Appeals, during the calendar year 1965, acted upon 251 claims in which they had received opinions from medical experts outside the Veterans' Administration. Of these 251 claims the independent medical experts disagreed with the Board of Appeals and the Chief Medical Director 96 times and agreed 155 times. This means that 96 appealed claims, or 38 percent of the total referred to independent medical experts, were allowed on the basis of independent opinion outside of the Veterans' Administration.

It is significant to note that the Veterans' Administration opposed the enactment of each of these public laws and that the VA could have established the appeals procedure and the independent medical expert program by administrative action if the agency had chosen to do so.

	Number	Percent
Stage I. Notices of disagreement:		
1. Pending Jan. 1, 1965	5,222	------
2. Received, to date	39,114	------
3. Disposed of, to date	38,325	100.0
(a) Allowed	5,434	14.2
(b) Withdrawn	2,004	5.2
(c) SOC issued	30,887	80.6
4. Pending	6,011	------
Stage II. Statements of case:		
1. Pending Jan. 1, 1965	4,892	------
2. Issued, to date	30,887	------
3. Disposed of, to date	30,776	100.0
(a) Substantive appeal filed	19,783	64.3
(b) Failure to respond	10,993	35.7
4. Pending	5,003	------
Stage III. Substantive appeals:		
1. Pending Jan. 1, 1965	3,830	------
2. Received, to date	22,467	------
3. Disposed of, to date	22,097	100.0
(a) Allowed	1,677	7.6
(b) Withdrawn	560	2.5
(c) Certified to BVA	19,860	89.9
4. Pending	4,200	------
Stage IV. Board of Veterans Appeals:		
1. Pending Jan. 1, 1965	5,606	------
2. Received, to date	22,194	------
3. Disposed of, to date	22,819	100.0
(a) Allowed	2,939	12.9
(b) Remanded	2,865	12.6
(c) Denied or dismissed	16,750	73.3
(d) Withdrawn	265	1.2
4. Pending	4,961	------

NOTE.—Percentages shown in each stage relate to dispositions in that stage only.

Report of outside medical opinions requested by Board of Veterans' Appeals, calendar year 1965 (Public Law 87-671)

Item description	Total	Disability compensation	Death compensation	Other
1. Independent medical expert opinions: [1]				
(a) Number requested, total	276	209	64	3
Percent of total appeals in these categories disposed of	2.1			
Number requested in connection with appellate consideration	257	193	61	3
Number requested in connection with reconsideration	19	16	3	0
(b) Number of favorable opinions submitted to a 2d medical expert or panel	1	1	0	0
(c) Number of unfavorable opinions submitted to a 2d medical expert or panel	11	10	1	0
(d) Source of requests: [2]				
Congressional	22	14	8	0
BVA on own motion	108	78	27	3
Veterans' organizations:				
American Legion	34	26	8	0
AMVETS	0	0	0	0
DAV	29	25	4	0
VFW	29	28	1	0
Other	47	36	11	0
Veteran	7	7	0	0
Dependents of veteran	3	0	3	0
(e) Cost:				
Average per opinion	44.02			
High per opinion	100			
Low per opinion [3]	0			
2. Opinions requested from Chief Medical Director [1]	470	378	71	21
3. Number of appeals allowed after getting an IME or CMD opinion	287	244	33	10
Regular appellate decisions	251	214	27	10
Reconsideration appellate decisions	36	30	6	0
4. Disposition by the Board after getting an IME or CMD opinion: IME: Allowed, 96; denied, 155. CMD: Allowed, 191; denied, 267.				

---

[1] Figures shown in items 1 and 2 relate to requests, not dispositions during report period. Although the Board requested 276 independent medical expert and 470 Chief Medical Director opinions, 283 independent medical expert, and 476 Chief Medical Director opinions were received.

[2] Some may be dual requests; i.e., service organization and Member of Congress, etc.

[3] 39 opinions rendered by the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, 1 by National Institutes of Health, and 1 by U.S. Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine, no fee involved.

NOTE.—When the Board decides, on the basis of medical controversy or complexity, that the opinion of an independent medical expert is to be sought, an expert opinion is usually first obtained from the Chief Medical Director of the VA, if such opinion is not already of record. If the opinion of the CMD is favorable to the claimant, the Board usually decides the case without proceeding further. If it is unfavorable, the IME opinion is obtained by the Board before finally deciding the appeal.

R.F.K. Uses the Lincoln Ploy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the following editorial appearing in the February 25, 1966, issue of the Peoria Journal Star. The editorial accurately points out that Lincoln—and the Whig Party—was careful not to say anything while the Mexican War was in progress that would detract from the efforts of the American troops.

The hostilities ended on September 14, 1847, and Lincoln made his speech on January 2, 1848. Lincoln made a special point in his speech that he thought the right thing to do was to remain silent until the war ends. Lincoln also made the point that he voted for all necessary supplies and support for the troops.

Lincoln supported the politically inspired Ashmun amendment, probably because the slavery issue was injected, but even this amendment was not offered until the end of hostilities. Lincoln tried to "get off the hook" with his own "spot" resolution and his speech of January 2, 1848. One might argue that the Gadsden Purchase answered the territorial questions raised in Lincoln's resolution which had previously been tabled, but the purchase certainly was not intended to erase the memory of the Alamo. Lincoln certainly never tried to erase the memory of the Alamo.

Lincoln realized his responsibilities in both war and peace.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial at this point:

R.F.K. Uses the Lincoln Plot

We have seen the trick used over and over and over again, until we are so annoyed with misrepresentation that we can't let it pass any longer, unimportant though the detail may be.

We mean the persistent practice of folks raising some form of fuss about the Vietnam war, claiming the "precedent" of Abraham Lincoln and his famous speech in criticism of the Mexican War.

Bobby Kennedy is the latest to do so. His recent speech that caused a bit of fuss led off with 2 pages of apologia on the virtues of dissent even in time of war and again cited Lincoln's alleged example, rapping the Polk administration in the "war of 1848."

But there wasn't any war in 1848.

It was over.

The Mexicans had been beaten on every field. Our troops were occupying Mexico City. A new election started the year 1848 with a new Mexican "peace president" and peace negotiations began at once.

We were already completely and totally victorious in that war before Lincoln rose to criticize in a speech that couldn't possibly affect American forces in the field or the character of the Mexican resistance and could only have been aimed at demanding a fair and reasonable peace treaty for the defeated Mexican nation.

The fact of history is that Lincoln held his tongue throughout the period of actual fighting and waited until our arms were not affected before he made his criticism.

And that's the precedent that has been repeated and falsely cited as justifying remarks being made today in the midst of battle at a time when they have been welcomed as encouragement by the enemy in the field.

If anyone were really, honestly, concerned to follow Lincoln's example they would, in fact, keep their mouths shut in these circumstances. He did.

Yet they have either the nerve, or the unscrupulous trickery, or the historical stupidity to actually claim "Lincoln's action" as an excuse for their own.

It's irritating, but we admit, beside the point.

There is not any question at all about the right to find fault in war as in peace. You can verbally attack the United States even though it does encourage the enemy in the midst of bitter fighting.

And, then, in turn you can also be attacked for your position on the matter—by the same principle, and right, and guaranteed freedom.

Your responsibility then is to defend your position—not holler "foul"—or cite a phony "example" in Lincoln.

We haven't heard anybody deny the fact that Ho Chi Minh has been encouraged by the seeming confusion, uncertainty, and fears thus expressed in the United States, to the point that he has publicly given thanks for them, and has cited them as evidence that the Vietcong should keep on fighting and refusing to negotiate.

No. They just want to howl—"But we have a right to speak up."

Sure, you do. That's beside the point. The question is not if you have such a right, but are you doing the right thing when you make use of it to give aid and encouragement to the enemy and to prolong the war in which Americans are fighting and dying at the behest of their country as required of them by those legally elected to make such decisions?

And you surely don't have a right to snuggle up to Lincoln—he plainly did not think such conduct was right.

Vast Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Cheyenne, Wyo., Eagle seems typical of many which I have read recently. It states that it believes "the vast majority of Americans understand and support the President in his policy of 'prudent firmness under careful control' while pursuing a diplomatic search for an honorable peace."

The paper recognizes that "President Johnson has left, is leaving no stone unturned in his efforts to move the Vietnam conflict from the battlefield to the conference table. And he has made it abundantly clear, over and over, that the United States will not be pushed out of Vietnam by force of arms."

The article to which I refer clarifies some issues which concern us so urgently at this time, and with the permission of my colleagues I offer the editorial for the Record:

Goals Underscored

By now, everyone in this Nation, and most of the leaders throughout the world, should understand our goals and purposes in Vietnam, our reasons for being there, and our determination to stay until aggression from the north has stopped.

President Johnson has left, is leaving no stone unturned in his efforts to move the Vietnam conflict from the battlefield to the conference table. And he has made it abundantly clear, over and over, that the United States will not be pushed out of Vietnam by force of arms.

In his state of the Union message, delivered during the 37-day bombing lull, the President said:

"We do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest."

He pointed out "our decision to stand firm has been matched by our desire for peace."

And he stated:

"Until peace comes, or if it does not come, our course is clear. We will act as we must to help protect the independence of the valiant people of South Vietnam. We will strive to limit conflict, for we wish neither increased destruction nor increased danger.

"But we will give our fighting men what they must have; every gun, every dollar, and every decision—whatever the cost and whatever the challenge."

Wednesday, the President again underscored U.S. goals in southeast Asia, pledging a continued military course of "prudent firmness under careful control" while pursuing a diplomatic search for an honorable peace.

"We will build freedom while we fight," he said, "and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high, hard road of freedom."

He said that, already, "the tide of the battle has turned" against the Communists. And he reminded North Vietnam his offer of unconditional peace talks still stands.

He assured critics here at home that "there is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation."

"We have threatened no one—and we will not," he said. "We seek the end of no regime—and will not.

"Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will reply."

"Men ask who has a right to rule in Vietnam. Our answer there is what is has been here for 200 years; the people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice."

Still with us, of course, are those who would have us plunge forward in a "mindless escalation" of the war.

Some urge unlimited bombing, regardless of what effect it might have upon world opinion, and apparently without concern over the question of whether it might bring China or Russia into the war.

On the other hand, some would have us turn our backs on our commitments—pull out of southeast Asia and leave South Vietnam, and perhaps other countries, at the mercy of the Communists. The utter folly of this course should be obvious to all.

Fortunately, the man with the responsibility is the President of the United States. The decisions are his, and he has the advice and assistance of the best experts available.

We believe the vast majority of Americans understand and support the President in his policy of "prudent firmness under careful control" while pursuing a diplomatic search for an honorable peace.

Business Citizenship Competition by the American Security Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, beginning today the American Security Council, nationally and internationally renowned for its sober analyses and projects regarding the cold war, is conducting a unique contest open to all Americans with respect to the role of business of the cold war. Awards amounting to $100,000 are being offered for the best papers and articles on this vital subject.

There are many of us who have felt that the United States had not exploited to the full its economic power in turning the scales against the Red totalitarian network in this incessant cold war. Also, the actual and potential losses of constructive American investments abroad, as for example in Cuba and Venezuela respectively, have not been soberly assessed by our dynamic entrepreneurs.

It is questionable, too, that private enterprise with its tremendous genius for technological revolution has been fully appreciated as a formidable weapon for freedom. In addition, the generally neutralist attitude of American business in the cold war is another angle calling for intensive analysis. These and many other basic points are ideas deserving of careful study, which this unique contest provides the opportunity for.

For the benefit of all Americans, I insert the release on "$100,000 for Best

Ideas on the Role of Business in the Cold War" in the Record. I also insert the rules and entry form, so that this vital information can be made available to all Americans concerned with the power of free enterprise in the cause of expanded freedom:

One Hundred Thousand Dollars for Best Ideas on the Role of Business in the Cold War

Chicago.—A $100,000 business citizenship competition to encourage fresh thinking on the responsibilities of business in the cold war was announced today by John M. Fisher, president of the American Security Council (ASC).

The competition will be conducted by the ASC under a public service grant from the Schick Safety Razor Co.

Calling the cold war a "psychological hot war," Fisher said that the purpose of the contest was to find effective ways to use the talents and resources of business in the worldwide battle for the minds of men.

He said that Patrick J. Frawley, Jr., chairman of the board of the Schick Safety Razor Co. made this grant because American business has the greatest array of sales, advertising, and public relations talents in the world but these talents have not been effectively mobilized to merchandise freedom.

"As the advertising genius who merchandised the Paper-Mate pen and the Schick stainless steel blade, Mr. Frawley is particularly aware of this business gap," Fisher said. "Someone had to take a first step in filling this gap, so Schick is granting $100,000 in awards to encourage the competition."

The top five individual awards are $25,000, $10,000, $7,000, $5,000, and $2,500. Grants equal to these awards will be given by Schick to cooperating organizations, colleges and universities named by the award winners. There will also be 1,000 medals given as special awards.

Entries are to be in the form of essays with the winning papers to be published as the appendix of "The Business Gap in the Cold War," the second in the ASC's current series of studies on "Peace and Freedom through Cold War Victory."

The contest will be judged by a committee headed by Robert W. Galvin, chairman of the board of Motorola, Inc.

Quoting the National Governors Conference report on cold war education, Fisher said: "The American right to engage in private enterprise, like the right of citizenship itself, is balanced by a responsibility to defend and strengthen the system which makes free enterprise possible."

He called upon all Americans to make their thoughts count for freedom by advising the business community how it can best meet these citizenship responsibilities.

Deadline for submissions to the competition is December 31, 1966. All Americans are eligible to enter except employees of the Schick Safety Razor Co. and the ASC.

Further information and entry forms may be obtained by writing to: Business Citizenship Competition, c/o American Security Council, 123 N. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

The American Security Council is a bipartisan not-for-profit association with over 3,500 member institutions throughout the United States. Its membership includes business firms of all types, newspapers, foundations, universities and other institutions. It is the means through which its members work together and cooperate with the government and with other organizations in the interest of national security.

Rules and Entry Form—$100,000 Business Citizenship Competition

A PSYCHOLOGICAL HOT WAR

Some call the current conflict a cold war. It is also a psychological hot war, waged by communism to shape and influence the actions of free men. The Communist takeover of Cuba is a good example of this kind of war. Most Cubans and Americans were fooled by the false picture of Castro the liberator—a composite of Simon Bolivar and George Washington. Not until Cubans had lost their freedom was he revealed as a tool of communism.

We understand, react to, and repel attacks by bullets and bombs, but if we are to survive the psychological and political warfare of communism, new and effective means must be found to counter communism's challenge to freedom.

Our challenge is to find the most effective way of recruiting and using the talents and resources of business in the global battle for men's minds.

BUSINESS RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE CONFLICT

Private enterprise and all Americans dependent upon it for their livelihood suffer every time the free world gives ground to communism. With each Communist gain, be it in Cuba, the Far East, or Latin America, the danger to the remaining free world increases.

Countering communism is the responsibility of all segments of society—not of government alone.

No one knows this better than President Johnson, who recently said, "The great majority of our citizens, I believe, want to understand the form and fashion of the challenge posed for us by communism." To meet that need, the President said there is "not only a proper role, but a real need for leadership of business * * * in providing Americans with * * * sound information on which they can rely and from which they can make their own decisions as to the rightness or wrongness of the paths we pursue in the search for a peace which preserves our freedoms."

And in a formal report on cold war education, the Governors of our 50 States reminded businesses that "the American right to engage in free enterprise, like the right of citizenship itself, is balanced by a responsibility to defend and strengthen the system which makes free enterprise possible."

USE OF IDEAS

The winning papers will be published as the appendix of "the Business Gap in the Cold War," the second in the American Security Council's series of studies on "Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory." The 128 colleges and universities and 102 major organizations which have cooperated in this series of studies will be joined by new cooperating institutions. All cooperating institutions will be eligible for grants to be given in the winners' names.

THE AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL

The American Security Council is operated for the improvement of business and public understanding of the cold war and how to meet the Communist challenge.

Leaders of American business created the council to provide a nonpolitical, nonprofit vehicle through which they could lay aside competitive business and political considerations to work together and with all segments of society in their common business interest of securing themselves and the country against the clear Communist threat.

In the 10 years since its creation, the American Security Council has:

1. Become the largest business-operated organization in the field of national security.

2. Brought together the largest group of opinionmaking organizations (102) and educational institutions (128) ever to cooperate in developing national strategy recommendations. The resulting strategic studies have been nationally acclaimed.

3. Built a major research center, which includes the largest private library on national security and communism in this country. This center has handled over 150,000 research assignments from members, Government agencies, congressional committees, and newspapers.

4. Published the weekly American Security Council Washington Report, which is widely reprinted or quoted by newspapers, used as a prime news source by international wire services, quoted in editorials across the country, used as a basis for class consideration of current events in a number of institutions of higher education, and served as the basis for many speeches on the floor of both the House and the Senate.

5. Produced the American Security Council Washington Report of the Air, the bipartisan world affairs radio program coedited by Dr. Walter H. Judd, Republican, and Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat. This program is broadcast by more stations than any other daily radio program in the United States.

6. Consistently maintained an impartial and nonpolitical program to identify and disseminate facts concerning the threat of communism to American democracy and to initiate sound and effective responses in support of private enterprise and individual freedoms.

OFFICIAL RULES

1. The business citizenship competition is open to all persons in the United States, its territories and possessions, except employees of the Schick Safety Razor Co., the American Security Council, and their families, and residents of areas where contests are prohibited or taxed by State or local laws or regulations.

2. The contest entry must be in the form of an essay not less than 10 nor more than 20 single-spaced 8½-inch by 11-inch neatly typewritten pages. The essay must include a statement or definition of businesses' cold war citizenship responsibilities and tell how a business firm like Schick can use its talents and resources effectively in the global battle for men's minds.

Recommendations for corporate action should be specific to the extent of identifying communications media and corporate resource and personnel commitments necessary for their completion. The recommendations may cover a full range of actions or be limited to one detailed program or activity.

3. The competition is open to any individual or group of individuals. Each submission must be in the name of one individual and accompanied by the official entry form. The names of others participating in the submission should be listed in the space provided on the entry form.

4. Entries must be postmarked no later than December 31, 1966, and received no later than January 10, 1967. They must be mailed to: Business Citizenship Competition, c/o the American Security Council, 123 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. Authors of award-winning submissions will be notified by mail on or before June 30, 1967.

5. Judging will be by a panel drawn from the National Strategy Committee and officers of the American Security Council. Decisions of the judges are final. All submissions become the property of the Schick Safety Razor Co. and the American Security Council and may be used by either or both in whatever way they deem appropriate.

6. Each participant in the competition may designate an educational institution or not-for-profit organization which is cooperating in the American Security Council's study on "The Business in the Cold War," to receive a contribution in his name equal to his cash award if he is one of the five top winners.

Cooperators will be welcomed from the ranks of bona fide colleges and universities, public or private, and from among the many nonprofit organizations whose interests include some element of national security.

To enroll as a cooperator in the current study, qualified institutions and organizations are invited to complete and send in the form on the reserve of the competition entry in this brochure.

7. State, Federal, or other taxes applicable to the awards will be the sole responsibility of the individuals, institutions, or organizations to which they are granted.

COOPERATING ORGANIZATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The task of the American Security Council is to link the business community of the Nation with the other vital segments of the American free society in the development and implementation of the means by which the challenge of communism may be effectively countered.

Vital to this undertaking is the cooperation of a wide variety of institutions and organizations representative of opinionmakers at all levels and in all areas of American endeavor.

In "Guidelines for Cold War Victory" the first of its series of studies entitled "Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory," the American Security Council had the unprecedented cooperation of 128 colleges and universities and 102 organizations. For the second study in this series, "The Business Gap in the Cold War," the council seeks to broaden this base of participation. To encourage participation, the Schick Safety Razor Co. is offering duplicate cash awards to the cooperators designed by the winners of the top five competition awards.

The basic work on each ASC study is done by its national strategy committee supported by the council's staff and consultants. Working drafts are then submitted to cooperators, member of the council, several council committees, and officials of governmental and international agencies who have agreed to review and criticize the draft.

The resulting review and criticism by cooperators, ranging from a single letter to detailed position papers, are considered in the preparation of additional drafts and the final study, thereby providing not only a balanced viewpoint, but an accurate reflection of the thinking and concerns of a broad spectrum of American life.

The five winning papers will be published as an appendix to this current study on "The Business Gap in the Cold War."

It should be emphasized that by becoming an official cooperator in an ASC study no individual, organization or institution is bound to specific positions and recommendations that may be taken in the final study report. The final content of the study is the sole responsibility of the National Strategy Committee of the ASC and is clearly identified as such.

For the purposes of the business citizenship competition, cooperation in the ASC study series shall in no way preclude submissions from individuals or groups affiliated with the cooperating organization or institution, such as faculty members, officers, or staff members.

THE JUDGES, NATIONAL STRATEGY COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL

Chairman: Robert W. Galvin, chairman and chief executive officer, Motorola, Inc.

Cochairman: Loyd Wright, past president, American Bar Association.

Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, U.S. Army (retired), former chief of staff to Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Bennett Archambault, chairman of the board, Stewart-Warner Corp.

Lloyd L. Austin, chairman of the board, Security-First National Bank.

Gen. Mark W. Clark, U.S. Army (retired).

Charles S. Craigmile, retired chairman of the board, Belden Manufacturing Co.

Henry Duque, partner, Adams, Duque & Hazeltine.

Wade Fetzer, Jr., chairman, Alexander & Co.

Patrick J. Frawley, Jr., chairman of the board, Eversharp, Inc., and Technicolor, Inc.

Fred Gillies, retired chairman of the board, Acme Steel Co.

Clifford Hood, former president, United States Steel Corp.

Wayne A. Johnston, president, Illinois Central Railroad.

William H. Kendall, president, Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

A. B. McKee, Jr., president, Forest Lumber Co., Imperial Valley Lumber Co.

Adm. Ben Moreell, U.S. Navy (retired), former chairman of the board, Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.

Dr. Robert Morris, president, University of Plano.

Dr. Stefan Possony, director of international studies, Hoover Institution, Stanford University.

Adm. Felix B. Stump, U.S. Navy (retired), former commander in chief, Pacific.

Dr. Edward Teller, nuclear scientist.

Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, U.S. Navy (retired), retired judge advocate general, U.S. Navy.

Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, U.S. Army (retired), chief U.S. strategist, World War II.

Maj. Gen. W. A. Worton, U.S. Marine Corps (retired), retired president, American Library of Information.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech entitled, "Democracy: What It Means to Me," written and delivered by Mr. Mike Stone, of Panama City, Fla. He is the winner in the Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary.

The speech follows:

DEMOCRACY

(By Mike Stone, 6024 South Lagoon Drive, Panama City, Fla.)

The institution of governments is an inevitable step in man's progression from the cave, but the success of these governments is by no means assured, even if we assume them to be logical and meritorious treatments of man's needs. It is rather man himself who, by his integrity and enlightenment or lack of it, determines the degree of permanency to which his government will attain.

Democracy, though not a governmental system, denotes, as it comes to us from the Greek, a philosophy which calls for "government by the people." In the modern concept, this "government by the people" has come to be considered a representation of all the people by the universal election of government officials, and it is in this sense that democracy is practiced in several nations of the world today, including our own. The fact that all the people are unable to take a direct hand in democratic government constitutes the strength as well as the weakness of the democratic system.

For if the mechanics of governments were administered by every citizen in his own manner and at his own discretion, the result would be chaos and anarchy. This is precisely the mode of behavior that man discarded when he left the cave. Yet, on the other hand, if the power of government should be placed in the hands of an exclusive few who are not held to the account of the populace, then we run the risk of tyranny and slavery.

This is why it has been said that freemen, by the very nature of their freedom, are the least free of all men. For they are charged with the indefatigable pursuit of knowledge if they are to succeed. The whole concept of representative government is predicated on the demand that the people keep themselves informed as to the emergent events of the day. At the heart of this responsibility is the doctrine of free speech. To reach the most lofty pinnacle of general enlightenment, it is essential that all citizens be free to speak out or record their opinions, if offered as such, without fear of persecution or restraint. Above all, no matter how unpopular a viewpoint may be, no matter how it offends the morals or the patriotic conceptions of the vast majority, that idea must not be kept from expression, lest that which is patriotic in intent become binding in effect, and we lose our liberties through fear to exercise them. To hang on to old ideas and condemn new ones as works of treason is to deny the functioning of the very principles which compose democracy. And to do this would certainly mean our demise.

Americans have been set down in a world which knows little democracy. Yet we cannot dissociate ourselves from the nations that do not entertain the democratic process. These nations exert, and will continue to exert, no minor influence upon the activities of the world community. We must acknowledge this and live with it. Coexistence with different ideas does not allow the forced condemnation of these ideas; rather, it demands that we use only the power of knowledge and truth to sway opinion, and that for this, we are first assured that our own philosophy is the culmination of intelligent debate. If we accomplish this, we will, in the process of gaining world respect and support, be reaffirming our own democracy.

The great triumph of democracy is that it has survived without imposing itself, and that it has had as its cornerstone the opposite principle that all peoples have the right to choose their own pursuits and their own governments. Unless we retain this single principle above all others, our name will join that long list of fallen powers which have been as temporal meteors in a sky that knows darkness as its only permanent feature.

Aircraft Accident Near Spain—January 17, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last January 17 a tragic aircraft accident occurred off the coast of Spain near the village of Palomares. A mid-air collision between a U.S. B–52 bomber carrying unarmed nuclear weapons and a KC–135 tanker took the lives of seven U.S. Air Force personnel. While the accident itself was announced at the time that it occurred, prior to yesterday no subsequent details concerning the effects of this accident had been officially announced by the U.S. Government or the Government of Spain.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has followed this matter very closely and has received on two separate occa-

sions in the last month and a half briefings in executive session concerning the accident, the search for an unarmed nuclear weapon and a report on the steps taken to assure that areas affected with radioactive materials have been thoroughly cleaned up.

While I believe that more specific information should have been given out to the public much earlier, I am happy to report today that the chairman of the Spanish Nuclear Energy Board, Dr. Otero, made a statement to a Madrid newspaper last night and said:

> Not a single case of radioactive contamination worthy of the name has been registered in the Palomares region or its surroundings.

He went on to state that there has been no kind of nuclear explosion and that "not a single persan among the inhabitants of the region or the personnel of the teams of the Nuclear Energy Board has received a dangerous dose of any kind."

His statement also pointed out that:

> All measures to assure that zones affected by the accident of January 17 are completely cleaned, have been taken. A quantity of vegetables and soil contaminated by accident is being withdrawn so it can be stated that security of zone already has been guaranteed.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a spokesman for the Spanish Government has now made its announcement concerning the safety of the people exposed in this area of Spain as a result of the B-52 and tanker collision, the U.S. Department of State has this afternoon released a statement which sums up the situation with regard to this tragic accident and the efforts made to clean up the area. Search is of course continuing for the as yet unrecovered, but unarmed nuclear weapon.

I place the official U.S. announcement on this incident in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

PRESS RELEASE MADE BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE ON MARCH 2, 1966

Pursuant to the statement by the chairman of the Spanish Nuclear Energy Board yesterday, I can say that search is being pressed off the Spanish coast for the recovery of material carried by the two planes involved in the recent air collision and for fragments of wreckage which might furnish clues to the cause of the accident. Included aboard the B-52 which collided with the KC-135 tanker were several unarmed nuclear weapons, one of which has not yet been recovered.

When this search and investigation have been concluded, further announcement will be made of the results.

The impact of the weapons on land resulted in scattering of a small amount of plutonium (Pu[illegible]) and uranium (U[illegible]) in the immediate vicinity of the points of impact. There was no nuclear explosion.

Built-in safeguards perfected through years of extensive safety testing, have allowed the United States to handle, store, and transport nuclear weapons for more than two decades. Thorough safety rules and practices also have been developed for dealing with any weapon accident which might result in the spilling of nuclear materials.

Radiological surveys of the Palomares area and its human and animal populations have included detailed laboratory studies by leading Spanish and U.S. scientists throughout the 44 days since the accident. They have obtained no evidence of a health hazard. These experts say there is no hazard from eating vegetables marketed from this area, from eating the meat or fish or drinking the milk of animals.

Steps have been taken to insure that the affected areas are thoroughly cleaned up, and some soil and vegetation are being removed.

These measures are part of a comprehensive program to eliminate the chance of hazard, to set at rest unfounded fears, and thus to restore normal life and livelihood to the people of Palomares.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the winning speech for the State of Utah in the Veterans of Foreign Wars and Ladies Auxiliary Voice of Democracy Contest. The speech was written by Dan J. Garner of Sunset, Utah, which is in my congressional district.

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

There can be no realization of life, without death; no virtue, without vice; no beauty without the hideous; and no freedom, without opposition. We, as inhabitants of the free world, cannot fully appreciate or realize the benefits of a democracy unless we are faced with the possibility of losing those basic liberties which we enjoy. We have defended our democratic way of life in past wars and, are now opposing the confrontations of despotism and tyranny around the world—specifically in our present struggle in Vietnam.

Democracy is not an abstract force which defies definition, but a form of government in which the people are both the governors and the governed. Democracy is an offspring of Christianity. It is based upon the applicability of Christ's basic teachings—love and justice.

We cannot sit idly by and enjoy the blessings of a democracy. Thomas Jefferson confirmed this statement when he said: "Liberty is a boisterous sea. Timid men prefer the calm of despotism." Each generation has been faced with the task of winning, for itself, the marvelous freedoms which we sometimes take for granted. We are not to be exempt.

It may seem a task, reserved for the wise with age, to preserve our democratic way of life. But the preservation of democracy requires the cooperative effort of everyone. So, what can we as teenagers and high school students, contribute to this effort?

Jefferson paraphrased the supreme need for a democracy in saying, "The state that hopes to be ignorant and free, is hoping for something that never was and never will be." The first step, in doing our part to defend our Government of equal opportunity, is to stay in school and strive to acquire the best education possible. Second, we must not be afraid to get involved. In supporting our laws, we are supporting justice; and, in supporting justice, we are defending democracy. Third, through the development of ourselves, intellectually and morally, blooms the success of our Nation; for, the moment any citizen begins to seek special privilege or to exploit his fellow men, that moment democracy ceases for him.

"Patriotism is the throbbing pulse of a democratic government." It is the force which inspires loyalty, in times of peace, and heroism, in times of war. But, true patriotism does not consist of saluting the flag. It is not merely lipservice; but, a deep and earnest conviction in democracy's superiority over all other forms of government. We can love a nation—I love this Nation.

As evidence, to support democracy, Edward R. Murrow said, "The largest educational machine in the world is in Berlin. It is 27 miles long. It is strung with barbed wire. It teaches lessons in the meaning of democracy and communism, of freedom and tyranny, of humanity and inhumanity. Its name is 'the wall.' "

Democracy is a practical form of government, established for the purpose of the betterment of man. A democratic government is based upon trust in man, as stated by Gandhi, "You must not lose faith in humanity. Humanity is an ocean; if a few drops of the ocean are dirty, the ocean does not become dirty."

Because of the icy cold war, in progress around the globe, and the raging hot war in Vietnam; we must stand firm in our democratic—our American—belief. My feelings toward America can be summed up in the following excerpts from a poem by Elias Lieberman:

" 'See,' said my father, pointing to the flag
that fluttered near;
'That flag of stars and stripes is yours;
It is the emblem of the promised land.
It means, my son, the hope of humanity.
Live for it—die for it!'
Under the open sky of my new country I
swore to do so;
And every drop of blood in me will keep
that vow.
I am proud of my future.
I am an American."

School Milk and Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposal to reduce drastically the school milk and lunch program is a matter of great concern to school administrators all over the country.

Mr. Paul W. Briggs, superintendent of Cleveland public schools, has written me as follows:

> If these programs are limited only to the children from welfare homes as suggested by President Johnson, school principals will find it almost impossible to administer the program without serious embarrassment to needy children.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that last year when we were discussing the medicare plan the means test was considered degrading. Is it any less so when applied to children?

As part of my remarks, I include the letter received from Superintendent Paul W. Briggs and a statement by the Board of Education, Cleveland City School District:

CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 23, 1966.

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: Attached you will find a statement approved by the Cleveland Board of Education at its last meeting.

The members of the Cleveland Board of Education are greatly concerned over the announcement that the national school lunch and milk programs are in the process of being drastically reduced. If these programs are limited only to the children from welfare homes as suggested by President Johnson, school principals will find it almost impossible to administer the program without serious embarrassment to needy children.

Your attention to this problem and assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Paul W. Briggs,
Superintendent.

Statement Concerning Cutbacks in School Lunch and Milk Program

The Board of Education of the Cleveland Public Schools regrets to learn that the Federal Government made a substantial cutback in donated commodities and milk subsidy in the schools' lunch program. This action seriously impairs a recent innovation in the Cleveland public schools, which has provided nearly 300,000 meals monthly to junior and senior high school students—a nutritious, hot lunch for 35 cents as compared to earlier costs exceeding 50 cents. Through the milk program, we are serving over 1½ million cartons per month including 360,000 cartons to needy elementary children.

The Cleveland public schools cannot believe the Federal Government intends to discontinue well-balanced hot nutritious meals to children of families receiving relief. A discontinuance of the present program would work a severe hardship on Cleveland children.

Medical studies of preschool children residing in impoverished areas have revealed serious nutritional deficiencies. We are convinced that the resources of the national school lunch and milk programs are an important dimension in providing for the total educational needs of children.

The Board of Education of the Cleveland Public Schools urges that congressional representatives from Cleveland make every effort to halt the present cutbacks and to consider the possibility of expansion. We urge that new programs and extensions include the needs of all children.

Approved unanimously, February 21, 1966.

Tribute to James J. Dolan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of this House the saga of a man who has fought a great fight to save the Brooklyn Navy Yard and to protect the careers of the workers uprooted by this unfortunate closing—he is James J. Dolan, president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, who in this capacity represents all the workers at the navy yard.

I would like to insert the following tributes—a citation from the borough president of Brooklyn, an article from the New York World Telegram of February 1, and two articles from the February 22 Civil Service Leader:

Citation by the President of Brooklyn, City of New York

Whereas the Brooklyn Navy Yard was established over 164 years ago by our Founding Fathers and has ever since provided the finest fighting ships to the U.S. Navy to deter aggression in peace and to win battles in time of war; and

Whereas the ships built at the Brooklyn Navy Yard from the first, the ship of the line *Ohio*, to the last, the modern fighting ship *Duluth*, have been built with pride and craftsmanship by the expert shipbuilders of the Navy Yard; and

Whereas the miracles of production wrought at the Brooklyn Navy Yard have justly earned for it the name of the "can do" shipyard; and

Whereas the Brooklyn Navy Yard has now, despite its magnificent history and tremendous facilities, been ordered to be closed; and

Whereas James J. Dolan, of the Borough of Brooklyn and president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, labored with untiring energy to prevent the closing of the Brooklyn Navy Yard; and

Whereas James J. Dolan in so doing was exerting his efforts not only in behalf of the 10,000 devoted men and women who faithfully labored at the shipyard in the interest of the U.S. Navy and their country, but also in behalf of the people of the Borough of Brooklyn: Now, therefore

I, Abe Stark, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, do hereby award this citation to James J. Dolan in recognition of his numerous efforts as stated above.

Attest:

Abe Stark,
President of the Borough of Brooklyn.

[From the Brooklyn (N.Y.) World-Telegram, Feb. 1, 1966]

Dolan Will Stay at Yard

James J. Doland is determined to remain at the Brooklyn Navy Yard and continue to help the hundreds of blue-collar and white-collar workers obtain jobs before the gates of the shipyards are closed forever on June 30.

Dolan, one of the principal fighters in a long but losing battle to keep the 291-acre naval installation from closing and save about 10,000 jobs, recently lost his own $10,000-a-year job as a planner and estimator, but he's back at the yard as a paid official of the carpenter's union.

Dolan continues as president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, which consists of members of the yard's trade unions. He has been a member of the council for the past 10 years and has been president since 1963. For the past 8 years, he has been president of local 2031, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, AFL–CIO.

ONLY 1,500 LEFT

In 1963, the trades council represented more than 9,000 shipyard employees in 23 trades. Today it represents 1,500 workers in about a dozen trades.

Dolan intends to keep the council active after the yard is closed by representing about 350 blue-collar emloyees at the Naval Applied Science Laboratory, which adjoins the shipyard.

As council president, Dolan played an important part in holding rallies and marches in the city in an attempt to save the shipyard. He appealed to the Governor, Congressmen, and Senators for help. He participated in a bus caravan with 4,000 persons to Washington.

Even though he was unsuccessful in stopping the yard from closing, the demonstrations helped to accomplish some gains for the shipworkers.

Among the accomplishments were the 6.1 percent bonus given to Federal employees who retired by last December 30 and severance pay given to eligible shipyard workers. Dolan said it was the first time a shipworker had ever received severance pay.

At a testimonial dinner given to Dolan last September 16, Borough President Abe Stark presented him with a citation for his "untiring efforts to prevent the closing of the Brooklyn Navy Yard."

Dolan, 39, and his wife, Ethel, live at 67 Dahlgreen Place, Fort Hamilton, with their six children, including 6-year-old twin daughters.

"I am happy and delighted the way things turned out as far as my job is concerned," he said. "I always wanted to stay with the yard until the end."

[From the Civil Service Leader, Feb. 22, 1966]

James Dolan—Dedicated to Fair and Decent Treatment of Brooklyn Navy Yard Aids

"It has a great past, but it has no future." With these words, it was reported, did Robert McNamara dismiss the subject of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, shortly after he announced its scheduled closing. The order to close the shipyard was made public on November 19, 1964, and is slated to be effective on June 30, 1966, a few short months from now.

Many events have taken place between the announcement date and the present time. The *Sandoval, Intrepid, Ogden,* and *Duluth,* all fighting ships of a fighting Navy, have been completed and sent to their places on the seas in the defense of this country. With unseemly haste much of the fine facilities of the Brooklyn Navy Yard have been ordered moved or destroyed. The Hammerhead Crane, the largest weight-handling structure in the Port of New York, with a replacement value of over $2 million was sold for $6,000 and demolished for the junk value. The Navy Yard with a record of 165 years of achievement was left to the control of individuals who seemed to step out of the pages of "The Caine Mutiny" or "Mr. Roberts."

But what has happened to the almost 10,000 men and women workers during this time? We can answer this question best by looking to James J. Dolan, president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, president of Carpenters Local Union 2031 and now general representative of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. Jim Dolan, as president of the Council represents all of the workers at the shipyard. For the past 2½ years he led the fight to save the navy yard and later to obtain the maximum in fair and decent treatment for the workers. This was a task that required in many instances 16 hours a day, innumerable meetings, frequent trips to Washington, and a dedication to his fellow workers that borders on the unbelievable. It might well be thought that the salary of president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council must be quite high. The reverse is true; the position does not carry a salary. As Jim said when asked, "My satisfaction is being able to help the devoted, hard working people of the Brooklyn Navy Yard in any way possible, especially at this time when most of their fair-weather political friends are not to be found."

What has this 38-year-old father of six been able to accomplish during his time as representative of the yardworkers? Prior to November 1964, he spearheaded a drive to keep the yard open that will long be remembered. The assistance of chambers of commerce, labor unions, fraternal and business groups was obtained. Petitions numbering almost half a million were collected and forwarded to the President of the United States; street rallies attended by prominent political figures were held; a letter campaign was started; proposed legislation was submitted to our lawmakers; Madison Square Garden was packed with New Yorkers protesting the threat to the Navy yard; and a comprehensive program of public education was undertaken.

The President of the United States publicly acknowledged, at Albee Square in Brooklyn, having had the Brooklyn Navy Yard future repeatedly brought to his attention. Despite these efforts of Jim Dolan, and the many who joined him in the fight, the Secretary of Defense, Robert Strange McNamara, announced the intention of closing the yard that had served the Nation so well and so long.

On November 19, 1964, the civilian workforce at the Navy Yard totaled 9,625. The average worker's age was 46 with 18 years of service at the yard. To this group, whose only mistake was that of choosing a career with the Federal civil service, the closure announcement was a thunderclap of doom. With their shipbuilding skills not required in the New York area and with family ties that in many cases prevented moving, they felt they were destined for the industrial scrap heap. However, at no point in the ensuing months did their dedication to duty falter. They continued to perform their work on ships in the same high-quality manner that had long ago earned the "can do" name for the shipyard. Commendation after commendation was received by the yard for topnotch work, performed on time.

TOP WORKMANSHIP

While the shipyard commander freely predicted an inability to produce work, the faithful men and women continued to turn out top quality workmanship. All this, while they were "working on their own coffin." When this work was finished, their jobs were through. Many believe that this sterling performance was in no small part due to the leadership of Jim Dolan and the fact that the workers knew that he was there to help them. During this time an outplacement program was established and Dolan was successful in tempering certain aspects of it that would have worked extreme hardship on the workers. He was also able to have layoffs delayed until they were required by lack of work. He continued meeting with legislators and assisted directly and indirectly in obtaining the passage of laws that provided for improvement of both retirement benefits and severance pay.

On September 16, 1965, at a testimonial dinner, Borough President Abe Stark of Brooklyn presented a citation to Jim Dolan in recognition of his efforts "not only in behalf of the 10,000 men and women * * * at the shipyard * * * but also in behalf of the people of the borough of Brooklyn." The testimonial dinner was attended by numerous prominent labor representatives, chamber of commerce officials and most important to Jim, many of the workers whose interests he has so well represented.

Since that date many of the workers have moved on to other jobs, some in other sections of the country, others have retired, and one of his worker friends gave his life while working on the U.S.S. *Intrepid* at the navy yard. With the last ship, the U.S.S. *Duluth*, gone from the once-proud Brooklyn Navy Yard the remaining workers are engaged in dismantling or packing machinery and equipment for shipping to other locations or scrapping. The former admiral in charge of the yard has been removed, a new admiral assigned and it is hoped a final phase of decent treatment for the remaining workers has commenced.

Thus the curtain slowly falls on the Brooklyn Navy Yard; the yard that has built and repaired the finest fighting ships of the U.S. Navy. The shipbuilding tradition that extended back to the time of Washington, Jefferson and Adams is now to be broken. Dolan has said hopefully, "May the time never come when American lives are lost because of the navy yard that no longer exists but whose ships are vitally needed."

As for Jim Dolan, he will continue to represent and fight for fairness for his workers until the last man leaves and the gates are slowly swung shut.

[From the Civil Service Leader, Feb. 22, 1966]

Navy Yard's History Is Remembered by Workers

(By Mike Klion)

The nostalgic past comes up and meets you in the face as you walk through the gate at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. You remember the 164-year history of this place and it makes you wonder why, after being the backbone of America's naval power, the yard was closed.

Walking through the Brooklyn Navy Yard today is like being in a deserted ghost town of the Old West. Where there once was activity and noise there is now only the deafening roar of silence and desertion.

The drydocks that saw so many of this Nation's greatest warships built and repaired now stand empty.

The administration building where the upper floors once hummed with active people working are now almost bare.

Railroad sidings that once held material of war in boxcar after boxcar now stand rusting and the few railroad cars that are left are there to carry away the salvaged remains of the 219-acre facility.

WAR BASIS

Once over 70,000 men and women worked around the clock to help construct the greatest naval war fleet that the world has ever seen. They also repaired those war machines, 5,000 of them in World War II, and when they couldn't repair them, they made them over. Now where these 70,000 people worked and crowded this place, there are less than 3,000 who, like hermits, are rarely seen. These remaining few are nailing the coffin closed.

You talk to some of these men and they still can hear the war activity going on. That sound will never leave them.

These people know that their job ends June 30. Yet, they don't know why. "If only someone would tell why we were closed, it might make things a little easier for us," one shipworker said.

Another employee of the yard who has been there since the height of the war said, "McNamara has changed the reason so often that I wonder what the real reason might be."

There are those who come back from the Philadelphia Navy Yard, just to visit. They tell of the conditions there that make it almost impossible to run an efficient facility and they too wonder.

One former Brooklynite told of a question that was asked in Philadelphia. He said that a production supervisor asked for a breakdown on the number of men who were working on a particular ship and the number of men in each area that were on vacation or had taken some other leave. The question couldn't be answered. When told that information of that kind was always available in Brooklyn, the supervisor said, "Yeah, that's why you were closed."

The shipworker said that if the reason for closure was efficiency then somebody overlooked at least that problem in Philadelphia.

It is important to note that the men are now resigned to the idea that their jobs are ending here in New York. They don't talk anymore about a longer phase-out or keeping the yard open. They now talk about the reasons and the lack of good ones for the closure. Most of them know where they will be going from New York. Others are aware that they will have to find some other kind of work.

You walk back into the administration building and go to the 18th floor which houses among other things, the production department.

You enter a room that at one time had hundreds of people planning and analyzing production procedures. All that remains now is vast emptiness.

AL GRAHAM

In an office near the end of this room sits the administrative officer of the production department. He has been at the yard for over 25 years.

Al Graham has seen the finest years of the yard and he has to also see its last years. On a board behind his desk is a placard which states "Save the Brooklyn Navy Yard."

Graham said that once he wished he could get caught up on his work. "My desk was hard to find under the paperwork. Now, I am caught up, and you know, I wish I wasn't."

The final chapter is being written today at the yard. The few remaining shipworkers are now doing a job that is usually left for funeral directors. They are burying the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Senate Joint Resolution 103 Says "Let the People Decide"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Stark County News, published weekly in Toulon, Ill.:

Senate Joint Resolution 103 Says "Let the People Decide"

Last spring and summer we published several editorials on the subject of reapportionment of our State legislature, and about the U.S. Senate bill to amend the Constitution concerning apportionment of State legislatures.

We were, and still are, in favor of Senator Dirksen's *Senate Joint Resolution 103*, which would amend the Federal Constitution to permit the States to apportion one of their houses on a basis other than population. This is in opposition to a 1964 U.S. Supreme Court ruling that both houses of State legistures must be apportioned on a population basis.

To the casual observer it may not make much difference as to the method of apportionment, but it does make a big difference. In order to have effective checks and balances in our Government, and to provide complete representation of the people, the house and senate should differ in their basis for representation. If both are based on population, then the large metropolitan areas will decide the fate of the rural areas.

If business and living conditions were the same throughout the State then there would be no problem. But since geographical location is as important as the number of people living in a given area, both sides of the picture should be considered when legislation is passed.

Senate Joint Resolution 103 is quite simple, in that it permits the people to decide for themselves how they want their legislation apportioned. Some States may feel that they would benefit from having both houses on a population basis, while other States may be better off with one house on a geographical basis.

The mortality rate of proposed constitutional amendments is high. Through the years many proposed amendments have been presented, but only a handful have been passed. They must pass a two-thirds vote of each House, then a three-fourths vote of the people. Needless to say only a few make it all the way through.

However, Senate Joint Resolution 103 appears to have a large number of backers from both political parties. A majority of the State legislatures (28) have called upon Congress to call a constitutional convention to adopt such an amendment.

In many States where the people have recourse to direct legislation—Michigan, California, and Colorado are notable examples—the voters have chosen the Federal plan of legislative representation and rejected systems under which both houses are selected on a strict population basis, only to be told their democratic choice is null and void.

Oregon voters have chosen strict population selection for both houses as best suited to their State's needs. While some States may prefer this method, should the other States be forced to use it if they do not feel it is best for them?

The Dirksen amendment would permit each State to make its choice in this matter. If this is a government "by the people," why shouldn't the people be able to decide how it should operate? The American people are not as free as they used to be, and if this amendment does not pass, we will be that much farther down the road toward a dictatorship.

As rural residents we stand to benefit if the amendment passes. We will be hurt if it does not. Why not write to your Senators and Congressmen and let them know that you want to keep your freedoms?

What My American Patriotism Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts winner of the annual Americanism contest of the junior chamber of commerce this year is William J. Aberizk, Jr., of Lawrence, Mass.

It was my privilege to hear him deliver his essay, "What My American Patriotism Means to Me," at the governmental affairs seminar of the junior chamber of commerce last Saturday in Auburn, Mass.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of this winning essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT MY AMERICAN PATRIOTISM MEANS TO ME

(By William J. Aberizk, Jr., 4 Fairmont Street, Lawrence, Mass., State winner, Massachusetts)

What am I because of my love for my country? I am a confident, hopeful, secure, young American. I know with pride, love, and knowledge that "my" country is the finest, greatest, most blessed country on the earth. I am always confident that my country and I are being well protected by our Armed Forces every minute of every hour. I also know that my very rights as a citizen are always being preserved by the law and the enforcement of these laws.

It means courage to me. The courage you need to get ahead in life. It is the courage to speak your mind when you honestly believe in what you're going to say, and you know, for a fact, that it is true. It is the same courage as the men at Iwo Jima had when they raised the American flag. It is the same patriotism that George Washington, Paul Revere, Abraham Lincoln, and Benjamin Franklin experienced. I am certain they felt the same way about their country as I do mine. I love, cherish, honor, treasure, and respect my country.

My patriotism gives me a sense of responsibility. I think that it is my duty as an intelligent American to make sure that all the factors which compose my country's traditions are upheld and preserved.

To me, as to many, love of country means sentiment. It is a joy when I see my fellow comrades and military officials marching in a parade. When my eyes behold such a sight, I thrill all over, just as I do when I hear our national anthem being sung, or see a flag-raising ceremony taking place. The only time I feel more patriotic is when I am taking part in one of these presentations.

My American patriotism is sacred to me. I would not trade it for anything on this earth. It is sacred because the country, people, and beliefs which it stands for, are to me sanctified. You can tell immediately that they are blessed by the Lord, for who else can bestow on the country in which we live all the possessions that we have been presented with? Who else but the Lord can give us all the natural resources, good land, exceptional minds and the many other things that our country, and not very many other countries have?

To me my patriotism is a great asset because it gives me a great amount of morale. This, to me, is one of the most precious possessions patriotism gives. It gives me the courage to complete what I start out to do. It gives me spirit, confidence, and determination. This is the same morale that our men had in wars such as the Revolution, Civil, and World Wars. It is the same morale that our fighting men now have in places such as Vietnam. This is one of the elements that give them the will to fight back and to try harder and finally accomplish their goal.

My American patriotism gives me comfort. It will give me the right to vote, when I am older, and the freedoms of worship and speech. It gives me the inspiration to tell people what I think when they say, "Today's teenagers will be tomorrow's leaders." We teenagers are tired of being "tomorrow's leaders." Aren't we good for something today? Can't we do something to help our country now? Because of the way I feel towards my American patriotism, I can say yes.

Finally, and most important, is that patriotism makes a country. If the patriotism of a country is low, then the country will be sure to fail sooner or later. But if the country's patriotism is very high and full of spirit, there is no telling what can happen. It will be prosperous, productive, and powerful. This is how America is today. Let's keep it this way. Remember, You are part of America. Be proud of it.

The Alternate Role for Draft Age Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the escalation of the war in Vietnam has placed increasing stress on many of our resources in this great Nation. Certainly not the least of these is our young, military-age manpower reserve.

As we slip deeper and deeper into the conflict in Vietnam, our need for trained, capable fighting men is naturally increasing. It is also natural in this day and age that, to meet these increasing demands, we rely on the age-old Selective Service System. After all, it provided the manpower for the most powerful military force in history during World War II and functioned with equal efficiency during World War I.

Times have changed, however, and a Selective Service System that could function effectively 50, or even 25 years ago, may not necessarily fit the needs of our time. Today, there are simultaneous demands placed on the youth of our country in addition to the needs of our Armed Forces. And, short of an all-out total war, these alternate contributions which can be made by able-bodied young men and women must be given equal authority in the call to arms.

The Peace Corps is one such example. Here is a project that has struggled up from a dubious idea to an international success. Today there are few informed voices raised in opposition to the role of the Peace Corps, and none who can challenge the incredibly effective job the Corps has done in its brief 5-year lifespan so far.

A number of newer projects, such as VISTA, which the Congress has approved under the war on poverty program, must rely on youth to achieve the important goals we have set for them.

But programs such as the Peace Corps and VISTA are in grave danger these days as a result of our expanding military commitment in Vietnam and what has clearly come to be, at best, an inefficient selective service code.

Recently, there appeared separate editorials in two highly respected newspapers in Massachusetts, the Berkshire Eagle in my hometown of Pittsfield, and the Boston Herald. These two fine editorials focus attention squarely on this problem and suggest some provocative solutions. Under unanimous consent procedures, I include both editorials at this point and respectfully commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorials follow:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Feb. 24, 1966]

A WAR AND PEACE CORPS

One of the many unpleasant byproducts of the war in Vietnam is the personnel squeeze that is being imposed on the Peace Corps by the mounting manpower demands of the Pentagon.

Until recently the Selective Service System had been granting virtually automatic "national interest" deferments to Peace Corps recruits, most of whom are of draft age. And while the Peace Corps has always emphasized that its volunteers have no immunity from the selective service after they complete their 2-year hitches, there has generally been a tactic understanding that draft boards will not induct ex-corpsmen.

Now, however, the picture is changing. With the military manpower pool shrinking rapidly in many communities, draft boards are showing increasing reluctance to grant deferments to prospective Peace Corps volunteers. What's more, an increasing number of Peace Corps alumni are discovering that their draft boards are no longer inclined to regard their duty abroad as a substitute for military service.

This personnel squeeze comes at a particularly inopportune time for the Peace Corps, which is currently seeking to expand its activities and personnel in accordance with authorizations granted by Congress last year. Large numbers of college seniors who are currently being interviewed for Peace Corps service starting this summer or fall are likely to be picked off by their draft boards before their training begins, and many other prospective recruits are likely to have second thoughts about Peace Corps service if they face a strong prospect of being drafted once their service is completed. While it's no doubt true that few applicants are primarily motivated by a desire to avoid the draft, it's also true that few want to delay their civilian careers for an additional year or two of military service on top of the 2-year Peace Corps stint.

One result of all this is that the Peace Corps may have to curtail or cancel a number of projects now in the planning stage because of personnel shortages. It is an unpleasant prospect for many reasons, not the last of which is the fact that it means cutting back on an extremely constructive and humanitarian program because of the manpower needs of a brutal war which has exceedingly little support outside of the United States.

This manpower competition between the Peace Corps and the Pentagon is another persuasive argument in favor of replacing the present inequitable Selective Service Act with a new system under which all young men of draft age would be required to perform 2 years of Government service, whether in the military, the Peace Corps, the VISTA program, or whatever other services seemed appropriate. If pay scales for the various alternatives were adjusted to provide a sufficient incentive for military service, the choice of which duty to select could be left to the individual.

Such a system would go far to eliminate the arbitrary and grossly inequitable aspects of the Selective Service Act, which tends in practice to favor the well-to-do, the college student, and the youths who are in a position to obtain occupational deferments. It would also, as a welcome bonus, eliminate for once and for all the moral and practical problem of dealing fairly with those who object to military service as a matter of principle.

[From the Boston Herald, Feb. 26, 1966]

Who Should Be Drafted?

Who should be drafted? No one should be drafted, not in a sane and peaceful world.

But we do not have a sane and peaceful world so some of our young men must be drafted to serve in our Armed Forces which are dedicated to the purpose of bringing to the world a measure of sanity and peace.

How you do it, though, is important. During World War II everybody who was the right age and physically able was drafted unless he was deferred for some very special war work or medical studies.

Today the situation is quite different. Though more young men are being drafted now than were a year ago, there is still no need to draft every able-bodied young man. Only a minority needs to serve to fill the ranks of our Armed Forces for a limited war like Vietnam.

And that is where the trouble starts. College students have been deferred to finish their studies, the theory being that educated men are assets to the Nation. It is a reasonable conclusion, but such a policy cannot help but be unfair to many young men.

For colleges are selective. They take only those who are well enough educated to pass their courses and rich enough to pay their way. There is a great range here, of course; State universities have low or even no tuitions; private colleges have many scholarships available. Standards vary markedly. But the fact is, a boy from a poor Negro family in Selma, Ala.—or from Roxbury, for that matter—is much more likely to be drafted than a boy from a comfortably off white family in Brookline. So the draft as it is now set up is discriminatory.

And, as several members of the Brandeis faculty pointed out Thursday, it is not even fair to those who are in college. Selective Service has announced a policy whereby it will determine deferments on the basis of grades. The student who has all A's and B's will be safe; the student who has all C's may be in danger.

Kermit Morrissey, dean of students at Brandeis, called such a policy "unfair to schools with highly selective admissions policies," and he is right. The boy who is getting C's at Brandeis, for instance, might be getting A's at a college with lower standards. And he might get A's at Brandeis if he took easier courses.

Dean Morrissey suggests a "fishbowl lottery" approach to the problem, and we think he is on the right track. Perhaps college or graduate school should not be grounds for deferment at all. Why should not every able-bodied young man, rich or poor, educated or uneducated, take the same chances? Education may be in the national interest but discrimination is not.

Hon. Hubert Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the recent editorial by William S. White, relative to our Vice President, the Honorable Hubert Humphrey and his trip through southeast Asia and the results of that trip.

H.H.H. Blazes Into Own: Asia Mission Does It

(By William S. White)

Those who were so lately burying poor Hubert in the dank shadows of obscurity are vying now to praise him.

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey is coming blazingly into his own in the afterlight of his mission to Asia for President Johnson. It is extremely likely that when next the national pollsters go about asking the citizens about H.H.H. he is going to turn up far more widely—and far more favorably—known than the last time around.

Heretofore, many voters had responded to questions about Humphrey with the most unintentionally deadly of all the wounds that can be inflicted upon a politician. This is the yawn that cuts to the heart. Indeed, some experts were saying only yesterday that in his latent contest with Senator Robert F. Kennedy, of New York, for the headship of the Democratic Party when Lyndon Johnson's Presidency is ended, Humphrey was sinking from sight.

But one of the laws of politics is the law of change. Now, Humphrey ranks second only to Johnson himself among the power-assayers in Washington. He has become the acknowledged leader, again next only to the President, of a patiently rational firm line in the Vietnamese war. And Senator Kennedy has given him an immense boost by moving himself, to some damaging if still debatable degree, into the camp of those ready to concede some kind of recognition to the Communist guerrillas who are trying to shoot down the legitimate government of our South Vietnam ally and to shoot their way into a peace table, if and when one is ever set up.

That Humphrey has emerged to full light as an urgent supporter of the war of resistance to the Communist invasion of South Vietnam is astonishing only to those who thought they had always known him but had never really known him at all. To be sure, he was a fair-liberal fellow, indeed, ready to howl eagerly for every conceivable domestic reform, ill considered or not. But not even in the old days of a kneejerk liberalism long since abandoned anyhow was he soft on the profound question of Communist containment.

In foreign affairs he was, as a Senator from Minnesota, always firm. Any fair and informed observer had to give him credit for well knowing where our vital foreign interests lay.

Indeed, in the presidential campaign of 1964, Humphrey's Republican adversary for Vice President, William E. Miller, of New York, made a capital mistake in going after H.H.H. on foreign policy, with suggestions that Humphrey in these matters was an irresponsible.

Miller had a legitimate conservative case against Humphrey on some domestic questions. But in hitting the man the President calls Ol' Hubert on world issues Miller stirred up Lyndon Johnson personally. And that was bad. For Johnson, though fully occupied with his own campaign troubles, then felt impelled to turn some of his restless energy to direct and personal assistance of Hubert Humphrey. Miller thus suddenly found himself running for a time against the first Democratic team as well.

The truth is that Humphrey's foreign policy is and has been essentially that of the last three Democratic Presidents—Harry Truman, John Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson. And this is a powerfully good omen for his future ambitions. For Robert Kennedy's present stance is in spirit, if not in all details, a marked turn away from what lies at the heart of those policies. This is a deep skepticism of Communist promises and a habit to demand instead some Communist performance as a precondition to any real accommodation in the cold war.

America's High Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include with my remarks a column from the Wyoming State Journal published in Lander, Wyo., contained in the February 1 issue entitled "High Country" and written by Mr. Tom Bell. It deals with two subjects of extreme importance regarding the public domain and the preservation of the natural resources of our Nation.

Tom Bell is a science teacher at the Lander Junior High School, the president of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation, a trained biologist and formerly with the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission.

I commend his statement to those who would wish to preserve our heritage in America.

The article follows:

IRONS IN THE FIRE

Going back about 6 months (where did they go?) I wrote a column about the public lands and antelope. Anyone who reads the Journal knows the tale didn't end there. The stories continued, but not under the column byline.

Just to recap a little, the Journal articles pointed to the effect of sheep-tight fencing on antelope herds. Most antelope just can't negotiate tight fences and the records prove it.

In many cases, the guilty fences are on public lands and enclosed large blocks of the public domain. The lands are supposed to be administered under the multiple-use concept. It would seem to be rather obvious that there is nothing very multiple about use when you destroy one of the uses and benefit another.

Investigation of some of the fencing in the Casper area revealed some rather fishy circumstances. And the further we went, the smellier it got.

One large, influential landowner and sheep rancher declared himself to be above the law. An affidavit was filed with the U.S. attorney in Cheyenne to see if he really was that powerful just because he was a Wyoming sheepman.

The last installments on this story have yet to be written. Decisions are being made in Washington on the highest levels as to whether illegal fences can be built—and remain—on public property. The outcome of those decisions should be appearing soon.

I can guarantee, the issue of fences on the public domain is not forgotten.

TIME FOR DECISION

Illegal fences are not the only issue that calls for attention. The time may be at hand for some other decisions.

For instance, we pride ourselves on the beauty of our streams and lakes and the wonderful fishing we have. But we have hardly begun to lick the problems of pollution. We are going to have to decide whether we want clear, pure streams or open sewers and industrial wasteways.

We take for granted the wonderful fishing, boating, swimming, and water skiing which can be enjoyed on Wyoming's streams and lakes. We tout our State as a vacation wonderland. We point to the fact that the tourist and recreation industry is the third largest, economically, and the fastest growing.

But how many people realize that recreational use of water is not recognized by law and that there are few, if any safeguards which can be applied to maintain recreational use on any State waters?

We will have to decide if we want our legislators to amend the water laws. The decision does not mean depriving another use or even threatening it. It does mean recognizing the fact that recreation is a legitimate use under the multiple-use concept.

Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request in the following letter, I include Mr. David Bean's speech in the RECORD.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
March 1, 1966.

HON. RICHARD BOLLING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLLING: Each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 300,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. First prize is a $5,000 scholarship, second prize is $3,500, third prize is $2,500, fourth prize is $1,500, and the fifth prize is $1,000. The contest theme was "Democracy—What It Means to Me."

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Enclosed is a copy of the winning speech from your State as delivered by Mr. David Richard Bean of Kansas City, Mo., a resident of your district. It shall be deeply appreciated if you would insert the enclosed speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also wish to remind you that the winning contestant from your State will be available in Washington the evening of March 8, 1966, 6 to 9 p.m., at the Veterans of Foreign Wars annual congressional dinner at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Sincerely yours,
COOPER T. HOLT,
Executive Director.

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

(By David Bean)

America the great. America, the friend of the people. America, the utopia with holes in it. For 200 years, America, the Shangrila in the mountains of enslavement. Today, America the cornucopia of food, of safety, of freedom, of people like you and me who know democracy and are afraid to find out what life is without it.

Democracy is the polls on Tuesday, and a coupon through the mail. Democracy is in the sarcasm of an editorial and in the Torah. And it's in the defense of Vietnams the world over. Democracy means a life to me. It tells me there is going to be a Young Republican's meeting next week. It says that the meatcutters are locked out. It speaks, and I listen. I listen for the sound of a Fourth of July parade. I listen to the strains of a big brass band. I listen and I hear the man say, "Are you still using that greasy kid stuff?" Oh, America. Without you my labors would be a tyrant's gains; my rewards would be my shackles. And what a tradition. We've fought and we've died, but we've saved.

I died a little when McArthur died; there was a man with a cause. I died a little when Switzer died; there was a man with a heart. I died a little when Kennedy died; there was an American with a vision. All three had one thing in common: a burning desire to see the world free. One, free from aggression; one, free from suffering; and one, free from the scars of the past. We must continue this tradition or men will say of our era, "The Americans meant well."

Let someone else walk for you and when the time comes for you to take a step by yourself you won't know how. Democracy is our soul; mankind is our burden. Democracy must be kept close to the people. Never let yourself be able to say, "Democracy? Well, it's around here somewhere," because just as surely as you think it's there; it's not. It's gone, and to get it back you and your children and their children and their children are going to struggle. They're going to have to retrace steps from the beginning of men on this earth.

You see, there is no shortcut to democracy. For those polls to be open on Tuesday, you have to have free elections. For that coupon through the mail you have to have private enterprise and a government willing to support it. For that biting editorial you have to have the right to write it and the privilege to read it. For that Torah you have to have a society that acknowledges the religious privacy a man is entitled to.

Yes, I can tell you democracy is no small thing. The veterans of our wars can tell you that, too, for they have shown the aggressors that if we live we live free, and if we die, we die that others may live free. What does democracy mean to me? What is the air I breathe to me? The food I eat, the clothes I wear, the roof over my head. A better question might be, "What doesn't democracy mean to me?"

There was a picture in Life magazine not too long ago, a picture of a little Negro girl mounting the steps of a school previously closed to those of her color. And as I looked at that photograph I knew that I was witnessing a great event in the history of free men, and I suddenly realized that this could happen only in America. This, all this, is what democracy means to me.

Fred Adams Receives National Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished young man in my congressional district recently received national and international recognition for his outstanding business accomplishments and contributions to his community. It is with particular pride that I and other Mississippians note that Fred Rodgers Adams, Jr., of Jackson, was named as one of America's 10 outstanding young men by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce last month.

The accomplishments which brought recognition to Mr. Adams symbolize well the success that is possible under our system of business competition and the vast opportunities available in my own State of Mississippi. His career is a fine example of what can be achieved by those of enterprising spirit who dare to compete within the free enterprise system.

As Mr. Adams said upon receiving his award:

> Our ability to produce food efficiently and abundantly can be our greatest asset in fighting communism.

The remarkable story of this young man's rapid rise in business circles is recounted in the February issue of Mississippi Valley Stockman-Farmer.

Mr. Speaker, the achievements of this young man represent a good example of what is going on in Mississippi today. Energetic and industrious young people such as those who compose the Mississippi Junior Chamber of Commerce are taking full advantage of a favorable business climate. The result is a rapidly expanding economy and a higher standard of living for all of our people. It is fitting that men like Mr. Adams be recognized by their fellow citizens. I congratulate him not only on the fine honor he received, but because he is a living example of what free men can accomplish in a free society.

FRED ADAMS RECEIVES NATIONAL AWARD

A 34-year-old Mississippi poultryman has received a signal honor. He was recently recognized as one of America's 10 outstanding young men. Only one other Mississippian has ever received this honor.

Fred Rodgers Adams of Jackson, who has poultry and egg enterprises in Mendenhall and Edwards, received his award in ceremonies at the annual Congress of America's Outstanding Young Men on January 15 at St. Paul, Minn. Dr. Arthur Guyton, noted scientist, is the only other Mississippian to receive the award.

Adams, owner of Adams Egg Farms, Inc., and the world's largest egg producer, joins such outstanding men, who have received the award in the past, as John F. Kennedy, Henry Ford II, Leonard Bernstein, and Rudy Vallee.

Receiving the award for 1965 were such men as Edward H. White II and Charles Conrad, Jr., NASA astronauts, and Bill D. Moyers, special assistant to the President.

The main office of Adams' operation of Adams Egg Farms, is now located in Edwards, Miss., where it was moved from Mendenhall in 1963. This year, Adams Egg Farms will be responsible for the production of some 17,000 cases of eggs a week from 1,400,000 layers. 1965 sales will be approximately $10 million, providing employment for 600 persons.

Adams is president of Simpson County Hatchery, Inc. (Mendenhall); Hens, Inc. (Bay Springs), and Simpson County Motor Co., Inc. (Mendenhall). He is secretary of Nearby Eggs, Inc. (Jackson), Jackson Mack Truck Sales (Jackson), and Cedar Lake Egg Farm, Inc. (Gulfport). He also owns a distributing plant in Carteret, N.J.

The mammoth enterprise includes the integrated facilities and operations for supporting the 1,400,000 layers—a feed mill, a hatchery, a processing plant, an eastern grading and packaging plant, nearly 200 poultry houses, 470,000 replacement pullets, 50,000 breeders, and more than a thousand acres of land.

Adams recently demonstrated his pioneering spirit by opening an egg grading and packaging plant at Carteret, N.J. Adams Egg Farms is now delivering eggs directly to New York metropolitan retailers only 1 day after getting the U.S. Department of Agriculture grades, and as little as 3 days after the hens laid them in Mississippi. The eggs are trucked north daily under refrigeration.

The farms now distribute eggs in 16 States in the United States and export them to other countries also. The farms were featured on the March 10, 1965, broadcast of Paul Harvey, and Adams has been the subject of many magazines and newspaper articles.

The Jackson Jaycees, in asking Adams to be named as one of the "TOYM" said, "We believe that Fred Adams, Jr., should be selected because he has, in fact, become a national, even a world leader in his field. He is the owner of companies which compromise an organization that is the largest egg producer in the world. That he holds this title is not near so spectacular though, as two other facts: He is only 34 years old, and he built the operation of world prominence through his own industry."

The application further stated, "In building this business he has introduced new concepts into the industry. We believe, also, that though his business accomplishments are enough to make him outstanding, his contributions to the community and State are deserving of extra consideration."

Resolutions of Polish American Congress Reflect High Level of Patriotism and Love of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWKSI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1966, the district of Connecticut, Polish American Congress passed a series of resolutions dealing with a number of contemporary political problems of world significance. I think these resolutions reflect the deep patriotism and abiding love of freedom so characteristic of the Polish people from whom I proudly claim descent. I recommend the reading of these resolutions by my colleagues in the House.

The Polish American Congress, district of Connecticut, assembled at the annual meeting held in Hartford, on February 27, 1966, hereby do unanimously resolve:

1. We demand, in the name of plain justice and fundamental human rights, that the Polish regained western territories, rebuilt by Polish hands after enormous war destructions and exclusively inhabited by the Polish population, transferred for the most part from eastern Poland, ceded to Russia by Western Powers, be formally recognized as an integral part of Poland and the present Odra-Nyssa line be confirmed de iure as the boundary of Poland.

2. We express our deep concern over continuously repeated demands, particularly made by Germans, to acquire a greater share in the possession of and the control over atomic weapons and we insist that the control over these awesome weapons and the decision on their use remain exclusively in the hands of the United States.

3. We strongly, fully, and unreservedly support President Johnson's firm stand against the Communist aggression in South Vietnam as the best and only answer to the Chinese version of the Communist takeover, disguised under the sham of the so-called "wars of liberation."

We condemn all naive or irresponsible and harmful, and very often Communist-inspired actions, demonstrations or pronouncements demanding the ending of war in South Vietnam by withdrawal or advocating formation of a coalition government with inclusion of Communists, as if the fate of Czechoslovakia and many other nations were not sufficient examples of fallacy of such deals with Communists.

4. We condemn the latest denial of a passport by the Communist regime of Poland to Cardinal Wyszynski for travel abroad and we expose this action as another example of the increased pressure on the persecution of the church and religion in Poland.

5. We request the Government of the United States to use their good offices to initiate and insist on repatriation of hundreds of thousands of Poles deported to Russia since 1939 and remaining there in forced labor camps and places of exile. We also urge that firm representation be made to the Warsaw Government to release all political prisoners still lingering in prisons in Poland.

6. We call upon all Americans of Polish descent, all friends of the Polish cause, to participate in celebrations of Poland's millennium to be held this year in commemoration of her 1,000 years of Christianity, her great and lasting contributions to western civilization, and unflinching stand as a bastion of Christianity throughout the ages.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 300,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. First prize is a $5,000 scholarship, second prize is $3,500, third prize is $2,500, fourth prize is $1,500, and the fifth prize is $1,000. The contest theme was "Democracy—What It Means to Me."

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

For California, the winner was, I am proud to say, young James Williams from my district. He resides at 6209 Amber Lake in San Diego and has, I am sure, a family of proud admirers because of his achievement. I ask my colleagues to take a moment from their busy day to read and reflect on Jim's fresh and interesting composition:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By James Williams, San Diego, Calif.)

"Democracy"—a word that is familiar to all of us. We all know the standard definition of democracy: "a government in which the supreme power is in the hands of the people, who exercise it either directly, or through their chosen representatives." Any history teacher can tell you this definition is factual, but any human being can tell you it lacks depth of meaning. It lacks depth of meaning because of the basic tendency to pass over one vital part of this definition. Allow me to repeat it. "A government in which the supreme power is in the hands of the people, who exercise it, either directly, or through their chosen representatives." Our entire democratic system is based upon and survives because of this one word—"exercise."

In order to exist, democracy cannot be understood merely as a definition in words, it must be exercised. Citizens can shake their fists and pound the podium proclaiming their patriotism, but without action and restraint, democracy is dead. Notice I said "action and restraint." These two words are implied in the word "exercise." Anybody in any society can become excited and emotional over an idea. Anybody can build up the desire to act whether or not action is called for. Under a democracy, there is both a right and an obligation to act when a situation demands action, and not to act when a situation demands restraint. This is the crux of the matter. Without the application of these two basic principles, democracy is dead, buried, gone, no longer exists.

There has been a great deal of talk lately concerning the inner unrest of the teenage generation. Our magazines and educators and ministers tell us there is a driving force within the youth of today that demands use. The American teenage generation has drive, it has initiative, it has power. There is a stirring unrest within the very heart and the very soul of every teenage human being across this country. I am a teenager, I have this unrest. I cannot deny it because I personally know it exists.

What can teenagers do to constructively use this energy? They can gather together and simply sit down in a mass protest demonstration; or they can march carrying signs proclaiming everything from religious beliefs to obscene words. "A government in which the supreme power is in the hands of the people who exercise it, either directly, or through their chosen representatives." Action and restraint. The substitution of conscience for emotion and intelligent thought for irrational thought. American teenagers do possess the right to sit down, they do possess the right to march, but they also possess the moral obligation to their country and to themselves to seriously ask themselves, each one individually, "What will I do with my energy? I have drive. I have initiative, I have power. I feel it, I recognize it, but I must control it. Am I willing to inquire and learn what is going on in the world today. Once I have a basic knowledge of the facts, will I freely discuss them with my friends, encouraging them to think? Will I discuss political and social matters with my parents, making them examine themselves and their relationship to their country? In short, will I be a mature human being?"

A strong democracy is built upon intelligent thought. It does not begin at the national level, it does not even begin at the local level. Democracy begins within the heart of the individual citizen. It is not a few thousand words written in a history book, but a dynamic force for daily use. Democracy is not something tangible that can be held in the hand, but a driving spirit for freedom. As young men and young women, we will not let it die—we must not let it die.

An Idaho Hand at the Throttle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Idaho has contributed many men of extremely high caliber to important positions in the Federal Government. One such man is Commissioner Abe McGregor Goff of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Under leave to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I submit for the Record an essay on this dedicated public servant, by Dwight Wm. Jensen, writing in the Idaho Observer of February 24, 1966, and published in Boise, Idaho:

AN IDAHO HAND AT THE THROTTLE

(By Dwight William Jensen)

For 24 years, ending in 1954, a man from Moscow, Idaho, named Bill Lee served on the Interstate Commerce Commission. When Lee left office President Eisenhower looked around and plucked from the Post Office Department its General Counsel, a man named Abe McGregor Goff, who also happened to hail from Moscow, Idaho.

It was late in the 19th century and early in this one that regulatory Commissions came to power in the U.S. Government; during the depression they bloomed to full flower. Now Idaho is furnishing three important members of those important regulatory Commissions.

Rosel Hyde of the Federal Communications Commission is the senior of all U.S. regulatory Commissioners in time of service.

Hamer Budge of the Securities and Exchange Commission is one of the newer Commissioners, but is coming to be one of the more respected.

And Abe McGregor Goff is one of the more experienced, one of the more colorful, one of the more gregarious.

He enjoys people, likes being with old friends, and meeting new acquaintances. And he loves to talk about his colorful and purposeful life.

Goff had served in Congress from Idaho's First District before going to work for the Post Office Department. Before that he had been in the Army, in both World War II theaters. His service included work on the staff of General MacArthur, work that brought him into contact with General Eisenhower, and work in the war crimes trials in the Far Eastern theater.

But his fame in Idaho preceded his work in politics, government, and the military. The first time Oregon State played Idaho at Boise—1923—Goff was a lineman of the Idaho team that won, 7 to 0. Playing with him were Sib Kleffner, Skippy Stivers, John Vessar, Larry Quinn, Bob Fitzke, Ray Stephens, Charlie Housen, and Dusty Kline, among others. Later he became a football coach, a prosecuting attorney, a State senator, and president of the Idaho State Bar Association.

In World War I, Goff served as a private in the Army. He entered the second war as a major and rose to the rank of colonel, winning the Legion of Merit and nine other decorations. Among the many unusual facts about this man is the fact that he is admitted to practice law before the Supreme Court of the Philippines.

He has held national offices in the American Bar Association, the American Society of International Law, the Federal Bar Association, the Federal Bar Foundation, and the Judge Advocates Association.

Goff was born December 21, 1899, at Colfax, Wash.; he was married in 1927 to Florence Richardson, then a faculty member at the University of Idaho. They have two children, both now grown. He is an Episcopalian.

Goff was with the British in North Africa during Rommel's 1942 drive across the sands; later he became a military envoy to the Emperor Haile Selassie, and for a time served as military escort to Madam Chiang Kai-shek. He organized the International Prosecution Section for the Supreme Commander in Tokyo before the war crimes trials there. And the Secretary of War once assigned him to make a special review of the court-martial of Billy Mitchell—Gen. William Mitchell.

The appointment of the ICC was not the first time Goff had succeeded William E. Lee; in 1926, when Lee left Moscow to become a member of the Idaho Supreme Court, Goff took over his place as the law partner of C. J. Orland. Goff had been a junior attorney in the firm for 2 years.

The Chairman of the ICC is selected from among the members on a rotating basis; Goff rotated into the top spot during 1964. He found himself chiefly concerned with big railroad mergers then being proposed, the giant of all being the New York Central with the Pennsylvania. Goff's decisions and views then might be felt for years to come in the economic and transportation systems of America.

Like most Commissioners, Goff cares not to talk about specific cases. But he will remark upon the general place of his Commission and all regulatory Commissions in the American system.

Goff disagrees with any tendencies to call the regulatory Commissions "a fourth branch of Government." Actually, says he, they combine elements of all three branches—the judicial, the executive, the legislative. But if they must be classified under one branch, that one branch, Goff thinks, must be the legislative.

"We are an agent of the Congress. Now, it's true that we are known as quasi-judicial agencies because we hold hearings and issue decisions. And we also exercise some of the functions of the executive—we have enforcement people who see to it that our policies are carried out.

"Basically, though, we are an instrument of Congress. Now, the Congress could sit down and it could write out safety regulations and freight rates and weight specifications and all the rest of that.

"But it is so complicated, so complicated, that Congress would find time to do nothing else. And so we handle that work under authority set out by Congress. The Congress can change anything we do. It can limit us or restrict us. We don't have the power of a fourth branch of Government."

Wars Lost in Home Capitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, history does repeat itself, or we might well say that the present administration is caught in its own web of confusion in its continued failure to provide leadership in the Vietnam war. The Chicago Tribune editorially brought home in very effective fashion this morning the lack of progress based on the lack of a practical policy:

WARS LOST IN HOME CAPITALS

President Johnson is back where he was a year ago on the war in Vietnam. On April 7, 1965, at Johns Hopkins University, he offered the Communists "unconditional discussions" to end the war, throwing in the promise of a billion dollars for reconstruction as a sweetener. North Vietnam responded that he could go roll his hoop.

Yesterday Mr. Johnson seized the fifth anniversary of the Peace Corps as occasion to renew his plea that the Communist regime in Hanoi negotiate peace and let war stand aside while elections are held. He said the United States would abide by the outcome of the balloting, presumably even if the Communists were to win a big or controlling voice in the Government of South Vietnam.

Along with this was the familiar tender of "a massive effort of reconstruction and development open to all including North Vietnam."

It is the same old Johns Hopkins formula. It didn't work then and it won't work now. As we remarked on that previous occasion, we are not aware that history offers a single instance that the Johnson formula of a purchased peace has ever bought off an invader.

George Washington did not join the Hessians in Christmas dinner at Trenton. He whipped them. When the Ottoman Turks turned up at the gates of Vienna, they were not turned back by a promise from the defenders, "Go home and we will reward you with a shipload of shish kebab." Nor did

Charles Martel deal with the Moors by taking the field at Tours with an offer of a few fat bucks if they'd just retire beyond the Pyrenees.

Mr. Johnson must be succumbing to the infection of the appeasement wing in his own party—the BOBBY KENNEDYS who would welcome the Vietcong into the Saigon Government, the FULBRIGHTS who are forever carping about a policy that requires standing up to the Communists at all, the MORSES who contend it would be no weakness if we bugged out.

Senator FULBRIGHT's Foreign Relations Committee recently heard a pointed warning from Gen. Maxwell Taylor that the leaders of North Vietnam still hoped "for some kind of victory in the south," apparently because they were convinced that the United States be detached from support of South Vietnam. The stream of criticism against the war which comes from Democrats in Congress is one reason for this Communist conviction.

"They have not," the general said in reference to the Communists, "forgotten that the Vietminh won more in Paris than in Dienbienphu and believe that the Vietcong may be as fortunate in Washington." Dienbienphu was a climactic French defeat in 1954, but the French at home had lost stomach for the war after 7 years, just as they later lost heart in Algeria, where French arms had succeeded in checkmating the guerrillas.

Our recent history amply demonstrates that wars can be more readily lost in Washington or at the conference table than in the field. Franklin Roosevelt threw away the fruits of military victory at Tehran and Yalta. Our allies, notably the British under the Socialist Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, became terrified lest the United States defeat the Communists in Korea. General MacArthur was handcuffed by Washington, and the victory that was possible was sacrificed in favor of an ignominious stalemate, equivalent to the first military defeat in this country's history.

It is all in process of happening again. The Communists know what rides on the stakes, for the North Vietnamese commander in chief, General Giap, has said, "If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated anywhere in the world." South Vietnam is the acid test whether Communist wars of national liberation are to sweep the world.

"Despoilers of Democracy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a highly respected Washington newsman and Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter, Mr. Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Cowles Publications, has authored a book entitled "Despoilers of Democracy."

In this straightforward writing, Mr. Mollenhoff has described, detail by detail, a record of cynicism and deceit on the part of some Government officials. Mr. Mollenhoff asks whether or not the American people are willing to tolerate the censorship which today surrounds many Government agencies, especially the Department of Defense and the White House—censorship which permits questionable policies to be pursued and which allows bureaucrats the opportunity to violate the public trust.

I recommend the reading of this book by all persons concerned over the tendency of Government today to keep the lid of secrecy tightly clamped on even the most trivial matters.

Following is a review of "Despoilers of Democracy" which was published in the January 1966 edition of the Washington World magazine:

"DESPOILERS OF DEMOCRACY," CLARK R. MOLLENHOFF (DOUBLEDAY)

In his unsuccessful 1964 campaign Senator Goldwater attempted to focus attention on the topic of corruption in Government and the need for the revitalization of the American Governmental processes. Clark Mollenhoff, a perennial critic of the political scene, in his heavily documented and incisive analysis, considers the background and intricate interaction between the problem of distorted democratic government and the breakdown of the independence of the several segments of our Government. The traditional balance of the divisions of our Government has lent stability in minimizing the problem of corruption in Government. Mollenhoff examines as principal figures in this breakdown the situations of such individuals as Bobby Baker, Billy Sol Estes, and in a different vein, Otto Otepka.

The use of Federal power for its own end is illustrated by the experiences of Don Reynolds who testified against Bobby Baker before the Senate Rules Committee. Reynolds, himself a controversial figure, was allegedly harassed by the Government to an almost unbelievable extent. Mollenhoff writes, "He [Reynolds] revealed that he had been questioned many times by the FBI, by tax agents, and by the Senate Rules Committee staff, and that the pattern of questioning made it appear he was the target of major emphasis, not Bobby Baker or others." Clearly this is a misuse of Federal power and an area of concern for those dedicated to the preservation and advancement of civil liberty for all our people regardless of their individual philosophy as Mollenhoff so compellingly discloses.

The author presents specific proposals to eliminate and cut down the threat of corruption to democracy and erosion of basic liberties. His strong arguments emphasize the decline in the independence of Congress in the context of American democracy in the 1960's and the companion decline in the independence of the American press under the influences of the Federal Government and the competition of centrally controlled media. To him the only way this Government decay can be effectively halted is if the people sense the problem, grasp its importance, and "demonstrate that the people are the masters." The public must become aware of the dangers of massive presidential political power and the effects on the governmental machinery of enormous Government contracts and Federal handouts. For Mollenhoff "in the end the responsibility for good Government rests with the people. America will get as good a government as Americans demand." Of course, as is so often the case in such writing, Mr. Mollenhoff fails to explain just how the people will become so aware and so aroused given the situation he describes. One obvious way would be to read his book.

Vice President's Mission Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the 43,000-mile mission to Asia by Vice President HUMPHREY was hailed in a recent column by David Lawrence who said it was "sensible tactics for the Vice President to go around the world making speeches, especially during critical times when the Communist propaganda machine is so active in sneering at or denouncing American policies."

The article is an interesting appraisal of the broadening duties of the Vice President, and because many will want to peruse its contents I am offering it to the RECORD for publication there:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Feb. 28, 1966]

THE NEW GLOBAL DUTIES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Originally, the chief function of a Vice President of the United States was to preside over the Senate. Nowadays, however, he plays a far more important role as an unofficial member of the executive branch of the Government. This practice arose only in recent years, when America began to participate actively in world affairs and the help of allies in meeting emergencies became essential.

Vice President HUMPHREY, who returned last week from a 43,000-mile journey to Asia, can do more during brief visits to the various capitals of the world to publicize American policies than sometimes can be accomplished in longer periods of time by the ambassadors or ministers accredited to those countries. This is because diplomatic representatives must be supercautious in what they say, as they have to stay at their posts the year around. But a Vice President, as the No. 2 man in the U.S. Government, can make speeches of a positive nature, and they will be widely printed.

Public relations has become a significant factor in the evolution of international policy. Many Americans do not realize that, although a speech by the President may be broadcast over television and radio and be given considerable space in the newspapers within the United States, it may get only a brief mention abroad—even in countries friendly to the United States. The reason is that what happens locally or in neighboring areas takes up most of the space in the news media.

When an emissary as prominent as the Vice President of the United States, however, visits a foreign country, it becomes a local story of magnitude. Crowds assemble to hear him speak, and the newspapers give front-page treatment to the event. Many an issue that has been repeatedly explained at home by the President is clarified for the first time in other lands when it is given publicity on the occasion of a Vice-Presidential visit.

It is, therefore, sensible tactics for the Vice President to go around the world making speeches, especially during critical times when the Communist propaganda machine is so active in sneering at or denouncing American policies.

Mr. HUMPHREY visited South Korea, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Thailand, and Laos, and, of course, spent some time in South Vietnam. All of these countries were given a clear statement not only of America's firmness and resoluteness in handling the Vietnam war but of the sincere desire of the United States to achieve an honorable peace.

Mr. Johnson, while Vice President, also made trips to Asia, Africa, and Europe, and in the preceding administration, Vice President Nixon went to countries on every continent, including a visit to the Soviet Union. The use of a Vice President for foreign trips is even more necessary today than it was a decade or two ago, because the international situations that have since developed are frequently subject to misunderstanding, particularly as the Communists are busily engaged in fomenting friction by means of repeated distortions.

When the Constitution was written, it was agreed that a Vice President should be designated to succeed the President in the event of the latter's death or disability, but nowhere else in the document were any duties of a Vice President specified in relation to the executive branch of the Government. Some Presidents have altogether ignored their No. 2 man. In the last 30 years, however, it has become customary for the Vice President to attend Cabinet meetings and to be given the confidential background of many important developments in national and international policies.

Mr. HUMPHREY happens to be a very vocal, healthy, exuberant person who delivers effective speeches. He has a congenial personality and makes a good impression abroad. Most important of all, he follows carefully the instructions given him by the President and the Secretary of State back home. So the role of the Vice President as a roving ambassador is indeed unique.

Certainly, in bygone days, when it was often said that a Vice President really had nothing to do, few people envisaged the important position that the No. 2 man occupies today in the American Government and throughout the world.

Those Who Place Themselves Above the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to include an editorial from the "Stars and Stripes-National Tribune" issue of February 17, 1966. This thoughtful editorial gets to the crux of the matter by stating: "We abhor the ever-growing doctrine that, if in an individual's judgment a law is a bad one, then he is not bound to conform with it."

The expression of this doctrine by Professor Lynd and the draft board sit-ins by students at the University of Michigan is special cause for concern because it comes from educated people who should have more appreciation of the consequences of their acts. The end result of this doctrine is anarchy and I join with the "Stars and Stripes-National Tribune" in expressing the hope that action will be taken to curb such activities.

IS LYND UNTOUCHABLE?

Like millions of other Americans, we are deeply concerned with the actions of Staughton Lynd, Yale professor who has so flagrantly flaunted the laws of our Nation.

Lynd, on two occasions has taken unto himself the prerogatives of defying the U.S. Government and the laws of that Government. He traveled to North Vietnam, meeting there with high Communist officials without U.S. authorization and actually in defiance of statutes which prohibit travel to foreign countries by U.S. citizens unless lawfully permitted.

More recently the Yale professor left the United States and appeared on a television broadcast in London, England, again without express permission from Government officials.

We abhor the ever-growing doctrine that, if in an individual's judgment a law is a bad one, then he is not bound to conform with it. This was first promulgated in aggressive civil rights demonstrations.

By far the overwhelming percentage of law-abiding American citizens do not look with favor upon Lynd's defiance of a Government edict. Not only is he an American citizen duty bound to obey the laws of his country, but his consorting with enemy leaders in enemy country gives the impression that our law-enforcement agencies for some reason to not want to take such perpetrators to task.

When American boys are dying daily in South Vietnam no unauthorized American citizen should abrogate to himself the functions of proper Government officials. We believe that it is time to curb the travel tendencies of Staughton Lynd and any other Americans who entertain similar views.

When Marines Wage Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to visit South Vietnam last fall and spend a week in the field with the 3d Marine Division. I served with this division in World War II, when it was bent on recovering territory seized by the Japanese.

Today, in Vietnam, the 3d Marine Division is determined to rid Asia of a new aggressor—the North Vietnamese Vietcong. All of us are very much aware of the military efforts of the marines in Vietnam, but there are many who do not realize that the United States and the marines are waging an equally important battle in southeast Asia—a battle against hunger, disease, and fear.

When American marines go into Vietnamese villages, they often carry the tools of peace, as well as the implements of war. Food, clothing, medicine, and friendliness are winning hearts while weapons provide security.

In the United States, marine reservists are raising CARE funds for these same villages, and other organizations are joining in this vital campaign.

The Christian Science Monitor, on February 24, published an excellent article detailing some of the marine activities in this other war. At this time, I insert this article in the RECORD in the hope you will share my pride in the Marine Corps and its Commandant, Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr.:

WHEN MARINES WAGE PEACE IN VIETNAM

(By David K. Willis)

WASHINGTON.—As the first marines walked warily into the hamlet, children watched silently from doorways. Adults stayed inside.

The sun beat down; fear and hostility hung in the air.

The villagers knew the Americans were fighting the Vietcong, but they were afraid of both sides. They just wanted to get back to their rice fields and to be left alone.

The marines started to patrol. As they fanned out, someone noticed a pump was broken. Without a word, it was fixed.

VILLAGERS TRAINED

The next day, a group of villagers walked over to the Marine headquarters, smiling gratefully. Soon they were stanch allies.

A new cistern was built with sand and cement bought by the marines from their own pockets. After a Vietcong attack, Marine doctors treated several villagers, then opened a center and helped up to 150 patients a day, 6 days a week.

"For Vietnam's 15 to 16 million people, there are only 900 doctors," a senior officer in the Agency for International Development (AID) told this newspaper, "but 600 of them are in the armed forces."

Others with medical training are either elderly or saddled with political or other responsibilities, and can work only part time in the health field.

Air Force Maj. Gen. James W. Humphreys is AID's man in charge of the medical effort. He is making radical changes in the program. He is encouraging U.S. medical units to train as many Vietnamese as possible. These workers are trained in rudimentary hygiene and health care.

Town health centers, safe from the Vietcong, are replacing vulnerable village stations.

Women are being encouraged to take up nursing. This has been a challenge, because, traditionally, nurses—like schoolteachers—have been men.

"We've broken the tradition, we think," said one official. "Now 70 percent of new nurses are female. Two years ago, it was 20 percent."

From time to time, AID officials tour the United States looking for volunteer nurses to serve in Vietnam. Recruiting drives have been held in Chicago, Los Angeles, and elsewhere. Housing and other facilities are limited in Saigon, but officials accept as many volunteers as they can.

FUND DRIVES SET

The war has also put a new focus on quick courses—6 weeks to 3 months—for lower echelon Vietnamese, to turn them into health workers for rural areas.

The Vietcong killed 30 of these health officers last year, and the Government pay is low—less than $1 a day. So the Vietnamese are not rushing to volunteer.

The Vietcong tells villagers that Americans will steal, kill, and torture. At the village of Le My, 7 miles north of Da Nang, more than one marine was killed by sniper fire as they began handing out extra rice.

But the people saw that the rice kept coming, that their children were freely helped by military doctors, that the "terrible" Americans smiled under their helmets.

A sergeant in Da Nang bought a small horse to give children rides. Others gave dolls to orphanages.

Then last September, the Marine Corps Commandant, Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., decided to organize this "civic action" on a wide scale.

RESTAURANTS CHIP IN

He authorized the 122,000 Marine reservists in the United States to launch fundraising drives to give the South Vietnamese more clothes, tools, blankets, food, and lumber.

The entire operation is carried on through CARE, a nonprofit organization. CARE receives the money, buys goods in Vietnam, and channels it to the villages.

Reserve units show films, put up advertisements, stir enthusiasm. They do not handle money themselves. They hand out yellow-and-gold envelopes, which donors send to CARE, Inc., on Connecticut Avenue in Washington.

Then CARE forwards the money to Da Nang.

The reservists' aim is $200,000 by March 1.

Several State Governors and mayors, including George Romney, of Michigan; William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania; Edward T. Breathitt, Jr., of Kentucky; Richard J. Daley, of Chicago; Jerome Cavanagh, of Detroit; and Joseph Barr, of Pittsburgh, have opened drives in their areas.

In Seattle, 15 restaurants donated their Christmas Eve takings to the fund. Donations have been pouring in at the rate of $2,000 a day.

In a narrow, green-painted office in the Marine Headquarters Building in Washington, a spokesman explained:

"The drive was launched just as communities were searching for ways to offset last year's wave of anti-Vietnam demonstrations.

"People couldn't help us fast enough. CARE, a fine group to work with, is providing all kinds of material—school kits, tools, soap, cloth, needles and thread, and so on."

PEOPLE'S SUPPORT HELD NEED

Another Marine spokesman continued: "General Greene is a strong advocate of civic action. Without the support of the people, we can't hope to really defeat the Vietcong or find out what he's up to."

The money is going to the four northern Provinces of South Vietnam, where the Marine 3d Amphibious Force is stationed; Thua Thien Quang Nam, Quang Tin, and Quangngai. (These include the cities of Hue and Da Nang.)

The drive illustrates how private American institutions are also helping fight the other war.

The National Association of the Junior Chambers of Commerce, for instance, has been active in raising money.

And CARE—which delivered its first food packages in France on May 11, 1946—is typical of the person-to-person aid agencies working in Vietnam.

So far in its history, CARE has delivered $610 million worth of supplies in four continents. A joint organization of 26 service agencies, it works in Vietnam with several other American organizations, including the Catholic Relief Service, the Mennonite Central Committee, and the International Volunteer Service.

The Marines also have joint United States-South Vietnamese military teams acting as military-civic cadres in the northern Provinces.

One of them, working near Hue, consists of four Marine units and eight Vietnamese units of provincial troops, under a Marine lieutenant.

It hunts down the Vietcong in a village, then stays to set the villagers on their feet.

VILLAGERS LEND AID

The marines are proud of their civic-action programs, limited as they are. They medically treated 134,110 Vietnamese between March and December last year, handed out 131,916 pounds of food, 120,767 pounds of clothes, and 40,946 pounds of soap, fed 33,387 refugees, evacuated 4,331 ill civilians, conducted 40 English classes, and provided $2,053 out of marine pockets.

Marines are satisfied that civic action—backed up with an efficient military operation—is the best weapon they have.

In Le My last year, a Vietcong patrol forced a village woman to guide it through an area newly occupied by the marines.

She guided them straight to a Marine outpost. She turned them in.

Another time, a Vietcong straggler stopped five village women on a sampan and asked help to find his patrol.

The women welcomed him aboard, took him downstream—and pushed him into the water in front of a startled Marine sentry, shouting "Vietcong. Vietcong."

Marines had rebuilt Le My's bridges and schools, and reopened its marketplace. They were reaping the reward of kindness.

Kindness. That's what the "other" war is all about.

Economic Growth in Southwestern Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Regional Industrial Development Corp., of southwestern Pennsylvania, known in the Pittsburgh area as RIDC, is a nonprofit development corporation established under the laws of Pennsylvania. It is concerned with the economic development and industrial growth of a nine-county area in southwestern Pennsylvania in which more than 3 million people reside. The principal objectives of RIDC are to strengthen and create new employment opportunities, to broaden and diversify the industrial base of the region, to provide new land, buildings and financing, for existing and new companies, to upgrade the labor force in fields where new skills are called for, and to make the region a unified economic entity working for the growth of the whole region.

As a measure of the success of this energetic, imaginative organization, I ask that "Highlights of the Past Year" from the 1965 RIDC annual report, be included at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PAST YEAR

Employment in the region is the highest in a decade.

Unemployment is lowest recorded since data compilation was begun, and rate is now below those of United States and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

New highs were recorded in capital investment for plant and equipment.

More than 75 major industrial expansions were announced or begun during the past year.

Five new plants are in operation or under construction in the RIDC-Allegheny County Industrial Park, representing an employment of 1,500 persons.

The RIDC Industrial Development Fund commitments now exceed $6,000,000 to 61 companies employing approximately 3,000 people.

Retraining programs have been undertaken which have retrained 3,500 people in more than 175 separate courses and 50 different subjects.

RIDC-sponsored Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority projects now total $14,000,000 ($5,900,000 in the past year).

The Pittsburgh region has established itself as the leading oxygen steelmaking center in the world.

The regions' diversification continues with the further growth of its research and development facilities and with Pittsburgh strengthening its position as a major administrative, management, and corporate center.

Profit in Filth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., writing in Our Sunday Visitor, the National Catholic ecumenical weekly, stated:

> We used to be able to count on our Government to protect us from salacious literature, but not any longer. Its sense of values has been perverted. The Government protects us from drugs that harm the body, but when it comes to salacious literature or seductive films that harm our morals, the Government does not seem to care.

I strongly believe the legislative branch of our Government does care, as evidenced by the fact the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed my bill last year to halt the unsolicited flow of obscenity through the mails. This legislation is now before the other body and I am hopeful of early consideration. Passage of this legislation, H.R. 980, will show the American people we do care.

Cardinal Spellman said recently:

> Our youth today is under assault from a powerhouse of perversion.

Father Lyons may have been appealing to the Congress of the United States when he added:

> For God's sake, do something about it.

I would commend Father Lyons' column to the attention of every Member of the Congress:

THE RIGHT TO DESTROY

(By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Tell me what you read and I will tell you what you are. Americans spend $2 billion a year on pornographic literature. If the merchants of filth traded only with adults, it would be bad enough, but three-fourths of the pornography in the United States falls into the hands of young boys and girls in their early teens.

Are you as an individual helping to preserve the values on which our Nation was founded, and on which it must rely in order to survive? Or are you, through your broadmindness and indifference, letting the youth around you become corrupted? To say that "there is nothing I can do about it" is just taking the easy way out.

We used to be able to count on our Government to protect us from salacious literature, but not any longer. Its sense of values has been perverted. The Government protects us from drugs that harm the body, but when it comes to salacious literature, or seductive films that corrupt our morals, the Government does not seem to care.

Morals do not seem to be of much importance. Just do not harm the body. The courts themselves seem bent on abolishing any restrictions on pornography. Legally, there seems to be no such thing as smut or obscenity any longer. You, as a taxpayer, are subsidizing the sending of this corruption through the mails. The attitude of America is: "Take care of your physical health, and your dog's." But Christ said: "Do not worry about those things which can harm the body; worry about those things which can cast both body and soul into hell."

NATIONAL SUICIDE

To sit back complacently and reason that smutty literature has its place is to condone national suicide. Listen to what the Nation's experts have to say on the subject. The New York Academy of Medicine pointed out last spring that salacious literature makes vice attractive. James Kilpatrick pointed out in the The Smut Peddlers: "The heart and soul of this racket is not the grownup sucker. It is the curious child * * *." Psychiatrists and police officials point to the results: rebellion against authority; venereal disease; illegitimate children; the shattered lives of unwed parents; an expanding population of sick perverts; a philosophy of self-indulgence that condones adultery, destroys the home, and threatens our whole society.

Psychiatrists point out that pornography is undermining the mental health of hundreds of thousands of teenagers. The chief psychiatrist of the county court in Philadelphia recently declared that the greatest single cause of sexual immorality in adolescents is pornography. Detective Austin Duke of St. Louis has not hesitation in saying: "I have never picked up a juvenile sex offender who did not have this stuff with him, in his car, or in his house." Inspector Herbert Case has testified that he has yet to see a sex murder case in the history of the Detroit Police Department but what I can show you obscene literature.

No one is on the firing line more than the judges who man the juvenile courts of our Nation. They point out at their national conference that salacious literature has had such a profound effect on our society that it is changing the very character of juvenile delinquency. J. Edgar Hoover put it very briefly: "Sex-mad magazines are creating criminals faster than jails can be built to house them."

Other nations have often wondered why America has the highest crime rate in the world, and why our youth play the leading role in this gruesome drama. How can we account for this precocious perversion and youthful addiction to crime? The greatest cause is indecent literature. But why has pronography been allowed to run so rampant? The answer is threefold: its profits are enormous: it has some of the sharpest legal talent in the country behind it; you and I have done little or nothing to prevent it.

PROFIT IN FILTH

Most of the $2 billion spent on pornography annually is profit for those who produce it. Some people have always been willing to sell their soul for a mess of pottage. Interfaith organizations, such as Operation Yorkville in New York City, have branded Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish groups together to attack it. This is true ecumenism. If we are to unite with other faiths on anything, we should unite against the forces of evil, and for the preservation of what is good. To sit idly by on the sidelines and say that the problem will always exist is to ignore the fact that the problem has never been so bad, and is daily getting worse.

Pornography is succeeding largely because the legal profession has worked so hard to defend it. I am referring particularly, of course, to the American Civil Liberties Union, whose members have been the key defenders of pornography in the courts. The ACLU believes that the free-speech section of the first amendment is absolute. It maintains that there should be no restraint whatsoever on what is printed. It insists that not even children should be protected from depravity.

What can you do about it? As you value your soul, and the souls of those entrusted to your charge, be stricter than you have been about salacious literature and seductive films. Join with other individuals and organizations in your area to find out how bad the situation is, and make concerted efforts to improve it. Where there is a will there will always be a way. Write to your Senator or Congressman, urging him to help.

Above all, write to the White House. Operation Yorkville is spearheading a national citizens appeal to the President during the month of January. The poverty of immorality is by far the worst poverty of all. If the President wants a great society in America, urge him to use his authority to stem the great tidal wave of smut that is engulfing our Nation's children. Operation Yorkville has the backing of Cardinal Spellman, who declared: "Our youth today is under assault from a powerhouse of perversion." For God's sake, do something about it.

One Man, How Many Votes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, the reapportionment amendment is one of the most important legislative issues before this session of Congress. There is, however, a great deal of public misunderstanding regarding the significance of the reapportionment issue generally and the need for enactment of the proposed reapportionment amendment to the Constitution. I would therefore commend to Members of Congress a series of articles on this subject which appeared in the Times-Union of Rochester, N.Y., not long ago.

This series, written by Calvin Mayne, associate editor of the Times-Union, is one of the best journalistic expositions of a complex legislative subject matter which I have ever been privileged to read. Hopefully, it may set an example for other newspapers and journals to inform their readers fully regarding the facts and vital considerations regarding the reapportionment amendment.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Wayne's 3-part series be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Times-Union, Dec. 27, 1965]

THE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT—ONE MAN, HOW MANY VOTES?

(By Calvin Mayne)

The late U.S. Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter once warned his colleagues that they were entering a thorny "political thicket" by tampering with State reapportionment.

Now the thicket has become a trackless jungle as State after State tries to comply with the High Court's one-man, one-vote rulings.

Most voters and not a few lawmakers do not know from one election to the next what, districts are represented by whom in State legislatures. The New York Legislature will make another stab at devising a legally acceptable reapportionment plan next month.

The sensible way out of this mess is for Congress and the States to adopt the reapportionment amendment to the U.S. Constitution proposed by EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, Senate Republican minority leader.

The amendment came within seven votes of the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate last year. It deserves passage in 1966.

The Dirksen amendment would permit a State to apportion one house of a two-house legislature on the basis of factors other than population alone. That could not be done, however, unless representation in the other house was on a strictly, "one-man, one-vote" basis and unless the people approved any apportionment plan in a referendum.

To support the Dirksen amendment, it is not necessary to reject flatly the one-man, one-vote principle. Nor is it necessary to think that some voters are inherently wiser and more virtuous than others; that America would be better off under some benign bucolic despotism, or that city folk are unfit to govern themselves and need a rural checkrein on their urban madness.

It also should be understood that even the Supreme Court is not dead set on absolute voting equality. Recent decisions indicate that a 15-percent deviation in the populations of voting districts would be accepted by the Court; so the Court really is talking about a maximum of 1.3 votes for some people against 1 vote for others. Inequality thus becomes a matter of degree.

To clear out some more underbrush, there is nothing subversive about Congress and the people overruling the U.S. Supreme Court. The process of constitutional amendment is, after all, the final bastion for democracy against undue arbitrariness, or even injustice, by nine very human men in black robes in Washington.

Many supporters of the Dirksen amendment first part company with the Supreme Court's decision on legislative reapportionment in the Court's rejection of the Federal analogy.

In Congress, there is a House of Representatives apportioned according to population and a Senate made up of two Senators from each State.

That means that voters in little Rhode Island—or voters in Alaska, which is very big in area but has an even smaller population—have a representation in Congress hundreds of times stronger per voters than in such densely populated States as New York, New Jersey, Illinois, California, Ohio, or Pennsylvania.

Perhaps the Supreme Court Justices now would like to declare this embarrassing (to them) section of the Constitution unconstitutional; but they are not likely to try, or to get very far even if they do try. So this patent inequality of representation simply stands as a mighty obstacle for the Court's supporters to bypass or ignore.

Advocates of one man, one vote usually call the congressional system a necessary compromise or a political accident. Yet there is abundant evidence that it represented sound thinking on governmental structure by the Founding Fathers that is as applicable today as it was when drafted nearly two centuries ago.

But the Supreme Court simply dismissed as irrelevant any comparison between the congressional system and a similar system of representation in State legislatures.

In one key decision, Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote off counties or cities for which any special degree of representation was sought as mere administrative subdivisions of the States. He called them "subordinate governmental instrumentalities created by the State to assist in the carrying out of State government functions."

On closer inspection, this statement reveals either a gross ignorance of the importance of these subdivisions in modern government—which is doubtful among the astute Justices—or a belief in centralism which seems unrealistic and even downright dangerous to many Americans.

Try to tell Mayor-elect John Lindsay that New York City is nothing more than a "subordinate governmental instrumentality created by the State to assist in the carrying out of State government functions." Or tell it to Mayor Frank Lamb of Rochester or Mayor Daley of Chicago.

Try persuading Gordon Howe of Monroe County or Porter Homer of Dade County, Fla., that the county governments they manage are simply convenient subdivisions of State government which legislatures are free to wipe out overnight to obtain a more convenient arrangement of subdivisions.

Some cities and metropolitan counties have become, in various ways, more important governmental institutions than the States of which they are parts.

The instinct for home rule runs very deep among the American people. The time when a State could exercise its theoretical power and wipe out its governmental subdivisions of cities and counties has long since passed. A State legislature that tried it would find itself overturned in the very next election by angry voters who would not think that their identity as residents of a particular city or a county should be so blithely disregarded.

Indeed, consider one Earl Warren, speaking from the less Olympian heights of the State capitol in Sacrimento when he was Governor:

"Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the State senate to a strictly population basis."

Something funny happened to Governor Warren's opinion on his way to the Supreme Court.

[From the Times-Union, Dec., 28, 1965]

THE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT—ONE MAN, ONE VOTE PERILS CITIES

(By Calvin Mayne)

One big reason why the Dirksen amendment to the U.S. Constitution is needed is that cities and counties are entitled to some sort of special recognition in the distribution of seats in a State legislature.

One of the highly questionable features of one-man, one-vote reapportionments is that they force legislatures to obliterate natural political boundaries in setting districts of equal population.

Only the very biggest cities now have exclusively city legislators. Even accounting for gerrymandering, it is a fact that city and county boundaries often must be ignored to conform with the courts' mathematical requirements.

This is neither a good thing for a State government nor a development desired by a great many of the people affected. The Dirksen amendment would permit States to give cities and counties strong, individual voices speaking for their interests in the State legislature.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, speaking for the majority in one of the U.S. Supreme Court's reapportionment cases, dismissed the argument that legislatures should take some account of geographic or economic or social factors in apportioning seats.

"People, not land or trees or pastures, vote," wrote the Chief Justice in a famous phrase.

But Justice Potter Stewart seems to have come a lot closer to the realities of modern life in a dissent.

He warned that the court's new mandate "forever freezes one theory of political thought into our Constitution, and forever denies to every State any opportunity for enlightened and progressive innovation * * * so as to accommodate * * * the interests and aspirations of diverse groups of people without subjecting any group or class to absolute domination by a geographically concentrated or highly organized majority.

"Throughout our history," continued Justice Stewart, "the apportionments of State legislatures have reflected the strongly felt American tradition that the public interest is composed of many diverse interests, and that in the long run it can better be expressed by a medley of component voices than by the majority's monolithic command.

"What constitutes a rational plan will vary from State to State, since each State is unique, in terms of topography, geography, history, heterogeneity, concentration of population, variety of social and economic interests, and political language."

What that means in simpler language is that Rochester isn't New York City, and the villages of Wayne County aren't the suburban subdivisions of Long Island.

The problems of various sections of the very diverse Empire State and similar States are quite different. These diverse sections need strong, distinctive voices at the State capital that are potent enough to be heard, and which cannot be drowned out by court or legislative fiat.

Much has been heard about the need for the protection of beleaguered rural minorities from a rampaging urban majority. The point needs no belaboring. And it is not necessarily the best one that can be made for the viewpoint that population isn't everything in apportionment.

Consider the case of the cities that are supposed to be the chief beneficiaries of "one man, one vote."

The Supreme Court is said to have snatched cities out from under the oppressive heels of suspicious, tight-fisted country cousins who have perpetuated their power through malapportionment in the State capitals.

That's true to some extent. But who will, in the end, get the real power?

Cities have very special problems that will need a lot of sympathetic handling by State legislatures.

In a time when special problems of crime and traffic control and expressway building and urban renewal impose a tremendous financial burden on cities just as they are suffering from shrinking tax bases, cities obviously must look beyond their own resources for assistance.

It is not just rural folk who would deny it to them. The cities must also contend with the affluent suburbs, filled with people who have fled cities because of the very conditions that cities must correct to survive.

These are people who often are unsympathetic to city needs and antagonistic to cities whenever cities try to obtain suburban support for effort to solve municipal problems—even though such suburbanites are perfectly willing to earn their livelihoods in the cities and to work and shop there.

But what is happening to the population of cities in this time when the "one man, one vote" principle is imposed on them?

It is shrinking steadily while the suburbs are booming. In New York State's major metropolitan areas, the total population of the central cities dropped from 9.6 million in 1950 to 9.5 million in 1960. But the total population of the suburbs outside the cities in these same metropolitan (urbanized) areas more than doubled, from 1.7 million to 3.5 million.

In 1950, the major cities had 65 percent of the State's population. In 1960, they had only 57 percent.

The trend continues. From the standpoint of cities confronted with "one man, one vote" apportionment, the situation will get steadily worse. Urban interests could be swept away in a suburban tide before too many years pass.

The need for protection of the diverse interests in a State against the "one man, one vote" system seems likely to become steadily clearer, and only the Dirksen amendment offers a practical solution.

[FROM THE TIMES-UNION, DEC. 29, 1965]

THE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT—FREE CHOICE FOR STATES

(By Calvin Mayne)

The Dirksen amendment to the U.S. Constitution, favored by those who would modify the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote rulings, is complex in its wording. But what it proposes is simply this:

If a State legislature is dissatisfied with its apportionment under "one man, one vote," it devises a new apportionment plan.

If there is a bicameral legislature (49 of the 50 States have one), the new plan must not dilute the one-man, one-vote principle in apportionment of one of the two houses. But it may apply to the other house a plan which takes into account factors other than population.

That could stipulate, say, that each city or each county is entitled to a certain minimum number of seats. Or it could take geographic or economic conditions peculiar to a State into account.

The Dirksen amendment also would prohibit racial discrimination in the apportionment of seats in either house.

That isn't the end of it, however. The legislature still must submit its plan to a vote of all the people in the State, in a form that gives them a clear choice between the modified one-man, one-vote system and an apportionment based entirely on population.

And just to make sure that an inequitable plan is not frozen indefinitely into a State legislature, the Dirksen amendment provides that a new apportionment choice must be submitted to the people every 10 years. If a State wants to do nothing, the Supreme Court's ruling would apply to apportionment. But if a State wants to experiment a bit to protect either rural areas or suburban areas or cities, depending on the situation in a given State, it would have the freedom to choose the system that suited it best.

But under the Dirksen amendment, the majority still would rule, because the majority—in cities if the cities have a majority—can overrule any funny business by a legislature which might want to give a big majority of its seats to a small minority of the people.

To become the law of the land, the Dirksen amendment, even if it passes the Congress, still must run a gantlet of three-quarters of the State legislatures.

Since far more than one-quarter of the State legislatures now have been reapportioned according to one-man, one-vote, they will have to recognize that they really need the flexibility the Dirksen amendment affords before it can be ratified.

Surprisingly, the Supreme Court has ruled that even a referendum on a State apportionment plan deviating from one man, one vote, is unconstitutional, since the majority cannot deprive a minority of its constitutional right to equal representation and thus equal protection of the laws.

The trouble is that this principle, carried to its logical extreme, means that the Constitution itself might never be amended. For many an amendment adopted in the past has deprived some persons of what they had considered their constitutional right of property, or liberty from Government regulation.

The majority of voters in the infant United States approved what, according to the Supreme Court, is an inequitable system of representation in our Congress. The Republic has thrived since.

What then is wrong with a majority in a State approving what would certainly be no less inequitable a system than Congress has, and which would at least recognize the value of diversity? It would be an affirmation that a computerized system of representation does not necessarily produce the best form of government.

There is much to be said honorably for what Senator DIRKSEN and his supporters are trying to do. They are, in the long run, sincerely attempting to preserve the strength of our local institutions, to safeguard the political identity of our cities and counties.

De Tocqueville, defender of democracy, once said: "Municipal institutions constitute the strength of free nations. A nation may establish a system of free government, but without municipal institutions it cannot have the spirit of liberty."

In this light, the Dirksen amendment is nothing less than a defense of the "spirit of liberty."

The Proposed USDA Program for State and Private Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech entitled, "The Proposed USDA Program for State and Private Forestry," delivered by Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the annual meeting of the American Pulpwood Association, New York City, February 22, 1966.

The speech follows:

THE PROPOSED USDA PROGRAM FOR STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

(By Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the annual meeting of the American Pulpwood Association, New York City, February 22, 1966)

It is good to be here in New York again for "Paper Week." Last year I had accepted your invitation with pleasure, but our budget hearings in the House made it necessary for me to remain in Washington.

It is especially appropriate, I think, to include in your forest policy forum a discussion of a program that involves close cooperation between private, State, and Federal organizations.

One of the most essential characteristics of a productive and mutually satisfactory partnership—between industry and Government for example—is straight talk. Each partner needs to express his views clearly and to understand the other's viewpoint. I think that we are doing quite well in this regard. In the past 2 years I have made four speeches to industry groups and prepared two major articles on subjects of particular interest to the wood-using industries. During this period Boyd Rasmussen, Art Greeley, and others on my staff have had many discussions and meetings with industry leaders concerning a variety of topics of mutual interest.

On all of these occasions we have tried to make Forest Service views and positions as clear as we possibly can. You have done the same and we appreciate it. In this direction lies real progress in pursuing our common goals of better resource management, adequate timber supplies, and a thriving wood-using industry.

The favorable outlook for the pulp and paper industry must be a dominant factor guiding your activities in 1966. Prospects of continuing growth in both the short-term and the long-term outlook are pleasant to contemplate for anyone interested in your industry. In my article in the special New York Times supplement a few months ago I tried to dramatize the tremendous demand for pulpwood that lies ahead. The 105-million-cord harvest of pulpwood, projected for the year 2000, would amount to a solid pile of pulpsticks covering Manhattan Island to a depth of 22 feet. On top of that we could imagine an 8-foot layer of chips from plant residues, imported pulpwood, etc., to represent the volume consumed that would not be produced from domestic roundwood. All told, a volume equivalent to some 141.5 million standard cords may be consumed by your industries that year.

I am sure that you must see this looming demand as a great challenge as well as a foundation for growth. By the end of the century, the average American household—and there may be 100 million of them by then—may require about 2,200 pounds of wood fiber each year just to meet their needs for paper and board. This volume is equivalent to the net annual growth on about 4.2 acres of typical commercial forest land in the East today. On a nationwide basis, it is equivalent to 87 percent of the total current volume of growth. Of course, we expect forests to be growing more wood per acre by the year 2000, and some of the Nation's wood fiber needs will be met from imports and by chipping wood residues. But it is clear that your industries will require a very large share of the productive capacity of forest lands in the United States.

Where is this huge volume of wood going to come from? The so-called small and miscellaneous private holdings occupy almost three-fourths of the commercial forest land in the East. And in 1962, 85 percent of the total national pulpwood harvest came from trees cut in the East. It seems likely that these properties will continue to be your major source of supply. Probably less than half of the pulpwood harvests that must be sustained to meet the needs of your industry can be supplied from lands owned by forest industries or by public agencies.

It will be an interesting story that unfolds these next three decades. Widespread use of wood as a source of raw materials for chemicals, clothing, and even food supplies, may develop before many years pass. Strong competition for timber of pulpwood size and quality may occur as a result of new and expanded uses of wood, and because of continued technological advances in your industry.

There are many unknowns in the timber supply/demand equations of the future. But we can be sure that a passive "wait and see what happens" role is not possible for either of us—industry or Government.

I can assure you that we in the Forest Service do not plan to sit on the sidelines for the next 30 years to wait and see what happens. I know that you will not do that either. Therefore, let me restate some of the basic principles or philosophies that will guide the actions we do take in those areas of particular interest to you. I want to be sure that our communications are adequate on this score, so that a viable partnership is not obstructed by any possible misunderstanding of our position.

We welcome each and every program or activity that promotes better forestry practices. This is a big field to plow; there is room for—and a need for—each to work effectively on the part that he can do best. As I have said before, any Federal program that we propose pertaining to State and private forest lands will be tailored to accomplish what is needed but not likely to be accomplished otherwise. In other words, the amount of the total job that is done by industry, State forestry organizations, consulting foresters, or others, largely determines the scope and size of our program proposals.

The progress that has been made through non-Federal efforts in recent years is very impressive. Programs such as the American tree farm system, busy acres, keep green campaigns, tree farm families, demonstration forests, and so forth, have been very effective. Splendid accomplishments on industrial lands and the increasingly effective work of consulting foresters and various associations are other major factors. Were it not for these, we would be faced today with the need to recommend a larger Federal effort—much larger than the one currently being reviewed.

I am sincerely pleased that this is the situation. The timber trends report has revealed the kind of progress that all foresters can understand and appreciate. We know that progress in forestry is not measured in terms of program dollars. On the contrary, a massive program recommendation would reflect a serious lack of progress in forestry.

Let me be equally frank, however, in telling you that we will continue to try to close the gaps in forestry efforts. We intend to improve existing programs, and seek new ways and means to advance the cause of forestry. We will continue to be uneasy about declining timber quality, about idle acres, about timber losses from fires and pests, about poor resource management practices, and about related problems.

The Forest Service has been involved in cooperative forestry programs for a long time—I think that our role in the scheme of things is quite clear. At times we have been, and must continue to be, a catalyst—a force of innovation to get action underway. This was the case in earlier years especially. And, of necessity, we must make sure that regional, national, and even international interests are reflected in program matters.

But as I see it, the Forest Service role in this field is primarily one of cooperation, encouragement, and assistance. This has been our approach for more than a decade and I see no reason to expect it to change. Our new administrative organization in the Eastern United States is designed and intended to strengthen and improve our capacity to cooperate and assist. The proposed State and private forestry program now being reviewed by Secretary Freeman is designed to improve the Department's ability to cooperate and assist.

One of the hallmarks of this new proposal is that participation by States, industrial groups, or others is voluntary. We hope to be able to offer more of the same type of cooperation and assistance that typify our cooperative programs today. There is nothing mandatory in the program. The States will decide what part of the package they want to buy into. The shape and character of the total program in any particular State will be determined locally. And we expect that the forest industries as well as other interested parties will share in making that determination. I am confident that a philosophy of encouragement and assistance will continue to be dominant in Forest Service attitudes.

It seems to me that in the field of research we have been able to develop an especially effective type of mutual assistance and cooperation. I think that we can and should take this as our goal—to develop an equally effective atmosphere of cooperation across the full range of the proposed USDA program for State and private ownerships.

The 10-year national forestry research program that Secretary Freeman sent to the Congress in April of 1964 could just as well have been part and parcel of the proposed program we are talking about today. It pertains directly to our role in advancing forestry on State and private lands and it stresses cooperation. In fact at one time we seriously considered proposing a comprehensive program including both research and cooperative forestry programs.

Working together, we are already making great progress within the framework of that blueprint for research in the years ahead. That pattern can be duplicated in cooperative action programs.

I do not think it unrealistic for me to stand before you today and suggest that it is both feasible and mutually advantageous for industry and government to work together more effectively across the wide range of State and private forestry programs. We are teamed up quite well already in some endeavors—but I really think that we have just scratched the surface.

In this connection I am personally delighted that after thorough study of the proposed program, the Forest Industries Council representatives found themselves "in broad sympathy with much of the program." Their efforts to focus constructive suggestions on the draft program are much appreciated. I would like to comment briefly on some of the points the council raised because they probably identify items of particular interest to you.

The dangers of duplication, competition, confusion, and a lack of program coordination are pointed out in the industry comments. We agree that those dangers exist. We share this concern and see a special need for positive actions to avoid them. This is an inevitable challenge in any broad-scale program in a field as complex as State and private forestry in the United States. Bringing together into one package the pertinent programs of nine agencies in the Department is certainly a step in this direction—through it we seek a better mesh of all USDA programs. Obtaining a review of the proposed program by State foresters and industry groups in the formative stages is another effort in that direction.

We look to the State foresters as the logical and most effective coordinating agents in this field. We could not be more in agreement with the industry comments that the State forester has a key role in Fedral forestry assistance programs, and that Federal efforts should be channeled through the State forestry organization.

To be strong and effective, however, a State forestry organization must have an adequate budget and stanch support from industrial leaders and other key people. Without these the State forester cannot redeem his responsibilities. If you want to keep forestry in the hands of foresters, then your course of action is clear. You must work hard to build State forestry organizations into towers of strength—into sources of leadership that can pull the various programs together effectively. If a vacuum is allowed to exist, someone is bound to try to move into it.

But let us not forget that coordination is the kind of job that requires hard work by all concerned. The State forster cannot do the job alone. As far as the Federal establishment is concerned, I can assure you that the Forest Service will continue to provide leadership in this field. Our sister agencies in the Department of Agriculture recognize that we have been assigned this responsibility.

As members of the third party in this three-legged stool of Federal, State, and private effort, you have a similar responsibility. Let me repeat that State foresters must have your help if they are to achieve the high degree of program effectiveness that we all seek.

There are a few comments I would like to make concerning industry reactions to some of the specific program measures:

Taxation: Making forestry investments financially attractive is obviously a major factor is this program. We had hoped that a measure focused on taxation problems might help to improve the economic climate in which forest landowners must operate. However, as you have pointed out, this is an extremely complex matter involving many different levels of government and a wide variety of situations. This item has been dropped from the program package. We will continue the fine research work that Ellis Williams is doing in this field.

Price reporting: The Department of Agriculture is deeply involved in reporting price and market information on farm commodities. Producers have come to expect and rely upon this type of information for corn, beef, oranges, and many other items. It seems logical to extend this service to include timber products. About 18 States already report price and market information for forest products. This program measure is intended to make assistance available to the States if they wish to establish or improve a reporting system. We agree that stumpage prices should not be included in such reports.

Cooperatives: I know that you are generally opposed to efforts to establish forest cooperatives. We recognize that establishing successful forest co-ops is going to be difficult. We expect to build on the experience in Appalachia and to utilize the best skills and assistance available in the Department or elsewhere.

It seems to me that a lack of economic incentive for owners of small forest tracts is one of the most basic problems that must be overcome in the years ahead. The profit motive works just as effectively on a 40-acre tract as it does in a $40 million company; the absence of an economic incentive can be equally discouraging in either case. Associations of woodland owners, involving game management and recreation use as well as timber production, may help to make forest land management profitable. This could, in turn, result in the increased wood supplies which you are going to need. For that reason alone, I think they are worth a try. From your standpoint, looking ahead to the clear need for improved management on these lands, I would think you might want to participate in guiding this work to the benefit of all concerned—including the wood-using industry.

Protection: We appreciate the endorsement of the recommendation to strengthen present pest detection, evaluation, and control programs. We too are concerned about the economic justification of intensified forest fire protection levels that are approaching the point of diminishing returns in some areas. This is a valid point. We are especially interested in the entire subject of rural fire defense capability for several reasons. The warning to avoid bypassing the State foresters, or overlapping existing fire protection efforts, will be heeded as these related programs mature.

Tree planting and timber stand improvement: The proposed program includes reforestation and cultural work that is justified on the basis of watershed, wildlife, recreational, or esthetic values—as well as on the basis of meeting future timber needs. We can certainly agree that public investments for these purposes should be based on sound principles of forest management. We think that such expenditures are in the public interest for many reasons. The entire Nation is concerned about family income, better living conditions in rural areas, natural beauty, and similar economic, social, or esthetic factors. These are matters which are of basic importance in cooperative forestry programs. We must look beyond timber production as such and consider the multiple benefits of reforestation, stand improvement, and better resource management.

A rising tide of public interest in natural beauty is rolling across our land. Sentiment for preservation of natural resources is strong. New definitions of conservation are emerging and they don't always include utilization of resources. The image of the forester, the logger, and the wood-using industry needs to be bolstered in this day and age. As many of you know, I have been speaking and writing as forcefully as I can to point out to the public that forests can be managed for beauty and for use—including clearcutting where necessary. Some industrial leaders are making the same kind of effort. This program provides an opportunity to present and support forestry activities on a broader basis than simply safeguarding timber supplies.

The proposed program for State and private ownerships is designed primarily to outline the Department's efforts in the next 10 years or so. In this sense, it is comparable to the development program for the national forests sent to the Congress in 1961 and the national forestry research program which followed in 1964. Those programs have proved to be most useful, and they are gradually being implemented as the national budget situation and the wishes of the Congress permit. We hope that this will be the case with the program proposal we are discussing today.

The proposed program is in Secretary Freeman's office now. It is being thoroughly reviewed by the budget staff, among others. In my experience, competition for Federal program dollars has never been more intense. What this will mean specifically in terms of timing, size, and scope of the program is not apparent at this time. The various elements of the program, when finally approved, will probably be implemented when and where feasible, as is the case with the other 10-year programs.

Regardless of how soon or how completely the measures recommended come to pass, we can move in the direction outlined by the program. For the most part we are talking about strengthening existing programs. We can get on with the job of cooperation and coordination.

Let me give you a current example of how cooperation can pay off in a related field. We are beginning to graduate young men from our Job Corps Conservation Centers. State Foresters are doing similar work under the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. Some of these youngsters possess exactly the kinds of training and skills as forest workers that are in short supply. It should not be too difficult to work out recruiting and employment arrangements that would benefit all concerned.

We can also continue to work toward strengthening the State Forester's role, as you suggest. We can build upon the exchange of views that has resulted already from your review of the program proposal. We can work together in establishing priorities in our efforts to implement the program measures. These are some of the reasons why it is important, and encouraging, that we are so nearly in agreement in this proposed blueprint for the years ahead.

As 1966 unfolds, I think that we will progress on all fronts. Looking to the years beyond, I see a continuing evolution—not revolution—in cooperative forestry programs if we work together effectively.

The roles of Federal, State, and private forestry organization with respect to non-Federal lands are distinctly different. But they are interrelated and they can be mutually complementary.

I suggest that we work hard toward an even better understanding and mutual respect for each other's efforts in this field.

Winning Speech in Idaho's Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Voice of Democracy contest inspires thousands of young Americans to stand proudly and speak out on behalf of patriotism. This year, as we move through troubled times, the declarations of the contestants have special meaning. Too often, loud voices of the confused few who object to this Nation's direction obscure the truth of our worldwide democratic objectives. .It is with extreme pride then, that I submit for the RECORD the patriotic declaration of James Hofmeister, of Hayden Lake, Idaho, a resident of my congressional district, and State winner in the VFW Voice of Democracy contest:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By James Hofmeister)

Here I am, a citizen in a great country where democracy is natural. People here have always had it. Some people take it for granted. But I don't believe that it should be taken so casually. Democracy is not something we can scoff at and say, "We don't have to worry; we'll always have it." Well, we'd better be careful; someday it could be lost. There are forces in the world which are seeking to destroy all democracy and any basis for future democracy. Democracy must mean more to us than something we just naturally have.

Looking into the past, I realize what democracy means to real Americans. I can see those brave farmers standing like a stone wall against the horde of redcoats. I can see the blue and gray uniforms at the Battle of Gettysburg. I can see the remains of a wagon train, smoldering in a valley where the Indians had left it. I can see the bombers attacking the peaceful ships at Pearl Harbor and, soon after, the valiant marines fighting their way to the shores of Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa. And today I see men dying on the battlefield in a foreign country they know nothing about, just because a people's freedom is being threatened. Now ask these men and women. They can tell anybody what democracy means. They died for it yesterday and they are dying for it today. They are the ones who make it all possible, for they are the ones responsible for passing down this heritage of democracy which I cherish so dearly today.

Then I look again and I see a young man tearing up his draft card. I see mobs of people chanting and carrying signs: "Yankee come home." And as I sadly watch all of this, I think that these people are so ignorant. They don't know what democracy is, and probably they never will.

I do take one more look at the entire picture. There must be some hope, for I see homes flying Old Glory. I see stanch supporters of the cause of freedom. Yes, I see these people, these lovers of freedom, these Americans; I see them far outnumbering the others. These people, too, know what is meant by democracy. They know the price that was paid and they believe that it should be paid again if it becomes necessary.

But just what is this democracy to me? I must ask myself what I mean by the thing I value so much. It can't be answered in short, for it is many things. It is freedom—freedom to say what I want, to worship where I like, to pick any field of occupation, to go where I please, to associate with anybody. It is rights—the right to the freedoms I have already mentioned, the right to protection from criminals and wartime enemies, the right to a good education, the right to equality with all men, the right to happiness. It is duties—duties of being a responsible citizen, of treating all people equally, of defending our freedom, of protecting the freedom of others. This is my democracy; this is my way of life and the way of life of millions in the United States.

I listed as a duty, defending our freedom. This could be a little difficult for me, a high school student, to do. I cannot serve my country in the military, I am not of age. I don't have enough influence to quiet the voices of the unpatriotic mobs which flare up throughout the country. I can't vote as of yet, nor can I do much about those who serve in public office. No, not many people will listen to a mere teenager. But there are still some things left I can do. This speech for instance. Here I can say what I feel and maybe I can even give a little fire of patriotism to someone who will hear it. Secondly, I can take up the responsibility of becoming a good citizen, one who will stand up for his rights, one who will not shirk his duties. I can do this by getting the good education offered to me and by keeping my eyes and ears open to the happenings around me. And finally, I must be loyal to my country, no matter what. She comes before any other, for she is mine.

Yes, I must see to it that democracy is safeguarded. I must make it secure for my children, for my grandchildren. I must see that other peoples obtain this great gift. I must become a soldier in the ranks of those fighting for freedom and democracy. This is my right; this is my duty. This is my democracy.

President Recognizes Jet Noise Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I outlined my efforts during the past year to alert my colleagues in the House to the increasing urgency of the aircraft noise problem. On August 19, 1965, I wrote to the President urging the appointment of a Presidential Commission to examine into the question in depth. During October a White House Conference on Aircraft Noise was called to review the problem.

Today, the President, in his transportation message to Congress, gave White House recognition to jet noise as a national problem and directed his Special Assistant on Science and Technology to work with the Administrators of FAA and NASA and the Secretaries of Commerce and Housing and Urban Development "to frame an action program to attack this problem."

In my 10 previous statements in the House of Representatives on aircraft noise abatement—in my two bills, H.R. 7981 and H.R. 7982—and in my correspondence and meetings with the President and officials of Federal departments and agencies, I have called for Federal action—both administrative and legislative—to reduce the affect of jet noise. These are the steps which the residents of my congressional district and districts throughout the United States located near airfields have requested to assist local communities meet this problem.

For the first time, a President of the United States has recognized jet noise as a national problem and has taken steps to place the resources of the Federal Government squarely behind the needs of the people by calling for action. I thank the President on behalf of my constituents in the Fifth Congressional District and I commend him for taking the necessary steps to frame an action program.

I am pleased that the aircraft noise problem has been placed in a national spotlight and I will continue my efforts in Congress to provide Federal assistance to reduce the affects of jet noise.

Escalation of the War on Disease—Representative Fogarty Speaks at New York Tropical Disease Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, February 17, 1966, was a significant day in the annals of our efforts to conquer killing and crippling disease.

At St. Clare's Hospital in New York City, his eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, gave his blessing to the Tropical Disease Research Center, established under his guidance and initiative. The center adds a new chapter to the long list of great and good works in New York and around the world which have been performed through the leadership and efforts of this great and good servant of God and man.

The center is truly fortunate to have as its director, an eminently qualified physician, Dr. Kevin Michael Cahill. One needs merely to cite Dr. Cahill's training and list his academic honors and experience to conclude that his selection is most fortunate.

Dr. Cahill graduated from Fordham University—egregia cum laude—and received his medical degree from Cornell. He interned at St. Vincent's Hospital in New York and received his residency training in Cairo, subsequently attending the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and the University of London.

Currently Dr. Cahill is associate clinical professor of medicine at New York Medical College, medical consultant—tropical medicine—at the United Nations; member of the medical attending staff of St. Clare's and a number of other hospitals in New York, as well as maintaining his private practice. In addition, Dr. Cahill is the author of a book on tropical diseases and many articles in this and other medical fields.

The conduct of treatment, care and research in tropical diseases under Dr. Cahill's direction will be carried on under the administration of Sister M. John Kevin of the Allegany Franciscan Sisters. These good women in every sense will be devoting their entire lives toward making the research of this great center and the care of its patients, the very best in the world.

An episode of human interest and near tragedy occurred recently which might even cause one to attribute near miraculous care to those who work in the hospital.

Some of my colleagues may recall an incident where a demented person exploded an incendiary device at the altar of St. Patrick's Cathedral causing a devoted woman worshiper to become badly burned as she knelt in prayer. This woman, near death from shock and severe burns, has been under treatment since that time at St. Clare's Hospital and may one day recover fully through the expert and devoted ministration of the doctors and staff at St. Clare's.

A brief description of the tropical disease program at the center would, I think, be of interest to my colleagues concerned with health programs:

TROPICAL DISEASE PROGRAM—ST. CLARE'S HOSPITAL, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Clinical tropical medicine centers are not common in the United States. When the U.S.A. was a contained isolationist nation, such a situation was understandable; today it is not. In New York—a city that annually receives over 3 million foreign visitors, that is home to a million Latin Americans, that is the base for the largest international business concerns and missionary organizations the world has known, that is (and for many years after the conflicts' resolution will continue to be) ever more involved in the chloroquine-resistant malarious jungles of Vietnam—is in urgent need of increased facilities in this specialty. There exists in New York a need for diagnostic and therapeutic service in this field; equally important, there is a magnificent opportunity to utilize such a proposed service as the base for sorely needed research in clinical tropical medicine.

A tropical disease service and research center has been established at St. Clare's Hospital on West 51st Street in New York City. This hospital offers the following advantages:

1. It is centrally located in Manhattan—halfway between the two existent New York City health department clinics in this specialty—and serves a large Latin American clinic population;

2. It's district includes all the major docks of the city from 34th Street to 52d Street, and the medical directors of a number of the international shipping companies and seamen's unions serve on the hospital attending staff;

3. There is already in existence at St. Clare's a research institute with animal quarters, laboratories, and others. More importantly, there is an appreciation of medical clinical research—evidenced in the 30 scientific publications that emanate from St. Clare's annually.

4. The hospital is willing to devote the necessary clinic and laboratory space for the development of a tropical disease unit. This is usually the greatest obstacle to initiating a new program since it constitutes the majority of the cost.

5. The Catholic missionary societies have, at present, no unified medical service for their personnel. The clinical and research value of studying controlled groups of Americans exposed to tropical infections has long been appreciated by experts—especially the military—as one of the most fruitful (and most difficult to secure) efforts in tropical medicine.

6. Dr. Cahill, a recognized authority in clinical tropical medicine (see curriculum vitae) is on the medical attending staff of the hospital and directs the tropical disease service and research facilities.

7. The house staff of the hospital comes largely from developing lands (the majority from the Philippines) and are vitally interested in tropical diseases. The establishment of a research unit in this specialty will not only fulfill an educational obligation to them, but have their interest and willing support.

The unit includes:

(a) a tropical disease clinic with facilities for both pediatric and adult patients. An attempt to have the NYC Health Department Tropical Laboratories refer cases, has already been discussed with them.

(b) an improved diagnostic laboratory in parasitology and parasitic serology. This will serve not only the needs of the hospital and clinic but also be the basis for clinical research projects.

(c) a carefully coded serum bank on all missionary personnel for retrospective immunologic studies. The Catholic Church has, at present, no unified medical program for advising, and, if necessary, diagnosing and treating missionaries. This population represents an unusual controlled group of Americans exposed to base levels of health in developing countries. One of the only other comparable groups, the combined Protestant missionaries seen though the interchurch center, now provide the basis for research studies of the Communicable Disease Center, Atlanta, and the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical School; such is our aim with the Catholic missionary group.

(d) a research program. This would initially include well-studied case reports, and serologic and stool surveys. Within a year, basic studies derived from clinical problems in tropical diseases will begin. This phase of the program is left purposely vague since it will depend on the type of clinical material presented. Dr. Cahill's bibliographic record, however, stands behind the statement that a productive research program will be in full motion within the year. As noted above, facilities for animal experimentation are already in existence.

Expenses

Research fellow	$5,200
Senior technician	5,200
Technician-secretary	4,800
Disposable equipment (syringes, antigens, containers, stains, slides, etc., paper)	2,500
Permanent equipment (freezer-refrigerator, microscopes (2), centrifuge, typewriter, proctoscope)	5,000
Travel (annual meeting of American Society of Tropical Medicine)	500

St. Clare's showed good judgment on the day of its dedication by extending an invitation to deliver the dedication address to our distinguished colleague, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY of the Second District of Rhode Island, who, during his lifetime has done more than any other American to assist medical research.

Congressman FOGARTY's message, I believe, is both informative and important to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I place the text of his address at this piont so that all Members may have the benefit of his learned views:

DEDICATORY ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TROPICAL DISEASE RESEARCH CENTER, ST. CLARE'S HOSPITAL, NEW YORK, N.Y., FEBRUARY 17, 1966

Your Eminence, Sister Mary John, reverend clergy, and friends, for deep personal reasons, I have been especially touched by what I have witnessed here today. And I am particularly grateful to you, Sister Mary John, and to you, Dr. Cahill, for inviting me to the dedication of your new Tropical Disease Research Center. I have no doubts that under your administrative leadership and professional guidance, the center will flourish.

Since being elected to Congress 25 years ago, and especially since becoming chairman of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Health Appropriations 16 years ago, I have been present at many similar events. Yet each new one is a source of fresh inspiration and admiration. What has been done here at St. Clare's is important. But the spirit of service in which it has been done is even more important and is what touches me deeply and lastingly. And it is to that spirit as well as to the physical act of creating a medical research center that I want to pay the profoundest tribute.

That spirit has deep roots in the history of church and missionary medicine. Many books have been written about the selfless work of the men and women—of many faiths—who brought and continue to bring healing and hope and faith to suffering human beings in the disease-ravaged tropics. I know from my own reading, for example, that medical care in the tropics would be much more deficient if it were not for the services of missionaries; that the modern medical profession in China is almost entirely the creation of the missionary; and that the rising standard of hygiene and improved care of the sick in many tropical countries owe much to the influence of missionary leaders and their organizations. And I also know that missionaries, though too busy giving direct medical care and comfort to do research, have still contributed significant information on the epidemiology, diagnosis, and treatment of tropical illnesses. Our debt to these people is great.

The establishment of a new Tropical Disease Research Center at St. Clare's comes at an appropriate moment. There is an emotional current running through Washington, a kind of charged atmosphere, from the White House to the Halls of Congress. It seems to originate in a renewed sense of urgency over the plight of the hundreds of millions of human beings who are suffering from tropical illness. It is as if almost everybody suddenly realized what some of us have been preaching for many, many years: that health—complete physical and mental well-being—is the keystone of economic and social and even political progress in the developing nations of the world. The people of those proud nations do not want handouts. They want to stand up on their own feet and help themselves with their own hands and minds. But how can they when so many of them are weighed down by disease and malnutrition and despair?

Not all of my knowledge about health affairs comes from reading. As chairman of the House Health Appropriations Subcommittee and as the congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation to six World Health Assemblies, I have had a unique opportunity to travel abroad and to observe tropical diseases with my own eyes. And I have talked with thousands of people who have had firsthand experience in the battle against tropical disease.

The story they tell is shocking, is saddening, is shaming. And the facts and figures tell only part of that story:

Ten million human beings are suffering from leprosy.

Four and one-half million human beings are suffering from yaws.

Four hundred million human beings are debilitated by the parasitic diseases schistosomiasis and filariasis.

Four hundred million human beings are blind or going blind from trachoma.

Three million human beings are dying each year from tuberculosis.

And 140 million human being are afflicted with malaria.

What these figures and many others that I have not listed mean is this: A serious infectious or parasitic disease afflicts most of the people who live in the tropics. And since two-thirds of mankind lives in tropical or semitropical areas, the majority of human beings are suffering, right now, from a serious infectious or parasitic disease that prevents them from leading a full life.

But the really appalling fact is this: The knowledge to control or prevent some of these diseases—malaria, yaws, smallpox, trachoma—is known but is not being applied widely or effectively enough. The principal material reason for this failure is a lack of trained people, a subject I will say more about later. But the material failure is linked, I believe, to a failure of will.

This is not to say that no efforts are being made to control tropical diseases or that all efforts have ended in failure. Much is being done, much has been accomplished, and the United States, along with many other countries and especially the World Health Organization, has played a big role in this campaign. Time does not permit me to describe all the U.S. Government's efforts in detail, so I shall touch only the high points.

The American people can be proud of the fact that the United States has year after year provided about one-third of the budget of the World Health Organization. This year that wise investment comes to $13½ million.

I regard the WHO as mankind's public health service. The WHO is blind to national boundaries and to racial, religious, and ethnic differences. It views the inhabitants of the earth as members of one family. Its major objective is to free men everywhere from the burden of disease and disability so that they may labor and enjoy the fruits of their labor in what could be a world of plenty and peace. The WHO has earned the respect and admiration of the American people. It deserves our continued support and encouragement.

I mentioned earlier the number of human beings—140 million—currently afflicted with malaria. In 1961, a group of world-renowned malaria experts said that malaria could be eradicated—everywhere in the world. Not just in countries like the United States, Italy, and the Soviet Union—but everywhere in the world. The goal has not been reached, but the work goes on. It must not be allowed to lag. This year the United States, through the Agency for International Development, is wisely supporting 15 malaria-eradication programs throughout the world. The total investment amounts to about $27 million. And almost all of it is being invested in fieldwork in Latin America, Africa, the Near East, the Far East, and south Asia.

Those of you who are close to international health affairs know all too well the recent history of cholera. Confined for many years to India, east Pakistan, and the Celebes, cholera in the past several years has spread to almost every country in the Far East and Western Pacific area. It was even reported 2 years ago, for the first time in two decades, in a modern developed country like Japan. U.S. quarantine officials are on constant alert against its importation into this country.

The major effort of the U.S. Government in the attack against cholera has centered in its support of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization's Cholera Research Laboratory. Located in Dacca, east Pakistan, the Laboratory develops, evaluates, and demonstrates measures for preventing and eventually eradicating cholera. The experience gained by the Laboratory's staff has proved useful in the fight against cholera not only in east Pakistan but in many of the other areas in which cholera has broken out, such as Hong Kong and the Philippines.

Cholera, incidentally, is one of the six major diseases that are the targets of an intensive joint research attack recently launched by the United States and Japan. The others are tuberculosis, leprosy, parasitic diseases like schistosomiasis and filariasis, arthropod-borne virus diseases like the hemorrhagic fevers and encephalitis, and malnutrition. The American part of this joint research program is being directed by the National Institutes of Health of the U.S. Public Health Service.

The National Institutes of Health, of course, is no newcomer to the battle against tropical disease. Indeed, the NIH's roots go back to the Hygienic Laboratory that the Public Health Service set up in its Staten Island Hospital in 1887 to study cholera. Many of the other diseases seen in that hospital and studied in that laboratory were infectious and parasitic diseases that the merchant seamen patients had picked up in the tropics.

Today the NIH, through its National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and its Office of International Research, conducts and supports one of the largest tropical disease research programs in the world. In 1965, alone, the NIAID spent close to $9 million (or about 23 percent of its total extramural funds) to support 411 research studies in tropical medicine at many university medical centers. It spent more than another $1½ million to conduct research in its own Laboratories of Parasitic Diseases, Parasite Chemotherapy, and Tropical Virology, and at its Middle America Research Unit in the Canal Zone.

The Middle America Research Unit is a joint venture of the NIH and the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. And scientists of the unit work closely with scientists at the nearby Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, which is supported by an annual contribution from the Congress. These scientists are all engaged in research on vital, parasitic, and fungal diseases of the American tropics.

Of all the medical research bills I have sponsored or supported, none has given me more gratification on its execution than the one which created the International Centers for Medical Research and Training.

Established in 1961 and administered by the NIH Office of International Research, the ICMRT program has joined in an international partnership for health five outstanding American universities and five leading foreign medical research institutes. The roster of their names and research interests is in itself stimulating and encouraging.

Louisiana State University is working with the University of Costa Rica on better treatment for leishmaniasis and diarrheal diseases.

The University of California has joined forces with the Institute for Medical Research, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, in research on infectious diseases transmitted from animals to man.

Johns Hopkins University and the Calcutta School of Tropical Medicine are conducting joint studies on cholera, leprosy, and smallpox.

Tulane University has teamed up with the Universidad del Valle Cali of Colombia to investigate tetanus, filariasis, and diarrheal diseases.

And the University of Maryland and the Institute of Hygiene, Lahore, Pakistan, are concentrating on arthropod-borne and rickettsial diseases.

Since 1961 the United States has wisely spent $11½ million to support the work of these five research teams. And so far 40 investigators have completed their studies and have published or are publishing their results.

Research is only one of the NIH's two big guns in the battle against tropical disease. Training is the other.

Since 1958, the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases has invested more than $9 million in training programs that have turned out more than 1,100 tropical medicine research scientists. These men are now in the forefront of the research attack against tropical disease in every corner of the earth.

This year the Institute is spending more than $1½ million to support the training of more than 200 research scientists in tropical medicine. They are studying and working under the direction of some of the finest tropical medicine experts in the world—men like Bang and Bueding at Johns Hopkins University, Biagi at the University of Mexico, Fox and Morales at the University of Puerto Rico, Lincicome at Howard University, Beaver at Tulane University, Weller at Harvard University, and Trager at the Rockefeller Institute.

And yet despite this large investment of men and money, the work has only begun. Much, much more will have to be done—in research, in training, and especially in the application of what is known to the control of tropical diseases.

I mentioned earlier that a shortage of trained people was the major obstacle to progress against the tropical diseases. There is a bill before Congress now that I believe would go a long way toward breaking down that obstacle.

That bill, H.R. 12453, which I hope goes down in the books as the International Health Act of 1966, would develop and strengthen the capability of the United States to help those countries that are struggling to cast off the burden of tropical disease. And that help would take the form of well-trained American public health workers for waging war against the tropical diseases—in the tropics. H.R. 12453 is a milestone in the struggle against tropical disease. And all of us who have an interest in tropical health should follow its course carefully and hopefully.

Some people may wonder why the United States, which has virtually freed itself of the tropical diseases, spends some of its treasure to help eradicate those diseases in other lands. The reasons have their roots in both self-interest and altruism.

First, disease anywhere in a world made small by the jet airliner is a threat to Americans, as it is a threat to people in other developed countries. Since 1950, the number of travelers entering the United States by air from abroad, including the tropics, has increased from 517,000 to 4,272,000—more than 700 percent. During that time smallpox has been imported into many Western countries, including the United Kingdom, Sweden, West Germany, Poland, and Canada.

Second, many Americans—250,000, according to the U.S. Department of State (and that figure does not include military personnel)—live in tropical or semitropical countries. And the Department's medical division has said that one out of five employees returning from abroad harbors intestinal parasites, and many others suffer from malaria and infectious hepatitis.

Third, the tropical areas, which in general can now barely feed their own people, could under appropriate conditions become the source of abundant food supplies so badly needed by the undernourished millions of the world. The tropics are already an important source of vital raw materials. They could with proper development also become an important market for the products of the industrialized nations of the world, including the United States—and to the benefit of all.

Fourth, there are in the tropics hundreds of millions of people who live in disease and poverty and despair with an average life expectancy of only 35 years. These are people who are less and less willing to spend their short lives dreaming about such luxuries as political freedom. They are desperate for a better life, and it is in our own interest to help them.

Fifth, no nation that has its spiritual roots deep in the Judeo-Christian ethic can view with anything but the deepest concern and sense of urgency the plight of the millions of human beings in the tropics who are ravaged by disease. To turn our backs on them would be the gravest hypocrisy.

Finally, my friends, we are all members of one family—the family of man. And the family of man lives in one world. As different as we all are in many ways, we all share a common humanity. And when one human being or one group of human beings suffers—anywhere in the world—we all suffer.

That is why man's noblest act is to extend his hand in loving care to a human being who is suffering the pain and torment of disease. And that act, my friends, is also the most personally self-fulfilling. Thank you.

Nothing for Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Carl Grovom, of Williams, Minn., has called my attention to a most interesting article in the Pastoral Call publication. Mr. Grovom expressed the desire that I share the article with the other Members of Congress. I am most happy to respond to the request and, with consent granted, the article will be reprinted at this point in the RECORD. It is in the form of a letter written by Charles E. Pedersen:

NOTHING FOR NOTHING

I am compelled, for conscience sake, to call attention to what I believe has been, and is, a threat to our society and to the free enterprise system. There is always a danger when speaking or writing about matters pertaining to our civil, economic, or political structure that criticism will result from Christians who believe that our sole responsibility is to preach the Gospel. I agree that this is our main task. However, we must also know that the Bible has something to say about work, responsibilities, using our talents, etc.

As many of you know, I am director of the Christian League for the Handicapped. This organization seeks to win handicapped people for Christ as its prime purpose. Secondly, we try to help these people take their rightful place in society through work opportunities, which in many cases result in full self-support. We have to begin by teaching that work is a way of life and is ordained of God. Man is to eat bread by the sweat of his brow (Genesis 3:19). Of course, humanity rebels against this because it is a result of the curse due to the sin of Adam and Eve. True as this may be, it is also true that man can find joy and satisfaction in his labor when it is performed with the right attitude of mind and remembers that "* * * whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him" (Colossians 3:17). To the Romans Paul writes, "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" (Romans 10: 31).

The Christian, especially, must realize that his occupation can be, or should I say must be, a means by which glory is brought to God. Keeping this in mind will help us to perform an honest day's work and not seek to "put one over on the boss" or see how little we can do for a day's pay. Some people seem to always have as their purpose the thought of getting all they can for nothing. This is a day when it must repeatedly be emphasized that there is nothing for nothing. Everything costs somebody something. It is this attitude which concerns me today, and perhaps my greatest concern is the fact that our Government seems to be contributing to the welfare state.

Some time ago a Chicago paper printed an editorial entitled "Handouts Stifle Initiative." I would like to quote from this article. "In Mount Rainer National Park, a ranger cautions visitors against feeding the animals. He explains that deer grow accustomed to visitors' handouts and lose the ability to fend for themselves. Bears, he says, come to believe that free food is their due—and become grouchy and violent if they don't get it. Chipmunks and squirrels congregate where handouts are supplied, and thus upset the balance of nature. There is a lesson here for humans—and for their government—about free handouts, which make people lazy and taxes high while it kills incentive among our poor people."

Further in the article the writer goes on to ask the question, "Just when will these lawyer politicians learn that people want to earn their living and do not want handouts?" He suggests that the politicians have created this handout program to stifle initiative, to establish this so-called Great Society. "They know by these handouts they control many millions of votes."

Certainly we do not want to become political, but we do believe that the time has come when conservative-thinking people must express their views with regard to the trend toward control of more people by handouts, socialized care, etc. We do appreciate the fact that there are people who are in need. However, the Lord Jesus Himself said that the poor we would have with us always and a permanent type of handout program has never proved to be a way to solve the problem. More than this, however, is the fact that initiative is sapped and the person becomes nothing more than a puppet dangling at the end of political strings maneuvered by ambitious, power-crazed politicians.

It may be surprising to you to know of the number of people who are Christians that refuse jobs because they are afraid of losing their welfare check, or some other type of aid check. We recognize that some are dependent on this kind of support for physical reasons. We tell our handicapped people that there must be a willingness of heart and mind to engage in a gainful occupation, and if some kind of work cannot be found for which they have capability, then certainly God knows this and we do, too.

Wherever physically possible, however, the Christian should be known as the best and most conscientious worker, because he is not working just to please an employer, but God, who is worthy of all "* * * blessing, and glory, and wisdom and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might for ever and ever. Amen" (Revelations 7: 12).

—CHARLES E. PEDERSEN.

My, How You Have Grown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, there were 2,469,000 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government during fiscal 1964. This figure increased to 2,496,000 during fiscal 1965 and is expected to rise to 2,639,000 during fiscal 1966, which will end June 30.

The upward trend in employment will continue during fiscal 1967, when there will be 2,700,000 people on the Federal payroll. This will be an increase of almost 9½ percent in 3 years.

Trimming of the executive payroll presents one of the greatest opportunities to reduce the cost of the Federal Government. If spending is to be cut substantially so that the deficit for fiscal 1967 may be reduced and possibly eliminated, the number of civilian employees will have to be reduced.

Much of the reduction can be accomplished by not hiring unnecessary personnel. Due to the huge turnover of civil service employees, a lot of reductions can be effected simply by not filling vacancies.

Curtailment of the bloated bureaucracy can be achieved by dismissing those who are not qualified, those who are not needed, and those who are not efficient. Further reductions are possible by consolidations of agencies and units, the introduction of more efficient methods of operation, by letting the States and local communities do the things which the Federal Government has been doing for them but which they could do just as well or better—and cheaper—themselves, and by letting private enterprise in like manner perform functions which are not properly governmental. Still further curtailment is possible through the ending of abuses in the use of sick leave.

Apologists for the bureaucracy often proclaim that the overwhelming majority of Government employees are competent, conscientious, and loyal. While this is certainly true, the fact that a worker is competent does not mean that he should be retained on the payroll if he is not needed. Neither should the fact that he is conscientious be a reason for not releasing him if the work that he is doing is properly the function of State and local governments or of private enterprise. The fact that he is loyal should not be a reason for keeping him if his agency is overstaffed.

Millions of competent, conscientious, and loyal Americans will never work for the Federal Government, simply because there is no need for their services or because there is a more pressing need for their abilities elsewhere. Why, then, should a Federal employee be kept because he possesses virtues that are also possessed by millions of other Americans?

A competent employee should want to work where his skills can be best utilized, even though it be outside the Federal service. A conscientious employee should not want to do useless work or do useful work in an inefficient manner. A loyal employee should be as much opposed to overstaffing, incompetency, and inefficiency as he is to acts of espionage, sabotage, and treason.

Neither Withdrawal Nor Escalation Is the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that neither withdrawal nor massive escalation is the answer to our dilemma in Vietnam. The Pittsburgh Press, in a recent editorial, said that the American people must exercise great patience in dealing with this crisis.

The danger—

As the Press editorialist points out—

is that for lack of obvious battlefield victories, will either pull back and prove to the world our anti-Communist role is too big for us—or will expand the conflict at vast, unnecessary cost in lives and money.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the entire editorial, entitled "A New Kind of War," as published in the Pittsburgh Press February 13, 1966, in the RECORD at this point:

A NEW KIND OF WAR

Confusion and divided counsels on Vietnam largely result from a lag in imagination—the tendency always to fight the new war in terms of the last.

A bookful of examples might be offered to illustrate this stubborn habit. British military brass scorned the tank in the First World War. American military authority practically had to have the airplane shoved down its throat.

Even as late as World War II the Poles sent cavalry against Hitler's tanks. De Gaulle sensed the futility of the maginot line but couldn't get French authority to listen.

The French used World War II tactics in Vietnam and were beaten by much smaller native forces, mainly armed with captured guns. The American military has had to learn the hard way how to fight a guerrilla war which is kept in bounds by common fear of nuclear weapons.

To the fixed idea as to how a war should be fought, Vietnam is bound to be frustrating. War should involve front lines which are attacked or defended, with progress computed in terms of slain enemies or gained real estate.

So far as the Vietnam phase of the present war is concerned, this is an outmoded concept. The big victories are gained maybe thousands of miles from battles which involve only a relatively few men.

This is too little comprehended by critics of U.S. policy—either those who think we can't win in Vietnam and should get out or those who appear to think we can clean this one up promptly if we just throw enough bombs.

True, in terms of the two prior world conflicts, this is a "no win" war. But, granting that Red China is our principal, immediate enemy in Vietnam, cast up the scores:

The Communist effort to take over Indonesia has collapsed in armed revolt which essentially has destroyed the Indonesian Communist apparatus. Does anyone honestly believe the Indonesian conservatives would have dared challenge the Communists with the United States either losing or withdrawing from Vietnam?

As result of Communist defeat in Indonesia the Indonesian assault on Malaysia has faded from view. Only a short time back this looked like big trouble.

A truce has been called in the menacing war between India and Pakistan. The Red Chinese invasion of India has not been renewed.

These are the "front lines" in the type of war we are fighting. Our weapons include food as well as guns. Our allies are the Indonesian patriots, the economists struggling with inflation in Brazil, the statesmen counseling faith in Africa.

In each of a hundred nations there are varying sets of political opinion as to which way to jump in order to get on the winning side in this struggle between America and the Communist powers.

This is cooly calculated. Only the strong can afford to stand up for principle. The weak must concentrate on saving their own hides and making the best possible deal with whichever of the big fellows comes out on top.

These people now watch Vietnam for evidence that the United States has either the will or the weight to fulfill it avowed commitment, which is containment of communism. The generally favorable trend of affairs in southeast Asia, indeed the generally favorable trend around the world—in Africa, Latin America, Western Europe—evidence world opinion as to who is winning the war in Vietnam.

It is a war requiring vast patience on the part of the American people because the local results are not immediately obvious and because it is difficult to associate cause and effect in events far from Vietnam.

The danger is that, for lack of obvious battlefield victories, we will either pull back and prove to the world our anti-Communist role is too big for us—or will expand the conflict at vast, unnecessary cost in lives and money.

Much depends on understanding of this if America is to be the eventual victor in this oddly fought third world war and avoid world-destroying nuclear conflict.

Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, once again we pause to note the passing of a beloved colleague. Too often the stalwarts of the Congress, who have written so much of the history of their times, are suddenly gone from the scene. In awe of God's inscrutable ways we meet today to register our sincere thoughts of ALBERT THOMAS, what he meant and how we will miss him.

To know ALBERT was to love and respect him. During the years he so ably served the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, I learned to appreciate what a fine, outstanding job he did in carrying out his responsibilities to his people. Loved and respected for his fairness, sound judgment, deep courage and devotion to America, his rare capacity for leadership will be sorely missed in the years to come.

He was quiet and soft spoken, and as he went about his daily tasks, he had a kind greeting for everyone.

In thinking of ALBERT, I am reminded of the words penned by the late Sir William Osler, the noted Canadian physician:

> I have three personal ideals. One, to do the day's work well and not to bother about tomorrow. The second ideal has been to act the Golden Rule, as far as in me lay, toward my professional brethren and toward those committed to my care. And the third has been to cultivate such a measure of equanimity as would enable me to bear success with humility, the affection of my friends without pride, and to be ready when the day of sorrow and grief came to meet it with the courage befitting a man.

ALBERT THOMAS fully measured up to such ideals. We shall miss him, but he has left forever with us countless memories of a wonderful person.

Some Commonsense Words About Our Supplementing World Food Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting in Albany, N.Y., held recently for northeastern dairy co-op leaders, Lester Martin, president of the 15,000-member Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, spoke some words of uncommon commonsense about the role of the American farmer in any new programs to supplement world food supplies.

As we prepare to consider the alternatives available to us in this connection, it would be well for us to pay heed to Mr. Martin's ideas, and, under my leave to include extraneous material, granted to me on February 8, 1966, his speech is now set forth:

STATEMENT BY DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE PRESIDENT TO THE LEAGUE'S AFFILIATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FEBRUARY 23, 1966

Much has been written and spoken in recent months about the great population explosion in the world and the virtual inevitability of a widespread food shortage in some of our most populous countries.

The U.S. Government, both in Congress and in the executive branch, has expressed concern over this critical situation and recommendations have been made at both levels for action to expand American food production to meet the emergency.

As a farmer and as an elected head of a major farm organization, I am ready, willing, and eager to see the untapped productivity of this Nation mobilized to aid everyone, at home or abroad, who faces a shortage of food. No one should go hungry if food can be made available to feed him.

At the risk, however, of being called selfish, I must urge all farmers, whether milk or grain producers, to stop, look, and listen before plunging headlong into expensive investments in more production facilities.

Whether the motive is a desire to cash in on the expected bonanza of foreign aid, or a desire to respond to the world need for more food—or a combination of both—let us not create a situation in which we can rapidly find ourselves once more the victims of our own efficiency.

For some 20 years the milk and grain producers of this country have been criticized, ridiculed, and generally ill-used by the press, politicians, and the public because of the national commodity price support program. In addition, farmers have been saddled with the economic distress that has accompanied an unbalanced supply-demand situation.

Most of this criticism was unjustified. The food surpluses that arose after World War II were an outgrowth of the war and the postwar needs of the world. They were advocated and encouraged by our Government to meet an urgent need. It was unrealistic to expect them to simply disappear when the need declined. The Federal price support program was used to prevent economic disaster to the industry that virtually kept a large part of the world alive during its darkest hours. It soon, however, became a political chopping block and an easy source of headlines. The farmer's role in feeding the world was forgotten. The new image of history's greatest provider, the American farmer, was that of a greedy hick with one foot in the tax trough and the other on the neck of the consumer.

If we, as farmers, let that happen again we deserve to wear the biggest and brightest dunce cap history can devise. At long last, consumption and production in this country are beginning to attain a reasonable balance. Prices to food producers have improved and will likely continue to do so if we exercise reasonable restraint in our expansion programs.

President Johnson this month sent a message to Congress dealing with the need for American efforts to curb world hunger through a food-for-peace program. His program would lead to increased food production in this country, stocking of domestic reserves, and use of some nonprice supported commodities purchased in the market for foreign aid. He also promised to make use of present legislative authority to buy dairy products on the open market "whenever necessary" for use overseas.

These are constructive steps. But they are not enough. They provide some incentive for the present, but no assurance for the future.

The American farmer does not need to expand his production facilities beyond the normal pace that can meet expected growth in commercial demand. To exceed this rate of expansion is to court eventual disaster. If our Government desires a faster or more extensive rate of expansion, then let us have adequate legislative guarantees from Government that we will not be left holding the bag a few years, or even 10 years, from now. Statements of good intentions are not enough.

Let the Government establish a specific national food reserve by law, one which the experts feel is adequate to protect this country in time of emergency. And let this reserve be totally and legally isolated from the marketplace. Make it ironclad that no representative of Government can use the reserve to put an artificial lid on farm commodity prices by selling off quantities of it in the market whenever prices threaten to rise above some arbitrary figure. I know of no such lid on wages or on the price of food production supplies and equipment.

Further, let the Government use its considerable facilities to estimate its needs, for foreign aid in various commodities, years in advance and let us have legislation enabling the appropriate agencies to contract for supplies of these commodities in the marketplace in advance. American agriculture does not look forward to expanding production so that Government warehouses may be used as cheap middlemen to supply foreign aid programs with food purchased at cutrate prices from farmers. If more food is needed to implement our foreign relations, then let us do it on a sound businesslike basis with the cost being borne by all American taxpayers, the same as is done when our Government makes tanks or guns available to foreign countries. Let us not continue it as a lopsided burden on food producers.

If there is an excess supply after these controls have been established, then it can truly be called a surplus and treated as one.

Finally, we must have safeguards to protect our additional investments in production facilities when and if the need and the urgency for new food supplies ends. It could happen in a few years, or it might not happen at all. Past history, however, leads us to be cautious. A farmer who has spent 20 or 30 years building up equity in his operation would be a fool to mortgage that equity on the gamble that his increased investment will pay for itself through sales and prices created by the food-for-peace program.

If the cost to the taxpayer became burdensome enough, Congress could chop this program in half or even end it overnight. And where would the mortgaged farmer's equity be then?

Let us have legislation that will provide a financially sound program to assure farmers that the additional investments they make to meet the world emergency will not be their risk alone. If it is argued that such a provision is not necessary because the increased demand for food will never end, then I say the provision will never have to be used—so why object to it?

Smarter men than I will have to figure out the details and language of the legislation I am proposing, but without such assurances I strongly urge all farmers to view any temporary inducements for rapid expansion of production with suspicion, and to act with extreme caution. A sudden bonanza for the machinery manufacturers, the banks, the feed dealers and land speculators, could well then turn into an eventual depression for farmers.

If we build again, as we did in World War II, in the postwar period, and during the Korean war, let us build on a better foundation than high hopes and higher mortgages.

American Lithuanian Council of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to address the American Lithuanian Council of Boston, Mass., on Sunday, February 20, 1966. The ceremonies were held to commemorate the 48th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, now only a bright memory in the heavy hearts of all Lithuanians.

I insert here my remarks on that occasion, as well as those of the Honorable Elliot L. Richardson, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, who was in attendance representing the Honorable John A. Volpe, Governor. I include, too, a list of the principal officers and guests who were present, and a copy of the resolutions adopted by the council at that meeting:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE

More as a friend and neighbor of my fellow American-Lithuanians, than as a U.S. Representative in the Congress, I consider it a particular privilege to take part in this program commemorating the 48th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence.

This annual ceremony is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians and their American friends because it is held to recollect the date of February 16, 1918, which marked the end of well over a century of suffering under a hostile, foreign rule. Back on that joyful day, Lithuania stood forth as an independent democratic republic. There was cause for celebration then and the future was faced with confidence. Your homeland people were happy and prosperous in their own sovereignty.

Unfortunately, in this year of 1966 our observance here must be shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the continuing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

The brutal tyranny now being forced upon Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a continuing challenge to the moral conscience of our Nation and the United Nations to reestablish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples. In simple justice, our Government must perseveringly insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

The major world powers, including the United States should not remain acquiescent parties to the disgraceful betrayal of the smaller nations like Lithuania—which betrayal defies every decent concept of self-determination and democracy.

On this occasion dedicated to the memory and future objective of Lithuanian independence, I again say that the United States and the United Nations must increasingly call upon Russia to give up her occupation and control over Lithuania and the other Baltic Nations.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly violated the political pledge made at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Unless restitution is made, the United States should not be held bound by such unratified agreements. We must continue to use our moral leadership in the United Nations to demand that the suppressed rights of Lithuania and other subjugated nations to govern themselves be restored.

Although we mourn over her present plight, there is no cause for despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumphs of oppressors. The Christian faith, which in 1399, defeated the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. From my own knowledge and experience with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know that deep in the heart of every Lithuanian is that passion for liberty and freedom which never dies. There is no power that can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

As the keynote of this ceremony, may I suggest that we rededicate ourselves in the determination to perseveringly reveal and present to the Christian world the facts and the truth about the persecution of Lithuania, so that the United Nations and the United States will be inspired to accept the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring Lithuanian independence.

In this rededication, I am sure you will have the complete support of all Christian, freedom-loving people throughout the world. I am confident you can rely upon them to join in your efforts and prayers that your homeland may once again be free. May God grant that such a joyous day will soon be realized.

Remarks by Lt. Gov. Elliot L. Richardson

We Americans are a blessed people living in a blessed land. Though there are imperfections in our system, these imperfections are constantly exposed to the light of truth, and as people of good will, we strive to right wrongs and injustices wherever they lie. This is the strength of our way of life, for it promises always the hope of better things.

It is this hope that sustains us, this surety that we can look forward to a succession of better days. It is hope that sustains freedom-loving people the world over, people who do not now share our freedom, but who live in hope that one day freedom will be theirs.

No people anywhere in the world today live under tyranny more rigid than the brave people of Lithuania; no people find their yearning to be free more driving than do these noble people.

And no people deserve freedom more than the people of Lithuania. Though their striving for freedom has been long, their history of freedom has been short.

The people of Lithuania have a long history of heroic resistance to foreign domination. In the Middle Ages, Lithuania was a major state in central and eastern Europe, stretching, by the 14th century, from the Baltic to the Black Sea. In 1386, through marriage of the thrones, Lithuania and Poland were joined together. The development of these two countries was far superior to that of other nations in eastern Europe. Lithuania was one of the first countries to accept Christianity.

Toward the close of the 18th century, the Lithuanian people were overcome and completely dominated by the Russian czars. Yet their yearning to be free was paramount, and during the more than 120 years of Russian rule, they never gave up their fight for freedom. The end of the First World War gave them their long-awaited independence. They established a Government based upon the spirit of equality denied to them over the centuries, and earned the respect of the entire world.

Lithuanians proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918, and thereafter for a little more than 20 years they lived in well-deserved peace in their liberated country. Having rebuilt their war-torn country, and having put their homes in order, they had created a new and truly democratic way of life in their homeland. But this happy period was a short-lived dream.

Soon after the outbreak of the war, Lithuania had to deal alone with its implacable foe in the east, the Soviet Union. Early in 1940, Soviet troops were stationed in certain strategic parts of the country, ostensibly to protect Lithuania from the Germans. In June they were occupied by the Red army, and a month later the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Since those fateful days Lithuanians have not known freedom in their homeland. Today some 3 million Lithuanians are suffering under the stern and unbending regime of Communist totalitarian tyranny. Brutally they are being forced into a Russian mold. Their customs are forbidden, their language is denied to them, their culture is being suppressed. Freedom for Lithuania has become, once again, a dream.

This week, then, we celebrate the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. But it is a celebration accompanied by mixed emotions—joy and happiness at the memory of the momentous events of 1918, but grief and sorrow at the recollection of the tragic fate of Lithuania since World War II.

Here in Massachusetts, where the persecuted found freedom more than 300 years ago, we share the hopes and aspirations of the brave people of Lithuania.

May the day come soon when this proud state will once again know freedom; when the old language will be heard again in its streets, the old dances danced in the village squares, and the daimos, the folk songs of the people, be sung loud and clear by a people who once more know the blessings of liberty.

Dignitaries Present on Sunday, February 20, 1966, at Exercises Commemorating 48th Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania, February 16, South Boston High School

Congressman James A. Burke.

Lt. Gov. Elliott Richardson, representing Gov. John A. Volpe.

Henry Scagnoli, deputy mayor of the city of Boston, representing John T. Collins, mayor.

Hon. Anthony O. Shalina, honorary consul of Lithuania in Boston.

Dr. Algirdas Budreckis, professor at Rutgers University, New York.

Attorney John J. Grigalus, president, American Lithuanian Council in Boston.

Algis Lapsys, chairman of the exercises.

Algis Zaporackas, president, World Lithuanian Youth Congress.

Ludvigs Reiters, president, American National Latvian League at Boston.

Dr. John Gidiuk, Ukranian Congress committeeman.

Paul Luuk, president, Estonian and Baltic Society.

Dr. John Oleksyshyn, professor at Boston University, Ukranian Congress Committee at Boston.

At a mass meeting of Lithuanians of Greater Boston held under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council of Boston in the auditorium of South Boston High School, South Boston, Mass., on February 20, 1966, to commemorate the 48th anniversary of the indpendence of Lithuanina and in appreciation of our country's firm and steadfast policy on nonrecognition of the illegal seizure and military occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet Government, the following resolutions were adopted.

Whereas this year reminds us of the 26th sorrowful years of Soviet occupation and subjugation of Lithuania made on June 15, 1940, a day of infamy; and

Whereas the United States of America has been in the forefront of the United Nations activities ending foreign colonialism in numerous Asiatic, African, and European countries; and

Whereas the Soviet Union is striving by any and all means to win recognition of its illegal seizure and incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the United Nations and the United States have been instrumental in freeing many formerly foreign colonial lands and bringing them into the community of free nations; and

Whereas the Soviet Union, while speaking out strongly for the abolition of all colonialism, has in actuality made Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia the newest colonies in the Soviet empire: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. That we again express our appreciation and gratitude to our Government for its firm stand in refusing to recognize the fruits of the brutal Soviet aggression and military occupancy of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

2. That we urge our Government not to ratify the consular convention under discussion with the U.S.S.R. inasmuch as this would only serve to increase the number of Communist espionage and sabotage centers in our country.

3. That we ask our Government to continue, whenever and wherever possible, to demand that the Soviets end their colonialism, withdraw their administration and forces from Lithuania and the other two Baltic States and allow them to restore their freedom and independence and self-rule.

4. That these resolutions be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; to the Secretary of the United States; to the Secretary of the United Nations; to the Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts; the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; the mayor of Boston, and the press.

The American Lithuanian Council of Boston,
John J. Grigalus,
President.
Anthony J. Young,
Resolutions Chairman.
Povilas Brazaitis,
Secretary.

The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, Tom Joyce, of the Detroit News Washington bureau, has a deserved reputation as a reporter who digs deep when writing a story. He recently completed a 5-week, 12,000-mile tour of the United States for a firsthand look at the war on poverty. Under leave to extend my remarks, the first article of a series follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Feb. 27, 1966]

News Reporter's Coast-to-Coast Survey—The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle?

(Editor's Note.—Detroit News Washington Correspondent Tom Joyce has just completed a 5-week, 12,000-mile tour of the United States for a firsthand look at the Johnson administration's war on poverty. He interviewed hundreds of people, visited slums from Harlem to Watts and drove through the rural countryside to find out where the antipoverty programs are succeeding and where they are failing. This is the first of several articles.)

(By Tom Joyce)

Washington, February 26.—From the stinking unheated tenements of Harlem to the tumbledown shacks in southern California where children of migratory workers sleep on nests of dirty rags, the cards seem stacked against President Johnson's war on poverty.

There is deep apathy and suspicion—both among the poor themselves and those who are being called upon to finance the biggest assault against poverty in the history of civilization.

A youth in Chicago who dropped out of school 6 years ago and who has never held a steady job asks plaintively, "Who they tryin' to kid, man?"

A businessman in southern Ohio asks essentially the same question in a more polished form—and from a totally different point of view.

Talk to people across the country—the engineer who sits next to you on an airplane, a taxi driver in San Francisco, a banker in Mississippi, a sharecropper in Georgia, a doctor in Michigan, a construction worker in New Jersey, or a housewife in Washington. The consensus is unmistakably clear: They do not think poverty can be rooted out of the corners of America where it still exists.

Some hope sincerely for victory in Mr. Johnson's war. But many others view it as just another bureaucratic boondoggle that is sending billions of dollars down the drain in a futile effort.

NEW CONVERTS, NEW CRITICS

There are some who are convinced the battle can be won. But they seem to be a distinct minority—intellectuals, liberals, academicians, and above all, the emerging new breed of antipoverty professionals and subprofessionals who are conducting the experiment.

This is the picture that exists today across the land. But every day there are converts to optimism. These are the poor who harbor new hope because of the poverty war—and the nonpoor exposed to some of the program's outstanding achievements.

But new critics, too, emerge each day. They are those who see, or hear about, waste, mismanagement, and failure. Maybe they meet a Job Corps dropout who is bitter. Or perhaps they see a television film on a Job Corps camp riot. Or, by chance, they know a lawyer whose 5-year-old son was enrolled in Headstart, a preschool program for children of the poor.

The war on poverty is a great sociological experiment. It is a drastic departure from traditional welfare programs where the poor are assisted meagerly on a day-to-day or week-to-week handout basis.

The philosophy of the war is bold and daring—to inspire the poor to pull themselves from poverty's maelstrom, to salvage youths, to rescue the children who are poverty's most pitiful victims and to get at the roots of indigence.

CAN WE END POVERTY?

Is it really possible to eliminate poverty? Won't there always be the poor? These are the questions one hears most often from almost every quarter of America's affluent society.

And they ring in your ears as you ride for miles on the "el" over Chicago's wretched tenements; as you meet a pretty little 6-year-old blond girl with a vocabulary of only 20 words in a crude Georgia shack; as you talk to an 18-year-old Job Corpsman who arrived at the seventh grade without an ability to recite the alphabet.

The little girl is not mentally retarded. It is just that she has never been told a nursery rhyme or a bedtime story. She has never had a children's picture book. She communicates by pointing and grunting, or striking out in frustration.

There are many more children like her. And they will raise many children like themselves if the war on poverty fails.

The Job Corpsman is not mentally retarded, either. He is the victim of a school system that passes poor children along from grade to grade despite achievement in what educators describe as "social promotion."

An oft-heard remark on the middle-class highways of America is that the poor are indolent and shiftless, that this is still the land of unlimited opportunity where a man can really make something of himself if he has gumption.

For the middle-class child this is true. But is it likewise true for the thousands of children like the little girl who starts school with a 20-word vocabulary and a staggering handicap?

Without question there are those who seem satisfied to spend the rest of their lives on welfare dole.

"Man," said a Harlem youth in skintight trousers, "I got it made. I pick up a little scratch here and there and I know four girls on ADC who just love to have me come and stay with them. I can get food, a pad, and a jug any time just for the askin'. So what's with this work jazz?"

But there is also a southern father of 13 children who works 60 hours a week to bring home $55. He is scarcely literate. But his employer says he is one of the most industrious workers he has ever had.

He is one of thousands, perhaps millions, who must be trained for employment. The war on poverty is trying to reach him. The progress is slow.

How do you motivate a man like this to try for something better, a man who has never known anything but abject poverty? And how do you motivate a young man like the one in Harlem?

It is happening every day. The question is whether it is happening fast enough—and whether there is a limit.

By summer, the poverty war will have cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $2.5 billion. And the Office of Economic Opportunity, which runs it, is seeking another $1.75 billion for next fiscal year's operation.

This is only the beginning.

Now in its second year, the struggle cannot claim any big dramatic victories. But none was expected.

How many people really have benefited so far?

No one can really tell.

OEO says that 4½ million have been helped either "directly or indirectly." But this figure is misleading, especially since the program is aimed at eliminating the roots of poverty.

LOANS, JOBS, AND AID TO CHILDREN

It includes, for instance, a million and a half poor people who have received rural loans, who found employment in the Neighborhood Youth Corps or the Job Corps. It includes, too, the children who participated in the Headstart programs.

By OEO calculations, the other 3 million are those who have been helped indirectly because their sons or daughters joined the Job Corps, because they participated in work experience programs, or because they somehow or other brushed against the poverty war.

How many jobs have been created and how many people have been trained for them? There are no hard figures?

The programs are spread through city ghettos, villages in Appalachia, and across the rural landscape.

To many in the war, the community action program represents the main assault. The philosophy is that people in the cities and in the villages be given a chance to devise and carry out their own self-help programs, which may be anything from courses in homemaking to training for jobs.

Because they are so spread out, it is difficult to monitor these programs for success, especially so early in the war. Many are just now beginning, after long delays.

By Government reckoning, and it generally is accepted, there are 34 million Americans who are poor. So, by any standard of progress, what has been done so far has scarcely scratched the surface.

OEO officials and those sympathetic to the program argue that it is far too early to make any kind of meaningful assessment. Some critics agree.

Capitol Hill opponents, however, are less charitable. Senate Republican leader Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois, for one, has blistered the program. And the searing blasts from Congress are just beginning as lawmakers debate whether the Nation can afford two wars—the one at home and the one in Vietnam.

Ironically, one of the poverty war's toughest opponents is the Government's own set of new figures covering employment and unemployment. These show that unemployment in the Nation has dropped to a low of only 4 percent and that only 3.33 million Americans are still out of work.

The figures underscore the problem of trying to fight poverty in the midst of plenty—in an economy that is booming as it has never boomed before. And the figures can be interpreted as supporting the argument that there will always be poor among us.

So why try to shoot for utopia through bureaucratic spending?

Ask the 21-year-old former prostitute who has found "respectability that I wouldn't trade for anything" because of the antipoverty program. For the first time since she was 14 she is not working "on the corners."

Or talk to the 6-year-old boy in Atlanta's muddy outskirts about how he kicked the glue-sniffing habit and has found joy in learning to read with the help of VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), frontline soldiers in the war on poverty.

Few people in today's prosperous America ever see the young woman in Harlem or the boy in Atlanta.

But most people who read newspapers know that in the same Harlem, where flamboyant and defiant Representative Adam Clayton Powell is king, antipoverty officials are trying to find out how thousands of dollars in the war's funds were spent. And they are not having much luck.

It is likewise no secret that in San Francisco, where millions of dollars have been spent, not a single antipoverty program is really off the ground. A bitter political fight has blocked progress.

POLITICS IN BIG CITIES

The war on poverty, in fact, is laced heavily with politics.

Big city mayors like Richard Daley of Chicago fear the power that the poor are gaining through new antipoverty organizations.

In Los Angeles, it took last summer's Watts riots to jar the antipoverty program there loose from Mayor Samuel Yorty's tight grip. And, after $40 million, only a dent has been made.

But there are a number of hopeful big city programs in operation.

Detroit's is the one that OEO officials most frequently point to with pride. But there are many others.

In the community action programs, communities are supposed to help themselves. The idea is to get the poor involved personally and the law reads that there should be "maximum feasible participation" of the poor.

This one phrase, regarded by the chief architects of the program as absolutely essential to getting at poverty's roots, has slowed down the battle like a line of Sherman tanks.

It is responsible for political fighting in the big cities of the North and the rural areas of the South where maximum participation means participation by Negroes.

HOT ISSUE IN POVERTY DEBATE

And it has given birth to a new American argument that can be heard in almost every living room, bar, or gathering place outside the neighborhoods inhabited by the poor.

It goes like this:

"If the poor knew what to do about their own poverty they wouldn't be poor."

Sargent Shriver, the President's five-star general in the poverty war, argues the loudest against this kind of thinking. But the debate is the hottest in the battle against poverty.

In getting the poor involved in the war, it is necessary to get them organized—so they can talk about their own problems, hopefully offer solutions, and so they can bring pressure againt the city halls of America to get the kind of services they are denied because they are poor.

This is where the program often rubs with city hall power structures, where politicians more often than not want control of welfare-type money for obvious reasons.

In one Kentucky antipoverty project, almost all the full-time staff jobs were given to Democratic Party workers.

In some cities, sons of well-heeled politicians were put to work in Neighborhood Youth Corps projects last summer.

WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED

But there is the other side.

One small neighborhood project in Chicago is finding jobs for people every day.

Other programs are turning out trained workers.

The Job Corps, despite its high dropout rate and a host of other problems that beset it in the beginning, is really salvaging some of America's lost young people.

And because of Neighborhood Youth Corps projects, thousands of dropouts have returned to school.

Despite the many setbacks, the damaging scandals and the myriad problems, there have been encouraging advances in Mr. Johnson's war.

It is on this tiny shaft of light in America's darkest corner that the administration is gambling billions of dollars against long odds.

Pittsburgh Renaissance Leaders Still Hard at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, as a recent KDKA radio and television editorial pointed out, the Pittsburgh renaissance story has been told many times, but some of its leaders are still hard at work helping to make Pittsburgh the forward-looking, progressive city that it is.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the KDKA editorial at this point in my remarks:

Retirement Benefits

The story of the Pittsburgh renaissance has been told many times. But it is still a significant story, and there's one part of it that hasn't received the attention it deserves. It is about the men who continue to lend their talents and their leadership to Pittsburgh long after others have gone into retirement. They are the best example of the spirit that is moving this city ahead.

Many Pittsburgh leaders continue working at difficult tasks after their normal retirement age, and we'd like to mention just four.

First. Dr. Alfred W. Beattie, who made important contributions to public education in his many years as Allegheny County's superintendent of schools. Dr. Beattie announced just the other day that he will leave that post next year. But he will continue to serve Pittsburgh as board chairman of the newly organized—and very vital—community college program.

Second. Dr. John C. Warner, whose contributions to the community came during his term as president of Carnegie Tech. Dr. Warner retired a year ago, but he is still active in civic affairs, and has just been named cochairman of the First International Conference on Urban Transportation. The Conference is the first phase of a drive to put Pittsburgh in the forefront of the rapid transit industry.

Third. Gwilym A. Price, who was associated with many renaissance projects during his years as president and board chairman of Westinghouse Electric Corp. Since his retirement, Mr. Price has been chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Pittsburgh, guiding Pitt through a difficult period of transition.

And finally, Leland Hazard, retired general counsel of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., who has long been recognized as one of the idea men of the renaissance. As a member of the Allegheny County Port Authority, Mr. Hazard has become the leading spokesman for an improved system of public transportation for Pittsburgh.

The secret of the renaissance has been cooperation and dedicated hard work by men who give more of themselves to the community than they really have to. These men who continue to serve Pittsburgh while others retire to a life of leisure are giving much more than they have to. For their contributions, and the example they set for others, they deserve our thanks.

Importance of All Classes of Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleague's attention a perceptive speech delivered by the prominent Philadelphia postmaster, Anthony L. Lambert, which appeared in the Pennsylvania Register and in the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., on February 10, 1966.

Postmaster Lambert in his speech stressed the importance that all classes of mail play in our postal service. I applaud Mr. Lambert for his recognition of this fact. I have consistently maintained that every class is essential to a stable economy and for the best interests of our country.

The speech follows:

Some Thoughts Concerning Third-Class Mail

It seems to me that postmasters must begin the task of establishing in the minds of the public the importance of the product we handle—the mail—and I mean all classes of mail.

It has become increasingly obvious that a carefully planned campaign is being directed against third-class mail—or at least against advertising matter mailed at the third-class rate. I understand that right now a chain of newspapers in Massachusetts is conducting an all-out effort to discredit this segment of the service we offer.

In my opinion and I believe this opinion is shared throughout the service—advertising by third-class mail plays a very important part in the economy of both the postal service and the country. The mail advertising association claims that this type of mail generates $35 billion in sales each year. Even if the figure is an optimistic one, it proves that mail advertising is a well-established, long-accepted business practice that is essential to the stability of our economy.

The postal service is now being geared to handle a fast-growing workload—75 billion pieces this year, 100 billion in a few years—with a tremendous investment of manpower, equipment, and space. Any effort to diminish the workload by reducing the volume of third-class letter mail would cut back the efficiency with which we are now working and undoubtedly result in higher rates all along the line.

In view of this I think we should grasp every opportunity to refute and counterattack prejudicial publicity in our communities—

1. By continually exerting ourselves to improve service; and thus eliminate justifiable complaints, and by

2. Frankly discussing the benefits and importance of this part of our service to the Post Office Department, community, and country.

The Third Partner in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, we in the 89th Congress have demonstrated, through numerous enactments, our firm commitment to education. We realize that today all Americans must obtain as much of the best education as we can provide. Therefore we have made great efforts to strengthen our elementary and secondary schools, to improve the quality of instruction in our colleges and universities, and to increase educational opportunity at all levels. As we strengthen our institutions of education, however, we are becoming increasingly aware of the important role which another institution plays in the educational and cultural life of the country.

The public library is truly becoming the partner of the school and college in the field of education. President Kennedy recognized this relationship when he said:

> For the individual, the doors to the schoolhouse, to the library, and to the college lead to the richest treasures of our open society.

The public library does indeed lead to the richest treasures of our society. It is not just a place where students and scholars come to do research, where many children first enter the exciting world of books, or where adults are spending a greater portion of their leisure time. For many Americans the public library is the means whereby they continue their education, and in a world which changes as rapidly as ours does education must be a lifelong process. No one must ever say that he has completed his education.

Originally the Library Services Act was designed to "promote the development of public library service to rural areas lacking such service or having greatly inadequate services." But soon it became apparent that library service in many urban areas was just as critical. In 1964, therefore, Congress amended the Library Services Act. We extended assistance for library development to include urban as well as rural areas, and added a new provision. Federal funds are now available to assist in the construction of public library buildings in areas lacking the facilities necessary for the development of library services. In this way we hoped that both urban and rural communities would be able to construct and improve their library facilities enabling them to reach out to all their citizens.

We in Alaska have long dedicated our energy and resources to developing library services. Many of our Alaskan communities are small and miles away from their nearest neighbors. For these communities the public library is the major source of recreation as well as instruction. In spite of our great efforts, however, even with the assistance of the Library Service Act it was estimated in 1963 that about 130,000 Alaskans were still without local library service. But with the increased assistance of the 1964 amendments we are making great strides.

Federal funds are enabling the city-public libraries of Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, and Ketchikan to extend library service to their rural boroughs. In 1964 such funds enabled the city of Anchorage to offer bookmobile and book deposit service to all the unserved rural areas of the borough.

Present plans to strengthen the public library extension include increasing book loans and reference resources, compiling statistical information, providing increased consultant service, and helping in the establishment of new libraries. All of these plans depend upon the assistance we can obtain to supplement our own efforts. Until 1964 Alaska was able to match only the minimum basic allotment under the Library Services Act. In 1965, however, after the act had been amended to include urban areas we were able to earn $109,480.

Mr. Speaker, other States have made similar progress and like Alaska will continue to do so if they continue to receive Federal support. Therefore we must not allow the Library Services Act to expire this June 30. Furthermore, if we are to bridge the widening gap between our population growth, our library needs, and our present library resources, we must develop new means of utilizing these resources to their fullest.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 12133 introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. PERKINS], and I have emphasized that support by introducing a like bill, H.R. 13153. Not only would this legislation continue the programs of library services and construction, but it would also expand them to better meet our urgent needs.

This bill would authorize grants to the States for library services under title I, $60 million for fiscal year 1967, $80 million for fiscal year 1968, $100 million for fiscal year 1969, $120 million for fiscal year 1970, and $150 million for each fiscal year thereafter.

I hope to see this legislation expedited and enacted by an overwhelming majority.

Voice of Democracy Contest Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. RUSSELL TUTEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I announce to my colleagues in the House, the participation of a young American from the Eighth District of Georgia in the voice-of-democracy contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary.

The parents of this outstanding young lady are lifelong friends and outstanding citizens of my home county of Appling. Georgians are honored that Miss Sarah Dale Dixon will represent us in the national contest on March 4, 1966.

Under unanimous consent I insert the speech of Miss Dixon, first place winner from the State of Georgia, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Sarah Dale Dixon, Baxley, Ga.)

There are ghosts haunting me. I can see their shadowy forms before me. Who are they? What do they want? Now, I can hear echoes coming down through the long hall of justice and freedom, and what I hear frightens me. There's Thomas Jefferson, and Button Gwinett, and Lyman Hall, and they are asking, "What are you doing about preserving democracy? Are all men free in your time?"

I answer them, and they thunder down with accusing resonance through the ages, "Why aren't they? We shaped your destiny long before you were born, began a free life for you with the Declaration of Independence. It was written, not to look good in history books, but building on the aching longing of men who braved death to come to America, that new land. Today, what are you doing to preserve it?"

And now they are all there—the dead from two world wars who died in order that our Nation would remain free. "We were not all of us great leaders when Hitler waged his war to conquer the world with false freedom." And then there was Korea, and now, Vietnam. "We were men, we were fathers, and we were citizens who left families and jobs and America to go to strange lands.

We hoisted the American flag in places where bullets were directed at our hearts, but we raised it. And many of us did not return, but we died knowing that the dream of democracy, and the dream of freedom was no idle, false dream. But, democracy can be destroyed because it lives in the hearts and minds of men. The subtle propaganda of false ideals can make the hearts and minds of men weak and unwilling to be vigilant or to give their lives for an ideal of democracy.

And now there is Adlai Stevenson and I can hear him saying during the Cuban crisis, "I will stand until Hell freezes over for an answer." And now they are all saying, "The task of preserving democracy is now yours. What will you do? What will your classmates do? I am even more afraid.

I ask myself, "Democracy? What is it? What does it really mean to me? Is it a word? No, it can not be just a word. It is a people. A people with a dream and a desire to be free, and a will to die for that freedom, that democracy. It is my life and my only hope for existence."

What am I doing about this democracy? This word that transcends time and age to me, a student? I am looking to my American heritage in search of an answer. I find that democracy did not evolve from individuality. Unity is the core of democracy. Unity of man with God. Unity of one state, one nation with another. I look about me in my world, my classroom, and I go from one class to another, searching. I look to my church. I see disbelief, hate, fear.

I see other ideals emerging. Many already strong and looming darkly as a threat to America as a democracy. I see the ways that individuals and groups hide their fear—with intolerance and hate groups. But even more dreadful, I see disunity. A growing discord. And I see myself in the middle of these teasing, tantalizing forces that are perpetually beating at me; coaxing me with false ideals. What then, is my role? What can I do to preserve America?

I, and my clasmates will look to the legacy of freedom that is ours. We will defend that freedom with three words that, like democracy, are more than words. They will secure this last frontier, this America against a desolate annihilation.

With education, for from education comes universal truths and the alliance of universally true concepts that lead to the solidity of democracy.

With faith in God, because this faith was the true foundation for the fiber of strength and endurance that has made our America of today, great.

With vigilance, we must be, because freedom is a never ceasing battle. We must be ever alert to the dangers about us in our world.

I will ally myself with my classmates and we will arm ourselves with education, faith in God, and we will be ever vigilant. With organizations like Tri-Hi-Y, Student Council, and Youth Assembly, we will fire questions more powerful than any bullet or all-out nuclear holocaust. And I, like Adlai Stevenson, will stand until Hell freezes over for answers that will never come from groups built on false concepts and lies because they have no answers.

My America, this last frontier for democracy, will grow even stronger. Only then, will these ghosts rest in their graves dug for freedom; only then will they cease haunting me. I will not have democracy destroyed in my time.

Campaign Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the continuing worries in our political system is that political decisions will be made on the basis of obligations incurred in the financing of campaigns. Thus, many of us, I am sure, were pleased at the President's proposal this year to provide tax incentives for small contributions to political parties. I personally endorse this proposal and hope to see it adopted.

Recently the Arizona Republic in Phoenix, Ariz., published an editorial supporting the President in this effort. I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues. Without objection, I shall insert the editorial at this point in the Appendix:

[From the Arizona Republic, Feb. 7, 1966]

CAMPAIGN REFORMS

Although most Presidents have been stymied in efforts to push through reforms in the area of campaign finance, President Johnson is determined to try.

In his state of the Union address last month, L.B.J. proposed tax incentives to stimulate small contributions to political parties, thereby enabling "those without personal wealth to enter public life without being obligated to a few large contributors." He also called for revision of present unrealistic restrictions on contributions and the attaching of strong penalties to the requirement for full disclosure of contributions.

As Congressional Quarterly noted, two of the most easily evaded laws ever passed by Congress are those regulating campaign contributions and expenditures: the Corrupt

Practices Act of 1925 and a group of 1940 amendments to the Hatch Act.

These require that candidates for Senator and Representative file reports of their campaign receipts and expenditures. But they exempt primary elections, which are sometimes the determinative races. And candidates can avoid reporting most expenditures by establishing separate campaign committees which are exempt because they operate in only one State.

Congressional candidates also avoid unrealistic ceilings on campaign spending by establishing separate committees to handle their funds. Many claim they were unaware of the amount spent by campaign committees working in their behalf. And national level political committees just as easily evade the $3 million annual limitation set by the Hatch Act by establishing satellite committees, each of which may spend $3 million.

Thus reforms in this area obviously are long overdue. Hopefully, L.B.J. can effect a cure where his predecessors have been unable to.

The American Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the history of our great country we have seen how our Nation has been repeatedly brought out of chaos and confusion because patriotic heroes stood fast. They were not ordinary men. Like Patrick Henry, they shared his noble sentiment, "Give me liberty or give me death." They were men who today would scorn the shameful motto, "Better Red Than Dead."

Too many of us Americans have become so sophisticated that we are inclined to think patriotism is old fashioned or corny. This attitude can scarcely fail to trickle down to our children.

We should be fiercely proud of our American heritage and instill in our youth love of country, and an understanding of the true traditions of Americanism.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an appropriate editorial opinion expressed by station WGR in Buffalo, N.Y., dated February 24, 1966:

[From WGR-TV and WGR, Buffalo, N.Y., Feb. 24, 1966]

THE AMERICAN CREED

Last week at town hall in New York City where a so-called peace rally was being held in protest against the war in Vietnam, an unidentified man started to sing "God Bless America." He was shouted down and told to get off the stage. "We've been hearing that song too long" he was told.

It's sad commentary on the breakdown of our moral fiber when people who shout for peace and freedom fail to realize that only in America can they have this peace and freedom through the efforts of our young men who are fighting in Vietnam to preserve it. They must realize that freedom of speech can only be preserved in a free society and if anybody thinks communism represents that, he doesn't know anything about Karl Marx and his philosophy.

This incident in New York is not isolated. There have been demonstrations against our policy in Vietnam all over the United States. We think it's time somebody brought back into our schools a required recitation every day of William Tyler Page's words:

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

That's the American's Creed. Let's not forget it.

Credit for Teenagers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, Hoboken, N.J., is a very old city and occasionally one has heard the opinion expressed that cities like Hoboken have outlived their usefulness. Thus, it comes as a special source of pride to me to see that under the very capable leadership of Hoboken's new mayor, the Honorable Louis DePascale, the old city is staging a most impressive comeback.

For many years, the migration of industry from our part of the United States has been a serious problem. Many industrial firms have been attracted by low wages paid in other parts of the Nation. That you get what you pay for is an old saying, and many businessmen are learning the truth in that statement. There is a long tradition of skilled workmanship in northern New Jersey and this combined with Hoboken's superb geographical location serves to make the city an ideal industrial site.

I would like to point out to all Members of this House that all the people of Hoboken are concerned with the great renaissance which is sweeping the city. Even our young people are enlisting in the campaign. The Jersey Journal, a leading newspaper in New Jersey, in an editorial published March 1, 1966, took notice of the kind of civic spirit which motivates our high school students. I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

CREDIT FOR TEENAGERS

The credit side of the teenager's scorecard got some good marks this week. Students of Hoboken High collected and donated $100 toward the cost of the big electric sign that will flash toward New Yorkers the good tidings that "Hoboken Welcomes Industry."

It is well to be reminded that today's youth does much that is worthy, in contrast to the things that usually bring more publicity. A hundred dollars is a large sum of money to solicit. Somebody did a lot of work on that, and the response was generous.

The fact that these boys and girls showed an interest in Hoboken's potential growth bodes well for the future. When the lights go on atop the Lipton Building, each student who contributed can feel that a bit of that four-story-high sign is his or hers.

Poverty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House a series of articles on the poverty program which appeared in the February 23 and February 24, 1966, issues of the New York Daily News.

Written by two of the News topflight Washington reporters, Dick McGowan and Gene Spagnoli, the series rubs some of the gilt paint from the faults of the program. The News article is worth perusal by all concerned with the many ways in which the poverty program has betrayed its original promise:

[From the New York Daily News, Feb. 23, 1966]

CAPITOL HILL FOES TAKE SHARP AIM AT POVERTY WAR

(By Gene Spagnoli and Richard McGowan)

WASHINGTON.—Congressional critics will zero in on the multibillion-dollar war on poverty next month to decide whether poverty czar Sargent Shriver's army is hitting its target or just wounding the taxpayer.

The program is one of the hottest issues before Congress. The spillover into fall elections is bound to be considerable.

At stake in the upcoming hearings will be next year's $1.75 billion appropriations for Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO)—the command post set up by President Johnson in March 1964 when he called for "total victory" against the poverty affecting some 35 million Americans.

The fight will be bitter.

Republicans, contending that no scarcity exists among high-salaried poverty officials, will rally behind the argument of House GOP Leader Representative GERALD FORD of Michigan, that OEO's administration has been "a national disgrace."

THERE ARE MANY DEMOCRAT DISSENTERS

Democrats generally will follow the lead of Representative SAM GIBBONS, Democrat, of Florida, floor leader of the original bill, who said the war "would now zero in on the projects that show the most promise after 2 years of experimentation."

But there are many Democratic dissenters.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat of New York, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, has, for instance, called it "a fiesta of political patronage."

In short, many Congressmen feel that Shriver must be doing something wrong. With disturbing frequency in recent weeks the war on poverty has made such headlines as these:

Monied youngsters given poverty funds; needy students denied jobs—Newport, R.I.

Ypsilanti Township fights acceptance of $188,252 poverty funds—Ypsilanti, Mich.

Poverty official's salary tops mayor's—Paterson, N.J.

Vicious antiwhite play by racist author backed by poverty funds—New York.

Poverty millions held up pending official probe of misuse of funds—Boston.

Shriver contends that the inefficiencies which have cropped up are the sort of bugs that afflict any agency.

This sprawling setup is Shriver's army. He likens his weapons to the tanks, ships, and planes of a military force. It consists of 10 separate units set up by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The OEO gets the funds—$2.3 billion thus far—for all the units. Administration of the 10 subdivisions is split among 5 agencies.

The OEO runs four, and the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education supervises three. The Labor Department, the Agriculture Department, and the Small Business Administration have one project each.

When asked whether this scatter-shot approach caused fumbles, Shriver said: "No, each department has a job to do and is doing it. While it's true that each of these agencies was set up before we were, we have been finding new things."

Shriver quotes figures. He cites 1.5 million poor Americans who have benefited in the 15 months that OEO has had funds.

These include 561,359 preschoolers in the summer and 125,000 year round in Operation Headstart, 530,107 in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, 107,525 students in the work study programs, and 18,250 youths in the Job Corps.

There are, he adds, 1,079 grants reaching 1,051 of 3,132 counties in the United States under the community action program.

These statistics will get a going-over by the critics.

"This figure spouting is one of the troubles," said Representative Charles Goodell, Republican, of New York. "Shriver's intent the first year was not so much in establishing programs on their merit and getting the money to the poor but of getting some started in every State.

"Then the war of the press releases would issue communiques showing how widespread the program was."

HEADSTART IS ONE OF MOST SUCCESSFUL

Representative Paul Fino, Republican, of New York, an early supporter of the program but now a constant critic, is more caustic. In a recent letter to Shriver, he asked:

"Who in my district received any of the grants totaling $20.6 million that you list in the multidistrict including my 24th District? Can you give me specific persons or groups in my district salaried or directly aided by this money?"

Fino said that "unless I receive specific answers, I will conclude that this presentation is a propaganda device, designed to try to overcome opposition to a program that is waste ridden and misdirected."

One of the most successful of poverty projects is Operation Headstart.

In an 8-week summer crash program, a half-million underprivileged preschoolers were prepared for kindergarten. Unbelievable cases of deprivation were discovered—hungry youngsters who had never held a crayon or a picture book—and partially corrected.

Shriver said the IQ of many of these children had been raised to near that of youngsters from more fortunate homes.

There were fringe benefits, too, as in Boston.

There medical tests given to 1,442 Headstart students revealed that 31 percent had major physical defects or emotional problems. Among these were two cases of tuberculosis. Two others required heart surgery.

Representative Charles Jonas, Republican of New York, criticized the cost, noting that his State had been conducting a similar program with professional teachers at $30 per child, while the Federal program cost $170 per child.

THE YOUTH CORPS WILL DRAW FIRE

Certain to draw more fire is the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which had many recorded abuses in its first year.

The program, designed to prevent high school dropouts, furnished 530,107 students with part-time jobs at $1.25 an hour.

Not all needed the help.

In Newport, a youngster from a home with a $14,340 annual income was on the payroll. But a girl whose father was dead and whose mother earned $2,000 annually was refused a job. And the mayor was receiving $8,000 as poverty program director.

Representative John Fogarty, Democrat of Rhode Island, who heads the House Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, said as many as three-fourths of the 1,000 Youth Corps projects had ineligible youngsters receiving funds.

John Howard, National Director of the Corps, has estimated that one-fifth of the enrollees may have been ineligible at the start of the program.

But, he said, the administering Labor Department has cracked down hard and dropped any youngster whose family income was above $3,000.

The Job Corps is another much-criticized unit.

Fights and stabbings have occurred at some of the 91 camps giving job training to 18,529 high school dropouts.

Shriver retorts hotly that much of the criticism is exaggerated.

"About 3 percent of our corpsmen get in trouble," he said. "I was in the shore patrol in San Diego, and on any weekend you would get a far bigger percentage of sailors involved in fights.

"The overall dropout rate in the program is 28 percent. When you compare that with the college dropout rate of 45 percent, you have to admit it's a pretty good record. Particularly when you compare the vastly different backgrounds of the two groups."

CHARGE NO NEED FOR JOB CORPS

Of the more than 800 youngsters who have completed 9 months or more at Corps centers, 349 have gotten jobs, 345 have entered the Armed Forces, and 149 have gone back to school, 10 of them to college.

Another criticism is that, with the unemployment rate dropping sharply, there is no need for the Corps.

Shriver said the program was now being more closely coordinated with job vacancies in the Nation.

As proof of the salvage operation that can be done by the Corps, Shriver refers to a letter from one of its first enrollees.

The letter was from a youth identified only as Charles, of Baltimore. He joined the Corps after 9 years of schooling and several minor encounters with the police and now is in the Navy. He wrote Shriver in part:

"It's a long way from the day we met * * * I know I gave the staff a pretty tough time * * * I think the Job Corps did a big thing for me, it showed me that I was somebody and that I could make it * * * I just want you to know that if there is anything I can do to help some ot her guy in the Corps, I want to. * * * Thanks to you and the other people who helped me."

Most Congressmen would agree that the war on poverty hit its target with Charles—but they believe that the overall aim must be made a lot sharper. Otherwise, they're afraid we'll run out of money before we run out of fellows like Charles.

[From the New York Daily News, Feb. 24, 1966]

Election Politics Rides High in Probe of Poverty Ruckus

(By Gene Spagnoli and Richard McGowan)

Washington, February 24.—The coming House probe on Sargent Shriver's conduct of the controversial multibillion-dollar war on poverty could determine his future—and that of Congressmen as well.

Watching the open congressional hearings closely next month will be many of the Nation's mayors who have been constantly at odds with Shriver over the program. The amount of backing the legislators give their views will determine how much energy the mayors will exert to help reelect the Representatives this fall.

These mayors feel that poverty funds are pitting the poor against city hall.

At the heart of the dispute is the community action program (CAP). That is the section of Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), which gives the poor a voice in the spending the poverty billions.

Since CAP gets about 40 percent of the total funds—$2.3 billion since November 1964—it's a pretty loud voice.

SEEMS TO BE SOME CONFUSION HERE

Few people know what CAP is.

OEO illustrates the confusion about CAP's role by telling the story of the dialog recorded between a worker and a youth in Harlem:

"What were you doing last summer?"

"I was in a community action program."

"What kind?"

"Fighting cops, baby."

This, the official hastened to add, was not the type of action CAP intends to promote.

CAP money goes, in OEO words, "to the local agencies which encompass the separate groups that are working for the poor.

"Its function is to help the poor make the best use of existing agencies.

"And in city after city, the CAP agency has been a catalyst of unified action never before possible."

Its target: Poverty.

Trouble is, say the mayors, too often the target is city hall.

Syracuse Mayor William Walsh, an early supporter of the program, said poverty funds administered by Syracuse University had started "what almost amounted to a war" between his administration and the poor.

He told an earlier congressional hearing that the main purpose of the university-run project was to "train agitators," that it taught "Marxist doctrines of class conflict."

POOR'S PARTICIPATION BOGS BOARD MAKEUP

Establishment of local CAP boards takes months because the problem of "maximum feasible participation" of the poor cannot be settled.

In Los Angeles last summer the Watts area burned with bloody riots while Mayor Sam Yorty and the OEO wrangled over who would sit on the board that would dispense some $20 million in poverty funds.

Yorty and Shriver later swapped charges as to who was at fault.

Despite endless talks the board still has not been established.

An election will be held March 1 to elect seven representatives of the poor. Only adults whose family income is below $4,000 will be eligible to vote.

Makeup of these boards is causing much concern even among Democrats.

Representative Sam Gibbons, Democrat of Florida, floor leader of the initial bill and a strong backer of the program, warns:

"We've got to make it clear that we aren't going to foster any revolutionary movements or put out money for the poor people to do with as they please. The program is being sponsored for the public's benefit."

In Los Angeles, a Black Nationalist who is an admirer of the late Malcolm X may be elected. If so, he will have much to say about the distribution of millions of poor funds.

SHRIVER STRIVING TO ACHIEVE BALANCE

The OEO maintains a hands-off policy.

"The only thing that we're concerned about is that it is a free election," said an OEO spokesman. "Extremists have rarely been elected to the boards, but the moderates always have been supported."

Shriver said he would not dictate the exact number of the poor to be on a board.

"All we can tell them," he said, "is that with our experience with the 700 boards set up so far, we have found that of the 13,000 people on the boards, 3,700 come from the slums.

"There's a great misconception about the poor running the program. They don't—they just have a voice in discussing problems and proposing solutions. Two things could kill this program—if the mayors had complete control or if the poor had complete control."

The mayors have a friend in Representative Hugh Carey, Democrat, of New York.

Carey, who has been on a House committee investigating the program, said: "I've got sympathy for the mayors. After all, they're elected by the people and they are responsible to them. They represent all the people."

Rallying to Shriver's side on the issue of involvement of the poor and backing him against attacks, curiously enough, will be a bloc of Republicans led by Representatives Charles Goodell, of New York, and Albert Quie, of Minnesota.

Goodell, who also has been on the investigating committee and is highly critical of other aspects of it, said: "Involvement of the poor, at first blush, may sound like riots, and demonstrations and chaos. It's just the opposite."

L.B.J. REMAINS KEY TO ANY MAJOR SHIFT

"The only thing that can convert the poverty program into something different than another tired old welfare approach is involvement of the poor."

Goodell denied that Republican support of the poor was aimed at driving a wedge between big-city Dems and Washington.

Whether the Democrats will be able to revise the guidelines of Federal control over Shriver's sturdy opposition depends on how much backing he gets from President Johnson.

Already neck deep in the Vietnam situation, L.B.J. may, as the easiest way out, heed pressures from local and State officials and give them more control.

But last year several amendments to tighten congressional control on OEO passed the Senate easily, then were shot down en route to the Representatives by an interceptor from the White House.

TWO-HATTED COMMAND AROUSED GOP'S IRE

Republicans, who have blasted inefficiency in Shriver's administration, long contended that he should not have been running both the Peace Corps and the OEO at the same time.

This two-hatted role ran from August 1964, until last January 17, when Johnson finally relieved him of his Peace Corps chore.

One prominent Republican said Johnson purposely let Shriver have the dual role so that he would take the brunt of any attack for failures of the poverty war.

There has been no public evidence of this, and Johnson has repeatedly praised Shriver.

Shriver, when asked yesterday whether this dual role had hurt the OEO, denied that it had. When pressed, however, he said: "I repeatedly said I never wanted two jobs at once. But you can't go in and tell the President off, can you?"

CAP SAVED TROUBLE, POVERTY CZAR SAYS

Shriver was asked whether the program was solid enough to ease the tensions in the big cities.

"All I can say is that where we had programs going last year there was no trouble," he said.

"In Harlem, for example, at the end of the summer there was a big parade and much of the worthwhile results of our program was shown. Many people have said that our funds helped make it a good summer."

He was asked about the antiwhite play put on by racist LeRoi Jones in Harlem last summer and whether such programs contributed to harmonious relations.

"We didn't know about that play, although it was part of the program financed by CAP funds. It was under local control—but there, you see, the play was taken off the boards by the local folks.

IT'S UP TO THE PEOPLE IN THE LAST ANALYSIS

"We're stuck with the intelligence of the American people. In areas where the people do a good job with our funds, we look good. And in areas where they don't use our funds effectively, we look bad."

Major reforms in the poverty war that could result from the present congressional session include:

Increased administrative efficiency by elimination of overlapping of agencies handling the 10 OEO units.

More control by local officials.

Checks on poverty salaries to bring them in line with other agencies.

Elimination of unnecessary programs and concentration on jobs for unemployed.

Independent audits of all poverty funds.

Checks on political phases of program by use of the Hatch Act to prohibit politicking.

Shriver is said to thrive on bad news. If this is so, the hearings may furnish him with his finest hour.

A Salute to Morocco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 10th anniversary of one of our close friends in north Africa, Morocco. Just as in the life of an individual, nations also look with pride on their birthdays and anniversaries. We wish to take this occasion therefore, to extend warm felicitations to His Majesty King Hassan II, of Morocco; and to the Moroccan Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Ahmed Laraki.

While some might look upon Morocco as being a relatively new nation of only 10-years existence, Morocco's friends are well aware of the fact that its history dates as far back as the 12th century B.C. when the Phoenicians established Melilla on the Mediterranean coast as a staging post en route to Cadiz. King Hassan II is a direct descendant of the Alawite dynasty which began in 1663.

Morocco's geographic position is such that it touches both the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea. This dual feature is also reflected in other matters. For example, while it is an Arab country, it is also an African one; while it is endowed with large modern cities, it also retains much of its rich cultural heritage of past Arab glory; while it has a rapidly expanding economy based on such items as phosphates and iron, it is still largely an agricultural country. These seemingly contradictory attributes have thus far not infringed on Morocco's economic growth. On the contrary, they have been utilized to an increasing degree to promote the welfare of Morocco's people.

Under the able and patient guidance of King Hassan II, Morocco has been striving to overcome the numerous complex problems which confront new states. Morocco's attempts to rely on self-help have earned the respect of much of the world, and her efforts should certainly result in rich rewards for her people.

This year marks the end of the first decade of a "new" Morocco. It has been filled with both promise and achievement; grief and joy; accomplishment and defeat. No one can predict what future years will bring, but there are definite indications that Morocco has laid a firm groundwork for whatever lies ahead.

I extend warm and hearty felicitations to His Majesty King Hassan II as he and his people close one chapter and eagerly begin another in what is to me the story of a most promising country.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, with all the debates that have taken place on Vietnam in recent weeks, I think it is appropriate for us to remember that one of our assets as a nation has been our exercise of the right to disagree.

This "airing of views" has more often been helpful in formulating policy than in obstructing it, and it is particularly fitting that these discussions take place here in the Legislative Halls of our National Government.

We are like a big family. We sometimes disagree vehemently among ourselves, but when the chips are down and when we art attacked from the outside, we fight and pull together.

Many of us realized last year, and many more of us are coming to the same realization this year, that if we had debated our domestic policy as fully as we are now debating our foreign policy, we would have produced more effective means of coping with our domestic problems.

Last Sunday, February 27, 1966, an editorial appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Kingsport Times-News of Kingsport, Tenn. The editorial briefly, but effectively, outlined this phase of our history.

I think it is helpful for all of us to be cognizant of these facts, and I insert it in the Record at this point.

THE AMERICAN WAY

Since the American way of life includes washing all our dirty linen in public, for all the world to see, and to carry on all the family rows in the living room that has a large picture window through which the interested neighbors can enjoy the show, the present family argument over the war was a big audience.

It must be fun for the people in Moscow and Peiping to watch; but also very puzzling. We can imagine the people in the Kremlin asking each other, "How can any government function in such an atmosphere of confusion and friction?"

We can imagine them thinking that the President cannot possibly reach a position of control and make a decision that will be acceptable.

What these people who wonder should do is read some American history. They will note two strange things; that is, strange to them. One is that this sort of Donnybrook Fair atmosphere is nothing new. It has been happening ever since Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton had their arguments that split the country into two political parties.

They should read the story of Andrew Jackson's administration and the battles that took place when Clay and Calhoun and Daniel Webster were the key figures. In fact the occasions where there was not political friction and criss-crossing of individual opinion are the exceptions.

Yet only once did the friction get to the breaking point and we came through that fiery ordeal, and became stronger than ever.

The other phenomenon they will notice is that when the battling seems to be worst there comes a pause. There is a decision based on executive order or congressional majority, and the whole argument ends.

And if the Russian and Chinese leaders read carefully they will not make the mistake that Kaiser Wilhelm and Adolf Hitler made. They will remember that we can pull together mighty fast when we have to.

And if they ponder over the peculiarities of our system it will finally dawn on them that this internal friction is not a sign of national weakness but the very core of our strength and the keynote to the great growth and power of this country.

It is this independence of the individual and the right of every man to have his say that is our peculiar heritage. When governments are run smoothly because people dare not express views that might conflict with the ideas of a superior, that is when weakness sets in.

A Creative New Integration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, educators throughout the Nation are keeping close watch on the progress of some new educational techniques undertaken in the Pittsburgh school system by our energetic, able new superintendent, Sydney P. Marland, Jr.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the March 4 issue of Time magazine at this point in the RECORD.

It is an excellent report on Superintendent Marland's imaginative but realistic approach to a problem which plagues many school systems throughout the Nation:

THE PITTSBURGH PHILOSOPHY

School integration, as every big-city educator knows, is not just a matter of folding Negro students in with white ones. The whites have got to stick around—and many of them don't. In 25 years, the proportion of Negro children in the public schools has jumped from 9 to 51 percent in Chicago, from 8 to 47 percent in New York, from 14 to 54 percent in Philadelphia, and from 39 to 90 percent in Washington. In Pittsburgh the Negro school population has more than doubled since World War II—and Pittsburgh is responding with a creative new program designed to raise the standard of education so high that the whites will want to stay and the Negroes will get the kind of training they need to take an equal place in society.

The experiment is still too new for hard statistics of success or failure. But it is being watched with growing interest in practically every metropolis north of the Mason-Dixon line, and in Washington with such hope that its administrator has the honor of being the only school superintendent on President Johnson's task force on education.

Sydney P. Marland Jr., 51, came to Pittsburgh's 77,000-pupil school system from such relatively vest-pocket operations as Darien, Conn., and Minnetka, Ill. Since September 1963, Marland has demonstrated that this did not diminish his ability to think big. The chief elements of his Pittsburgh plan:

Team teaching: As in other schools, a group of half a dozen or more teachers work together with a large group of children. "But team teaching is more a spirit than a thing," says Marland. He finds that, since teachers can be more creative, teaching in slum areas becomes more interesting and exciting, which boosts student motivation and community involvement. By the end of this academic year, team teaching will be fully operative in 46 of Pittsburgh's 84 elementary schools, involving 30,000 pupils—the largest team-teaching project in the Nation.

Job training—with a twist: Vocational, technical, and junior-executive education is more in demand than ever; yet the grubby old vocational school is dying, and good riddance. "Ambitious parents felt that for their children to identify with vocational courses was to perpetuate the laborer, anti-intellectual concept," Marland notes. Pittsburgh's contribution is job training given in comprehensive high schools, along with a respectable helping of academic courses, With the cooperation of local businessmen, the system has thoroughly modernized job-training equipment, and the proportion of students taking such courses has risen from 6 percent in 1963 to 43 percent now.

Primary education: Two years before the Headstart program was conceived, Pittsburgh was one of a handful of communities experimenting with uplifting preschoolers. Operated largely with Ford Foundation funds, the program now accommodates about 1,300 students, aged 3 and 4, on an 11-month program basis. Preprimary classes are now run without Federal funds, but as Federal money becomes available this year, the program will double, using space made available through the purchase of prefabricated classrooms.

Advanced classes: The Pittsburgh scholars program, now in its second year, has enabled roughly 650 pupils in the eighth and ninth grades to take a high-powered set of college prep courses. A vigorous, 5-year program of study, the scholars program is utilizing new courses created by university scholars in cooperation with the school system. Marland says that "the program is one way in which we provide students with the means to stretch for excellence by bringing together exceptional students, exceptional teachers, and a very demanding curriculum."

Superintendent Marland is cautious about making claims for Pittsburgh's dramatic drive for educational excellence. "We can't prove through conventional means that our work is paying off," he says. "We can't prove that Johnny can read better. We can prove that he behaves better, that he enjoys school more, that his attitude is better, that he is reading more library books. We are satisfied we are on the right road, and we will stay on it and continue to invest heavily."

The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle?—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD the second of a series of articles by Detroit News Reporter Tom Joyce, on the realities of the war on poverty. The article follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Feb. 28, 1966]

BOON OR BOONDOGGLE?—POVERTY WAR FERRETS OUT AMERICA'S HIDDEN POOR

(By Tom Joyce)

(Second in a series)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—Paradoxically, America's poor are concealed by prosperity.

They are hidden by the millions of new homes in growing suburbia, the ribbons of new interstate highways and other symbols of affluence that they do not share.

The slums and the ghettos where poverty is a way of life are rarely seen today by most Americans.

The insurance salesman on his way from his surburban home to his downtown office might get a quick glimpse as he speeds along the expressway at 60 miles an hour.

But he never gets inside the homes where he can see the blank expressions of children who do not have enough food for either their stomachs or their minds.

WHAT GOES UNSEEN

Suburban housewives, with sparkling new shopping centers only minutes away from home, are rarely exposed to poverty.

Most people are likely to believe that children never go hungry in today's United States. But they do.

Outside of Gainesville, Ga., on roads of red clay that turn to red ooze with a light rain, there is what the experts describe as a rural slum. Walk into one of the homes and your nostrils burn from the pungent odor of poverty.

Inside one of the ramshackle huts—and this is all they are—sits a stout Negro mother, feeling the first twinges of labor pains.

WHERE'S DADDY?

Scurrying about in the 1½ shabby rooms that close in about her are seven children, the oldest 9. Everyone sleeps in the living room, taking turns on one bed and a battered sofa.

There is no father. Or, more correctly, there are several fathers.

But their whereabouts is not known by the mother as she prepares for her eighth child.

Outside it is 32° and one of the children has just tossed the last large chunk of coal in the stove in the middle of the room, the only source of heat.

The water and electricity have been cut off because the bills have not been paid. There is an open toilet in the house, but it cannot be used because there is no water. And there is no outside facility.

HUNGER PANGS

The children are asking for food. But there is none. It is expected that one of the neighbors will bring a little basket later, along with a bucket of coal.

The eyes of the children are expressionless and hollow.

They have nothing to do, except fight with one another. Not a toy or a book is in sight.

What about welfare?

The woman has had too many illegitimate children, the authorities have decreed. She is no longer entitled to help. There are ways of getting special aid for the children if enough redtape is cut. But she doesn't know about redtape or where to begin. Welfare workers are very busy.

The woman is a pathetic figure, an illiterate for all practical purposes. But she is not without guilt. The children are. And they present a pitiful sight in rags, mismatched shoes, if any at all, and runny noses.

Down the red-ooze road the story is repeated several times, not in every detail but with equal despair.

Who are the poor in America today?

By official definition, they are the 34 million who do not have enough on which to live by minimum standards.

The yardstick is a city family of four with an income of under $3,100 annually—or a rural family of four with less than $2,050.

Not all, obviously, are as bad off as the families in the shabby cluster of houses outside Gainesville.

Some of the proud mountain dwellers of the South who are lumped into the statistics run you right off their land at the point of a rusty shotgun if you tell them they are poor.

A good many experts have disputed the 34 million figure.

Nevertheless, it is the official one. If you travel across the land you do not have to look very hard to realize that there are indeed millions of poor people by anybody's measuring device.

About 47 percent of the Nation's poor live in the South.

Almost a third of the families in the South are poor.

THE AGED POOR

Only about one-eighth of families in the Northeast and one-seventh of those in the West fall into the poverty category.

Nearly 30 percent of the poor are aged.

(This figure has generated a lot of controversy because many of the aged are able to live fairly well on an income of under $2,000 a year if they have savings, own their own homes, and if they live in the country where they can grow a little of their own food.)

About 17 percent of the poor, like the rural Gainesville woman, live in families where there are no male heads of households.

All told, about 28 percent live in rural areas, where poverty is the hardest to fight. Only about 25 percent live in big cities.

Lack of education is the biggest single cause of poverty. Nearly half of the poor are in families where the breadwinner has not gone beyond the eighth grade.

This is why President Johnson's poverty war is concentrating so heavily on education—from preschool children to the aged.

The Job Corps is making significant new discoveries about why children drop out of school. Already this information is being fed back into the educational institutions.

Not all the poor are in families where the head of the household is unemployed. Millions, in fact, are not.

The mother with five children to support in the Woodlawn section of Chicago is poor even though she has a job as a domestic worker and earns sometimes as much as $60 a week.

UNEMPLOYMENT LOW

When the Kennedy administration took office it set as its "interim goal" an unemployment rate of 4 percent. Last month this goal was reached—making it the lowest rate since 1957 when the 4-percent figure was reached briefly for a month.

A total of 71.2 million Americans are now working and in some areas there are manpower shortages. More shortages are expected as the country moves closer to full employment.

But many of the unemployed are not employable. In an increasingly technical job market, they have not even the crudest skills to offer.

CAN'T APPLY

Several antipoverty programs, in cities like Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles, have turned up evidence that a surprising number of these people cannot even complete a job application form.

It is easy to say that the man who does not have a job today does not really want one. But is that true?

One thing that the poverty war is revealing is that a surprising number of people without jobs do want them. But, even though it sounds incredible, many haven't the slightest idea how or where to look.

Aren't there State employment services in every State? Indeed there are.

But for the city man who has been out of a job for a long time, or a youth who has never worked, it means a trip downtown.

DOWNTOWN A THREAT

A lifelong resident of a teeming ghetto, maybe even a second or third generation resident, has a fear of downtown. It represents authority, bureaucracy, and redtape.

Where war on poverty programs have set up small neighborhood employment offices, staffed by people of the neighborhood, results sometimes have been dramatic.

Moreover, unemployment figures are misleading. Only those who are actively seeking employment are included. The man who has given up and resigned himself to dole is not. Neither is the high school dropout who quit looking for work to hang around the street corners.

The Job Corps is full of such young men and women.

DROPOUT DROPS-INS

A handsome, broad-shouldered youth at Camp Parks in California who quit school in the 10th grade was found reading a book and sipping a soft drink in the library.

"What got you interested in the Job Corps?" he was asked.

"I got tired of just hanging around," he replied. "There's just no future in it. Today you gotta know how to do something to get a job. And I didn't know nothin' from nothin.' "

At the Job Corps center he is studying for the equivalent of a high school diploma and learning a trade at the same time.

Last month, for the first time since 1957, the number of American families on general relief dipped below 300,000.

FATHERLESS HOMES

At the same time, however, the number of those receiving aid to dependent children (ADC) assistance climbed to a record of 4.4 million.

The assistance is for families where there usually is no father in the home. The figure represents 1.1 million mothers and the rest children.

The program is often abused and officials are well aware of this.

If you can convince her that you are not a welfare worker and promise not to use her name, a woman in Chicago will tell you that her husband sneaks into the house at night.

"What are we supposed to do?" she asks. "If they find out, I get cut off of ADC. But there isn't enough money to live without it."

The children get a twisted image of their father.

BOYFRIEND INSTEAD

In some ADC homes, it is not the father who comes at night and the image is even worse.

A VISTA volunteer who lives in a slum where there are many ADC families invited a friend for dinner one night. They had cocktails. One of the children of the neighborhood stopped by to borrow a book from the library the VISTA worker has set up. When the boy was introduced to the volunteer's friend he commented:

"You smell just like the man who comes to visit my mamma."

War on poverty officials know it is impossible to reach all of the 34 million Americans they regard as poor.

But it is felt that helping large numbers of adults help themselves will have an impact on the Nation's future generations.

EMPHASIS ON YOUTH

The most important thrust of the war is toward the children and youths who populate poverty's ranks. These are the children in the preschool programs like Headstart and young people enrolled in such ambitious undertakings as the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Job Corps.

But there are programs for adults as well.

Many communities have set up day care centers for preschool children. The idea is to free the mothers in fatherless homes for work or training and at the same time to provide help for culturally deprived children.

But it is often impossible to convince a mother that she should give up ADC payments for a job or a chance for a job.

Some community action programs are aimed at just this kind of resistance. There has been some progress.

But it is only a small start on a long road and nobody really knows where the road is leading.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies' auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 300,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. First prize is a $5,000 scholarship, second prize is $3,500, third prize is $2,500, fourth prize is $1,500, and the fifth prize is $1,000. The contest theme was "Democracy: What It Means to Me."

I am proud to say that the winning contestant from the State of Colorado is a young man from my own congressional district: Mr. Donald Batt of Adams City, Colo.

His speech, which I am inserting in the Record at this point, should be read by every Member of this House for its message of inspiration in these difficult days when it is so easy to lose sight of the ideals this young man so clearly sees. The speech is appended herewith, in full:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Donald Batt)

For the past 200 years, men have been sent to the battlefield; there they have shed blood and died defending the proposition that all men should be afforded the opportunity for freedom of expression.

Why should this abstract political concept be worth the lives of so many brave and noble men?

This country's ideals were formulated by men not ignorant of government. For years they were subject to men nonrepresentative and indifferent to the peoples' needs; they knew of the injustices wrought by tyranny. They knew that if their new Nation was to survive it must derive its power from the people.

Since those times the United States has stood as a beacon of human dignity, but only because our Nation has always been aware of its responsibility to the world as custodian of the fundamental integrity of all men.

Democracy then, means much more than a government representative of the people. It is more than a society where the right is recognized that everyone may live his life and voice opinions as he wants. Democracy means recognizing that these rights not only belong to you, but to every human being as well. It means that if self-expression is not allowed to prosper, then the entire Nation will suffer.

For this is why America is the mightiest Nation in the world, because men have been allowed to pursue their interests as they please: to develop the airplane and the telephone, and to benefit from the fruits of their labor—to create an incomparable civilization of freemen.

How then can this indisputably great gift be best preserved?

We must be taught the value of freedom and democracy at an early age and realize that freedom is a very personal thing. We must be able to relate our actions with freedom of choice and of speech. We must appreciate the significance of majority rule and the voice of the minority.

These things are being done in our educational system. Practically every school in the United States today has a student government, and every student organization selects its leaders according to the wishes of its members. I have personally had experience in this area. I have served in student council for 6 years, as president of several student organizations, and as mayor of my city in Boy's State.

History and civics courses are incorporating into their curriculum the value of our heritage and the significance of the fact that the strongest nation on earth is governed by freemen. In these ways we are passing from generation to generation the hallowed concepts of liberty and political equality.

The dangers to democracy are many. There are those who pompously attempt to impose their form of government on the world for the good of all; they would try to lead the blind when they themselves cannot see. There are those who, under the guise of patriotism, attempt to pull the country their way, while declaiming against those who oppose them as Communists and bigots. They are the saviors of a nation, just as Hitler was.

And finally there are those who constitute the greatest threat to democracy: the indifferent, the apathetic, the ones who have never realized that freedom is the prize of responsibility.

These things are what democracy means to me: The reward for years of struggle by my fellow countrymen, a beacon to the world proclaiming freedom for all, and the treasure to guard from those who cannot understand the meaning of human dignity.

But democracy means more than this: It is going up on a hill at sunrise and watching the sun's rays creep over a land where wheat is waving in the soft morning breeze, and corn rustles with the anticipation of an early harvest. It is building a home and family and knowing that no man can take away what I have earned. It is knowing that I am no man's slave and that I can help build a nation where all men are responsible for its success or failure. For democracy is freedom, and freedom is the true meaning of life.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a voice-of-democracy contest. In the last contest over 300,000 school students participated and the winning contestant from each State was brought to Washington to compete in the finals.

The contestants compete for scholarship prizes ranging from the $5,000 first prize down to fifth prize worth $1,000.

I am proud and pleased that the winning speech from the State of Pennsylvania was that of Mr. Roderick Michael Crossland, Reading, Pa., which is in my congressional district.

I should like to take this opportunity to commend Mr. Crossland for his excellent paper on "What Democracy Means to Me." I should also like to extend to him my best wishes for continued success in pursuing his future education.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to share with my colleagues Mr. Crossland's thoughts on "What Democracy Means to Me":

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

(By Roderick Michael Crossland)

There is a subject no author can fully research, a subject that no files list directly, a subject which lies somewhere in a man, a library and in the legislative halls. It is a feeling that one experiences when he sees the flag waving above factory smoke, a college campus, or a serene graveyard. It is well to take time out from our busy life, America, and ponder the subject of democracy.

As a high school student and a citizen of the greatest country in the world, I will tell you what this precious gift means to me.

Democracy's meaning lies not in defining it but in applying it. A student's degree of participation in his Government is, of course, limited but this in no way hinders him from displaying our democratic way of life. Youth is the raw material of our Nation capable of molding our civilization into a vessel of of honor or dishonor. Democracy can mean a great many things to a student: it can mean the definition from his history book or the Constitution or Declaration of Independence taped haphazardly to the classroom wall. To me it is a form of life, a heritage of history. It is the civil religion of a race of Americans. It is a word so strong that its syllables have echoed for 200 years across the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific and it will be these same vibrating syllables that will cut through the Iron Curtain and smash down the Bamboo Curtain.

Everyone has a personal role in his democracy yet how many of these millions fulfill this role? By acting as a leader, obeying school authorities and participating in extracurricular activities I help to preserve our Democratic way of life.

Our work is never done until its ends are visible. Like a river, democracy has many rivulets and each represents a new way of filling the river with spirit and life so that the river may be carried into the ocean of society.

It is not then the time for us to sit back and relax for indolence breeds decay. We must as students apply a youthful endeavor toward a prime goal, God and democracy. We must show America that we are capable of ruling this mechanical world of machines and men. I am not critizing but emphasizing. Yes, emphasizing the need of renewed and greater interest in government, race, and religion. Are we now after 200 years of power and prosperity going to atrophy into a bunch of weaklings? Are we going to sit back when all other nations are racing the race of revolution? No, I am quite sure we are not, but a warning is always better than disaster. However, I wonder when students marry to avoid the draft or parade obscene signs to exercise their freedom of speech. America must guard against these things. We must insure our democracy.

It is difficult to find an end to a beginning. It takes more than 5 minutes to live what I have said. Democracy is that light illuminates our country. It is the power that makes us Americans. Keep it, share it, protect it, and nourish it and reap the benefits of this golden harvest.

Mobilization for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times has set the record straight about charges leveled at Mobilization for Youth, pioneer project on Manhattan's Lower East Side under the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act. I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dated February 9, 1966, by Warren Weaver, and an article dated February 13, 1966, by Sidney Zion.

James E. McCarthy, former director of Mobilization for Youth, now staff director of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Poverty of the House Committee on Education and Labor, wrote a letter to the New York Times, which was published on February 26, 1966, in which he clarified the situation. His letter will follow the articles.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1966]

KEY POVERTY AID WAS SCORED HERE—U.S. INVESTIGATOR RESIGNED CITY POST UNDER FIRE

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—James E. McCarthy, who resigned as head of a major New York City antipoverty program amid charges of mismanagement, has spent the last 4 months examining the management of poverty projects in other cities.

After Mr. McCarthy left Mobilization for Youth in 1964, ending 6 years with the Lower East Side group, he was attacked in investigative reports for loose and shoddy administrative practices, and lavish and improper spending.

This background of accusation, which never advanced beyond newspaper accounts, has not appeared to impair Mr. McCarthy's effectiveness as a congressional investigator of poverty programs in a dozen eastern cities.

Since last September, the former New Yorker has been chief investigator of the special House Education and Labor Subcommittee dealing with poverty. He was named to the staff by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of both the full committee and the subcommittee.

Representative POWELL, a Manhattan Democrat, was asked if he thought the record of Mr. McCarthy's departure from Mobilization for Youth was incompatible with hiring him to oversece the operation of local poverty efforts.

"I hired James McCarthy," Mr. POWELL replied, "after making a personal assessment of his educational qualifications and professional experience in the areas most intimately affected by the war on poverty.

"I am satisfied that there is nothing in his professional background which detracted from the most effective, efficient, and honest execution of his duties as chief investigator."

A spot check of committee members of both parties familiar with Mr. McCarthy's activities over the last 4 months tended to support the chairman's view.

M'CARTHY IN AGREEMENT

One Representative even suggested that the poverty investigator's troubles with Mobilization for Youth "may have been an asset to him in taking a look at some of these newer outfits."

Mr. McCarthy himself, not surprisingly, agreed. He said he thought "I've been able to do a better job for the committee because of my experience at MFY. We were an early experiment. Having been part of it, I think I've been able to spot problems elsewhere."

The chief investigator has been part of a 4-man study group that has inspected 78 poverty projects in 22 States and the District of Columbia for the Powell subcommittee. Its report is scheduled for submission to the chairman this week.

Among the programs Mr. McCarthy has surveyed is Haryou-Act, the controversial Harlem poverty project that is being investigated by Federal and city authorities for allegedly poor or nonexistent financial management and slipshod administration.

Powell aids have predicted that the full investigation report will not be made public but that there will be recommendations based on it, both for remedial legislation and improved local administrations.

When Mr. McCarthy left Mobilization for Youth in the fall of 1964, the organization and its leadership were under fire on several fronts. A major accusation, largely developed by the New York Daily News, was that there were numbers of present or former Communists and other subversives on the agency staff.

In November 1964, the New York City Antipoverty Operations Board made public its report on an inquiry into Mobilization for Youth that said that Mr. McCarthy "must be held responsible, too, for failing to establish personnel procedures and standards insuring against the hiring of individuals to sensitive undertakings."

An accompanying report by the New York City investigation commissioner, Leon A. Fischel, accused Mr. McCarthy of having spent more than $23,000 in agency funds "for dinners, hotels, restaurants, etc," repaying $2,800 before his resignation.

"Whether this amount is justified as a necessary part of the program of MFY is unknown at this time and is the subject of continuing investigation," Commissioner Fischel said at that time. *No further report is known.*

Winslow Carlton, chairman of the board of Mobilization for Youth during Mr. McCarthy's tenure, was asked today if he thought the former director's record with MFY should disqualify him as a congressional poverty investigator.

"In no way," Mr. Carlton replied. He said he believed the former MFY director had been the victim of bad publicity and added: "Without Mr. McCarthy's contribution, there could have been no Mobilization for Youth."

However, Mr. McCarthy's $15,000-a-year post with the Powell subcommittee is by no means secure. With the national survey of poverty projects completed, the staff is scheduled for a 50-percent reduction in the near future.

[From New York Times, Feb. 13, 1966]

EX-AID DEFENDS POVERTY EXPENSE—MCCARTHY SAYS HE PAID ONLY TENTH OF SUM CHARGED

(By Sidney E. Zion)

James E. McCarthy, former Administrative Director of Mobilization for Youth, has produced evidence that he says clears him of charges that he spent more than $23,000 of the antipoverty agency's funds for "wining and dining" between 1962 and 1964.

A former city investigation commissioner, Leon A. Fischel, largely substantiated Mr. McCarthy's statement, agreeing that the $23,000 figure did not accurately reflect Mr. McCarthy's spending. He reported that $5,000 of the sum actually had been spent by the city administrator's office in entertaining civic leaders.

Mr. McCarthy, who is now a congressional investigator for poverty programs in a dozen eastern cities, said in an interview last week that an independent accounting report showed that he had spent "only about $100 a month" on personal expenses connected with the agency's business.

"That's a little different than the thousand-dollar-a-month party Screvane said I was on," Mr. McCarthy remarked.

REPORT MADE IN 1964

Mr. McCarthy referred to a report filed in November 1964, by former City Council President Paul R. Screvane in his capacity then as chairman of the city antipoverty operations board.

The report was made 2 months after Mr. McCarthy resigned amid charges that Mobilization for Youth was infiltrated with Communists. The report, among other things, accused Mr. McCarthy of "shoddy administrative practices" and charged that he had spent more than $23,000 in a 23-month period for dinners, hotels, restaurants, and entertainment.

The financial aspects of the report were said to have been based on findings by Mr. Fischel.

In a telephone interview last week, Mr. Fischel said the Screvane report "did not accurately reflect" his findings in regard to Mr. McCarthy.

"The $23,000 figure was the total spent on wining and dining by the entire organization," Mr. Fischel said. "It includes over $5,000 spent by (office of the) the city administrator on food and drink that was paid out by MFY under a Ford Foundation grant."

REIMBURSEMENT MADE

Mr. Fischel estimated the final figure attributable to Mr. McCarthy's personal expense account as "about $2,500." This reflects a $1,500 reimbursement to the agency made by Mr. McCarthy after the investigation began, he said.

Mr. Fischel made it clear that he was not exonerating the antipoverty agency or Mr. McCarthy from the charge of "lavish spending."

The Screvane report made no mention of expenditures by the office of the city administrator, although as examples of lavish expenditures the Screvane report listed a number of affairs that were actually arranged and paid for by the office.

One of these was a dinner at the Plaza Hotel, listed as an expenditure of $949.66. Henry Cohen, former deputy city administrator, said last week that this dinner had been planned by his office and that the invitations had gone out in Mr. Screvane's name. The city administrator's office was vacant at the time.

PROMINENT GUESTS

The dinner, Mr. Cohen said, "had a guest list that read like 'Who's Who' in New York," and was arranged to give civic leaders an advance briefing on Dr. Kenneth B. Clark's "Youth in the Ghetto." This later became the basis of the Haryou-Act antipoverty agency.

"The affair was attended by Mr. Screvane and Mayor Wagner," Mr. Cohen said. "The money for it was provided by the Ford Foundation, but banked with MFY. We submitted a bill and they paid for it.

"There were a number of affairs like this. We spent over $5,000 on this type of thing. Everybody knew that we were paying for it and not MFY. I don't know why it was charged to them in the Screvane report."

Mr. Screvane said last week that he did not recall the Plaza affair. He said he had based his report on Mr. Fischel's findings.

SCREVANE ASSAILED

Mr. McCarthy was interviewed in the office of Prof. Richard A. Cloward of the Columbia University School of Social Work, director of research of mobilization for youth. The professor said that the Screvane report "could only have been the work of a liar, a fool, or both."

"Screvane had made wild public charges that MFY started the Harlem riots, was engaged in illegal social action and had been infiltrated by subversives." Professor Cloward said. "When these charges proved to be unfounded he needed a way out. So he released a bunch of lies about McCarthy's expenses."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1966]

MFY REIMBURSEMENT

To the EDITOR:

I would like to express my deep appreciation to the Times for the news articles published February 9 and February 13 regarding aspects of my administration at Mobilization for Youth.

I particularly would like to commend your reporter, Sidney E. Zion, who so carefully, critically, and in depth examined the reckless and untruthful charges that had been leveled against me by former City Council President Paul R. Screvane. I feel that as a result of Mr. Zion's objective reporting, especially the revealing statements he obtained from Leon A. Fischel, former city investigations commissioner, the record has been set straight.

But I would like to comment on one statement made by Mr. Fischel that appeared in the February 13 article—namely, "this reflects a $1,500 reimbursement to the agency made by Mr. McCarthy after the investigation began." I believe a brief explanation to clarify what "reimbursement" meant is required because it may imply misuse of funds.

From the beginning it was the fiscal practice at Mobilization for Youth for executives to utilize credit cards for travel, hotels, meetings, and conference expenses, including meals and the like. The accounting department at MFY paid the various venders when statements were received. In turn, staff members, including myself, periodically made payments to the agency for any items that were personal expenses. The $1,500 referred to by Mr. Fischel represented payments for personal expenses that I had incurred. These payments had no relationship whatsoever to the investigation launched by the department of investigations. Rather, I was following a routine procedure in line with established fiscal practices at MFY.

JAMES E. MCCARTHY.

WASHINGTON.

Address by Gov. Dan Moore, of North Carolina, at Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Richmond, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, at Richmond, Va., the Democratic Party of our State held its annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner. Our speaker on that occasion was the Honorable Dan Moore, Governor of North Carolina.

Governor Moore made a splendid address and one which I feel is worthy of much study and thought. I would like to include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY GOV. DAN MOORE AT ANNUAL JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF VIRGINIA, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1966, JOHN MARSHALL HOTEL, RICHMOND, VA.

Jefferson, the Virginian; Jackson, the North Carolinian. Jefferson, the thinker, the mind of the Democratic Party; Jackson, the doer, the man of action. It is fitting that we pay tribute to these two great Democrats who founded our party.

Let me say first that I consider it the greatest of honors to be accorded the privilege of addressing you here tonight. This is also an honor accorded to my State and to the 5 million people that I represent. I feel very much at home here in Virginia.

Since becoming Governor of North Carolina last year, I have benefited greatly from my association with your former Governor, a good Democrat, the Honorable Albertis Harrison. During this short time, I have come to know him well, to admire his ability, to respect his judgment. Governor Harrison is, in the finest sense, a Virginian.

In keeping with your tradition of good Democratic government, the people of Virginia have elected another outstanding leader to follow in the footsteps of Albertis Harrison and those Governors who went before him. I was pleased to be here in Richmond only a few weeks ago when Governor Godwin was inaugurated. It was a good day for Virginia.

I look forward to my association with Governor Godwin. I admire his determination, his eagerness to get on with the job of making this an even greater State, and his tremendous desire to serve the people of Virginia. It will be a pleasure to work with him in the years ahead for the mutual benefit of our two States and this Nation we all love.

Cooperation has been the hallmark of the relationship of Virginia and North Carolina throughout history. Even as the ideas of Jefferson, the Virginian, and Jackson, the North Carolinian, were mingled to form our Democratic Party, so, too, have been the spirit and hopes of our peoples.

Our ties go deep. From the very beginnings of Virginia and North Carolina, we have had a constant interchange of people and of ideas. For example, our former Gov. Luther Hodges was born a Virginian, and your former Gov. John Battle was born a North Carolinian. Governor Battle claimed, however, that his being a Tar Heel was purely unintentional. His mother happened to be visiting in our State when he arrived ahead of schedule. Governor Hodges, we might point out, came to North Carolina of his own free will.

As for the exchange of ideas, in the early thirties our legislature asked your Gov. Harry Byrd to come to Raleigh and address it on how Virginia had solved its own depression-created fiscal puzzle. He did and we appreciated it just as we appreciated the fine work he later did in Washington. The year after Governor Byrd came to our State, North Carolina returned the favor when our Governor Gardner was invited by your general assembly to explain our newly enacted legislation establishing a statewide highway system. After the trip from Raleigh today, I am pleased to see that you Virginians followed Governor Gardner's recommendations.

Through the years our two States have engaged in healthy, good-humored competition. We have competed fiercely for new business and industry, and have matched strides in improving basic governmental services to all our people. Both States have a proven record of supporting good government and strong fiscal integrity in the use of State tax funds.

While we remain friendly rivals, of course, it has not been easy sometimes for North Carolinians to keep a stiff upper lip when our history is compared with that of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

We do recognize your priority when you contend that Jamestown was the first permanent English settlement. But, we hasten to remind you that Virginia Dare, the first English child who was born in America, first saw the light of day in what is now Dare County, N.C. I might add that we attach no historical significance to the fact that at the time Virginia Dare was born, Dare County was then considered to be in the colony known as Virginia.

Why do Virginia and North Carolina have so much in common? Our people have shared a common heritage based on democratic principles of freedom and free enterprise. Many years ago, they developed strong State Democratic Parties and they have supported their State parties loyally and faithfully down through the years. From the ranks of the Democratic Party has come outstanding leadership at the local and State levels, as well as outstanding representatives in Congress, in the U.S. Senate and in the the National Government. Virginia and North Carolina have adhered to the principles of good government and responsible leadership laid down by Jefferson, the Virginian, and Jackson, the North Carolinian.

Free enterprise is a case in point. North Carolinians, like Virginians, have always believed in the principles of our free enterprise system. Call it what you will—free enterprise, capitalism, or, simply business—this system is the greatest of all the manmade miracles. It has fed more people, clothed more people, educated more people, given more happiness to more people than any other political or economic order in the history of man—and its potential scarcely has been tapped.

Let's take three routine, but dramatic, examples of free enterprise:

In 1918, kerosene was widely used for lighting in many rural homes. Today kerosene is used mostly as fuel for jet engines that move giant transports through the skies at nearly the speed of sound.

In 1918, there were only 6 million cars in the United States, and these vehicles chugged along at slow speeds over indifferent roads. We now produce automobiles at the rate of 9 million a year and there are 72 million traveling our modern highways and streets at this time.

In 1918, the first commercial radio broadcasting station had not yet gone on the air, and great news events of the day were heralded by the appearance of newsboys crying their "extras" up and down the streets. Today, with radio, television, and communication satellites, we get "instant news" along with our instant coffee.

In 1918, only 6 percent of our college-age young people were enrolled in institutions of higher learning as compared with approximately 43 percent today.

In the face of these hard facts, one would expect that we Americans would have widespread public appreciation of the free enterprise system and understanding of what it takes to keep it moving ahead. Unfortunately, this is ont true. Too much is taken for granted, and the voices of support are seldom raised. Someone has called the record of America's free enterprise system "the greatest story never told."

Yes, I champion the cause of free enterprise. I know from first-hand experience what it has accomplished for our States and for our Nation. We must use our resources, our talents, and our abilities to inform all our people, especially our youngsters, on the values of the fundamental economic principles on which this country was founded and has grown.

The Democratic Party, a champion of our free enterprise system, has played the dominant role in the development of our two States and our Nation. Our people have turned again and again to our party for the leadership that they must have. The American people have turned to our party to give leadership for the free world and to maintain and promote the sound growth of our domestic economy. Democrats have met every challenge on both the State and National levels. Here in Virginia you met the challenge of these difficult times when you elected Mills Godwin as your Governor.

The Democratic Party remains the most effective organization by which the citizens of a free society can maintain and control the directions of their government on every level. Strong and active leadership from the precinct up is essential, however, if our party is to retain the confidence and active support of our people.

This is true in North Carolina; it is true in Virginia. As Governor Godwin said so eloquently in his inaugural address: "Virginia is of the South. She will always be, and she will guard and cherish the high principle, the warmth, the humanity that have marked our region." This, too, is true of North Carolina. But, we—Virginia, North Carolina and the other States of the South—are, as your Governor said, "of the Nation."

Time does bring many changes. An exploding population, a most productive and expanding economy, the conflict in Vietnam, the explorations into space and to the bottom of the sea are clear indicators of the scope and complexity of problems and opportunities which press upon our Nation from all sides. Events at the local, State, national and international levels move with such bewildering speed that those of us in public office are hard pressed merely to keep informed of these developments.

While we cherish, and seek to protect and maintain the great principles of Jefferson and Jackson, we must apply these principles under the pressure of daily crises and the need to make decisions which cannot wait until the morrow. Yes, Virginia and North Carolina are "of the Nation." Like all the American States, we must continually face new realities and new challenges.

The importance of local, State and national governments is increasing every year— every day and every hour, in some cases. Government today is larger, more difficult to manage than either Jefferson or Jackson ever envisioned. Still these founders of our great party warned of big government, and the dangers it can present. Their wisdom in these areas is as sound today as it was during their lifetimes.

Jefferson said: "The people, to whom all authority belongs, have divided the powers of government into two distinct departments, the leading characters of which are foreign and domestic; and they have appointed for each a distinct set of functionaries."

Jefferson continued, "These they have made coordinate, checking and balancing each other, like the three cardinal departments in the individual States: each equally supreme as to powers delegated to itself; and neither authorized ultimately to decide what belongs to itself, or its copartner in government."

Jackson, in one of his inaugural addresses, said: "In such measures as I may be called on to pursue in regard to the rights of the separate States, I hope to be animated by a proper respect for those sovereign members of our Union, taking care not to confound the powers they have reserved to themselves with those they have granted to the [Union]."

Federal-State relationships have changed drastically in recent years, as the Federal Government has moved more and more into areas we formerly considered reserved to the States. Regardless whether we approve or disapprove of the many Federal aid programs, the trend is well established and new Federal-State relationships are now a matter of fact. We cannot turn back the clock or reverse the tide in the basic areas of governmental service. Federal funds collected from the States are now being used in a variety and profusion of programs touching almost every aspect of our life and economy. These Federal funds are increasingly important to the States and to the people.

Many people today feel that our Federal Government is becoming too powerful, and that it is usurping State authority. I understand this concern because we all realize the dangers involvd in putting too much power in one central government. However, I do not believe that the important role of the States is diminishing, or that the effectiveness of State government is at a minimum. We all recognize that the best government is that which is closest to the people it serves. Our own history, I believe, has clearly proven this point.

There are encouraging signs of change in the trend and philosophy of the Federal Government toward the States. The Democratic administration has shown in recent sessions of Congress that it realizes the importance of State governments and their abilities and opportunities to serve their citizens. A case in point is the Appalachia program in which Virginia, North Carolina, and other States are working as partners with the Federal Government for the betterment of the people in this great region.

In the Appalachia program, the Federal Government has accepted State governments as full partners in the planning, as well as the operation, of this program in natural resources. Under the unique Appalachian Regional Commission, representatives of the States and the Federal Government work together as equals to stimulate local initiative, to resolve the complex problems of the Appalachian region, and to cooperate as equals in mutually agreeable solutions. This is an encouraging sign and the Democratic Party is responsible for it.

To serve the needs of all our people, the States must be equal partners with the Federal Government. Too frequently in the past, the States have been the junior—or silent—partner in Federal-State programs. The opposite approach is exemplified by the passage by Congress of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. This act provides for the planning of economic development programs in which the Federal and State governments will work together as full partners.

This type of partnership offers, perhaps, the last chance for State governments to maintain initiative in their own affairs. If we fail, then the trend toward Washington can do little else but continue. Yes, here will be complaints about Government so far away from home, about solutions offered by people who do not know or understand local problems. But, unless we Democrats here in Virginia, and in North Carolina, and elsewhere do something constructive about it, the trend toward Washington will continue.

In my opinion, our Democratic Party can offer the leadership, the principles and the vision necessary to maintain equal partnership between the Federal and State governments. Representing a broad base of citizens, our party must meet its responsibility in stimulating free enterprise, individual initiative, and the programs, whether Federal or State, in creating higher per capita income and a better life for all our people.

I am confident that the Democratic Party, as envisioned by Jefferson and as led by Jackson, is vibrant and strong. Never let us forget that the bedrock of our party, indeed of our Nation itself, is the individual citizen whose loyalty, patriotism, hard work, and ideals we must never betray.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt expressed it clearly when he said: "The Almighty God has blessed our land in many ways. He has given our people stout hearts and strong arms with which to strike mighty blows for freedom and truth. He has given to our country a faith which has become the hope of all peoples in an anguished world."

Thomas Jefferson never quailed before the doubters, the cynics and weaklings. In his first inaugural address on March 4, 1801, he asserted: "I believe this * * * the strongest government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he then, be trusted with the governments of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."

Fellow Americans, history has answered this question—and in the affirmative. Our great Nation still stands, stronger and more resolute than ever, 165 years after these challenging words were spoken by Thomas Jefferson. I have every confidence, as do you, that America will remain forever the land of the brave and the free—always ready to champion the cause of free peoples in the fight against tyranny, injustice, and fear. With your help, and with the help of all Americans, we shall preserve, protect, and strengthen, the United States of America for our children and generations yet unborn.

Inauguration of Sea Trade Between Boston and Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, there is currently being conducted in Puerto Rico ceremonies celebrating the establishment of maritime service between the ports of Boston, Mass., and San Juan, P.R. A trade mission is visiting Puerto Rico to mark the establishment of this trade by Sea-Land Services, to enable Boston businessmen to become acquainted with the economics of Puerto Rico and to examine its industrial growth, tonnages handled, and to meet with government and business officials in San Juan and other cities of the Commonwealth.

Puerto Rico enjoys a tremendous trade with continental United States and purchases annually more than $1.25 billion of goods from the United States, more than $1 billion of which is shipped to Puerto Rico from east coast and gulf coast ports.

The port of Boston now will share in this trade and will serve shipments to and from Puerto Rico for New England.

Most of this two-way trade between the Boston and San Juan ports will consist of leather goods, jewelry, food, and electronic equipment. Other mainland ports serving Puerto Rico are: New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Charleston, Jacksonville, Tampa, Pensacola, Lake Charles, Mobile, New Orleans, Galveston, and Houston—not to mention ports on the west coast of the United States.

It is expected that the Boston port will initially handle more than $1 million worth of goods for the Puerto Rican trade and that this amount will increase rapidly.

Taras Shevchenko Statue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a result of historic events of 1963–64, pertaining to the unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko statue in our Nation's Capital, we are all aware of the importance and significance of this poet laureate, not only for the freedom of Ukraine but also of all other captive nations in Eastern Europe. House Document No. 445, entitled "Europe's Freedom Fighter," further explains the enduring power of this historic figure for the genuine independence of all nations in Eastern Europe.

In numerous communities throughout our country, the month of March is observed as Shevchenko Month—the anniversaries of both his birth and death. Shevchenko was born in 1814 and died in 1861.

I deem this to be an appropriate time to underscore again my proposal (H.J. Res. 226), providing for the issuance of a Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp. Although our energies, thoughts, and prayers today are concentrated on Vietnam, we must not forget the captivity of numerous nations in Eastern Europe, the largest of them being Shevchenko's Ukraine. I shall again urge the Postmaster General to consider this resolution favorably, and also continue to seek the support of all Members of this important undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the 1964 statement by President Johnson in regard to Shevchenko in the Record, as justification enough for the issuance of this stamp. Also, I insert the full text of my resolution:

Statement by the President

It is most fitting that those who love and admire Taras Shevchenko should meet to seal and place in the crypt of his statue certain documents which will be of interest to American citizens in years to come.

The love for the Ukrainian poet laureate is fully understandable and pride in his accomplishments wholly justifiable.

It is most appropriate that here in the Capital City of this great and free Republic a statue of Shevchenko should have been erected to serve as a reminder to all the living, and those who follow us, of his greatness.

Shevchenko well deserves the honors paid him. He was more than a Ukrainian—he was a statesman and citizen of the world. He was more than a poet—he was a valiant crusader for the rights and freedom of men. He used verse to carry on a determined fight for freedom. His poetry was of and for the people. It gave hope to those in despair and stirred to action those who might otherwise have been resigned to enslavement.

So widespread was his audience and so great his influence that his words were read and loved far beyond the frontiers of his own land. So valued were the copies of his poems that families struggled to own two books—the Bible and Shevchenko.

As a member of the U.S. Senate back in 1960, I sent a message to your organization saying, "I would like to congratulate you for reasserting the spirit of freedom and liberty held by Ukrainians everywhere. I am convinced that the Democratic Party best serves the cause of Ukrainians everywhere in the world."

This is also my message to you in 1964. As President of the United States I renew my congratulations for your accomplishments and assure you that this Nation and this Government earnestly desire the return of freedom to all peoples from whom it is even now denied. And Shevchenko's poetry will serve as a constant reminder of this most important task.

H.J. Res. 226

Whereas in his 1964 Captive Nations Week proclamation the President declared: "It is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations" and urged all Americans "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty"; and

Whereas since 1959 both President Dwight D. Eisenhower and President John F. Kennedy expressed similar thoughts and sentiments in their successive annual proclamations; and

Whereas the Eighty-sixth Congress of the United States honored Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet laureate, by authorizing the erection of a monument to him on public grounds in Washington, District of Columbia; and

Whereas the same Congress provided for a documentary biography of Shevchenko in tribute to the everlasting spirit and works of this freedom fighter of Europe; and

Whereas the unremitting condemnations and attacks by imperialist Moscow and its colonial puppets against these farseeing acts clearly prove the wisdom of the United States Government in properly claiming this contemporary of Lincoln as one of freedom's outstanding lights; and

Whereas in 1961 the President of the United States paid respects to the ideals and immortal teachings of this former serf, whose poetry, art, and philosophy have deeply inspired the forty-five million Ukrainian nation in its aspirations to freedom and independence; and

Whereas the profound humanism of this champion of liberty was courageously directed against the colonial subjugation of all the non-Russian nations in eastern Europe and central Asia, as well as against the suppression of the Jews and the slavery of Negroes; and

Whereas in consonance with the policy of the United States it is both proper and fitting to advance the aspirations for freedom and independence of all nations by honoring their historic advocates of human liberty, and thus forging indissoluble spiritual ties with the respective peoples; and

Whereas by all evidence a freedom stamp series can become an important and essential vehicle of expression in the formation and strengthening of such ties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is requested and authorized to create and initiate a captive nations freedom series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom. The first of this series shall be designated as the Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp, symbolizing the determined struggle of his Ukraine, the largest captive non-Russian nation in eastern Europe, for national freedom and independence. Within the selected format of the series, such stamps shall be of such denomination and design and shall be issued for such period commencing in 1965 as the Postmaster General shall determine.

Attainable Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, given the priorities which face him, President Johnson has settled on what seem modest but attainable goals in attacking water pollution, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin comments editorially.

The modest but attainable goals are ones that will produce the maximum in visible results—the paper believes.

It points out:

The key proposal is a Federal contribution of about one-third of total cost in a demonstration rivers program aimed at purging individual basins from source to mouth.

Certain demanding criteria must be met by the States and communities in the basin area to qualify for grants. The ultimate result, if all goes well, will be a sparkling waterway which will make residents of river basins elsewhere insist on the same.

This legislation is of much significance to this country. The editorial which discusses it is forthright and lucid and I suggest that it be included in the Record.

Modest Water Program

President Johnson's frustration, almost as much as his goals, is revealed in his message to Congress on attacking water pollution.

He would like, he says, "to cleanse our rivers of the blight that burdens them"—strain them pure and sweet all at once, Paul Bunyan style. But then there is the war in Vietnam and so many, many other things that must be paid for, and so * * *.

And so, he has come up with a proposal that is probably the best available under the circumstances but that in fiscal 1967 would call for an expenditure of $50 million toward solving a problem which Federal authorities estimate will run to $20 or $30 billion from all sources.

Given the priorities which face him, Mr. Johnson has settled on what seem modest but attainable goals—ones that will produce the maximum in visible results.

The key proposal is a Federal contribution of about one-third of total cost in a demonstration rivers program aimed at purging individual basins from source to mouth. Certain demanding criteria must be met by the States and communities in the basin area to qualify for the grants. The ultimate result, if all goes well, will be a sparkling waterway which wil make residents of river basins elsewhere insist on the same.

Mr. Johnson also asks for authority to bring suit to halt pollution that is an immediate danger to public health, an answer to a need that has been met only spottily at the State level.

The great effort in purfying the streams lies ahead, beyond reach at the moment. But the President's proposal makes an acceptable approach to it.

The Golden Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great American stories is the one about the millions of immigrants who have come to this land since that company of adventurers landed at Jamestown, Va., to settle in a new land.

While those cavaliers founded the first permanent English colony in America they were not the first immigrants and the 42 million who followed will doubtless not be the last.

On October 3, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law a new immigration bill which removes many of the discriminatory and distasteful elements which had given to bigotry, the stature of law during the early part of this century. This was the latest act in the long history of American immigration, the reopening of the golden door on a virtually nondiscriminatory basis.

There are Members of this Congress, including myself, who were the children of immigrants in the very specific sense that one or the other of our parents came here from some foreign land but as Franklin Roosevelt pointed out to the Daughters of the American Revolution in 1938 we are all of us the children of immigrants.

With this in mind, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the February 20, 1966, edition of This Week magazine:

The Golden Door

(By Thomas J. Fleming)

In 1748, 16-year-old George Washington made his first trip over the Blue Ridge Mountains to work as a surveyor along the western frontier. One day he noted in his journal meeting an Indian war party, with two scalps—and later a group of immigrants who impressed the future Father of his Country as "ignorante * * * they would never speak English but, when spoken to, they speak all Dutch."

There is a beautiful simplicity to this encounter. It sums up, in an offhand sentence, the whole story of the immigrants in America.

The young man who made the observation was the great-grandson of immigrants who had been driven to Virginia by poverty and religious persecution about 90 years before. The imigrants who spokes only "Dutch" were Germans, seeking refuge on the frontier for almost identical reasons.

So it has gone, from generation to generation. Each new wave of imigrants have come to America poor and unschooled and prospered until they came to regard the next wave as "ignorante." (Later generations added such unlovely names as mick, wop, yid, polack, spik.) John F. Kennedy, a great grandson of an immigrant from Ireland, wanted to stop, once and for all, this futile pattern. When he died he was working on a book which he called "A Nation of Immigrants." There are grounds for believing he got the idea from his father, Joseph P. Kennedy, who once remarked, "I was born in the United States and so was my father. Yet my children are still called Irish. What the hell do we have to do to become Americans?"

WE ARE ALL CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS AND REBELS

It is the plain truth. All of us, from *Mayflower* descendants to the toddlers born to Cuban refugees from Castro's communism, are children of immigrants. President Franklin D. Roosevelt threw the Daughters of the American Revolution into a furor when he reminded them of it in a 1938 speech. "Remember," he said, "always, that all of us, and you and I especially, are descended from immigrants and revolutionists." But the whole truth is much larger than this plain truth. The story of American immigration is more than the search for a full dinner pail. It is one of the sagas in the history of the human race. Since 1607, when the first English settlers landed at Jamestown, Va., a staggering 42 million people have migrated to the United States—the largest mass movement in recorded history.

FIRST WEDDING, A MAID AND A LABORER IN VIRGINIA

Who were they—and why did they come? One thing is certain. From the beginning, almost to a man and woman, they were not aristocrats. Although there were a number of gentlemen among the first settlers in Virginia, they were of the poorer sort. As one of Virginia's earliest historians, Robert Beverely, remarked in 1705, "'Tis not likely that any man of a plentiful estate should voluntarily abandon a happy certainty to roam after imaginary advantages in a New World * * * the chief design of all parties concerned was to fetch away * * * treasure." Virginia's first marriage (1608) was between Ann Burras, a lady's maid, and John Laydon, a laborer. Stephen Vincent Benet describes the scene with fine irony in his narrative, "Western Star":

"And the first white wedding held on Virginia ground will marry no courtly dame to a cavalier but Ann Burras, lady's maid, to John Laydon, a laborer.

"After some 6 weeks' courtship—a fall wedding when the leaves were turning and the wild air sweet, and we know no more than that but it sticks in the mind, for they were serving maid and laboring man.

"And yet, while they lived, (and they had not longe to live), they were half of the first families in Virginia."

In New England, the story was much the same. There was not an iota of blue blood aboard the old freighter *Mayflower*. Nor is this the only myth that needs exploding.

Because America is an English speaking country, most of us have the impression that English immigrants alone cleared the forest primeval, fought the Revolution, secured independence—and then the others—Irish, Germans, Jews—began to arrive. Actually, most of America was well on its way to becoming a "nation of nations" by the time the embattled farmers fired the first shot at Lexington.

As early as September 25, 1608, six sturdy laborers strode ashore at Jamestown and within 3 weeks had a roaring fire going under a glass furnace, the first factory in America. Their names were Michal Lowicki, Zbigniew Stefanski, Jur Mata, Jan Bogdan, Karol Zrenica and Stanislaw Sadowski.

In 1619, when Virginia convened America's first representative assembly, the Governor declared that only natives of England would be allowed to vote. The Poles immediately went on strike, and won an almost instant victory. The court book of the Virginia Company records: "Upon some dispute of the Polonians * * * it was now agreed that they shall be enfranchised and made as free as any inhabitant."

Over 6,000 Dutch settled in New York and the Hudson River Valley and invited people from every country in the world to join them. Twenty-three Jews, refugees from Portuguese persecution in Brazil, arrived in 1654. French protestants driven out of France followed, as did Italians from the Piedmont.

One of these young Jewish immigrants, Asser Levy, won the first clear-cut victory for religious freedom in the New World. When he applied for citizenship in Nieuw Amsterdam, the Governor, gruff Peter Stuyvesant, turned him down. For 3 years, Levy proceeded to perform all the duties of a citizen. He regularly mounted guard along with the Dutch. He paid his taxes. Finally he reapplied, and by this time the Dutch burgers backed him so firmly that Stuyvesant was forced to grant him citizenship—though he warned that this would mean men of all religions would now be able to demand the same rights. Which is exactly what happened. When the English took possession of the colony in 1664, they found citizens of 18 different nationalities, and almost as many religions.

Sweden and Finland, meanwhile, had sent 500 sturdy planters to Delaware, where they introduced that symbol of American pioneering, the log cabin. Refugees from religious wars in the Rhineland poured into Pennsylvania in such numbers that in 1766 Benjamin Franklin estimated that the colony was one-third German. Ten years later a census revealed they were between 110,000 and 150,000 strong. Irish, particularly the Protestants from the northern counties, streamed into American ports from Boston to Charleston at the rate of 2,000 a year from 1700, with the numbers soaring to 10,000 a year in the 1770's. Famed for their fighting prowess, they were sought by every colony to serve as buffers along the restless frontier. Thus, they founded Worcester, Mass., Londonderry, N.H., and some 500 other towns on the edge of the wilderness. Thousands of doughty Scottish highlanders and lowlanders were welcomed for similar reasons, and moved into the back country of North and South Carolina.

"FOREIGN" CONTRIBUTIONS TO INDEPENDENCE

The colonists keenly appreciated the contributions of these non-English immigrants. British attempts to prevent their influx was one of the major grievances cited in the Declaration of Independence. "He [King George III] has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that reason obstructing the laws of naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands."

In the struggle for independence, these foreigners played a vital role. Thomas Jefferson took the phrase, "All men are created equal" from the writings of Philip Mazzel, a brilliant Italian who lived for a number of years in Virginia. Charles Thomson, Secretary of the Continental Congress from 1774–89, the man who preserved the most precious moments of American history and who was called "the life of the cause of liberty" in Philadelphia, was born in County Derry, Ireland. Of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, 18 were of non-English stock and 8 were first-generation immigrants. Paul Revere, the man who sounded the historic alarm, was of French descent.

At times more than a third of the American Army was Irish. The Pennsylvania Continentals, 1 of Washington's toughest brigades, was often called "the line of Ireland." John Sullivan, son of a Limerick school teacher, was a major general; his brother, James, became Governor of Massachusetts. Commodore John Barry, the "father of the American Navy" was born in Tacumshane, Ireland. In the first months of the war, when the New England troops tried to celebrate Guy Fawkes day, a notoriously anti-Catholic celebration, Washington sternly rebuked them for planning such an insult to the Irish soldiers who fought beside them.

At Valley Forge, the New Englanders raised Irish tempers by parading a "stuffed Paddy"—a very uncomplimentary image of St. Patrick—around the camp. The Irish seized their guns and for a moment it looked like civil war. But Washington quickly appeared and asked the Irish to point out their tormentors and he would have them punished. This the Irish declined to do, so Washington said: "Well I, too, am a lover of St. Patrick's Day and, must settle the affair by making all the Army keep the day." Whereupon he ordered an extra ration of rum for every man in camp, and in the words of an aide, "All made merry and were good friends."

Thousands of Germans also volunteered. One of their leaders was the fiery Peter Muehlenberg, pastor of a Lutheran Church in Virginia. In January 1776, he ascended the pulpit and preached a blazing sermon in which he declared: "There is a time for preaching and praying, but also a time for battle, and that time has now arrived." He then flung aside his ministerial robes to reveal the uniform of a Continental Colonel. Three hundred men enlisted at the church door. By 1777, Muehlenberg was a brigadier general, and as he led his men into the battle of Brandywine, the Hessian troops on the British side recognized him and cried out: "Hier Kommit Teufel Pete"—(here comes "Devil Pete")—a nickname he earned in his student days in Germany.

Another German hero was Nicholas Herkimer of upstate New York. When the war began he organized four battalions, all with German colonels and largely Germans in the ranks. In 1777, when the British master plan for ending the Revolution called for three armies to drive down New York State to cut the colonies in two, Herkimer was the first to meet the challenge. In a fierce guerrilla encounter at Oriskany, he fought his way out of an ambush and though mortally wounded, directed an all-day battle that eventually drove the British and their Indian allies with heavy losses. It was a crucial victory, leading directly to the British surrender at Saratoga, the turning point of the war. Washington paid him tribute commenting, "It was Herkimer who first reversed the gloomy scene * * * he served from love of country, not for reward."

"OUR LITTLE FRIEND ON FRONT STREET"

The chief financier of the Revolution was Robert Morris. Less well known but at least as devoted to the cause was his friend, Haym Salomon, a Polish Jew who spent 2 years spying for the Americans in British-held New York, and then moved to Philadelphia, where he consumed his personal fortune advancing cash to Congressmen, Army officers, and the bankrupt American Government. James Madison wrote home: "The kindness of our little friend on Front Street near the coffeehouse, is a fund that will preserve me from extremities, but I never resort to it without mortification, as he obstinately rejects all recompense."

Other Jews fought in the Revolutionary ranks. One of the bravest was Francis Salvador, who was born into a wealthy London family and became a pioneer in South Carolina's back country. Early one morning in July 1776, a bleeding fugitive staggered into Salvador's house to gasp out the news of a British-led Indian invasion. Salvador flung himself on his horse for a wild, Revere-like, 28-mile ride to rally the militia. Then he joined in the fierce fighting that followed, and fell mortally wounded. On his tomb his neighbors engraved the words:

> "Born an aristicrat, he became a democrat,
> An Englishman, he cast his lot with America;
> True to his ancient faith, he gave his life
> For new hopes of human liberty and understanding."

Another fighting frontiersman was the Italian, Giuseppe Maria Francesco Vigo, who played a crucial role in the 1779 capture of Fort Vincennes, key to what was then the Northwest. Not only did he guide the American expedition across 240 miles of unmapped winter wilderness, but he put up most of the money for the food, equipment, and ammunition. One historian of the victory (which eventually brought the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and part of Minnesota into the Union) declared: "The whole credit of this conquest belongs to two men, Gen. George Rogers Clark and Col. Francis Vigo."

By the time the Revolutionary War was over, keen observers such as Michele Guillaume St. Jean de Crevecoeur, a Frenchman who lived on a farm in Orange County, N.Y., from 1769 to 1780, were already noting that "Here, individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men * * *." To prove it Crèvecoeur cited a family in his vicinity whose four sons were married to women of four different nationalities.

The leaders of the Revolution were determined to keep this tradition alive. In December 1783, Washington wrote a reply to an address from a group of recent Irish immigrants: "The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions." A few years later, Thomas Jefferson asked, "Shall we refuse to the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe?"

For about 35 years after the Revolution, however, there was a lag in immigration to America. The long series of wars between England and France was the primary reason. But Europe was aboil not only with war. Between 1750 and 1850, the population of the continent doubled. A sharp decline in the "death rate" explained it. But no one could explain how to cope with this stupendous increase in people. Farms could be subdivided no smaller; the beginnings of industry in the cities simply could not absorb the restless millions flocking from the countryside. Inevitably, the adventurous poor looked to the New World as the answer to their rising discontent. The era of "mass immigration" began.

THE NUMBER OF IRISH ROSE WITH EACH DECADE

The Irish came first, prodded by crop failures, to escape the heavy hand of the British Government's "penal laws" which refused Catholics the right to own land. They came on timber ships from Canada, three-masted tubs. Ships that carried coolies from Madras to the West Indies were pressed into the trade. (Some even came on a *Mayflower*—from Ballyshannon.) From first to last they ran a gauntlet of fellow-Irish "mancatchers" who specialized in swindling them. But still they came, mounting with each decade: 50,724 in the years 1821–30; 207,381 from 1831–40.

Then came that fateful day in 1844 when early risers in Ireland noted a "peculiar smell" in the country air. Blight had struck the potato crop—the food of the poor. The great famine had begun. For 5 successive years the potatoes rotted in their beds, and over 1,500,000 Irish died of starvation or the diseases of malnutrition.

A TIDAL WAVE OF DESPERATE HUMANITY

A million others fled, and a tidal wave of desperate humanity burst on the shores of a startled America. By 1850, the Irish formed 44 percent of the foreign-born population of the United States. They were poor, desperately, unbelievably poor. The stench of some of them, as they emerged from 6 to 8 weeks in the foul steerages of the immigrant ships, caused proper Bostonians to vomit.

In New York and other cities they crowded into America's first slums—"the oldest, most rickety wooden buildings, open to the wind and the storm and far less comfortable than the buildings used as barns or cattle stalls by the great body of farmers throughout the country." There were no toilets or sewers; even water had to be carted from outdoor pumps. Boston was worse—Lemuel Shattuch, a census statistician, estimated that the average life span of an Irish immigrant there was 14 years.

Thus the Irish bore the first bitter brunt of the mass immigration era. Inevitably, the grinding poverty of slum life broke the hearts and health of thousands. From 1849 to 1859, 85 percent of the foreign born admitted to Bellevue Hospital were Irish, Gangs of Irish hoodlums, such as the Kerryonians and the Dead Rabbits, terrorized the Five Points and Bowery sections of New York. But most crimes were the minor vices of the poor. A typical newspaper report of the day read:

"ARRESTS

"John McGorty and Michael Dowd were arrested for stealing a keg of white lead; John McKeeney on suspicion of having stolen $34; Jane Mullen for stealing a washtub; Mary Donahan stole 34½ yards of calico from the premises of Mr. Taylor, 31 Catherine Street."

THEY STARTED AS MAIDS AND DAY LABORERS

Thousands upon thousands of other Irish fought the evil undertow of slum life. They worked, men and women both, almost all as laborers and servants in the beginning. With no skills beyond native wit and strength, they built America's canals and railroads, laid its sewers, toiled as serving maids. A laborer's pay, when he got it, was seldom more than $1.25 a day, often less, and out of this pittance he had to buy his food and clothing at stores run by the contractors who hired him. He worked from sunrise until, as one laborer put it, "our sweat mixes with the nightly dew." Again and again, contractors (most of them fellow Irish) would abscond with the month's wages, which led to so-called Irish riots. At various times the militia of Baltimore, Chicago, and New York State were called to stop enraged Irishmen from tearing up their own work.

Out of their pitifully small wages, the Irish saved incredible amounts of money which they sent home to bring friends and families to America. Nicholas Waterhouse, at a meeting of English social scientists in 1858, declared: "If we look back through the pages of American history from the present to the day when the *Mayflower* first sighted that wild New England shore, we shall find no more magnificent spectacle than this—the work not of the great, the rich, or the mighty, but of those who were poor, and needy, and destitute of all things save true hearts and strong hands."

Unfortunately, people tend to see the worst in strangers—and the Irish with their brogues and quick tempers, their ragged clothes and Catholicism were very strange to Americans. Thus the Irish became the first immigrants to feel the cruel lash of prejudice. In newspapers throughout the Nation appeared advertisements such as the following: "Woman wanted to do general housework * * * English, Scotch, Welsh, German, or any country or color except Irish." Although the Irish had been fighting English tyranny before it ever occurred to Americans, they were accused of being hostile to democracy. Even liberal Ralph Waldo Emerson suspected "the wild Irish element * * * led by Romanish priests who sympathize, of course, with despotism."

Out of this native American hostility grew a political movement, the American Party, nicknamed the "Know-Nothings" because each member took a solemn oath to answer "I know nothing" to any inquiry from an outsider. Feeding on ignorance and anti-Catholicism, they ran candidates for public office, pledged to rid the country of foreign influence. In 1855 they elected 6 State Governors and 75 Congressmen and in 1856 won 25 percent of the presidential vote. Know-Nothing agitators took to street corner pulpits to denounce the Irish. "The Negro is black outside," they would shout, "the Irishman is black inside."

ANTI-IRISH MOBS ATTACKED THE CHURCHES

Inflamed by such gutter attacks, ugly anti-Irish riots exploded in Philadelphia and New York. Mobs attacked Catholic churches in Clinton and Southbridge, Mass., burned a church in Raritan, and shot an Irishman to death in Newark, N.J. In Ellsworth, Maine, a priest was tarred and feathered and left unconscious. Sisters of Charity were assaulted in Providence, R.I. A Know-Nothing mayor arrested the Irish Catholic Bishop of Pittsburgh on a trivial charge.

It is frightening to think of what the Know-Nothings might have done to the Irish and their fellow immigrants. But the movement collapsed because it could not agree on the great issue of the era—slavery. When the Nation went to war to decide whether it would remain half slave and half free, the vast majority of Irish saw it as their big opportunity to prove their questioned loyalty to the republic.

Over 144,000 strong, they marched to Civil War battlefields, and soon became the favorite fighting men of more than one general. On July 4, 1862, the Union commander in chief, George McClellan, publicly thanked the Irish Brigade "for superb conduct in the field" and declared he wished he had "20,000 more of them." No fewer than 38 regiments in the Union army had the word "Irish" in their names. New York's "Fighting 69th" led the Union charge at Fredericksburg and lost 128 out of 238 men. "Are the green flags ready?" Boston-born Maj. Gen. Edwin V. Summer would ask as the Union battleline poised for attack.

The Irish were by no means the only immigrants who volunteered by the thousands for the Civil War. A startling half-million foreign-born soldiers fought in the northern ranks—1 in every 5 of the boys in blue. Even larger than the Irish contingent was the German contribution—no less than 176,817. Three German-born volunteers, Franz Sigel, Carl Schurz, and Peter Osterhaus, became major generals, nine others were brigadiers. German citizens of St. Louis saved that city—and the State of Missouri—for the Union, when southern sympathizers tried to seize it just after war was declared.

ONE IN SIX OF US COME FROM GERMAN FOREBEARS

With the end of the war, it was the Germans who now formed another cresting immigrant wave. Germans had come to the country in a steady stream since 1830. But their numbers did not approach the enormous influx of the post-Civil War decades. From 1861–70, it was 787,468; in the next two decades, 2,144,438 flocked to das Land der unbegrenzten Moglichkeiten—the land of unlimited possibilities—putting the Germans far ahead of all other non-English nationalities. Today, experts estimate one in six Americans can trace all or part of his ancestry to them.

Because they usually came in solid family groups, and often had substantial financial resources, the Germans escaped some of the suffering and prejudice the Irish endured. But they had another problem: the language barrier. Within their own communities the Germans were forced to thrash out one of the fundamental choices made by millions of immigrants who came after them: whether to accept the American culture—or to try to preserve their own traditions. Some of the most enthusiastic Germans even dreamed of setting up a "new Germany" where German language and culture would be perpetuated. Proof of the idea's appeal can be glimpsed in the several hundred German newspapers flourishing in 1884.

IRISH AND GERMANS AT LOGGERHEADS

Part of this crucial battle was fought within the Catholic Church. When the mass of Germans had arrived, Irish clergy controlled the machinery of the church. They resisted German inclinations to have parochial schools in their own language, and in general followed a policy of urging immigrants of all nationalties to learn English as soon as possible. A dispute developed, which came to a climax in a petition to the Pope, the so-called "Lucerne memorial" written by German philanthropist Peter Paul Cahensly.

Cahensly urged the Vatican to guarantee a kind of proportional representation of bishops based on ethnic ratios—which would have enabled the Germans to outvote the Irish. Cahensly also wanted parishes to be organized along national lines, each using its own language. Thanks to fierce lobbying by Irish-American churchmen, Rome rejected the proposal. Some ethnic parishes were established for first generation immigrants, but they were clearly designed to be "bridge experiences"—and English remained the official language of the parochial schools. This decision was one of the major turning points in the American immigrant experience.

But there were other reasons for the German inability to remain an isolated offshoot of Das Vaterland in America. For one thing, the other nationalities who poured into the German strongholds of the Midwest had no such inclination. First to come were the Swedes in their own mounting wave—100,000 in the 1870's, 300,000 in the 1880's. Some Swedish villages lost half their inhabitants in a single year. By the mid-1960's 1,257,492 had made the long voyage. On their heels came the Norwegians, 846,012 by mid-1960—and 355,301 Danes and 28,853 Finns. Dutch came too, the first since the 1960's—some 340,761 in all, settling the rich farmlands of Michigan, Iowa, and Illinois.

IN THE MID-19TH CENTURY—THE ENGLISH AGAIN

Last, by no means least, were the English, who began abandoning the mother country in unprecedented numbers during the 1850's, when 394,237 came over, and cresting in the 1880's when the figures swelled to 810,900. We tend to forget these English, but no less than 2,978,901 have arrived since 1820, and they have made tremendous contributions to America. It was an English immigrant named Samuel Slater who carried in his head the know-how to construct the intricate machinery which became the first American cotton spinning mill at Pawtucket, R.I. Over 45,508 English-born soldiers served in the Union Army, making them the third largest foreign group in the fight against slavery. English and Welsh technicians made vital contributions to creating the American steel industry.

The best and brightest among the immigrants plunged wholeheartedly into the American experience. London-born Samuel Gompers became founder and for decades leader of the American Federation of Labor. German-born Carl Schurz was one of the founders of the Republican Party, a confidante of Lincoln, Senator from Missouri, champion of Negro and Indian rights. Another famous German politician was Illinois' John Peter Altgeld, who in 1893 became the first foreign-born Governor of an American State. The Irish talent for politics enabled them to construct remarkable, if not always admirable, political machines in New, York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago.

In business industry German influence was enormous. John A. Roebling, graduate of the Royal Polytechnicum of Berlin, invented wire rope and built the Brooklyn Bridge. Otto Mergenthaler—from Würtemburg—revolutionized printing with the invention of the Linotype. George Westinghouse invented the airbrake, and made countless contributions to the field of electricity. Even greater was General Electric's genius, Charles P. Steinmetz. The Rockefellers, in oil, the Schwabs and Fricks in steel, the Studebakers and Chryslers in automobiles—all came from German immigrant families.

Many of the great Jewish fortunes were founded by German-born immigrants of this era. Lazarus Straus, founder of R. H. Macy, began as a peddler, trudging from door to door with a pack on his back. Benjamin Bloomingdale, the Seligmans, Samuel Rosenwald, the Guggenheims, began the same way. Scores of communities, like Falk, Idaho, derived their names from Jewish peddlers who tired of life on the hoof, opened a little store at a promising crossroads and grew up with the town. Many times they repeated the experience of Joseph Jonas, the first Jew to arrive in Ohio. A Quaker woman prowled curiously around him several times, while a crowd stared from a distance. Finally, the Quakeress spoke. "Thou art no different from other people. Would thee care to sup with us?"

SCANDINAVIANS RAPIDLY BECAME CITIZENS

Few immigrants exceeded the Swedes in their enthusiasm for America. For them it was framtidslandet—the land of the future. With ax and saw—often called "the Swedish fiddle"—they cleared an estimated 15 million acres of American soil. Watching a gang of Swedish track layers pushing his Great Northern Railroad westward, Robber Baron James Hill exulted: "Just give me Swedes, snuff, and whisky and I'll build a railroad through hell." No other immigrant group learned English as rapidly, or applied as eagerly for naturalization papers except perhaps their fellow Scandinavians from Norway and Denmark.

Scandinavians have made notable contributions to American science. The Stromberg carburetor in your car was invented by John Gullborg, its starter by Vincent Bendix, the disk clutch by George Borg. An earlier Swedish immigrant, John Ericsson, designed the ironclad *Monitor*, which saved Union control of the seas during the Civil War. Our radio and TV sets have at least 20 inventions by Ernst Alexanderson, ex-chief engineer of General Electric.

Most immigrants became neither millionaires nor inventor geniuses. It was the vastly expanding world of American sports that gave the newcomers their real heroes. For the Germans it may have been Honus Wagner, baseball's fabulous Flying Dutchman or one of Yale's first all-Americans, Bill Heffelfinger. The Irish could choose between "Ironman" McGinnity, who hurled two games on 1 day the most times, or Big Ed Delehanty, who won both the National and American League batting championships, or pint-sized John McGraw, star of Baltimore, hero manager of the New York Giants. But in those more primitive days, boxing was the sport—and immigrants of all nationalities found their superhero in heavyweight king, John L. Sullivan.

The son of Ireland's shillelagh champion, the Boston strong boy acted out what all immigrants dreamt of doing—he put his fist in the face of life and knocked it down—"My name's John L. Sullivan and I can lick any man in the house."

John L.'s success lured Irishmen by the dozen into boxing. For 30 years they dominated the sport, and when men of other nationalities began to compete, they at first had to take Irish names, because the promoters were convinced that only an Irishman could draw the crowds. But compete they did, uneasily answering to their Gaelic monickers. A fiery little featherweight named Joe Carrora, winner of over 100 bouts as Johnny Dundee, was the first to signal that a new era was beginning in American immigration.

It had, of course, begun a decade before Johnny Dundee began to fight in 1910. Throughout the 1880's, the German and Scandinavian immigrant surge began to expire, and overlapping them, just as they had overlapped the Irish, came a new human tidal wave, from an entirely different part of Europe. Italians, Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Slavs, Russian Jews, Greeks, they all began the now familiar story of discovering America. By the time the Statue of Libery was dedicated in 1886, the new immigrants were already beginning to arrive in vast numbers. When Emma, Lazarus, descendant of Spanish Jews who were among the first American pioneers, saw arriving in her native New York the wretchedly poor Jews driven from Russia by the Czar's vicious pogroms, she was inspired to write a famous sonnet to help raise funds to bring the Statue of Liberty from France.

Christening her "Mother of Exiles," she put stirring words in Liberty's silent lips.

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teaming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

THEY SPOKE STRANGELY AND LOOKED DIFFERENT

Noble as those sentiments were, they contained some unfortunately apt descriptions of the new immigrants. Most of them were as poor as the Irish of 50 years before. Worse, they all spoke strange tongues and had the dark complexions and different profiles of the southern and eastern European. By 1903, when Miss Lazarus' poem was inscribed on a tablet and placed on the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty, the reaction against them was in full swing. The National Board of Trade, forerunner of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, had come out for protection against the scourings of foreign disease, pauperism, and crime.

The affluent German Jews themselves recoiled with distaste from the sight of their fellows from Russia, with their long beards, strange (Yiddish) language, and abject poverty. "Kikes," the German Jews called them scornfully. "Yids."

Italians took an equally bad beating. "You don't call * * * an Italian a white man?" a west coast construction boss was asked. "No, sir," he answered. "An Italian is a Dago."

In 1897, Congress for the first time passed a bill requiring a literacy test for adult immigrants. President Grover Cleveland promptly vetoed it, declaring that literacy was a test only of a person's past education and not of his future ability or worth as a citizen. When the Immigration Restriction League lobbied to reintroduce the bill at the next session of Congress, the immigrants of earlier years swung into action. They created an Immigration Protective League and fought hard against the bill. Officers of 150 German societies, for instance, issued a furious blast against it as a revival of know nothingism.

Another telling blow came from the great Irish-American humorist, Finley Peter Dunne, who had his immortal comic creation, Mr. Dooley, discuss immigration restriction with magnificent sarcasm in 1902. "As a pilgrim father that missed the first boat, I must raise me claryon voice again' the invasion iv this fair land be th' paupers an' arnychists in Europe. Ye bet I must—because I'm here first. * * * In thim days America was th' refuge iv th' oppressed in all th' wurruld. * * * But as I tell ye, 'tis different now. 'Tis time we put our back again' th' open dure and keep out th's savage horde."

EVERY NEWCOMER FACED FIERCE HOSTILITY

Immigration restriction was temporarily dead but fierce hostility against the new immigrants persisted. Slavs and Hungarians had replaced the Irish in the Pennsylvania coal mines. When the United Mine Workers led the newcomers in a strike at Hazleton, a sheriff's posse of 102 men surrounded the immigrants. Someone punched the sheriff, and the deputies poured volley after volley into the defenseless men, killing 21 and wounding 40. In Colorado, six Italians implicated in the death of a saloonkeeper were massacred while awaiting trial. In New Orleans, when the superintendent of police was murdered, nine Italians were tried for the crime but a jury was unable to convict them. A mob proceeded to "remedy the failure of justice" by slaughtering 11 Italians. Five hundred workers in a New Jersey glass works went on a 3-day rampage when the management hired 14 young Russian Jews. In Omaha, Nebr., a 1909 riot against the city's 1,800 Greeks caused hundreds of thousands of dollars damage.

Fortunately, there were other Americans who stoutly defended the new immigrants. One of the most influential was Peter Roberts, who published a remarkable book about them in 1912. Roberts told of visiting a group of Poles who were working in a foundry in Rockland County. The employers treated them well, gave them good salaries, took an interest in their living conditions. They gave prizes to the families with the best gardens. Only a few miles away, there was a similar plant, where other Poles worked under dreadful pay and living conditions. This plant had all sorts of trouble with its workers. When Roberts compared the peaceful atmosphere of the first plant, an executive told him: "Yes, but that company has a better group of Poles than we have—these men are no good."

Roberts' answer was to insist that there was no such thing as bad Poles or good Poles, any more than Italians, Greeks, or Slavs were bad. All the new immigrants wanted was a decent life, and anyone who treated them fairly and honestly would find them first-class citizens. In fact, the country could not get along without them. Between 1880 and 1905 the capital investment in manufacturing had increased fivefold. Roberts told of asking a man who ran a tanning factory if he preferred to employ "foreigners."

"No," was the man's answer, "but the Irish and Germans are gone and if this plant's to run, Italians, Lithuanians, and Poles must do the work."

As a final rebuttal of the wretched refuse idea, Roberts quoted the extensive investigation of the U.S. Immigration Comission, which declared: "The present movement is not recruited in the main from the lowest * * * strata of the population * * * it represents the stronger and better element of the particular class from which it is drawn."

Meanwhile the new immigrants, heedless of the dispute, streamed past Liberty's upraised torch. Over 4,500,000 Italians came between 1890 and 1920, making them the second largest immigrant group in America. Most were very poor, and like the Irish before them, they toiled for backbreaking hours on railroads and public works.

THE ITALIAN PADRONES HAD A USEFUL PURPOSE

The Italians' lot was harshened by the padrone system, whereby one who could speak English hired the rest and deducted from their small salaries all their expenses. Often the padrone ran the immigrant's life, telling him where to live, banking his money, selling him steamship tickets to bring his wife or relatives from Italy. Some padrones were corrupt, but in the grim realities of immigrant life, the system had its merits.

Many padrones took their profits and turned contractors. Their success in business created new jobs for their countrymen, and new prestige for the Italian community. Other padrones turned to banking. Best known is A. P. Giannini, who boldly painted "Bank of Italy" on a small store in San Francisco and with the deposits of fellow Italians quickly prospered until he changed his firm's name to "Bank of America." Today it has more branches than any other bank in the country and ranks among the top half dozen in the Nation in deposits and business volume.

Steadily, with the same stubborn pride of those who came before them, the Italians found their place in American life. In 1928, Getto of Pittsburgh became the first Italian All-American followed in 1929–30 by Notre Dame's Carideo. Tony Lazzeri of the Yankees was one of baseball's All Stars in 1932. Today, after three decades of Italian sports stars such as DiMaggio, Guglielmo, Ameche, Marciano, Calavito, an Italian name draws no special attention. But because the memory is still close to them, Italians themselves remember the hard road they have traveled. Michael Angelo Musmanno, who was elected to the Pennsylvania State Supreme Court in 1952, tells how a proud father kissed the American flag and said something in a whisper at the swearing-in ceremony. The judge asked the old man what he had whispered. "I said: 'Thank God for a country where the son of an Itailan immigrant coal miner and railroad section hand can rise to become a judge.' "

Poles, Slavs, Greeks, all the other so-called new immigrants have similar tales to tell. All have disappointed the prophets of doom who called them "steerage slime" and predicted they would never become Americans.

IN 1916 RACISM REARS ITS UGLY HEAD

But these negativists nevertheless had their day. The climax of agitation against the immigrant came in the 1916 publication of Madison Grant's "The Passing of the Great Race." Chairman of the New York Zoological Society, trustee of the American Museum of Natural History and councilor of the American Geographical Society, Grant's credentials were impressive. Henry Fairfield Osborn, research professor of zoology, Columbia University, wrote a preface. The message? Simple, blatant racism. The Anglo-Saxons or Nordics were the supermen of the universe. The races drawn from the "lowest stratum of the Mediterranean basin and the Balkans" were "human flotsam and the whole tone of American life, social, moral, and political has been lowered and vulgarized by them." Grant and Osborn anticipated Adolf Hitler's Nordic madness by more than a decade.

A year after the publication of this vicious book, America was at war. Over 400,000 Italians fought in the ranks, collecting 103 Distinguished Service Crosses, suffering a full 10 percent of the casualties. Poles, Greeks, all responded with equal fervor. But in the isolationist mood of the 1920's, Congress decided to clang shut the golden door.

There was some justification for restricting the numbers of immigrants. The depression of the early 1920's suggested to many that America's ability to absorb more millions of newcomers was nearing the limit. But the Immigration Acts of 1920 and 1924 used a "national origins" system that was shamelessly based on the racist doctrines of Grant and Osborn. Quotas for each country were established according to a percentage of persons from that country present in the United States in 1920. This meant the English and other Northern Europeans vastly outnumbered the newer immigrants—who were still eager to come. Great Britain, for instance, never filled its annual quota of 65,361. In other countries, huge backlogs soon built up; 61,293 in Poland, 132,435 in Italy. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 perpetuated this racist system. Harry Truman vetoed it, because, he said, "The idea behind this discriminatory policy was, to put it boldly, that Americans with English or Irish names were better people and better citizens than Americans with Italian or Greek or Polish names * * * Such a concept is utterly unworthy of our traditions and our ideals." But Congress passed the act over the President's veto.

Meanwhile, another group of immigrants was winning perhaps the hardest fight to share equally in America's freedom. The Japanese Americans had met fierce legal and social discrimination on the west coast. Like their Chinese fellow Asians, who preceded them (the Chinese peak year was 1882) they had been driven into ghettos which tourist promoters called "little Tokyos." When World War II erupted with the Japanese assault on Pearl Harbor, panicky U.S. officials yielded to highly prejudiced advice, and evacuated the Japanese en masse. In dreary "relocation centers" it looked for a while like their hopes of an American future were ended.

But the younger generation soon convinced U.S. officials that they deserved a chance to prove their loyalty. They formed the 442d Regimental Combat team, and fought with incredible heroism throughout the war in Italy. The average American casualty rate in World War II was less than 25 percent. The 442d's rate was 308 percent. They garnered medals by the dozen, becoming in the words of Gen. Mark Clark, "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States."

After the war, the Japanese found a drastically changed attitude. They were able to abandon their little Tokyos and enter professions and industries which had hitherto barred them. Only two-thirds of them returned to the west coast. The rest found homes in a dozen major cities. Chicago, which had only 300 Japanese before the war, now has 15,000 to 20,000. Today over 10,000 hold jobs in the Federal civil service. Nisei have graduated from West Point and Annapolis. San Francisco and Seattle have hired Nisei schoolteachers. No wonder many Japanese now look upon the humiliating evacuation of World War II as "the helpful catastrophe."

Surely, if immigrants from Asia can win such acceptance, the old pattern of struggle and prejudice must be disappearing from American life. It is true that the more than 5 million refugees who came to America from Europe before, during, and after World War II have won easier acceptance than earlier arrivals. But most of them came from countries which had already sent immigrants by the tens of thousands to our shores, and they welcomed and assisted them.

FOR PUERTO RICANS, THE SAME TRIAL BY FIRE

Two other new immigrant groups are in recent years undergoing the same trial by fire. In New York alone, over 2 million Puerto Ricans and Negroes have entered the city since World War II, an increase of 250 percent in less than a quarter of a century. As Oscar Handlin, one of the best-known historians of immigration has pointed out, "this is a migration comparable in scope to that of the Irish and the Germans between

1840 and 1860 and of the Jews and Italians of 1890 to 1915. Millions more Negroes have moved out of the Old South to other northern and eastern cities.

In terms of time, the Negro is, of course, not a new immigrant. The first Negroes arrived in Virginia in 1619. But the first almost 250 years of the Negro's American experience was spent in the limbo of slavery, and for almost another hundred years most Negroes were isolated in the rural South. There is no doubt that today's Negro is an immigrant to the world of American opportunity.

There is also no doubt that over the centuries, he has done his best to earn it. Free Negroes stood side by side with the men of New England at Bunker Hill. Over 180,000 Negroes fought for the Union in the Civil War, and have borne their share of blood and sweat in every war since. Like other immigrants, the Negro has welcomed the chance to use the football field and the baseball diamond to prove his equality in skill and courage with his fellow Americans. From Jackie Robinson and Willie Mays to Jimmy Brown, he has consistently made the grade.

OUT OF GHETTO AND INTO EQUALITY FOR MANY

Like those who came before them, Negroes are now making vast strides in other areas. So are the Puerto Ricans. In New York they recently elected their first prominent public official, Herman Badillo, as Borough President of the Bronx. In the southwest, Mexican Americans (1,291,922) are making progress, with the election of Congressman HENRY GONZALEZ. All are fighting their way out of the slummy ghettos to which their poverty and differences of color and language first confined them. Eventually, they, too, will win full equality beside the rest of us in this Nation of immigrants.

On October 3, 1965, the foot of the Statue of Liberty, the President of the United States signed into law a new immigration bill, which declared that the Government of the United States was determined to apply in practice our ideals of equality and freedom. Junked for good was the national origins system. Henceforth, the United States will admit 350,000 citizens each year from all nations on a first-come, first-served basis.

Since last December 1, they've been arriving. Just last month, 400 Italians landed, led by Salvatore Esposito, a 29-year-old Neapolitan who had been here from 1961–63 after illegally jumping ship in New York Harbor. He married the former Marie Anzalone before he was caught—he left the United States voluntarily, but now he's back for good.

The new bill is in most essentials the one requested by John F. Kennedy in his message to Congress on July 23, 1963. There would seem to be no better way to end this story than this, with the triumph of fairplay and justice, won through the work and sacrifice of the first Irish-American President. In his book "A Nation of Immigrants," he said, "Yesterday's immigrants * * * have supplied a continuous flow of creative abilities and ideas that have enriched our Nation * * * the immigrants we welcome today and tomorrow will carry on this tradition and help us to retain, reinvigorate, and strengthen the American spirit."

Additional Federal Judges and Districts

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained on official business outside the Capital this afternoon and was not able to cast my vote on S. 1666, to provide for additional circuit and district judges. Had I been here I would have voted for this bill.

Again the Ultraright Aspires to World Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the latest issue of Prevent World War III—No. 67, winter 1966—published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 50 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., contains a timely article entitled "Again the Ultraright Aspires to World Power" by the well-known columnist and author, James H. Sheldon.

This article shows how the rightwing in the United States, and in Europe, is attempting to capture political power. Using materials prepared by the rightists themselves, Sheldon shows how extensive the ultraright is here in the United States as well as overseas. He draws particular attention to the rightwing movements in Germany which has fallen prey to the right in the past and may well do so again.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans have an interest in this article, which will help to show how the ultraright misuses and distorts the responsible and loyal conservative movement here and elsewhere, to its own irresponsible and disloyal aim. Under unanimous consent I insert this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend it to you and my colleagues as fascinating and, at times, frightening reading.

AGAIN THE ULTRARIGHT ASPIRES TO WORLD POWER

(By James H. Sheldon)

(NOTE.—James H. Sheldon, the author of this article, is a foreign correspondent and regular columnist for the American Examiner. He is an officer of the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League and a former professor at Boston University.)

Neo-Nazi voices are heard again—while the "new extremism" burgeons; here are just random evidences of the dangerous revival of political extremism and racism throughout the globe:

In West Germany, veterans of the infamous SS Corps hold reunions which are openly announced in the press.

In Sweden, Italy, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain, Iceland, and 24 other countries neo-Nazi periodicals find enough support to publish and increase their size.

In England, a swastika-bedecked publication agitates for a halt to "the colored invasion" and says citizenship should be restricted to people of "Aryan blood."

In Rhodesia, a taciturn Prime Minister tries to turn back the clock by denying voting rights to the vast majority of the population.

In America, the John Birch Society starts another magazine, a professional "right wing" lobby sets up business in Washington, and a hate group strong enough to appear on the ballot in several States calls for an end to kosher labels on food, as part of its anti-Semitic propaganda.

And a new left, along Peiping-oriented lines, peddles its wares through at least four international publications and scores of local ones.

As yet, we are talking mostly of symtoms of possible future crises—but a very little decline in the world's economy might change the picture overnight, and turn millions of people into followers of antidemocratic leadership and advocates of religious of racial discrimination.

AN INCULPATING DIRECTORY

How strong is the far right in the United States?

One answer is supplied by the extremists themselves, in a publication called the First National Directory of Rightist Groups, Publications and Some Individuals, issued by a Los Angeles center called the Alert Americans Association.

The new issue of this directory contains the names and addresses of 3,114 domestic organizations and publications, agitators and public figures, whom the editors consider worthy of mention. Advertisements of the directory which have lately appeared in extremist publications proclaimed that "over 10 million Americans" are represented in the combined membership rolls of the organizations listed.

Here the interested citizen can find the addresses of 18 major units of the Ku Klux Klan, 31 American Opinion libraries or bookstores (American Opinion is the 112-page monthly publication of the John Birch Society), and 42 principal offices of the ultrasegregationist citizens councils—plus extremist pressure groups like the Liberty Lobby (which has elaborate offices in Washington) and openly neo-Nazi movements such as George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi Party or James Madole's National Renaissance Party (both of which continue to operate in spite of troubles with tax collectors and police authorities).

Sandwiched in between, in the directory listings, are evidences of some of the stranger aberrations of the ultraright, including 18 organizations opposing the fluoridation of water supplies (a Communist plot, according to one; a Jewish scheme to undermine the Nation's health, in the view of another). Entry No. 1,036 is "Destiny," principal publication of a strange but widespread cult called the Anglo-Israel Movement which holds that the Nordic peoples, not the Jews, are the true inheritors of God's covenant as reported in the Bible.

Item 971 is Gerald L. K. Smith's magazine, "The Cross and the Flag," a 32-page monthly brew of assorted hatreds and prejudices. Smith's publications, and his various nationalist political movements, use up a budget of a third of a million dollars a year.

Also listed (No. 2065) is the National States Rights Party, whose publication, the Thunderbolt, carries the old Nazi emblem of the jagged lightning flash on the masthead. Currently, this paper has been engaged in a campaign against the right of food producers to label products as kosher. "Why should we Christians pay a tax to support Jewish rabbis on each can of food we purchase?" asks the Thunderbolt. Although it represents the most extreme form of anti-Semitism, and has been involved in civil rights disorders all over the South, this party has actually succeeded in being listed on the electoral ballot in several States.

The Liberty Amendment Committee would like to abolish the Federal income tax—and it has the addresses of 60 branch offices listed. Most of them are also purveyors of extreme nationalist propaganda of all kinds.

DISTORTED USE OF THE FINEST WORDS

The choice of names favored by the ultraright is in itself worth a little study. Never have so many of the finest words in the English language been made to serve more dubious purposes.

Thus, 190 listings in the directory (nearly three pages) start with the word "American," and 76 others begin with the word "Christian." Sometimes the names seem designed to stir up latent emotions, and in other cases they are camouflage.

Item No. 575, to select one at random, is the Christian Educational Association of New Jersey. This turns out to be the corporate publisher of Common Sense, a tabloid described by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as the source of "some of the most virulent hate propaganda ever to come to the attention of the committee."

Certainly, an average issue of commonsense contains little that is even remotely educational and still less that is Christian, in the usually accepted meanings of these words.

Looking further, we find 75 listings that start with the word "freedom," 91 beginning with "liberty," and 40 with the words "constitution" or "constitutional." Most of these engage in rabid attacks upon the Supreme Court, and a good many are centers of anti-United Nations activity.

A few of the more notorious individual agitators of the ultraright are evidently considered worthy of special listings. Thus, Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama, who sought to defy the Supreme Court on the matter of Negro rights, appears as No. 2,955, and Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker (often advertised as the putative "man on horseback" of the ultraright) is on the same page, as No. 2,952 (he gets a double listing, thanks to his American Eagle Publishing Co., at Dallas, Tex., which is No. 90).

Throughout the above, we have been referring to the current, or fifth, edition of the rightist directory. The first edition appeared in 1955, and contained only about 500 addresses. The jump from 500 to 3,000 in a decade provides a rough estimate of the alarming proliferation which has taken place in 10 years.

An appendix to the directory continues with an enumeration of 300 selected rightist groups in other countries. This list, of course, is only a very partial and abbreviated one—but nevertheless it contains entries from 30 different nations, covering every one of the world's continents.

Some, like the Britons Publishing Society in London, the neo-Fascist Movimento Sociale Italiano (MSI Party) in Italy, or the ultraright newspaper *Rivarol* in Paris, are well-known hardy perennials.

Others are flagrantly and openly neo-Nazi, like Nordisk Kamp, organ of Sweden's Nordic State Party, or Mjolnir, the swastika-ornamented monthly publication of an Icelandic group of the same background. There are also semiconfidential geopolitical letters issued to a limited number of leaders—such as Friedrich Kuhfuss' bulletin from Spain; pamphleteers like South Africa's R. K. Rudman, who tries to keep Hitler's memory alive and wants an even more violent apartheid policy; and a few "far out" groups like the Odinist religion, which wants to revive ancient Nordic myths of racial superiority instead of what it disdainfully calls "the brotherhood religions" of today. (The Odinists, believe it or not, have branches in half a dozen countries. The address of their Rhodesian unit is at a place appropriately called Valkyre.)

IN GERMANY—TOO

The number of German-oriented rightist movements is vastly larger than the Bonn government would like to admit.

The Deutsche National-Zeitugn und Soldaten-Zeitung, a weekly publication primarily appealing to former Nazi soldiers, has a circulation of 100,000 in West Germany, and publishes frequent anti-Israel articles. This paper would like to revise recent history—or at least, turn it upside down. For instance, in the December 3, 1965, issue we find an article on Nazi concentration camps. In it, we are blandly informed that stories about gas chambers and crematoria during the Hitler era are mostly faked, having been "fabricated by the Allies, especially the Americans."

This same publication also lists reunions of SS Corps units and other former Nazi elements. One announcement dealt with the eighth meeting of the former 4th SS Panzer Division (which was among those involved in the Malmedy massacre) at Marktheidenfeld on Main; another, with a national reunion of other SS men at Rendsburg, in Schleswig-Holstein.

Here are unfortunately clear indications of the existence of a substantial and growing organization of rightism in Germany.

Incidentally, if one returns to this side of the Atlantic, and looks in the December 1965 issue of the Voice of the Federation of American Citizens of German Descent, it is possible to find almost exactly parallel propaganda.

Citing the "lie about what the Nazis were alleged to have done to Jews," one article in the Voice says that "only a fool or a swindler would claim that the corpses of Jews were converted into soap." This language is found in a column signed by the president of the federation, Dr. Austin J. App, who has a long record of opposition to U.S. policies in Germany. Another article suggests that "the American urge to interfere precipitated Pearl Harbor"—and so on.

Some of the more obvious racism is to be found in official publications of such governments as the Union of South Africa, Rhodesia, and the United Arab Republic. (In fact, various information bulletins of all three are listed in the directory of rightist groups cited earlier in this article.)

NASSER PLAYS HIS PART

The case of Egypt's Nasser is of special interest, because on the one hand he has shown a partiality to Moscow's leadership in world affairs, while at the same time cultivating the support of rightwing extremists and professional anti-Jewish propagandists in the Western world.

Nasser's hatred of Israel goes so far that publications of his own government usually do not even admit the existence of Israel as a country. Consequently, the section of the semiofficial Arab Observer devoted to Israeli affairs is headed "Occupied Palestine."

One 1965 issue of this publication devoted two whole pages to an attempt to prove the absurd contention that the desecration of Jewish synagogues and cemeteries which has been taking place in a number of countries was in fact a scheme of Zionists and Israel diplomats to stir up trouble for Egypt.

Thus, we are informed that "there is little doubt that anti-Jewish acts which are being perpetrated in Europe or in Latin America, or even in the United States, are machinated by the Zionist authorities. All those who carry out these acts are stanch supporters of Zionism or the secret envoys of the Israel Government.

"The swastika has lately been much seen. Jewish tombs have also been desecrated. * * * The Zionist press began to wail, claiming that a new wave of anti-Jewish feeling has begun to emerge."

Why should such things be done? The answer: "To provide grist for the pro-Zionist western press," and to get financial support for Israel.

Another issue, devoted to German-Israeli relations, contains a long article headed "Germany Goes on Grovelling." The content is obviously calculated to appeal to pro-German nationalist sentiment abroad.

Such agitation, taken up and repeated by hundreds of nationalist movements and hate groups, and by the large segment of the ultraright which is anti-Israel while keeping up the pose of not being anti-Semitic, can do enormous harm. The readers of such material are apt to be all too ready to forget the fact that perpetrators of most of the recent large-scale swastika outrages have been apprehended, and found to be in one way or another connected with obviously neo-Nazi backgrounds.

In the United States, the Arab Information Office and related agencies expend huge sums in purveying their propaganda, and the impact of most of it has been to assist the ultraright. This is often true even with some of the cultural output of these agencies—e.g., a pamphlet reviewing the motion picture "Exodus."

Sometimes, an outright tieup can be proven, linking an Arab agency and a native hate monger. For example, the postage for mailing publications of the flagrantly neo-Nazi organization called the National Renaissance Party (headquarters in New York) was for a time paid for by a propaganda office supported by a group of Arab governments concerned in liberating Palestine. The evidence was obvious in this case, because a postage meter was used, and all an observer had to do was compare the official numbers appearing on mail of the two organizations. When activities of the uniformed strong-arm squad maintained by the Renaissance Party resulted in indictments and prison sentences, the relationship was discreetly dropped, but meanwhile the tie had been all to clearly established.

THEY THRIVE EVERYWHERE

In a brief survey such as this, it is impossible to cover all the groups, or even to name all of the major ones. We should, for example, devote some paragraphs to the Tacurara organization in Argentina (a country, by the way, where exiled SS veterans have been holding monthly reunions in a Buenos Aires coffeehouse, open to the public view). Or again, we should mention the White Coats and the enormous Soko Gakkai movement in Japan. Both of these appeal especially to the youth—and of course we have the Viking Youth in Germany, and a host of rightist groups in American colleges.

The ultraright even has its own philosophical publications. Probably the most important is the expensively printed Western Destiny, the successor to the British Northern World. Its editors include a cross section of the more literate agitators, ranging from A. K. Chesterton, editor of Candour, organ of the League of (British) Empire Loyalists, to Austin J. App, already mentioned in connection with the Federation of Americans of German Descent. Western Destiny is published in California, and has close organizational relationship with the publishers of the directory of rightist organizations from which we have quoted above.

Not quite so far to the right, are the numerous books of the John Birch Society and its related corporations, including the Western Islands Press. And even farther toward the center, we find fairly well established groups of economists and political scientists, and organizations such as the Foundation for Economic Education, whose position may usually be defined as "ultraconservative" rather than "rightist."

The picture on the leftwing is similarly complicated, and extensive—but that warrants a separate article. Anyone looking for information on this phase of extremism will find it well described in a number of current publications, and in the reports of Federal agencies. The sudden development of a number of organizations related more or less closely to Peiping is a matter of grave concern—as readers of publications like Challenge (New York) or the Bulletin of International Socialism will immediately realize. We shall hope to continue this story at a later time—and meanwhile want to make it clear up to this point we have been dealing with only one-half of the problem of the revival of extremist movements in this decade.

As one of his last public services, the late Alben Barkley chaired a Senate Committee on Postwar Planning. Its report, written 20 years ago, began with a warning that every great war in history has been followed by a period of political disorientation, and by the growth of racist movements of all kinds. Through an accident of history, the Korean war intervened before the post-World War II reaction had much chance to develop. It may be that we are now in the time of which the late Vice President so urgently warned. If so, every good citizen should be especially on the alert to support in our day the principles of democracy, wherever they may be attacked, from either the right or the left.

The Spade and the Spear—A Problem of Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the grave problem of the war in Vietnam is on the minds of most Americans. It has been a special challenge to American clergymen as they attempt to look at the war from *their clerical viewpoint.*

I was particularly impressed with the sermon of the Reverend William H. Hudnut III, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Indianapolis, on Sunday, February 6, 1966. It follows:

The Spade and the Spear—A Problem of Conscience

Text: Nehemiah 4: 16: "* * * half of my servants worked on construction, and half held the spears, shields, bows and coats of mail."

Perhaps some of you read the New Yorker, and if so, you may be familiar with those biting cartoons by Whitney Darrow that lampoon much in our way of life that needs to be punctured. Several years ago, a drawing appeared depicting two clergymen, one a scrawny young neophyte, the other a wide-girthed, double-chinned, white-haired elder statesman, obviously a resounding ecclesiastical success. They were conversing in the latter's richly appointed study. The stinging caption underneath the drawing read: "Meadows, if you want to get on in the church as I have done, there are two subjects never to speak on: one is religion; the other is politics."

This morning, at the risk of not "getting on in the church," I aim to disregard that piece of advice, because bearing hard upon my conscience is the exceedingly perplexing matter of American involvement in Vietnam. There is a lot of confusion in our country about the war there, a lot of soul searching, a lot of agony, a lot of determination, a lot of comment. Everybody's concerned about it. Everybody's talking about it. It is the topic foremost in American minds. And the pulpit has a responsibility, does it not, to grapple with such a question that vitally concerns church members? We do not want our church to be a place where we insulate ourselves from the world, do we?

Our church should be a place where we seek to equip ourselves for ministry in the world, for understanding of the world which God loves and wants to save, and for transforming that world by the application of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the problems that vex it.

I believe that in the life of the Christian church, so serious a problem as Vietnam should not be ignored or bypassed, but discussed and placed, if at all possible, in the context of our Christian faith.

So we speak, hopefully without arrogance, rather with humility and sincere concern. I have no special wisdom to offer, only some convictions to express. To talk about military strategy or the politics of the war would not be fitting, because it strikes me as rather gratuitous for a minister to use his pulpit to deliver himself of free advice upon matters he is not professionally competent to handle—although there is nothing wrong with him having an opinion about them. But it is not out of place for the pulpit to direct attention to certain ethical and moral implications of our involvement in the struggle in southeast Asia.

Any time Christians, either individually or collectively, become involved in armed conflict, they have a problem of conscience. On *the one hand, our Christian ethic of love of* neighbor enjoins us not to kill and to overcome evil with positive good will. Yet on the other hand, we have our Christian responsibility for our brother, our duty as citizens, our involvement in the problems of the world, our battle, if you will, against the powers of darkness.

If we disavow armed conflict, taking the way of nonviolent resistance, our conscience will be stricken by our disassociation from the struggle, which may allow evil to win a vistory by default; yet if we participate in that struggle, our conscience will be vexed by our perception that we have forsaken the *more ideal way of brotherly love that Christ desires of His followers. Christ himself* appreciated the dilemma in which His disciples would be placed when He exhorted them to be "wise as serpents and innocent as doves."

The Christian is someone who learns to live with a bad conscience and understand the interplay within himself of the serpent, or, we might better say, the hawk and the dove, which warfare is projected onto the stage of history in the world at large, resulting in various spasms of civilization such as the one we are now experiencing.

Perhaps the Old Testament figure Nehemiah provides a relevant Biblical illustration of this tension. Nehemiah, you remember, was the highly placed Jew in the court of Artaxerxes, the fifth century B.C. Persian monarch. Nehemiah returned to Jersualem as Governor to rally his peale to the task of rebuilding the city's walls, which had been lying in ruins ever since Nebuchadnezzar destroyed them in 586 B.C.

While the construction was proceeding, Nehemiah's enemies, certain non-Jews, gathered round the city, ridiculing his efforts and threatening to attack. Consequently, as a precaution, Nehemiah equipped his workers with armor. "Half of my servants," he wrote in his dairy, "worked on construction; and half held the spears, shields, bows, and coats of mail." Half were engaged in peaceful activity, the other half were prepared to wage armed combat. Half were trying to cement good relationships in the community, the other half were ready to fight if the occasion demanded. Half carried tools of peace—trowels, shovels, wheelbarrows, bricks, and mortar; the other half carried the instruments of destruction—swords, spears, shields, bows, coats of mail. The upshot of the matter was that the attack never came, and eventually the walls were finished.

Do we not have here in the story of Nehemiah a symbolic representation of the two vantage points from which Christians must view the war in Vietnam, or any other conflict in which we may become engaged—the spade and the spear? The spade represents the Biblical hope of a peaceful world in which men live together in brotherly love;the spear suggests the Biblical awareness of the reality of evil and the obligation to oppose it. Perhaps it would be instructive to examine them in turn.

Consider first the spade. In Scripture we can find a winsome longing for peace and a stern command to work for it. Isaiah envisions the day when "nations shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks" when "nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore." Zechariah dreams of the day when Jerusalem shall not need any walls to protect her against invasion (2: 4). The Book of Revelation speaks of the healing of the nations (22: 2). But the Bible also makes peace a present imperative as well as a future hope. Build peace into the structures of life, says Scripture. "Blessed are the peacemakers," said Christ in the Sermon on the Mount. Paul appealed to the church at Rome: "Let us pursue what makes for peace and for mutual upbuilding;" (14: 19) and also "do not be *overcome by evil but overcome evil with good." (12: 21).'*

If we take such Scriptural passages about peace seriously, and sincerely endeavor to subordinate our opinions to the Word of God and make ourselves captive to the mind of Christ, will we not be driven to the conclusion that the priority of our witness as *Christians must be given to peacemaking?* and that the Biblical injunction to seek peace provides our war-weary world with a goal, whether acepted by all or not, that challenges and rebukes the pride and self-justification of the nations as they compete antagonistically on the stage of history? I think this implies at least the following *four things:*

1. Christians should deplore war as contrary to God's intention for His children. War should be clearly condemned as "a particular demonstration of the power of sin in this world and a defiance of the righteousness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and Him crucified." *(Oxford Conference on Life and* Work, 1937.) "War is a scourge," said Lincoln. "War is stupid, crime [the] Devil's madness," wrote the poet Robert Service. "War is cruel and you cannot refine it," remarked William Tecumshe Sherman as he marched into Atlanta in 1864; and later he said, "War at best is barbarism * * * war is *hell." And what is hell, but alienation* from God and *rejection of love?*

2. Christians should never lose their capacity to care. A Christian gentleman is someone who cares. Being Christian means being able to say, "Your grief is my grief. Your tears are my tears. Your suffering is my suffering." But, unfortunately, one of war's first casualties is almost always our spiritual and ethical sensitivity.

War can dull our consciences and dehumanize our feelings. Yet Christianity teaches respect for human life and love of neighbor. It recognizes that God has made "of one blood every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17: 26) and that consequently all men, regardless of race, nation, social status or political persuasion, are, in some sense, children of God and brothers to each other.

Christian faith says, with John Donne: "One man's death diminishes us all." Therefore, to grow insensitive to the taking of human life, to view with composure or even with rejoicing the large-scale death of other human beings, to talk glibly about bombing a whole people "back into the stone age," to give way to the frightening, irrational, brutalizing emotions of hatred, fanaticism, belligerence, and vindictiveness, is to forsake the practice of such virtues as patience, steadfastness, forgiveness, forbearance, and compassion, which Jesus Christ, our Lord, demanded of His followers.

3. Christians should, it seems to me, express to the responsible national leaders, following the suggestion of Pope Paul, their desire that nothing be neglected that might bring minds closer together, and that no favorable occasions, however slight, be overlooked, to achieve a peaceful, honorable, and just solution of the crisis in southeast Asia. They should welcome free and open discussion in the public forum of this vexing issue, and respect the right of men to disagree without impugning their loyalty. And they should worry not so much about saving face as about doing what's right and what the strongest nation in the world can do to avoid unnecessary escalation and achieve reconciliation.

4. Christians should be concerned about eradicating the causes of war and planting the roots of peace wherever possible. The conflict in which we are engaged is primarily ideological, not military; and we will be fighting it on that front long after some accommodation has been reached on the battlefields of Vietnam. We are engaged in a battle for the minds and hearts of men.

It is a battle for the moral and spiritual rearmament of mankind, and it is incredibly naive to suppose that military victories alone can win that battle. So should we not be thinking about filling the vacuum that military competition creates with a positive program of reconstruction?

This means praying for peace and for those who suffer so terribly in southeast Asia. It means caring for refugees and displaced persons, perhaps by contributing to Church World Service or a similar agency. It means supporting the work of the Christion church around the world in its ministry of healing. It means uprooting the things that frustrate the cause of peace—things like abysmal poverty, race prejudice, injustice, disease, illiteracy, and all the rest of it. And it means, so far as each one of us as individuals is concerned, trying to be peacemakers.

So much then for the spade. It stands for the constructive aspects of the human mind, the nonmilitary ways of dealing with the conflicts and misunderstandings that inevitably arise among people. It points us to the positive peace that lies beyond the truces of military strategy, diplomatic science, and atomic stalemate. It suggests the hope of growth and regeneration. It symbolizes the triumph of life over death, good over evil, light over dark, and peace over war.

Now what about the spear, which, as we suggested earlier, though a last resort, and below the spade on our list of priorities, is nonetheless the second necessary vantage point for understanding the Vietnamese struggle?

It is interesting to note that Nehemiah decided to arm half his men only after he had prayed about it. In that tense situation, God led him to understand his responsibility to protect his people against possible attack. Which is to say, in a world where men attack other men, spears are necessary as well as spades, and can represent some facet of the will of God.

Christian faith at its best is realistic. Christ taught in some of His parables, like the wheat and the tares, that in history there will be no simple triumph of good over evil, but rather a struggle to the end in which Christians must responsibly involve themselves.

In a fallen world, imperfect, sinful, plagued by demonic powers that produce division and hostility, beset by vaulting human ambitions, if you equip yourself only with spades, the men with the spears may destroy you.

That is why, in my opinion, a pacifist ethic of nonviolent resistance to evil is illusory and irrelevant. Of course, genuine Christian pacifism is a valid position. It represents the perfectionistic impulse in the New Testament that serves as a conscience for us all. But it is not the final answer, because there is no guarantee that perfect love will ever win a worldly victory.

So those who tell us to stand by, to quit playing policeman to the world, to pull out and come home, are naively handing the world over to power, and indeed assuring the extension of the area of conquest, violence and suffering.

Somewhere tyranny must be resisted or it will continue to grow. Somewhere the lust for power must be checked or it will produce war and more war. Somewhere the rotten apple must be found or it will infect the whole barrel. Somewhere the cancerous cell must be tracked down and removed by surgery or it will destroy the whole body. Somewhere freedom must be defended or it will be tramped upon by the boot of unconscious power. Somewhere the integrity of a people and their right to self-determination must be protected, or a hungry bear, with a nibble here and a gobble there, will in a matter of time consume everything.

So we take our stand. Somewhere we draw a line. Most of the debate right now seems to be whether or not we have drawn it in the right place. But somewhere we draw a line, and there we make a commitment, relying upon the sober judgment of our national leaders and supporting them when the chips are finally down. We hold our spears. We fight, knowing that worse than peace is dishonor and extension of tyranny. Not that our hands are clean. Indeed, they are dirty. Not that the situation is clear or unambiguous. Not that we are all right and the other fellow is all wrong. But we will not stand blithely by the side of the road, while our neighbor is attacked. We will not fiddle while Saigon burns.

In the name of love of neighbor, we will fight for his rights, after all rational and nonviolent means of reconciling conflicting feelings have been explored and exhausted. In order to be our brother's keeper, as the Old Testament has it, or to bear one another's burdens, to use a New Testament phrase, we will do what we judge has to be done in the struggles of history, perhaps remembering that line from the First Epistle of Peter, which reads: "Your adversary the devil prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking some one to devour. Resist him."

A man, if he is a man and not an animal, does not ever want to fight, but when those things he holds dear are threatened, perhaps he has to. When Henry Van Dyke saw Augustus Saint-Gaudens' statue of General Sherman, to whom we have already referred, he composed a bit of verse:

"This is the soldier brave enough to tell
The glory-dazzled world that 'war is hell':
Lover of peace, he looks beyond the strife,
And rides through hell to save his country's life."

Sometimes you have to ride through hell to save what you love and believe in. I believe that riding through hell in Vietnam is worthy of what we believe in as Americans and Christians. I believe that in today's historic struggle, after all the ambiguity has been stripped away, there is a clear preponderance of right on our side, which I hope can be affirmed without arrogance or self-righteousness, and that those who obscure it are deluding themselves. If we cannot make a distinction here then there are no historical distinctions which have any value.

I believe in a government of laws not men. I believe that government by consent is more just than rule without it. I believe the individual is more valuable than the state. I believe that faith in God is better than atheism, and emancipation of men better than enslavement. I believe that the perimeter of freedom must be defended against the encroachments of tyranny. I believe South Vietnam is the zone of contact, as Senator Javits has stated, in the struggle for freedom of Asia. I believe the fight there, now that we are into it, needs to be waged. And I believe it deserves our support until by the grace of God it has been satisfactorily concluded.

The last line in the Book of Nehemiah reads: "Remember me, O my God, for good." There were probably some things Nehemiah did he should not have done, and unqestionably other things he should have done that he did not do. Without a doubt, he had an uneasy conscience. But he tried. Taking spade and spear, he attempted to do the right as God gave him to see it. And so it is with us and our country.

We take our stand. We do what we think must be done, unsettled conscience though it gives us. We try our best with both spade and spear to achieve under God a just and lasting peace among ourselves and the nations of the world. And then at the end of the day, knowing how imperfect we are, we humbly and hopefully pray: "Remember us, O God, for good."

Separate People From Machines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edgar D. McKean, who operates a motor vehicle leasing company in Pittsburgh, has come up with an imaginative new approach to the problem of traffic and pedestrian congestion in big city downtown areas. He proposes to double the available space for traffic by using elevated sidewalks which separate the pedestrian from the motor vehicle.

Mr. McKean has served 15 years on Allegheny County, Pa., planning bodies studying traffic and transit problems. Under leave to extend my remarks I insert Mr. McKean's outline of his plan, as published in his company newsletter "Fleet Use," February 1966, at this point in the RECORD:

SEPARATE PEOPLE FROM MACHINES

How to move people is an old problem of the big city. Much has been said of late about it, and about the self-selection of Pittsburgh as Detroit of mass transit. Where are we going with this problem? Are we moving forward? Will we remedy the frustrating rush-hour traffic congestion? What's the ultimate solution? We're no expert though we served more than 15 years on Allegheny County planning bodies trying to update mass transportation. We continue to have our own solution to vexsome problems of urban transit. It is simply to separate the pedestrians from the vehicles. Man from machine.

All we want is a simple, logical, clear-cut remedy for critical central city congestion—passenger cars, trucks, buses, streetcars, people. One of the simplest measures to overcome this convulsive congestion in Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle, for example, would be elevated sidewalks. These will separate people from machines. To elevate the machines would be prohibitive in cost, but sidewalks could be elevated by means not heavier than ordinary scaffold construction.

These elevated walks could be heated to free them of hazardous snow and ice, with stairways or escalators at approaches. Mesh steel flooring, made in Pittsburgh, of course, could be heated to melt snow promptly to eliminate hazards of falling and also the need for city cleaning crews.

Case in point: Pittsburgh's Fourth Avenue. The elevated sidewalk would be necessary on just one side of the street, with walkways across to opposite buildings. And for the machines? Instead of a congested one-way narrow street, we'd enjoy the benefits and expediency of a full two-way thoroughfare. This system would afford double the capacity of Fourth Avenue, and it would elevate the people safely away from traffic, particularly at crosswalks. Has any city tried this? Hartford, Conn., although smaller with many differences, built new central city buildings with elevated sidewalks, enabling cars to run under the complex and the people above them. It may be too late to recast Pittsburgh's buildings, but we can still try elevated sidewalks.

Take for example those foreboding traffic funnels, Pittsburgh's Smithfield, Wood, and William Penn. If these three narrow alleys had elevated walks—especially the bustling, bungling corner of Fifth Avenue and Smithfield Street where it's safer today to walk against the light—this alone would be progress.

For a city on the move, which Pittsburgh claims to be, machines and men alike should be able to move. The business owners would share in the expense to make such innovations. For these walkways would bring more retail foot-customers into downtown stores and other firms. The taxpaying public, also benefiting, would also cooperate.

We can't move the entire city. We can't tear it down and build it over. But we can double the traffic space if we elevate the people and separate them from the vehicles.

Another suggestion is to reactivate the commuter trains. Renovate present coaches and cars. Make them clean and livable. Air condition them. Refurbish with latest equipment. Then, in Pittsburgh with its tough topography, don't fight it, join it. Have the trains run up and down the stretches along the Allegheny, Ohio, Monongahela Rivers, over the B. & O. and Pennsylvania mainlines, all the way, back and forth. Lease the commuter trains to the railroads and let them operate the system. This would prove wiser than letting politicos run a railroad. Such trains could run about every 20 to 30 minutes with stops at precise time intervals. At every stop there would be a guarded, attended parking lot with parking privileges only for the train commuter.

Clean, air-conditioned cars and fast, reliable service. What more could a city ask for? With so many virtually unused railroad tracks today coming into the central city and fanning out in all directions, what better opportunity is there? Add the accompanying parking lots and it's a solution to at least some of our urban transit problems.

Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to join with my colleagues in paying a deep and sincere tribute to our beloved Member, the late ALBERT THOMAS of Texas.

When I first came to Congress it was Mr. THOMAS who was so kind about details of budgetary affairs of great significance in my district.

There was never a time, nor an occasion, when he was not helpful and always he was a courtly, gracious gentleman.

The United States and Texas have lost a great Member of this body, but each of us has lost a magnificent friend.

My deepest and sincerest sympathy to his family.

History Will Smile on Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

HISTORY WILL SMILE ON LYNDON B. JOHNSON

(By Eugene Patterson)

Like him or leave him, President Johnson has done an impressive job up to now. His "consensus" is a term of derision among the ones who don't like him. But when the wisecracks are done, the accomplishments remain.

No single element of American society seems to feel any passionate partisanship in his behalf.

For he has shown none in any single element's behalf.

His leadership is peculiarly southern, except that he uses conservative techniques to advance liberal causes.

He does not seek to make any single group triumphantly happy. He does not try to make any one irretrievably mad.

That means everybody gets mad at one time or another—but goes along.

TRUST

Latest anger comes from organized labor, of all things.

Labor's leadership last week made threats to desert Johnson if he didn't favor labor more. But the President knows labor doesn't have anywhere else to go. And he is prepared to risk some labor disfavor and some management unhappiness in the interest of keeping them working together.

They are working together and the boom continues, though both castigate him publicly. They trust him privately.

In civil rights, he passed the broadest legislation in history—and is executing it with painstaking restraint.

In domestic legislation generally, he has implemented the most radical social programs since the New Deal, and has blurred the radicalism by describing it conservatively in comforting terms.

He has quieted conservatives who don't like him by saying little that sounds as if he is tinkering with the status quo, and has undercut the liberals who are anxious to detest him by pointing to seismic changes he has wrought in the status quo.

In short, Lyndon Johnson does not draw issues sharply so that the electorate can choose up sides and fight. He uses diffusion deliberately as a means of oiling the waters he churns.

This leaves just about everybody wishing for a better handhold on a club with which to belabor him. But it creates a society of unusual dynamism and tranquility.

The only loser is Lyndon. Nobody loves him. Homely and unlovable as he is, there is a distinct nobility in the thankless course he has chosen.

Vietnam is the prime example.

His political education and instincts tell him that the principal threat of unmanageable pressure has always lain, and still does, in the jingoistic rightwing.

To keep that threat dormant he has silently suffered an incredible pasting from the leftwing without hitting back.

WEARY

He could hit back quite easily. But to do so—to answer the peace placards with rallying war cries, to shield his limited war policy by invoking patriotic fervor—he would risk the loosing of a war fever that would damage the country far worse than any act the complaining left wing is capable of.

So he endures the complaining of the left and goes on describing his policy in the mercifully blurred terms that provide him with a rein on the war and an opening to peace.

The blurring infuriates those who want easy, sharp-edged answers to complexities. But it is serving the country.

He is no "total victory" exponent nor is he a "peace on any terms" man.

He is Lyndon Johnson, everybody's target and nobody's hero, pursuing the possible undramatically. His rule by consensus will not be satisfactory to some of the people all of the time. But his accomplishments are likely to impress historians as being among the notable examples of effective and responsible leadership in this century.

Fiscal Juggling Hides Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the February 16, 1966, issue of the Alhambra, Calif., Post Advocate contained an excellent editorial questioning the budget juggling which is taking place and the possible consequences of these actions.

As the editorial states:

> Unless the cure of reducing Federal spending to conform to realistic income is practiced, the day of reckoning will result in sharply increased taxes that no amount of figure juggling can hide.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this editorial for inclusion in the RECORD.

SPENDING MEANS TAX BOOST: FISCAL JUGGLING HIDES TRUTH

The 18th century philosopher who said there is nothing as fallacious as facts, except figures, would feel at home working today for the Federal Budget Bureau.

Both the facts and the figures of the proposed 1967 budget and the revenue to support it give ample reason for disquietude.

Only the motive of the budget accountants is clear. It is an election year and the figures must be made as palatable as possible. Additionally, the Government must support its contention that the Nation can afford unprecedented social programs in addition to the essential cost of the war in Vietnam. The former is open to serious question.

Tinkering with figures is obviously done also to convey an impression that the present budget is nearly in balance and black ink on Federal ledgers is probable in the years ahead.

In the light of the unknowns in the war in Vietnam, not even the $112.8 billion budget for 1967 constitutes a firm figure. The war is the first order of business and must be prosecuted for a military victory. There is a distinct possibility of essential supplemental appropriations for this purpose in the year ahead.

More disturbing is the sleight-of-hand with revenue figures which show a $11 billion increase in the year ahead. Of the total, $3.6 billion will come from accelerated corporate and personal income taxes. These are not new income sources, but collection of money that ordinarily would not reach Federal treasuries until 1967. New problems will arise after that.

Additionally, the Government will realize $4.7 billion from private funding of previous Federal programs—an increase of nearly $3 billion. Expansion of similar financing in the future is limited.

Further seeking to show good bookkeeping, the Government is realizing millions from the sale of materials from its stockpiles. It also will realize $1.56 billion profit in 1967 by converting silver coins to money of less intrinsic value. Obviously, continued income from both sources is limited in the future.

The most unfortunate aspect of the one-shot windfalls and the other quick money-raising schemes is that they are a panacea for Federal fiscal ills, not a cure for the disease. The inevitable day of truth will come and the longer it takes the more severe the results are likely to be.

Unless the cure of reducing Federal spending to conform to realistic income is practiced, the day of reckoning will result in sharply increased taxes that no amount of figure juggling can hide.

Congress owes it to the American people to begin the return to fiscal realism at this session.

Fino Introduces Preventicare Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to establish a "preventicare" program in America to supplement the medicare program.

My bill, introduced in the Senate by Senator Williams of New Jersey, amends the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title calling for regional and community health protection centers to examine persons over 50 years of age for certain ailments and physical difficulties on a free and voluntary basis. The bill would also provide for assistance for training personnel and conducting appropriate research.

The types of ailments the centers would seek to conduct examinations for include heart conditions, cancer, diabetes, tuberculosis, anemia, respiratory and hearing impairment, gout and the like. The test results would be passed on to private medical practitioners for any treatment. No treatment would be given at the centers. The Fino bill authorizes expenditures of $60 million over a 3-year period for the establishment of health protection centers under this "preventicare" program.

This bill is part of my legislative campaign to bring more of the benefits of America's riches to our senior citizens. Last week I introduced legislation to bring cost-of-living and gross national product factors into computations of social security benefits. The week before I introduced legislation to establish a National Senior Community Service Corps to make the talents of our senior citizens available to our communities. That same week, I announced my intention to introduce legislation (now being drawn up) which would switch the emphasis of the poverty program to concentrate on substandard income among Government pensioners. My program calls for an Office of Household Emergency Loans and Pension Supplements—HELPS—which would make loans and pension supplements available to pensioners with incomes below local poverty lines.

"Preventicare" is the next measure in my program. I think that detection centers like this will be a great boon to persons over 50. "Preventicare" is a perfect companion to medicare. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and I think "preventicare" will ease the burden on medicare and be a general all-round benefit to the community.

What Democracy Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I take great pleasure in inserting in the Congressional Record a copy of a speech made by Mr. Michael Assey, of Georgetown, S.C., which is located in my congressional district.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary each year conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. I understand over 300,000 school students participated in the contest this year and the Veterans of Foreign Wars awarded 5 top prizes. First, a $5,000 scholarship, second prize is $3,500, third prize is $2,500, fourth prize is $1,500, fifth prize is $1,000.

The title of the theme used by all the contestants was "Democracy—What It Means To Me."

I want to congratulate Mr. Michael Assey of Georgetown, S.C., and one of my constituents on being selected the winner from my State of South Carolina. Mr. Assey comes from one of the finest families in the State of South Carolina and I am certain he has a great future.

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

(By Michael Assey)

The space race of this modern age offers an interesting analogy concerning the working of the democratic way of life. The successful space shot depends on hundreds of intricate instruments performed precisely.

In democracy, the people are the intricate instruments. Democracy depends on the individual. Just as the real strength of any space program depends on its mechanical makeup, so, too, the forte of democracy lies in the citizens of its society. As a high school senior, I will not be called upon to make any policy changing decisions concerning democracy in our country, however, I am still vital to democracy. I am that part of a spaceship that is never mentioned, but at the same time, never overlooked. The greatest danger to democracy is right here in this country—right in its stronghold. The danger is indifference. It is easy to spot the obvious enemies of democracy. They can be seen in student revolts in Indonesia, in the jungles of Vietnam, or around the barbed wire fences of Berlin. But, at least, these enemies are open to our eyes.

Indifference to democracy is a special problem, specially classified, especially dangerous. It is both malignant and contagious. We must fight the spread of indifference. It is just as hard as our freedom loving forces are fighting in defense of democracy overseas. The fight to prevent indifference to democracy is our challenge—a challenge to the students of America. It's a fight that's being carried on at this very moment in our classrooms. It's a battle to know and love democracy and to familiarize ourselves with the enemies and schemes they use to destroy it.

Democracy is not just a school subject, it is a way of life. It is not abstract, rather, it is a living thing. To some it may mean food or clothing, to others it may promise freedom from tyranny or political oppression. Unfortunately to still others, it may mean nothing. True, it is simple to take something of this nature for granted in a country as great as ours. As students, this is our role. We must keep democracy in our mind and daily thoughts. We, too, must be good soldiers. We must take the battle for democracy beyond our classrooms.

It must not end at the period of a class or school day. We must show other students of other governments of other countries that ours is the greatest way of life, a life of democracy—a life of freedom. We must live democracy, then we will be good soldiers—soldiers of democracy.

As a part of the spaceship, we must go ahead in our ways, strengthening this freedom. As Americans, we must practice what we preach. A picture is worth a thousand words and a picture of a thriving democracy is worth a thousand, thousand political speeches. Democracy will have triumphed when it is accepted by all; when it can be seen in action by this country in every corner—and ultimately in all the world. Then and only then will democracy have meaning for all. Then the world will be safe for democracy.

The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the Record the third of a series of articles by Detroit News reporter, Tom Joyce, on the realities of the war on poverty.

The article follows:

Boon or Boondoggle?—Job Corps Flaws To Dim Hope for the Poor

(By Tom Joyce)

(Third of a series)

Washington, March 1.—A Job Corps official sat behind his desk in Washington and made this frank confession:

"There have been some awful mixups in the program."

And indeed there have been. No doubt more will be made today and tomorrow.

Nevertheless, the Job Corps, a favorite target of antipoverty war critics, might be on its way to becoming one of the brightest spots in President Johnson's assault on poverty.

One major conclusion is being drawn: Businessmen operate training centers much better than academic organizations such as universities and governmental educational arms. There is a solid body of evidence and testimony to support the conclusion.

There are still some formidable problems. And no one can say at this point that the project, designed to rescue youth from the worst imaginable kinds of backgrounds, will really work.

But for many young men and women who had given up on society—and whom society had given up—it is working.

Some already have been placed in jobs, others who had been rejected for military duty are now serving and some have returned to high school while others have gone on to college.

Not many. But some.

Nearly 85 percent of the young people in the Job Corps are high school dropouts.

They arrive at the centers as drifting, jobless, hopeless kids who have decided the Job Corps is their last chance to make good.

Today a corpsman named Terry looks much like any healthy, 19-year-old American. At 165 pounds his weight is just about right for a muscular youngster who stands 5 feet 10 inches tall.

But when he arrived at Camp Parks, an urban job center in California, a few months ago, Terry weighed in at only 128. He had never been to a dentist and his teeth were shot full of cavities.

He quit school in the ninth grade in Alabama to get a job.

Why?

"I always had the headache and I was hungry all the time. You can't learn nothin' when there's a poundin' in your head always."

Terry discovered that the pounding went away when he got enough to eat. But there wasn't enough food at home so he went out in search of a job. He worked from time to time, "but nothin' regular like."

Then he joined the Job Corps after he saw a commercial on television.

"I couldn't do no worse than I was doin'," he said.

America clings to the spirit of Horatio Alger, But it is doubtful that the heroes of Alger's "luck and pluck" series would have succeeded with constant headaches and growling stomachs.

Terry's story is not unusual among the young men who find their way to the Job Corps.

INCREASED DIET

At Camp Parks, nestled between the hills of Livermore Valley in the wine country, the first corspmen, who came were so undernourished that medical officials decided to increase the daily diet from 4,100 calories for each corpsman (the standard Air Force diet) to 6,000.

In all of the camps, neglected teeth have pushed health costs far above what had been estimated.

The youngsters come from big city slums, shacks in Appalachia, grubby homes on the outskirts of little towns, and wherever the poor scratch for a living in this land of plenty.

Many, if not most, come from broken homes. Some have never known a father and would just as soon forget mother. They are tough, suspicious, and bitter.

They get drunk when they go on pass, fight, and get tossed in jail.

DISTORTED STORY

This is the raw material the Job Corps gets in its 8 urban camps for men and 72 rural conservation centers all over the United States.

The Job Corps is expected to turn these unskilled, rebellious youngsters from the street corners into useful citizens.

Statistics to date tell a distorted story. But they cannot be ignored.

There are now 18,529 enrolled in the centers for both men and women, 8,300 of these in the urban camps. Only 819 have been graduated and of these 395 are employed, 275 are in the Armed Forces and 149 have returned to school, some to college.

The overall dropout rate is 27.9 percent, running from 25.5 in the urban centers, to 30.7 in the remote conservation camps.

REAL TEST TO COME

But the Job Corps has really been cranked up for less than a year. The real test should come next spring when thousands of graduates are expected to be placed in jobs.

Perhaps one of the most significant contributions the corps is making is in developing new teaching techniques and discovering why school dropouts give up and what can be done about it.

This information already is being turned over to the schools which, hopefully, one day will take over some of the work the Job Corps is doing.

Reading is at the bottom of many failures.

Few of the recruits have a sixth-grade reading level. In many camps the average is around third grade. A surprising number, some of whom have reached the 10th grade, cannot recite the alphabet all the way through.

CHEAPER METHOD

How does this happen?

In some school systems, especially in the rural South, it is cheaper to promote a youngster than deal with his special problems. So if he sits in the back of the class, is polite to the teacher, and doesn't say anything, a child can even get through high school without enough skill to read a third-grade book.

A 19-year-old boy at Camp Custer near Battle Creek is just a case. He is in a remedial reading laboratory and progressing swiftly.

Through the use of new teaching techniques and equipment, another corpsman at the same camp increased his reading skill from the second- to the seventh-grade level in 5 months.

Why does a boy or girl quit school? The Job Corps is finding out, where regular schools do not have the time or staff to handle such research.

SYMBOL OF DEFEAT

There are many reasons. Sometimes parents encourage it for financial reasons. But one reason that pops up frequently is that the school becomes an unbearable symbol of defeat.

A culturally deprived child from a poor home begins kindergarten with a big handicap. His vocabulary is limited. He has trouble communicating. He hasn't had association experiences.

By the time he reaches first grade he is a step farther behind. He doesn't learn as quickly as the other children. By second grade he is asked to read material that is too much for him. And so it goes, until failure after failure is too much. It is easier to quit. It is too embarrassing to remain.

What is the Job Corps doing? First, it lets the corpsman proceed at his own speed so he can build self-confidence by exchanging failure after failure with success after success.

LEVELS VARY

Half of the corpsman's time is spent in the classroom where studies are related to vocational training. A corpsman who wants to be a machinist learns quickly in the shop that he cannot do it unless he understands math and can read detailed instructions.

In remedial reading labs there are special textbooks designed for readers at various levels—and the latest audio and visual equipment.

Ten students in the class might be reading the same story. The covers on the books are almost identical. But the words in some are easier.

Embarrassment is a major obstacle. A 19-year-old boy we will call Lonnie at Camp Custer used to be a gang leader in Philadelphia. He was a big man in his neighborhood. And he doesn't want it known that he can hardly read a comic book. He is not dumb. Maybe a little slow. But he really wants to learn to read.

The danger, his instructor says, is that if he gets embarrassed he'll give up. It is delicate work.

JARRED BY CHANGE

Vocational training programs range from learning how to operate heavy roadbuilding equipment to culinary arts at the urban centers.

At the conservation centers, somewhat similar to the old CCC camps of the Great Depression, are young men whose achievement levels and work habits are so underdeveloped that they are not yet ready for vocational training at the urban centers. Some never will make it.

The camps at Vesuvius Lake in the foothills of the Appalachias in southern Ohio, are remote and lonely places. It is a jarring change for city-bred youths.

Some plainly do not like it, perhaps explaining the higher dropout rate at the conservation centers.

A tough kid from Chicago was assigned to a crew improving a timber stand. How was it going? He replies:

"So the cat running the show points to this here tree and he tells me it's an oak tree. So okay, I believe him, it's an oak tree. Now I know what an oak tree looks like. So what?"

BAD PUBLICITY

But Richard Bester, 17, of Harbor Springs, Mich., who quit school in the ninth grade and joined the Job Corps because he thinks it is his last chance, says he wouldn't trade the experience for anything. And he hopes he can go into training for forestry work.

The Job Corps has been plagued by bad publicity, some of it deserved and some not.

There was a riot last November in Kalamazoo involving men from the Custer center. But early reports were greatly exaggerated. In the final analysis, only 12 corpsmen were arrested on charges ranging from larceny to profanity. The most serious offenders were expelled. And there have been no major incidents at the camp since.

But there are abundant signs of progress. And you don't have to spend much time there to discover that morale is high.

Ronald Kehoe, 17, of Indianapolis, is learning to be an auto mechanic. He dropped out of high school in the ninth grade and was just "bumming around at odd jobs" with no future.

GOOD STARTS

His instructor, Zell Scamehorn, thinks that half of the boys in the class are getting something out of the program and will be ready for employment when they complete it. This won't be employment as first-rate mechanics. But it will be a start.

S. S. Uslan, the pipe-smoking director of Camp Parks, is more optimistic. He thinks "we can get success with 90 percent when we reach peak efficiency."

Uslan, a doctor of psychology with Litton Industries, Inc., is not a dreamer. Neither is his company, a tightly managed industrial complex that runs 96 plants and laboratories in 21 States and 42 more in 12 foreign countries.

The Job Corps Center is operated by Litton's educational systems division and it is pointed out as a classic example of how big business is able to run this kind of operation.

COSTLIER THAN HARVARD

Critics frequently refer to the fact that it costs about $4,500 to keep a young man in the Job Corps for a year of training—more than it would cost to send him to Harvard or Yale.

Uslan, who has heard the analogy a hundred times, responds easily:

"But these boys can't go to Harvard or Yale. They can't go any place. And they will be lost if nothing is done for them."

If they are not salvaged, many, of the types the Job Corps deals with, could well end up on welfare rolls. And some studies indicate that a married couple with one child on welfare for 12 years costs the taxpayer about $20,000.

Moreover, Uslan and Job Corps officials say the cost will go down. The initial shot is high because it includes the cost of rehabilitating old Army camps and other facilities.

BAD FOR NATION

"These kids are restless," Uslan says, "and they think in terms of right now. And I think youngsters like this are the greatest threat to the Nation. They are the most prone to subversive groups because they are willing to follow anyone who offers success, real or imagined. And they are against society. That's why it is so important we do something."

Camp Breckenridge, just outside the little town of Morganfield, across the Ohio River in Kentucky, is singled out as an example of what happens when education institutions try to take on a Job Corps operation.

The contractor is Southern Illinois University. The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), which runs the poverty war, has announced that it is not renewing the $10 million, 18-month contract.

The camp was the scene of a riot last August. Officials at the Center prefer to call it a "hell of a street fight." And it was.

The trouble began when the recruits began arriving. The Center was not ready for them.

RIOT BREAKS OUT

At best, old Army camps are bleak places—rows of barnlike barracks, fields of weeds and high grass and a fence that creates an atmosphere of confinement.

And when the new and hopeful corpsmen arrived at Breckenridge, the barracks were dilapidated and the paint was peeling off. The training programs were not set up. And the corpsmen were put to work painting and gardening when they expected to get job training.

"They were told," said Director James Fornier, "that soon there would be things like a fully equipped auto mechanics school in a weatherbeaten old building. They just didn't believe it."

Disappointment exploded into riot.

This was not the case at Camp Parks, or Custer, operated by U.S. Industries. Nor was it the case at other Centers where experienced management firms were running the show. Buildings were painted, services were arranged and classrooms and teachers were waiting when the corpsmen arrived.

BLAME IS SHARED

But despite the start, Breckenridge today is not as bad as many people paint it. There are programs going, even if not as smoothly as at some other spots.

And the morale is high.

Designed for 2,000 corpsmen, there are only 500 there now. The main reason is that OEO cut off the flow after the riots and did not resume it until only recently.

Fornier, a former high school counselor, who is uncertain about his own future, remains a solid supporter of the Job Corps idea.

"I still feel," he said, "that this is one of the most important things going on in the country today. It is the answer to a national emergency."

He contends that OEO is not without blame in the failure of the camp. And he is right.

WRONG PROMISES

OEO officials in Washington admit that in the beginning the screening program was "lousy." In its haste to get the program rolling "kids who had no chance of succeeding" were recruited, helping to boost the dropout rate.

And often recruiters were overzealous.

"The first kids we got," said Fornier, "were promised the moon. Some actually arrived expecting private rooms with maid service."

Nevertheless, identical problems were overcome at places like Custer and Parks.

One of the toughest tasks is to get these youngsters, who arrive in leather jackets, boots, tight pants, and wearing long hair, thinking about their own problems and their responsibility to others.

One of the techniques is group counseling—group sessions that industry and business now are experimenting with under such names as "sensitivity programs."

Essentially, they are big bull sessions with no holds barred.

The topic under discussion when this reporter walked into a session at Camp Parks involved an incident in which one corpsman creased another's skull with a trash can, a leisure diversion that required several stitches and a trip to the hospital.

The victim, a white youth from the South who had returned drunk from a pass in town, demanded a Negro give up his seat in the dormitory television room. The Negro refused, despite repeated threats and exhortations.

When the aggressor tried force, the Negro picked up the nearest weapon—the trash can—and slammed into the intruder's head.

Strangely, the discussion revolved around who was wrong.

Because drinking is a problem for many of the corpsmen, and because they come from backgrounds where it is a problem, there was a tendency to excuse the aggressor.

"Well, you know he was drunk," said one of the participants. "And you know you can't talk sense to a man who is drunk. So why didn't you just give him your seat and forget about it?"

Some of the others agreed.

SESSIONS FAIL

In the end, the consensus was that the white youth was wrong.

What did he learn from the experience?

"I won't get drunk any more," he told the group. "You're a damn liar," a voice rang out in the back of the room.

Near the end, many complained that such sessions do not accomplish anything.

"These things don't do any good," said a skinny kid in a sweat shirt and tight trousers. "I just don't dig this stuff," said another.

But when it was over, a young Puerto Rican from New York walked up to the reporter and volunteered:

"Don't get the wrong ideas. There is more here than meets the eye."

WORDS AND FORCE

The psychologist-counselor, Rue Lawrence, says the sessions can mean the difference between failure and success because they teach the corpsmen about themselves and others.

He added:

They let them learn for themselves that the other guy has the same problems. And it gives confidence."

There is the case of a paratrooper who was given a bad conduct discharge because he fought with anyone and everyone about anything. As a last chance he joined the Job Corps. The first day he started a fight. He was warned he would be expelled. In private counseling sessions, and counselors are available 24 hours a day, he confessed he really wanted to make it but could not control himself. In group sessions, slowly, he learned he could influence others with words as well as force.

TWO-SIDED BATTLE

Now he is captain of his dormitory.

University of California professors from the Berkeley campus who advise on the academic side of the Camp Parks program agree that it is an operating success.

And Western Michigan University, which provides Camp Custer with an academic staff, says U.S. Industries is doing a good job.

But at Camp Kilmer, N.J., a battle over methods of helping the poor is going on between academicians and businessmen.

The camp is operated by Federal Electric Co., a subsidiary of International Telephone and Telegraph, under an $11.5 million, 18-month contract with a guaranteed profit of $520,000. The maximum profit allowed by OEO is 4.7 percent.

Teachers at the center and Rutgers University professors employed as consultants on a subcontract, argue that "business methods" are being employed and that economic considerations have led to a reduction in the teaching staff.

But despite the fuss, programs are going on at Kilmer.

Generally, there has been little trouble at centers operated by business corporations and Sargent Shriver, director of the poverty war, says:

"They (the businessmen) know how to run things. They are good managers. They know what kind of employees they need. They train people in realities. The kids know they're dealing in realities."

Corpsmen get $30 a month for incidentals. And when they graduate, if they do, they get another $50 for every month spent in the corps. The maximum enlistment is 2 years. In addition, if the corpsman sends home up to $25 a month, OEO matches this.

As the official said, there have been some awful screwups.

JOBS EXIST

But the dropout rate has been cut. And anyone who takes the time to tour a camp (and many of the critics have not) can see that the corpsmen are getting training for jobs that really exist—in electronics, welding, culinary arts (where the demand is high in hotels and restaurants) and in other fields.

But a new kind of trouble already is beginning to develop as more and more graduates are produced. Many are not sticking with the jobs that have been found for them.

One reason is that jobs are often in unfamiliar surroundings, away from family and friends and where the graduate must live alone in a roominghouse or the YMCA.

"It's a problem we have to face," said a Job Corps official.

Other problems will develop. And more mistakes will be made.

There will be more ammunition for the congressional critics.

For one thing, the cost is high at a time when there is an increasing demand to cut Federal spending at home.

"But," asks the Camp Parks director, "what is the cost going to be if we continue to neglect this problem?"

A Sellout Coming in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, is a shapeup for the sellout gaining momentum? I bring to the attention of my colleagues a column which appeared in the Miami Herald, which indicates that the Johnson administration is thinking more and more in terms of negotiating any kind of peace to get us out of the Vietnam war.

Peace with honor was once the byword of this Nation. We have made vast commitments of men and materials to Vietnam. Has our conduct of military operations been so misguided that we are now on the verge of admitting defeat?

I suggest that my colleagues read this thoughtful analysis of our present position in Vietnam. A text of the column follows:

A Moderate Foresees Defeat for Our Vietnam Efforts

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

Washington.—A friend who is a U.S. Senator made an observation the other evening that seemed to be the most significant thing I've heard about the Vietnam crisis in some time.

This Senator expressed the belief that President Johnson, if and when it became necessary, could take to the television and convince the citizens of this country that they had to accept humiliation and a failure of mission in South Vietnam.

This comes from a thoughtful and troubled man, who has been neither an appeaser nor a bombardier in his public utterances. The importance of his words lies in the implication that the middle ground Members of Congress, and perhaps the bewildered citizens of the Nation, are getting ready for the excruciating experience of throwing in the towel.

It is difficult to believe that a President could do this and get away with it politically. Johnson would be torn to shreds as an appeaser. And the Democrats would have a terrible monkey on their back in the 1966 campaign.

But we did it in Korea. Once the military caskets began showing up in the United States in fearsome numbers, it became possible to negotiate a truce which after 16 years is most precarious.

Facing the reality of a failure of mission will be all the more difficult because of the propaganda that the White House, the Pentagon, and the Department of State have fed the people these many years about our commitment in South Vietnam.

Despite all the hopeful predictions, despite all the increased bombing pressure, the grim reality of Vietnam control of much of South Vietnam continues to stare at us as the big fact of the war out there.

And they may have to face up to the problem in that we cannot negotiate a peace unless we talk with the guerrillas who have been dug in all the time. In effect, we will have to negotiate with burglars who have taken over the upper floors of the house.

The first day we negotiate with the Vietcong we repudiate the government in Saigon, and they go down the drain. After all the months and years of mish-mash that we have been "defending freedom," out in South Vietnam, the repudiation of our wards in Saigon will come as a pretty tough blow.

But when moderate men are speaking privately of President Johnson's ability to make the American people accept the humiliation of defeat, it may be later than they think over in the Pentagon.

Additional Federal Judges and Districts

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Res. 734) providing for consideration of S. 1666, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support S. 1666, to provide additional district and circuit judges.

In the eastern district of Wisconsin—which encompasses territory with about two-thirds of the State's population, its highest growth rates, and its chief centers of industry and commerce—there has long been a need for additional judicial manpower.

As of June 30, 1963, 11.6 percent of the pending cases ready for trial in the eastern district of Wisconsin were more than 3 years old. For the Nation the figure was only 8.4 percent.

At that time, the median period from filing to disposition of cases was 29 months in the eastern district of Wisconsin and only 16 months on the average across the Nation.

Litigation was being seriously delayed and this was of great concern to all who recognize the validity of the maxim that justice delayed is frequently justice denied.

In October, 1963, I introduced legislation to provide a third Federal judge in the eastern district of Wisconsin. The bill was referred to the Judicial Conference which in March, 1965 recommended an additional judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, on a temporary basis.

The Judicial Conference's recommendation is included in the excellent legislation before us today.

The passage of this bill and the appointment of an additional judge of the eastern district of Wisconsin will provide for the elimination of the large backlog of pending cases and will substantially improve the administration of justice in that district. It will alleviate the very heavy burden on our present judges, Robert E. Tehan and John Reynolds.

My only regret is that the judgeship for Wisconsin will be temporary.

With the bar of the eastern district of Wisconsin, I believe that Wisconsin's eastern district already needs three permanent judgeships. If this need is not yet clear—as the Judicial Conference and the Judiciary Committee appear to believe—surely the eastern district of Wisconsin is on the brink of having a continuing workload that would fully justify three permanent judgeships.

As the judicial business of the district continues to grow, I hope that Congress will make the third judgeship permanent.

Our Presence in South Vietnam

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN BUCHANAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Buchanan] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks now debate has raged and many questions have been asked concerning the rightness of our presence in South Vietnam and the rightness or wrongness of the way in which we are conducting our mission there.

It was my privilege, within the past two weeks to visit southeast Asia on the occasion of the Lincoln Day recess. I felt there could be no more appropriate way to spend it than with our troops who are fighting for human freedom in South Vietnam. So it was I spent 6 days in the field, observing our men, what they are doing, and how they are doing it. This trip was not made at Government expense, but was financed by friends in my district, and it had a rather special purpose.

BIRMINGHAM'S ADOPTION OF 1ST INFANTRY

Back in January I informed the House that during the fall recess my city had adopted the 1st Infantry Division. We did so as a sign of our support for the men in Vietnam, for our soldiers, and for what they were attempting to do there. This idea was first conceived by retired Brig. Gen. Edward M. Friend, Jr. It was a good choice.

The Big Red One is this country's oldest division, and has an outstanding and much-decorated history. It was first to shed American blood in France in World War I, and it was the first to land in North Africa in World War II. It spearheaded the conquest of Sicily; it stormed across Omaha Beach in the D-day assault at Normandy, and was first to be in Germany. It was the first infantry division to sweep across the line into Czechoslovakia, the farthest advance of U.S. troops in World War II. The 1st Division is now distinguishing itself in the battle for the freedom of the people of Vietnam. It was my pleasure to go as the people's representative to tell these fighting men of our support for them and our pride in them.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of this adoption became a reality when the mayor of the city of Birmingham, the president of the county commission, the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, the Birmingham News, and others, got together to organize a coordinated council of distinguished citizens. It was fulfilled by the overwhelming support of the people of Birmingham. In this plan, particular civic groups and other organizations are serving as sponsoring or adopting units for particular units of the 1st Division. While there have been many letters, Christmas gifts sent, and so forth, to individual soldiers by sponsoring groups, the primary emphasis has been on joint projects for the benefit of the Vietnamese people in the III Corps area. For example, the Birmingham Retail Druggists Association has donated medicines and supplies for use in dispensaries set up by the 1st Division for citizens of hamlets and villages there. Many hundreds of people are receiving medical help heretofore not available from any source in this way. Berry High School in Birmingham has adopted an orphanage. The list of such activities goes on and on.

At the kickoff of this project, Sgt. Maj. Bill Woolridge of the 1st Division came to Birmingham to represent the Big Red One. He promptly won the hearts of our city for himself and for his division. Later, the Birmingham News sent two representatives, Alf Van Hoose, correspondent, and Tony Faletta, photographer, to cover the 1st Infantry's operation and to provide the communications necessary to maintain the relationship. These two fine ambassadors for Birmingham accompanied me throughout my tour in Vietnam.

QUESTIONS NEEDING ANSWERS

There was a second reason for my visit. I have many constituents and sons of constituents who are engaged in the Vietnamese action, and I have personally written too many letters to the parents and to the wives of servicemen who have given their last full measure of devotion for the freedom of southeast Asia.

Therefore, in my own mind, as I know has been the case with many Members, there were questions: Is what we are doing in Vietnam necessary? Are we doing it right? Can we succeed in our mission? How is the morale of our troops? Are they adequately trained? And are they adequately supplied?

To seek out the answers, I spent 2 days in the field with the 1st Infantry, touching all its units and operations, then the balance of my time touring from the engineering miracle of Cam Rhan Bay to the Marine's domain in Da Nang and the far north; touching all our major forces, plus the crack Republic of Korea Tiger Division; visiting the "golf course" at Ankhe and spending the night on America's nuclear-powered *Enterprise*, with its awesome striking power.

I came back encouraged and inspired by what I found in Vietnam. There has never been a more classic case of good versus evil, light versus darkness, freedom versus tyranny than the struggle in which we are now engaged. Nor has America ever produced finer soldiers than the officers and men of the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

Our forces are in large part made up of and led by regulars, fine professional American soldiers. Yet there are also represented young draftees and volunteers, taken away from a life here which had every reason to make them soft at an age in which they could not be expected to yet be men. To all the doubters of the strength or virtue of this Nation's youth I must report that these magnificent young Americans who are fighting in Vietnam are their Nation's crowning glory. They are not soft and they are fully men. They are the finest soldiers a great military tradition has yet produced. From where I stand, they look 10 feet tall.

Typical was a young man I met in a field hospital who could not have been more than 20—blond hair, young face, young-old eyes and a fine, muscular body minus one leg, lost to a Vietcong mine.

He said:

> It's all right, sir, I know what I've been fighting for.

This conviction was repeated by every American I met in Vietnam. Would God the Congress—all the Congress—could know as well.

IS VIETNAM NECESSARY?

Is such a costly action as this really necessary? In answer, we must face two great grim realities about southeast Asia in our time.

The first is the fact—the reality of Communist aggression—the aggressive acts of a tyranny which would impose its iron rule upon the people of all southeast Asia if it were permitted to do so. In Vietnam we face the present and continuing aggression on the part of North Vietnam and Ho Chi Minh that is continuing every week of every month at this time. But it is not only a present aggression, an aggression we are sworn to act against and committed to act against. It is also a longrun aggression. Ho Chi Minh has been working for 20 years to establish his rule in Vietnam.

The infiltration of subversion and the terrorism in South Vietnam sponsored from the north—these things have gone on not for months but for years and because for years he has been working to infiltrate and to subvert and to capture control of South Vietnam and of its people, the Communists of the Vietcong are thoroughly woven into the fabric of the society of the Republic of Vietnam. They are deeply entrenched. They are interwoven into the whole life of the society.

They are imbedded and they are in a position so intermingled with the rest of the people of South Vietnam that their removal is a slow and painful and step-by-step process. This longrun aggression makes of this present action in Vietnam a unique kind of warfare in our history in which we are combating not only the regular troops in the field, where we can find them and get them to face us, but in which we are struggling against a very insidious kind of guerrilla warfare.

A REIGN OF FORCE AND FEAR

The reign of the Vietcong where they do have power and influence is not one of the love of peace or democracy, it is gangster government. It can best be compared to the influence and power of the Cosa Nostra—the underworld—in this country. Sixty-five percent of their actions are criminal rather than military—crimes against people.

The idea that there is any desire on the part of the Vietnamese people for the kind of government which regularly beheads those who disagree with it and which regularly uses as its methods, murder, torture, and terrorism and which rules by force and fear is ridiculous in the extreme. The benefit to the people involved in permitting VC control of or participation in government is approximately equal to letting the underworld take over the government of Chicago, or advocating that Bogaloosa, La., be run by the Ku Klux Klan.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Vietnam are enduring a terrible kind of tyranny and persecution at the hands of the Vietcong.

The aggression being committed in southeast Asia is a brutal and tyrannical aggression. There is nothing pretty about it. There is nothing in it that either conservatives or liberals in this country could reasonably defend. This rule of force and fear has been imposed upon large numbers of people in the Republic of Vietnam and has been sustained by terrorism. This is the first grim fact about southeast Asia.

We see in Vietnam Communist aggression which, if left unrepelled and unchecked, which if we bow before it and surrender, will extend to nation after nation until the millions of Asia are living under the dark night of tyranny.

This is the grim threat not only of the North Vietnamese but of the Red Chinese aggression—the dark night of communism which threatens all of southeast Asia is the first great reality that we must face.

THE NEED

The second is the poverty of Asia. Americans are not prepared to see the poverty which fills Asia, and Vietnam is no exception. The condition of the people stands in marked contrast to the startling beauty of the land. Poverty, disease, illiteracy are everywhere.

It is a wonderful thing that here in these United States where we have to search out the people to be the recipients of our poverty program and apparently have to use great dilligence to find these persons. But the fact is one does not have to look in Vietnam.

One does not have to go anywhere at all to find poverty, disease, and illiteracy running rampant. It is unfortunate to have to say so but we were not left a very pretty legacy by the French. The citizens of Vietnam have been subject peoples most of the time for hundreds of years, and for 70 years they were under the control of the French.

Yet, when we see the legacy left us and to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, we see a country in which there are virtually no public schools. We see one in which various epidemics run rampant, and disease is everywhere, one in which there is no kind of public health program, one in which there is great poverty and no little hunger.

We see one in which there is one hospital per province, and these poor by our standards. There are only 100 doctors in the land and most of these are inaccessible to the people. American military medics, AID people, and private agencies have become literally the difference between sickness and health—and even life and death—for countless citizens of this nation.

So if we ask ourselves is it necessary for us to do what we are doing in Vietnam, we need to answer that question in the light of Communist aggression, which left unchecked, could threaten the freedom of all Asia and, indeed, all the world.

We must also answer recognizing the poverty of Asia and the need of the people for a life that is blessed with liberty, with human dignity, and with some opportunity for economic, medical, and agricultural advancement.

OUR COMMITMENT

We must also look at our solemn commitments. Everything we are doing is in line with our commitments as a member of SEATO and our specific commitments to the Republic of Vietnam.

Those are solemn contracts of this Government which must be solemnly fulfilled.

THE INVESTMENT

We must look at what we are doing in the light of our investment in southeast Asia. We have invested not only millions of dollars economically, but also that which is most precious in our land. Some of us for the first time voted the other day for an aid bill to provide economic assistance to the people of southeast Asia.

The House of Representatives overwhelmingly voted for that bill and for the bill this day, not only in the fulfillment of our commitment, but as a sign of our willingness to make whatever further investment is necessary to fulfill our mission there. And well we should, for we have invested our young men in Asia, and any other investment pales to insignificance in the face of their sacrifice.

During my visit to the 1st Infantry, I talked to a certain young soldier. He and another American had for some time been helping the people in a nearby Vietnamese village build a school for their children. Having worked for several weeks without incident, they had relaxed their guard a bit and had set down their weapons a little too far away. Suddenly a group of Vietcong appeared from hiding, grabbed the rifles, fired at the Americans, and ran away. One soldier was wounded, his buddy killed. This wounded soldier had requested to return to complete the project as soon as his wounds permitted. "The school is not finished yet," he explained, "and besides, now I have got an investment." America's job is not finished yet, either, in Vietnam. And our investment is too great to turn back now.

THE ALTERNATIVE

Is it necessary to stay in Vietnam? Let us answer in terms of the future freedom and safety of all the world, because this, too, is at stake. The domino theory is not inaccurate, for if the tyrant sees he can succeed by aggression and by extending his tyranny, he will continue by force to so extend it, and he must be stopped still here and now.

THE MORAL QUESTION

Are we doing right in southeast Asia? There are the doves who say that we have no moral right to be doing what we are doing, and we ought to seek immediate negotiations and not do anything that might be interpreted as escalation of the war, that we are the aggressors, and we are the ones who are immoral.

What are we doing, and are we doing it right? It seems to me that in response to the doubters of our land we need to recognize very fully and very firmly that the President has gone the second mile and has turned the other cheek in his attempt to find the road to peace. He has sought negotiations consistently for a long period of time. He has explored through his own efforts and those of the Vice President, the Ambassador to the United Nations, the Secretary of State and others every avenue that might lead toward negotiations and toward peace.

He declared a cessation in the fighting, two holiday periods. He declared a cessation in the bombing. He has persistently sought the pathway to peace, to negotiation. And consistently Hanoi and Peiping have jeered at those efforts, and rejected them. They have rather used those times of unilateral peace moves on our part as times of reorganization, entrenchment, increasing supplies and men into South Vietnam as times of increased aggressive action.

Mr. Speaker, once, when I was a 10-year-old boy, the lesson in Sunday School one Sunday morning made a great impression on me. For some weeks another boy who lived two doors from my home and I had had a series of fist-fights almost every day over events that would develop. The Sunday School teacher said:

> One should turn the other cheek and go the second mile.

Being thereby converted, I told my friend the next morning that no matter what he did, my response would be to turn the other cheek and not fight back. He became delighted at the idea. He hit me on one cheek, I turned the other, and he hit me on that one, too. While I did not completely lose my religion, it seemed I had run out of cheeks to turn, and it became necessary for me to enter into fisticuffs with him to attempt to teach him to respect other people's religion.

It seems to me that we have gone well past the second mile and we have turned all the cheeks that there are to turn in seeking the way to peace and to negotiation, and the enemy has used these to his consistent advantage and has consistently rejected our overtures of peace.

Consequently, it seems that the only thing we can do under such circumstances is to do everything in our power to render the aggressor incapable of further aggression, to stop his present and continuing aggression, and to do all we can to demonstrate to him with all the force at our command the foolishness, the folly, of trying to get those who are firmly determined to stand for freedom and for human dignity to bow before tyranny and to accept his aggression without responding with great force and with unaltering firmness. Such a course seems the most likely way to bring the present conflict to an early and honorable conclusion. There are times when a big stick brought down with vigor upon the head of a bully is the most effective instrument of peace.

STRIKING AT THE SOURCE

I would say this would include stepping up the bombing of strategic targets, cutting supply lines, cutting the flow of North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam in every way possible, increasing sanctions against those who are supplying North Vietnam, and doing anything and everything reasonably possible to stop the aggression there at its source.

PACIFICATION AND RECONSTRUCTION

There is a second task. Even if we step up the bombing of strategic targets, even if we close the harbors, even if we use strong enough sanctions against other nations so that they do stop supplying the Vietcong—he receives supplies from many places, though Red China is the primary source of supply—we must, nevertheless, do a second job, which is a job of step-by-step pacification and reconstruction in South Vietnam, in the Republic of Vietnam.

It is an oversimplification to feel that we can step up our activities against the north, against Ho Chi Minh, and that, in 6 months or a very short period of time, by escalating our own conduct of the war, we can bring this situation to a successful conclusion. The fact is that because of the long-term aggression of Ho Chi Minh and of the Communists in Vietnam, this is not enough. The only kind of action which can possibly secure the land, which can possibly put the country into a condition under which there can be such a thing as free elections, such a thing as self-determination, is action to release the people from the rule of terror and the reign of fear of the Vietcong within South Vietnam.

Our troops, in cooperation with the Republic of Vietnam, are conducting a step-by-step pacification and reconstruction program. They are going out to clear given areas of the Vietcong, and they are moving in to convince the people of those areas that we can protect them from the one who holds his gun to their heads. If elections were held all over South Vietnam now, in those areas where he has influence and power, he would respond with murder to any who opposed him.

We must, as we are doing now, seek out the hidden enemy. He is hidden and entrenched as a guerrilla. For example, tunnels have been found that have been as long as 2 miles, and six layers deep. Also he dissolves into the populace. Because people fear him, they do not always readily identify him, until they are sure we can provide them security from his reprisal.

We must, therefore, convince the people that this enemy who dissolves himself into the civilian population, and who remains unidentified, because of the fear the people have of him, is one from whom we can and will protect them.

In the second place, we must convince them that we are their friends. Regrettably, one of the propaganda instruments the Vietcong have used rather effectively against the Americans has been to compare them to the French, by saying, "They are here to rule, to exploit."

The French soldiers in many instances were mercenaries. They were fighting for pay and for the loot they could take, and their record was not always what it should have been. The French rule did not accomplish for the people of Vietnam what might have been accomplished by more humane and enlightened policies.

Therefore, we must overcome this and other forms of propaganda against our troops. We must persuade the people that we are their friends, that we can protect them and that we want to help them.

Mr. Speaker, everywhere I went I was greatly impressed by the understanding of this phase of our mission possessed by our troops. They understood they had a military mission to meet the enemy on the field, as regular troops. When this has been done they have made a marvelous record and have totally defeated the enemy.

They also understand that they have to search out the guerrilla forces, which is a step-by-step as well as a dangerous and time-consuming occupation, requiring many troops. They are doing this and doing it well.

But a civic action phase of our mission goes hand-in-hand with the military program. We are helping to demonstrate concretely our friendship for the people of Vietnam, our desire to help rather than to rule them, by helping them to construct roads and schools and churches. We are helping them to meet their medical needs by setting up dispensaries all across the land, and are conducting a variety of other programs of civic action, all in cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. This is being done in cooperation also with our AID people and our private civilian agencies, and it is being conducted in many instances by our military personnel.

THE GREAT HUMANITARIANS

Our men are demonstrating once more for the world to see that GI Joe is the world's greatest humanitarian. Their understanding of this part of their mission and its necessity and the way they are performing it is an inspiration to behold. These men understand that they must win the friendship of the Vietnamese people, and they are doing so. It is apparent to anyone.

The fine young officer assigned to escort me was Capt. Bert H. Custer, a West Pointer, a fine soldier, a good example of the kind of fine professional that we have at every level of leadership in Vietnam. His easy but firmly disciplined relationship with both senior officers and enlisted men was matched by his rapport with the people of Vietnam. He has been a fine fighting soldier as well as having the kind of finesse and patience necessary to serve as a congressional escort.

On the day of my departure from Vietnam, he and I went to visit an orphanage in Saigon. This orphanage was one that Dr. Tom Dooley had helped begin. When we entered the grounds little Vietnamese children swarmed around us and surrounded us. They lifted their arms to us with their faces lighted in smiles. In the wisdom of their innocent hearts they knew that Americans were the good guys.

Those tough combat soldiers who had come into Saigon for an evening and taken a little group of orphan children to the zoo and who had hearts as big as all outdoors—the children knew them to be their friends, and so did the people in the villages and the hamlets.

When people have had sick children for many months, and the Americans have come in to provide medical care to help heal their children, such people understand that we have come in friendship. As they understand they begin to have confidence in us and in their Government, which Government looks more hopeful than any we have seen for some time in Vietnam. They are beginning to warm up to us and to gain courage to identify the hidden enemy in their midst, the local Vietcong, so that the Government of the Republic of Vietnam can deal with these enemies.

Now, this step-by-step part of succeeding in our mission will take time and will take troops. This will require firmness of purpose; it will require patience at home; but unless we do this to free and liberate the people of the Republic of Vietnam from the power and influence of this long-term aggression of the Vietcong, and unless we stand firm until we do this, we cannot succeed in our mission in Asia.

CAN WE WIN IN VIETNAM?

This brings me to another question; namely, Can we succeed? May I say that I have never seen anything quite matching the high morale of our troops in Vietnam. These men, everywhere I went, wounded men, generals and privates, men in the hottest spots in Vietnam, and everywhere in that area, universally reflected high dedication matched by understanding of and an unshakable faith in the rightness of their mission. They also demonstrated the confidence and conviction that they were going to succeed in their assignment in Vietnam. Their morale was as high as I have seen anywhere.

LEADERSHIP

We shall succeed in Vietnam because these men who would match any soldiers that this country has ever fielded in any of its wars, and we will succeed in this mission because we have great military leadership. The men who are leading the combat there in this supporting role of ours read like a roll of honor. First among them, of course, is Gen. William Westmoreland, who is a gifted military general and who has also a gift for understanding the delicate political and diplomatic phases of his mission. He respects his supporting role in the Republic of Vietnam and remains in that role, but he manages to lead magnificently from that position.

I found confidence, unshakable confidence, in General Westmoreland on the part of every man under his command as well as on the part of the Vietnamese everywhere. This man has done nothing less than a magnificent job of leadership, and we owe him a debt of great gratitude. Such was also the case with each of his field commanders.

Gen. Jonathan O. Seeman, who is commanding officer of the 1st Infantry Division, with which I spent much of my time, is the finest kind of military leader. High quality marks the leadership of the 1st Cavalry, the Air Force, the Navy. Nor could any military force boast greater leadership than that of General Walt with whom some of us were privileged to meet this day. The Marines under his command are living up to the highest traditions of their corps. Everywhere one goes in Vietnam, one is impressed with the high caliber of both officers and men.

General Westmoreland gives to every man who becomes a part of the U.S. Armed Forces in Vietnam nine rules for personnel to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include them in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

NINE RULES FOR PERSONNEL OF U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, VIETNAM

The Vietnamese have paid a heavy price in suffering for their long fight against the Communists. We military men are in Vietnam now because their Government has asked us to help its soldiers and people in winning their struggle. The Vietcong will attempt to turn the Vietnamese people against you. You can defeat them at every turn by the strength, understanding, and generosity you display with the people. Here are nine simple rules:

1. Remember we are guests here: We make no demands and seek no special treatment.
2. Join with the people. Understand their life, use phrases from their language and honor their customs and laws.
3. Treat women with politeness and respect.
4. Make personal friends among the soldiers and common people.
5. Always give the Vietnamese the right-of-way.
6. Be alert to security and ready to react with your military skill.
7. Don't attract attention by loud, rude or unusual behavior.
8. Avoid separating yourself from the people by a display of wealth or privilege.
9. Above all else you are members of the U.S. Military Forces on a difficult mission, responsible for all your official and personal actions. Reflect honor upon yourself and the United States of America.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, these rules are abided by, and our men are following them and following them well.

MOBILITY AND FIREPOWER

We shall win because we have superior mobility and firepower. This is being used with increasing effectiveness to rout the Vietcong. There has never been more extensive use of air transportation and air support, from helicopters to bombers and from light reconnaissance to heavy transport. Helicopters are used with great flexibility and effectiveness—transporting troops and supplies, rescuing downed aviators and wounded men, and flying combat missions. Armed helicopters are proving of great value in this operation. Artillery is being widely and effectively used against Vietcong strongholds.

Ground-air support and bombing missions by Air Force, Marine, and Navy jets are having a cumulative effect both in casualties and in their demoralizing effect upon the Vietcong. As our intelligence improves, these become increasingly effective. Skill and science, men and morale, mobility and firepower are being blended into a devastating combination which is playing havoc with the enemy.

MEDICAL AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT

Mr. Speaker, the medical work we are doing outstrips anything we have ever done. We have stationary hospitals which are in a central location. Since the conflict is everywhere, and there are not fixed battlelines, as in previous wars, rather than having field hospitals which normally follow the troops, helicopters bring into this central location men who have been wounded in battle. A doctor there at one of the hospitals told me that often within 30 minutes of the time a man was wounded he had him in surgery at that particular hospital. We are losing almost no men who get to the hospital and who have been wounded. The ratio is extremely low. This work has been outstanding.

We shall win because the men who are there have had excellent training. They are marvelously trained. They are highly motivated. They understand their mission. They have excellent medical care. And they are well supplied. In spite of the engineering and logistical miracle required to move 150,000 troops into this little country with no real port facilities, few roads, none of them safe, and limited railway, persistently interdicted by the Vietcong, and then sustain those troops and support the military actions of a highly mobile army, this has been done. We are developing the port facilities. We are moving the supplies. I found no present shortages anywhere I went, and I went almost everywhere.

ROTATION POLICY

Mr. Speaker, another thing that means a great deal to them is this: We have a policy of rotating each man after 1 year. While morale is of the highest, every man there can tell you to the minute how much time he has left on his tour and on his mission. This is a system worth maintaining.

A STABLE GOVERNMENT

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the encouraging South Vietnamese progress.

This government is taking seriously the need for reconstruction in order to meet the needs of the people and is determined to lead the way to a better life for them. This government is determined to successfully complete its military operation. It is committed to free elections as soon as security is established. And it shows signs of strength and stability that are greatly encouraging to see.

Mr. Speaker, we have another encouraging factor, and that is the participation of the forces of the Republic of Korea. It was my privilege to visit the Tiger Division and to see with my own eyes as fine a group of fighting men as I have seen anywhere. These men are the reflection of our earlier investment and continuing investment in this part of southeast Asia.

It was with particular interest that I visited with this Republic of Korea division and saw its outstanding work, because the blood of my own family was shed in Korea, for the people of southeast Asia. Their devotion to freedom is an inspiration to behold.

Mr. Speaker, this represents another indication of the fact that what we are doing is right, and that indeed we can succeed. I believe we shall succeed, not only because of our superior mobility and firepower and magnificent leadership, not only because of the high morale and courage on the part of our troops doing an outstanding job, not only because of the new hope on the part of the South Vietnamese Government, and the other hopes that we see reflected in Korea and in its people there, but I believe that we shall win because in the last analysis, as Abraham Lincoln said, "Right makes might."

RIGHT MAKES MIGHT

We are on the side of truth and justice in Vietnam. The Communists murder and steal and dismember and destroy. We heal, and we help. They tax away the people's rice. We take it away from the Vietcong, and give it back to the people. They tear down. We build up. They terrorize. We make secure. They enslave. We set free. There may be those in the other body of this Congress, and there may be those elsewhere, who will question the rightness of what we are doing in southeast Asia. But there is no question on the part of our military forces there. We are fighting a battle to liberate a people from a tyranny and from poverty and sickness. We are fighting a battle to bring new hope to the millions of Asians. We are fighting the eternal battle for human freedom. This is perhaps the most crucial battle of all in the modern history of Asia. This can be the turning point, introducing a new era of hope, of freedom, of self-determination, of individual liberty and human dignity for the people of southeast Asia, or it can be the beginning of the darkest night that Asia has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, there is much at stake in Vietnam. We have invested much, because we have invested there our young men. But we must not swerve in our purpose. We must recognize the necessity of victory for freedom and the danger of settling for anything less. Our President must stand firm, and we must stand firmly behind him.

THE SUPPORT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. Speaker, on the day on which I left Saigon I had the privilege of visiting with Mr. Mann of our AID program. He made a suggestion which I am glad to pass on to my colleagues. There are some 43 provinces in Vietnam, each roughly equivalent to a State. He recommended that it might be a good idea if each State in these United States adopted a Province. I had told him about my city's adoption of the 1st Infantry Division, relating that since the men's needs were met, other than the need for the knowledge of our support, we had agreed that what we could do best was to work together on civic action programs to help the Vietnamese people of the area of operation of the 1st Infantry in Vietnam.

So we are doing so in a number of concrete ways. I told him about it and he said that he would like to see each State of our Union adopt a Province in South Vietnam. There is such tremendous popular support for what we are doing in southeast Asia.

There is a great desire on the part of millions of Americans to demonstrate how much they stand behind our troops, and how much they believe in this battle for human freedom. Here is a concrete way to demonstrate that support and to turn it into a constructive channel that can help us fulfill our mission and succeed therein.

NO TURNING BACK

There can be no turning back in southeast Asia. The battle call is sounded. The troops are in the field and human freedom and human dignity and all the things that all the years of American history stand for are at stake. If we fail in our mission, we shall not only fail the people of Vietnam but the people of southeast Asia and not only the people of southeast Asia but the hope for freedom for the people of all the world in our time. If we fail, we shall have betrayed our own heritage and our own future.

If we become weak and if we do not stand firm, we shall betray everything that America has stood for in all its shining years. In our weakness and in our failure, we shall become traitors to our own destiny, and the Judas Iscariots of a civilization.

We have no choice in southeast Asia but the choice that was made by the men of the Continental Army and by Americans in each succeeding generation: That we will pay whatever price is necessary that freedom might live in our time.

John T. O'Rourke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, with the retirement of John T. O'Rourke this week, the free press everywhere has lost the active service of one of its most vigorous advocates. Mr. O'Rourke, the editor of the Washington Daily News for 27 years, has been admired throughout the ranks of journalism for his intelligence, energies, and enthusiasm. I wish to bring to the attention of Congress just one of the many tributes to Mr. O'Rourke and the fine tradition he has advanced, and insert in the RECORD at this point the following editorial from the Washington Post, which has tilted many journalistic lances with Mr. O'Rourke over the years:

AN EDITOR RETIRES

John T. O'Rourke was editor of the Washington Daily News for nearly 30 years and his retirement ends an era in Washington journalism. The three decades in which he served at the top of his profession were exciting decades for Washington, for the country, and for the world. John O'Rourke enjoyed the excitement and participated in the life of his times with zest and enthusiasm.

He was in the best tradition of his craft. He was a good writer. He had a sharp nose for news. He had a heart easily stirred by misfortune and a temper easily roused by injustice or wrongdoing. His mind was alert to developments in many fields—aviation, art, and music were within the range of his most intense interest.

For many years he has been a leading figure in the Inter-American Press Association. He is known and admired by editors throughout Central America and South America. He has labored to lift up the standards of his profession. He has struggled to increase understanding among Americans North and South. He has fought for a free press throughout the hemisphere. His colleagues in Washington cherish him as a friend and respect him as a keen newspaper competitor.

Old Myth and New Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include the following editorial from the March 1, 1966, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: "OLD MYTH AND NEW REALITY"

Two years ago Senator FULBRIGHT wrote a book called "Old Myths and New Realities."

Let's look at some of the things he set down then, coolly and soberly.

"It is difficult to see how a negotiation, under present military circumstances, could lead to the termination of the war under conditions that would preserve the freedom of South Vietnam. It is extremely difficult for a party to a negotiation to achieve by diplomacy objectives which it has conspicuously failed to win by warfare. The hard fact of the matter is that our bargaining position is at present a weak one, and until the equation of advantages has been substantially altered in our favor, there can be little prospect for a negotiated settlement.

"It seems clear that there are only two realistic options open to us in Vietnam in the immediate future: the expansion of the conflict in one way or another, or a renewed effort to bolster the capacity of the South Vietnamese to prosecute the war successfully on its present scale. The matter calls for continuing examination by responsible officials in the executive branch of our Government.

"Until and unless they conclude that the military situation in South Vietnam, and the political situation in southeast Asia, warrant the expansion of the war, or that the overall situation has changed sufficiently to establish some basis for a successful negotiation, it seems to me that we have no choice but to support the South Vietnamese Government and Army by the most effective means available."

In the same book, he suggests that carrying the war to North Vietnam might be necessary in order to bring them to the conference table.

This is the same FULBRIGHT who now publicly "wonders" how we got into this situation? Who throws up his hands at what the President has done as if it were carried out mysteriously and secretly behind his back? And, above all, as if he never, never consented to such action?

Is it the same Senator FULBRIGHT who had earned a considerable reputation for responsibility in his long years in the Senate, and who wrote those words just 2 years ago—is this the same man who turns over his Senate Foreign Relations Committee to the Senate's long-recognized prize eccentric, WAYNE MORSE, for the kind of diatribes against the United States and its Government that have characterized him for a dozen years?

Is this the same man who now permits his committee to be a platform to make a loner, the "black sheep" of the Senate appear, falsely, before the American people to be the voice of the U.S. Senate?

Something has happened to Senator FULBRIGHT.

Something sad.

And something dangerous too, because the new, strange FULBRIGHT carries over something of the shred of reputation, at least, earned by a different kind of man—the man he was before.

How else to explain that a man who explained 2 years ago that we cannot negotiate from weakness, is now engaged in making our position to achieve negotiations weaker?

Was the Fulbright reputation an "old myth," and is this sorry spectacle, the "new reality?"

Francis J. P. Cleary, Retired Employee of Department of Agriculture and Friend of Congressional Staffs, Dies at Age 90

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress and many veteran staff members will recall pleasant associations with Francis J. P. Cleary, who headed what later became the Congressional Inquiry Unit of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and who retired in 1946.

I have been asked to advise Mr. Cleary's friends that he passed away at the Susan B. Miller Nursing Home in Woodstock, Va., last Monday at the age of 90. Funeral services for him were conducted this morning.

I am told by a member of my staff who knew him intimately that Mr. Cleary had a Horatio Alger type of rise to prominence in the career ranks of the Government. I understand he started his Government service as a messenger at the age of 16 and in 54 years rose to a key position through which many congressional offices successfully channeled their inquiries and problems involving the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Cleary was born in Nenagh, Tipperary, Ireland, on March 2, 1876, and was brought to the United States as an infant by his parents, Dr. Frank P. Cleary, U.S. Army, and Nora Egan Cleary. His earliest years were spent in Illinois, and the family moved to Washington, D.C., in 1881. Mr. Cleary attended public and parochial schools in Washington and was graduated from the School of Law of Georgetown University.

At the age of 16, Mr. Cleary entered Government service as a messenger in the Department of Agriculture. He served for 54 years in the Department, retiring in 1946 at the age of 70. He rose through the ranks as a career employee and was an administrative assistant to the Director of Information when he retired. For many years he was the employee-elected member of the Personnel Appeals Board of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Cleary's late wife was Frances Ann Whalley, sister of Mrs. F. Wilson Gearing of Woodstock, Va. Mrs. Cleary died in 1950, and since 1951 Mr. Cleary had resided in Woodstock.

An active participant in sports in his youth, Mr. Cleary was an avid sports fan. During his long career in Washington he also was active in amateur theatricals and in the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. Cleary is survived by his brother-in-law and sister-in-law, Dr. and Mrs. F. Wilson Gearing of Woodstock, Va., and by three nephews and two nieces, Dr. F. W. Gearing, Jr., of Harrisonburg, Va., and John K. Gearing, W. John White, Mrs. Clarence R. Gorman and Mrs. R. Earl Harron of the Washington area.

In behalf of a number of veteran staff members on Capitol Hill who were acquainted with Mr. Cleary, I want to extend condolences to the family.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following speech, "Democracy: What It Means to Me," which was given by a young constituent of mine who has made an outstanding record in scholastic endeavors.

Mr. R. Glen Smiley, of Bozeman, Mont., was the winning contestant from my State in the annual Voice of Democracy contest put on by the ladies auxiliary of the VFW. I urge my colleagues to visit with the winners from their respective States at the VFW annual congressional dinner, March 8, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

The speech follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By R. Glen Smiley, Bozeman, Mont.)

Though I be not of great intellect, I wish to go to college and some day become a practicing lawyer. Though I wish to be a lawyer today I wish to be able to change my mind tomorrow. Though I love my country, I do from time to time disagree, as well as agree, with some of our Government's actions. I wish to express my opinions. Though I am not as yet of the age at which I may vote, I wish to have that privilege should I attain that age. And though I may now worship my God in my own way I wish to have that privilege always.

Most natural-born Americans of my generation, I myself included, have no real concept of any way of life other than the bountiful one we have come to know so well, in this the land of the free. I doubt very seriously that we appreciate it as much as we should. We have not had the advantage or disadvantage of living through a depression and at least one World War, as has most of the preceding generation. They know hard times and perhaps have a little deeper appreciation for democracy and its many virtues.

This sense of appreciation, held by most of the preceding generation, must be at least in part transferred to our generation—this deep feeling for the only way of life that I, like thousands of others like me, have ever known, coupled with an undying faith in God and a good strong knowledge of the difference between right and wrong, will form all the armor, swords, and shields necessary for democracy and freedom to survive.

What democracy is to me it may not be to someone else. To a boy in another land, it may be a meaningless abstraction. Oh, how a taste of this sweet fruit as we know it might stir his imagination.

Democracy is the American way of life and undoubtedly our most aged and beloved institution. It is Old Glory rippling gently in the breeze, the shrill notes from the trumpet playing "The Star-Spangled Banner," our citizenry reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, the White House and all its tenants, the stately Halls of our Nation's Capitol, Arlington National Cemetery, and the dedicated, courageous souls of those resting peacefully there. It is the amber waves of grain, the purple mountain's majesty, the fruited plains.

It is fishing in a rippling brook under a large shade tree, a boy and his dog, a little girl in ruffles and lace. Democracy is our President, our Congressmen, and other public officials, the laboring man, business executives, white-collar workers, the educator. It is 50 sovereign States, our Republic.

Democracy is the will of the majority without denying the minority its precious rights. It is the ideal that my rights end where my neighbor's rights begin. Democracy is mine. I intend to keep it. Born in freedom and believing in freedom, I am willing to fight to maintain freedom. I, like all those who believe as deeply as I do, would rather die on my feet than live on my knees.

Tribute to Robert M. Van Sant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the recent demise of Robert M. Van Sant, retired former director of public relations of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, brings to our recollection that after graduation from Princeton University, military service in World War I, and a stint with the Conde Nast publications, he came to work for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and was forever after a dedicated Marylander. His widespread popularity all over the railroad system developed when, as editor of the Baltimore & Ohio magazine, he fostered a spirt of employee-employer loyalty and understanding unique in railroad employment at the time. This attitude was reflected in unusual politeness always shown passengers by the company's trainment that won for the Baltimore & Ohio the widespread reputation for courtesy it enjoyed. Furthering his ideas of good employment relationship, "Bob" Van Sant encouraged employees to form a singing society of which he became the director. Thereafter, this choir, known as the B. & O. Glee Club, gained well-deserved fame in all the 13 States traversed by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

One of my constituents, John A. Rupp, a retired employee of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and one who knew Bob Van Sant well, paid tribute to him in the following letter which he sent to the forum of the Baltimore evening papers:

> Traveling down the corridors of time, it is appropriate to pay tribute to the memory of Robert M. Van Sant. He was an A-1 publicity man and peerless leader of the B. & O. Glee Club, having served his country and the railroad well.
>
> "Bob," as he was affectionately known, was a protege of the late President Willard and followed his "boss" in many good attributes, notably the good-neighbor policy. "Love's Old Sweet Song" was his favorite ballad during life, and at death became the "Master of his fate, the captain of his soul."

Additional Federal Judges and Districts

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1666) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I support the committee bill for additional judges, because I feel that additional Federal judges are very badly needed in this country. We hear a lot these days about the population explosion, but it is not often recognized that there is in addition and concomitant to the population explosion another explosion, which is the litigation explosion. As the population increases and as the cycle of business becomes more rapid, there is simply more business than the courts can handle with the bench at its present level of staff.

Therefore, I feel there is a demonstrated need for the passage of this bill. Nothing is more harmful to the cause of the administration of justice than long delays in obtaining a trial. Nothing is more frustrating or disappointing to litigants than the fact that they literally cannot get their day in court.

One way that we in Congress can help maintain their respect for law and order, one way that we in Congress can help to create a stronger sense throughout the country that the Federal courts are truly the refuge of all those who seek justice, is to pass a bill which will make the number of judges more nearly comparable to the number of cases that need to be decided.

As we pass this legislation, I think that the administration, particularly the President and the Attorney General, should be aware that we are placing a heavy responsibility on them to nominate the kinds of judges who will do the job that needs to be done. Certainly judges who are appointed purely for partisan reasons or purely for personal reasons are not going to be the kinds of judges who are needed. I sincerely hope that the President and the Attorney General will seek those men who are leaders in the profession, who are qualified, who have had experience, and who will deal to the American people the kind of well-tempered justice which these times demand.

Mr. Chairman, I think the testimony before the Judiciary Committee, which is available in the printed hearings, and the evidence which is summarized in the committee report, demand that we support this bill today.

Application Procedure for Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILLIP BURTON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication this past week from one of the business leaders in the San Francisco community who, in good faith, has made an effort to apply for the supplemental benefits provided by medicare.

I doubt if this constituent's experience is a unique one; therefore, I urge those in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare responsible for implementation of medicare to review their application procedure, with a view to simplifying it.

The current procedure, in many respects, is unnecessarily onerous, confusing, and complicated.

My constituent's letter follows:

> I am writing to discuss the method being required of people over 65 years of age to qualify for medicare.
>
> I filed with the local Social Security Administration in order to apply for the supplemental medical benefits provided under the new medicare legislation. I completed the form sent to me and returned it together with a certified copy of my birth certificate which I had obtained in 1943 for passport purposes. I have now been advised

that I must file an application with the Bureau of the Census, Pittsburg, Kans., in order to further substantiate my birth records. They want certain information from me because the certificate of birth which I sent them had not been issued before I was 5 years of age.

I was born in Vallejo, Calif., on October 22, 1897. The application for search of census records requires that I give the number and street ("very important") in the town where I lived on June 1, 1900, at which time I was 2½ years of age. It happens that I have an older brother living who more or less remembered the address of our home on that date. The same information is requested for similar dates in the next six decades. This I was able to give with moderate accuracy.

This form contains the statement: "If signed above by mark (x), two witnesses must sign here." I doubt that anyone who has to sign by his mark will thoroughly understand the requirements of this application.

It seems to me that the procedures which are being developed ostensibly to assist elderly people to obtain medicare benefits will defeat their own ends. The purpose of these forms should be to simplify, not to complicate, obtaining medicare.

I practiced law for 35 years and have been the head of a business for about 10 more. I will complete every form sent to me until I can properly qualify for medicare benefits, whether or not I remember the number and name of the street I lived on when I was 2½ years old. I have two types of health insurance which will provide the benefits that medicare does, but I want to participate in medicare.

It is of great concern to me that many people who should be getting medicare benefits and who are the people for whom the statute was adopted are either going to be without such assistance or be subjected to endless requirements for qualification.

I don't think they should be so subjected. I think that many of them will forget the whole thing rather than go through the bureaucratic trivialities attached to it.

I would very much appreciate any assistance you might be able to give that would lead to simplification of these requirements. I think we should keep in mind the general objective of the statute, which is to help elderly people.

Sincerely,

—— ——.

Letter From Sergeant Skipper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in the national debate over our policies in Vietnam, our men on active duty deserve to be heard. Sgt. Terry Skipper of Oakland, Md., has expressed his thoughts on the war and his role in Vietnam in a letter printed in the Free State Warrior, the official publication of the Maryland Department of the American Legion.

I would like to bring his comments to the attention of the Congress:

From a Free State Warrior in Vietnam

(This letter is reprinted here just as it came to us from Sergeant Skipper, in Vietnam. We're proud to claim him as a native of Oakland, Md.)

Plei Me, *December 8, 1965.*

American Legion.

Dear Sirs: Today I celebrated my birthday and I started out the same as always, by bailing water out of my present home and tying loose sand bags. Aside from being one more day closer to going home, it looked like just another day. I have carried a little paper flag on my helmet for 3 months and all my men wanted one and all the native children would try to talk me out of it. I promised my men I would get them each a flag after reading a news clipping about the American Legion giving away flags.

This evening, I was surprised and happy to receive a box of 1,200 from the American Legion in Baltimore. That was by far the best birthday present I could have wanted. So far I have only had the opportunity to give one to each member of my company. I will give one to everyone I meet, especially the Vietnamese children. I was amazed at the way my soldiers pinned on these flags and I knew to a man, each one is proud to be an American and to be here in this war.

I have heard many complaints and gripes, but I have never heard a man complain about being over here. Many of us have served in Korea and knew what to expect. Most of our new replacements are volunteers from Germany, Korea, and some stateside organizations. Once a man is here, he realizes what we are fighting for. But people who are safe and content at home can't or won't visualize what is happening in the world today.

The soldiers in Vietnam are not politicians or brilliant tacticians, but everyone here argues and debates about the situation, and every group, in the chow line, the mess hall or work details, talks about the war all the time.

Everyone here realizes that we are fighting for the survival of freemen everywhere and not for the freedom and safety of South Vietnam. My dad told me if a bee stings you, kill it. If more bees sting you, destroy the nest. We have been stung in Korea, Cuba, Dominican Republic and Vietnam and numerous other places. Americans who help build the nest by demonstrating, volunteering aid (to the enemy) and burning draft cards are only tearing freedom apart. I burnt my draft card too, but I was a sergeant with 6 years in the Army when I did burn it.

I believe in freedom of speech but I also believe in the truth. I see no reason why these demonstrators, card burners, and agitators are not punished. To me this is no more than treason and should be treated as such.

I suppose I am bitter because of the many soldiers who died by the code and their creed. I would give my life without hesitation, but not for the unpatriotic few who couldn't care less.

My men and I are trying to earn the respect of our country and the world by living up to the standards set down by American servicemen in our Nation's history. Not only are we soldiers, but self-appointed ambassadors, and we try to indoctrinate the natives as all GI's before us. My only hope is that someone will attempt to indoctrinate those bums at home who hurt our image.

I am presently a squad leader in the reconnaissance platoon, 2d Battalion, 5th Cavalry. There are 12 of us left from the 34 men we started with when we arrived. Some of you have experienced this before and it will happen again, but my men fought for a cause and I am proud of them all.

I am also proud of the organizations such as the American Legion for I know they are behind us. We realize that America is behind us and our morale is high. Just keep the people behind us and it will shorten this war for everyone.

I will let you know what effect the little flags have on the people here. I am sure it will be a pleasant effect.

Thank you very much.

Sgt. Terry Skipper.

A Throwback to Slavery: FEC's Yellow Dog Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, last year, the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, held hearings on amendments to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. The initial reason for the proposed amendments related to the exemption of the Alfred I. du Pont estate of Jacksonville, Fla., from the act.

It was suggested to our committee that the exemption of the Du Pont estate from the Bank Holding Company Act, which exemption made it possible for the Du Pont estate to keep properties it would otherwise have to dispose of, had enabled the Du Pont estate to pull together an empire of vast size. The size of this empire was such that the Du Pont estate became a major factor in the political economy of Florida, exercising appropriate power and influence.

One of the Du Pont estate holdings is the Florida East Coast Railway. During testimony before our committee, Mr. Edward Ball, who runs the Du Pont estate empire, said he knew of no instance where anyone had ever accused the Du Pont estate of abusing its economic power. I will give him an instance today—I accuse the Du Pont estate of abusing power with respect to the serfdom it is trying to impose on the workers of the Florida East Coast Railway.

I am inserting into the Record an editorial from the March 5, 1966, edition of Labor, the weekly newspaper of a group of transportation unions. I think the editorial shows the abuses very clearly. The railroad unions can be sure I am with them on this, and I have no doubt that once the facts behind the labor baiting of the Du Pont estate are known, that our Nation's railroaders will be able to rely on the firm support of the entire Congress.

A Throwback to Slavery; FEC's Yellow Dog Plan

Several weeks ago, in a news story, we mentioned the "yellow dog" contract that Financier Edward Ball is trying to force on the employees of his Florida East Coast Railway, where "nonoperating" employees have been on strike since January 23, 1963.

Some readers have asked us to explain what Ball's "yellow dog" notice contains. We are glad to do so. Ball and his officials now feel they have the whip hand over the employees. Their demands illustrate what any railroad management might insist on—if they feel they have a whip hand over the employees. Thus, these facts are important to every railroader.

The uniform demands served by Ball's FEC Railway on all the nonops include the following items:

"Employees covered by this agreement shall perform any work assigned them by the carrier, including work not normally performed by them in the job classifications to which the carrier has assigned them."

"Nothing in these rules shall limit * * * the right of the carrier to contract work

* * * to independent contractors of the carrier's sole selection."

The notice then sets out job classifications and rates of pay (the rates being generally 37 cents an hour less than now paid on all other class I railroads). The notice adds: "These job classifications may be eliminated, consolidated, or added to by the railway as the requirements of the service demand." Also, "The railway may, at its discretion, designate positions in any craft as 'excepted,' following which those positions will no longer be subject to the rules of this agreement." The notice also sets up only four master seniority rosters for all nonops.

The notice abolishes the principle of laying off and calling back on the basis of seniority, stating that instead "fitness, ability, and seniority shall prevail"—with the railroad as the judge.

The notice abolishes paid meal periods and also abolishes the regular 40-hour week, stating that "regular assignments will be on a 5- or 6-day workweek basis in accordance with the requirements of the service."

The notice abolishes any fixed starting times, places, or traveltime allowance for all nonop jobs.

On vacations, the notice changes the work qualifications and lops off the standard fourth week of vacation after 15 years of work.

On holidays, the notice abolishes paid holidays, saying that an equivalent has been added to the regular rates of pay.

The notice leaves the terms and administration of any employee health and life insurance solely up to management.

The notice states: "Where service is intermittent, 8 hours' actual time on duty within a spread of 12 hours shall constitute a day's work."

The notice would deprive FEC employees of the Washington job protection agreement in case of merger or consolidation.

In addition to these and other setbacks, the preamble to this FEC notice reserves to management, except as "specifically restricted or limited by this agreement," the "sole right and prerogative to hire, lay off, promote, demote, transfer, suspend, or discharge for cause," to "assign and reassign duties to jobs," and, in fact, everything else of importance to the employees.

The FEC has pressed a substantially similar notice on the operating employees, with some added items such as these:

All ops will be in a single master seniority group. Mileage basis of pay will be abolished and so will any crew consist of requirements and any distinction between road and yard work. "Regular assignments will be on a 5-, 6-, or 7-day workweek basis in accordance with the requirements of the service." Rates of pay are set far below the standard on other railroads.

As one railroader put it, "The FEC left only one thing out of these notices—they don't require us, so far, to wear stripes."

Both ops and nonops have made long and sincere efforts to negotiate with the FEC on these notices. Last January the FEC made an apparent conciliatory gesture, offering to boost the pay rates by 15 percent. But FEC officials tied this to acceptance of their "yellow dog" contract in toto, including refusal to call back the strikers based on seniority. That is where things now stand.

These facts, we think, make one thing clearer than ever: Every railroader in America owes a debt of gratitude to the FEC employees for their long and grueling struggle against economic serfdom. Let us do what we can to help them.

Proclamation of the Cleveland Committee for Hungarian Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the widespread arrests of so-called suspicious people taking place in Hungary today has reached shocking proportions. Reports in the free press indicate the so-called suspicious persons are being arrested by the Communist security police on the alleged grounds that they are engaged in antistate activities. Many of those arrested were imprisoned previously for taking part in or sympathizing with the Hungarian Freedom Revolution of October 1956. Under a general amnesty, offered as evidence that the brutal Communist system of the deposed Rakosi was an evil of the past, these political prisoners were released from prison. A great propaganda campaign was then launched to paint the new regime as humane, concerned about the needs of the Hungarian people, and providing more freedom for everyone in Hungary.

This latest evidence of the dictatorial and tyrannical tactics used by the Hungarian Communist regime is ample to demonstrate that there is no political liberty or individual freedom in Hungary and, on the contrary, there is in progress a widespread program for suppressing human rights. No one should be deceived that the Communist regime in Budapest has liberalized conditions for the Hungarian people, or that there is any genuine desire on its part to abide by the human rights guaranteed by the United Nations Charter.

In these circumstances the representative to the United Nations of the Hungarian Communist regime is busy on the American scene attempting to carry out the propaganda program which has been discredited by the very acts of the Budapest regime now taking place in Hungary. To counteract the propaganda work, responsible citizens in Cleveland have issued a proclamation pointing up the duplicity as well as the threat to peace involved in these propaganda maneuvers.

I include at this point in my remarks the proclamation of the Cleveland Committee for Hungarian Liberation:

STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR HUNGARIAN LIBERATION

According to an item in the February 20, 1966, the Plain Dealer, an organization called the Hungarian American League for Peace intends to honor Karoly Csatorday on March 5, 1966, with a banquet at the City Club. Mr. Csatorday hold himself out as an ambassador of the Hungarian people to the United Nations. Since Mr. Csatorday represents the Hungarian Government, rather than the Hungarian people, we wish to state our position.

The Communist dictatorship currently ruling Hungary imposed on the Hungarian people a "must vote, but must not elect" mockery in their elections. The Kadar-Kallai regime, elected under this situation, sent Mr. Csatorday to the United Nations, and he is therefore a representative of the Communist government, but not of the Hungarian people. In an international organization, such as the United Nations, a representative sent by the government, but not freely elected by the people, is not a true representative of the people.

Mr. Csatorday, during the years 1951 to 1955, was in Communist China and North Vietnam. The officials of the Communist Party, which is now the ruling party of Hungary, have long been guilty of arresting Hungarian workers, peasants, freedom fighters, students, and priests who disagree with their form of government. This is the bitterest type of war—a war of tyranny against defenseless citizens. Mr. Csatorday, a representative of this type of government, stands only for war, and not for peace.

We solemnly protest the honoring of a representative of a Communist dictatorship.

We demand for the Hungarian people a free, general, and secret ballot by which every vote for every candidate would count, and by which a candidate, regardless of his politics, could be elected by the people.

We demand for the Hungarian people the end of the cold terror; the end of the Russian occupation of Hungary; the end of political arrests; the end of imprisonments of the revolutionary heroes of the Freedom Fight of 1956; the freedom to work, to worship, to have a free press, to belong to unions which are free from government tyranny; and to have the right to unrestricted ownership of land without kolchoses.

We demand the return of Hungary to her people so that she may become a new, free Hungary.

COMMITTEE FOR HUNGARIAN LIBERATION,
ISTVAN ESZTERHAS, *President.*
ELEMER HOMONNAY, *Vice President.*
ANTAL J. LELBACH, *Vice President.*
LASZLO A. SIRCHICH, *Vice President.*
ERNO GODANY, *Chairman of the Board of Directors.*

Albert Thomas

SPEECH
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, for almost 30 years I have had the privilege of knowing ALBERT THOMAS who with each year of service rose in the esteem and affection of every Member of the House. This House will not be the same without him.

ALBERT THOMAS was a quiet man; he shunned publicity, devoting his energies to making himself expert in the most complex legislative matters, such as appropriations for the Department of Defense and appropriations for independent offices. His discretion and judgment served the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy well.

Albert Thomas had courage and faith, and both sustained him during his last illness. I looked upon him as one of us oldtimers. Only 10 men now in the House of Representatives have served longer. Especially for those of us among the 10, his passing is especially cruel.

To his wife and to his family I extend my deepest sympathy and join in their sense of loss.

Repeal the Medicare Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with several of my colleagues in the House and Senate in proposing legislation to repeal the controversial non-Communist loyalty oath provision of the new medicare health insurance program for our senior citizens.

Under the loyalty provision, more than 2 million Americans over the age of 65 must sign a disclaimer of Communist affiliation in order to establish their eligibility for medicare health benefits.

As one of the original congressional sponsors of this forward-looking program to provide comprehensive hospital and medical benefits for the aged, I am astonished that we would subject our elderly citizens to the indignity of signing such an offensive and demeaning affidavit—with its repugnant inference of disloyalty—before they can take advantage of this historic legislation.

I would like to point out that no farmer is asked to sign a loyalty oath to get a crop loan, nor is any small businessman asked to sign such an oath when he seeks financial help from the Government.

And only last year Congress eliminated such disclaimers as requirements for participation in the Job Corps, and for VISTA volunteers, in the Federal antipoverty program.

Earlier, Congress amended the National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation Act to eliminate a disclaimer that the academic community had for years considered offensive—so offensive, in fact, that many of our leading colleges and universities simply refused to participate in the programs established by those acts.

Mr. Speaker, I am greatly encouraged to know that the National Council of Senior Citizens has announced its support of the effort to repeal the non-Communist disclaimer clause.

The section of the medicare law to which we object does not affect the 17 million senior citizens covered by social security, railroad retirement, or civil service.

But, the approximately 2 million Americans over 65 not covered by these programs have to make a special application for medicare benefits.

And the loyalty clause requires these medicare applicants to affirm that during the preceding 12 months they have not been members of any organization required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950. This relates primarily to Communist and Communist-front organizations.

My bill would eliminate this special loyalty test requirement for the 10 percent of Americans over 65 who are now affected by it.

Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, each year, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a voice-of-democracy contest in the Nation's schools. This year, over 300,000 students participated in the contest, competing for scholarships. They wrote their speeches on the subject: "Democracy—What It Means to Me."

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I present the winning speech for the entire State of Minnesota. I am proud that it was written by a young constituent of mine, David Allen of Albert Lea, Minn. As I read David's speech, I found that he comes to a conclusion that is basic to democracy—and yet which is disregarded or misunderstood by too large a segment of our citizenry—that for democracy to function effectively the greatest possible participation and sense of responsibility on the part of each individual citizen is necessary.

The winning contestants from each State are to be in Washington next week for the final contest judging. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that David Allen's speech should be among the top contenders of the national competition.

The speech follows:

FREEDOM AND FROGS

(By Dave Allen)

You know, there's an old story about freedom and frogs. This fable has it that you can't kill a bullfrog by dropping him in boiling water. Why? Because he reacts so quickly to the sudden heat that he jumps out before he's hurt. But if you put him in cold water and then gradually bring the water to a boil, he never decides to jump till it's too late. By then he's not only lost his freedom, but he's well done.

So it is with men, too. Sometimes it seems we're as foolish as the bullfrog. If our freedoms were taken away from us all at once by some totalitarian power, we would have nothing to fear. America would unite, fight, and win. But this is not always the case. The lasting losses of freedom are often surrendered, not by force, but peacefully, bit by bit. And too often we sit back and blindly let them go. Giving up a little freedom and democracy for some profound goals sounds noble, but it's the first step down a one-way street—a dead end street. And once liberty is gone, it is extremely difficult to recapture.

Too many times we as students tell ourselves, that since we are not of legal age to vote, we shouldn't get involved in the democratic process. This is a dangerous assumption. Democracy was founded on the principle of participation. And participation is the vital organ of democracy. If we become apathetic in our youth, when we have the energy and idealism to actively participate, will we change so suddenly when we reach that magical age of 21?

All American citizens enjoy the fruits of our democratic system, and even though we're students, we are American citizens, and we enjoy those same fruits held dear by all. Thus, we, as teenagers, have the same obligations and responsibilities. Freedom cannot be preserved without responsibility on the part of every citizen—in other words, individual participation.

Why should we get involved? And how does it affect us? Within the next few years most of us will be exercising our cherished democratic privileges. Soon a nation will be thrust upon our shoulders—the whole world will watch to see what we will do. We must not fail to respond. This Nation, in our hands, will carry upon it the burden of the world—a world in which two-thirds of the people will go to bed hungry tonight, a world which must pay the debt left us unjustly by history, a world in which our American democracy must stand strong so that it will be a model for a searching world. And most important we must defend freedom around the world so that this system will perpetuate for our children not yet born.

How can we meet these challenges of tomorrow and retain our own rights, freedoms, and liberties? We must first renew freedom in our own hearts and in our homes. And what is a better way to do this than to participate? Participation is democracy's champion. Take an active role in your community. Political parties are staging a never-ending battle to recruit volunteer help, your help. Often the work is not very glamorous, but necessary, necessary to elect the man whom you want to represent you. He will be your voice.

Speak up for freedom at every opportunity. This will combat prejudice. Learn all you can about the enemies of freedom, and oppose those people and policies that try to limit the use of your natural and constitutional rights. And, of course, whenever the chance becomes yours, vote, vote your choice. We can already exercise this part of democracy in our own school elections. Voting intelligently now will enable us to make the right choices in the future.

If we value anything more than freedom, we stand the chance of losing freedom, and the irony of it is that if it's comfort and money which we value more highly, we will lose them also.

Are we as teenagers, as the future leaders of tomorrow, like the bullfrog who found out all too soon that it was too late to jump? What are we going to do today to defend our democracy tomorrow?

Toward Clean Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record an excellent editorial entitled "Toward Clean Water" which appeared in the Detroit, Mich., News of February 25, 1966.

The article follows:

TOWARD CLEAN WATER

President Johnson's proposals this week for fighting water pollution represent a welcome expansion of Federal interest in this growing problem.

Sure to win wide support are the President's requests to double the existing Federal aid to State antipollution agencies and to eliminate the $1.2 million ceiling on sewage treatment construction grants to any one city. Both Michigan and Detroit may be helped if these changes are approved by Congress.

Forward looking, too, is the suggestion that future efforts to secure clean water will be handled on the basis of entire river basins. The President's idea that Federal money be supplied to fund the interstate organizations needed to carry out this work is sound.

Not so popular will be his proposals to speed Federal enforcement of cleanup orders by eliminating the 1-year delay possible under existing laws and to give Federal officers power to intervene directly in pollution problems affecting only one State.

Nor will some local interests like the idea of Federal men making their own inspections of waste treatment operations by municipalities and industrial plants.

There is nothing the polluters like so much as interminable delays—unless it is dealing with friendly local officials who know local problems.

As the President admitted, his proposals contain some strong measures. Some would clearly intrude on areas heretofore reserved for State and local action. As we have often said, however, the story of water pollution has been a case study of the failure of State government to deal with its own problems.

With probably the strongest law and best enforcement program in the Nation, Michigan is a notable exception to this pattern, but even we have been late and slow in our efforts.

Now, after several years of very deliberate, but rather timid and not notably successful attempts to get other States to move forcefully to conserve the Nation's water, Washington has decided it must take the initiative. We agree.

Alaska Centennial of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9963) to promote the economic development of the State of Alaska by providing for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, no one has greater respect for the Speaker than I, and he knows that. As I understood the debate there was no challenge of the reference of the bill as it was drafted. It is my recollection of the debate—and I was the one who raised the question—that the bill was drafted as its title reads:

To promote the economic development of the State of Alaska by providing for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be hold in Alaska during 1967.

The bill as reported out, and the point that was made, was that the title in effect originally as introduced was not a celebration title, but as has been amended, is a centennial bill, and standing as it is properly in that amended form within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. The amended title says "A bill to provide for U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska purchase," being a centennial bill.

However, the point that has been made is that the Committee on the Judiciary does not vote money generally to celebrate centennials and this is the obvious reason for drafting the bill so it would go to Public Works instead of Judiciary. This is, in my opinion, a subterfuge to get money for a centennial that could not be obtained through the Judiciary Committee. It gives preference to Alaska over all other centennial or commemorative bills.

Therefore I request that the bill be voted down, because the amount of money requested is too great, and it in effect is a public works bill, and as such went to the Committee on Public Works for Alaska rather than its being a true centennial bill and going to the Judiciary.

"We Will Bury You"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, Miss Betty Bullard, of Vicksburg, Miss., was recently named winner from my State of the annual voice-of-democracy contest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Miss Bullard, a student at H. V. Cooper High School, wrote her award-winning speech on the contest theme of "Democracy—What It Means to Me."

The stirring comments by this young lady indicate a unique awareness of the magnificent heritage which belongs to this Nation. As long as patriotic young people such as Miss Bullard are determined that their native land shall remain "the greatest nation on earth" then surely the great American democracy will remain secure.

Her speech follows:

"WE WILL BURY YOU"

(By Betty Bullard)

This is the threat. No matter how eccentric it sounds the country behind these words is nothing to laugh at. What am I doing to oppose this deliberate, rash statement?

I pledge with full heart, each time I hear "The Star-Spangled Banner," to renew my efforts of becoming a faithful member of this democracy. As the old familiar strains roll on I shiver though the air is still. Oddly enough my thoughts wander to friends and their comrades sleeping on foreign soil where the air is not so still. These are the fighters of my generation opposing the bold onrush of slavery toward our people. I pray that this strife may soon find us victorious.

By being informed and discussing issues in the classroom and at home, I am preparing to be a full-fledged citizen. Through participation in Youth Congress and Girl's State, I have become more dedicated to working for my country. I have learned the inner gears of this democracy by actually holding the reins of a mock government. I know the thrill of victory when a good bill has passed the mock house of representatives and the despair when I cannot convince a friend of the validity of my arguments.

The helplessness that fills my mind as I search for other ways to serve is overwhelming; for I cannot carry a rifle in battle to meet the enemy. But there is a way. I can be the voice of democracy.

I have a heart that bursts with feeling toward a great Nation that seems divided and a voice that begs to shout from the rooftops of the joy of living in the pursuit of happiness.

Democracy is participating in freedom as long as you live. Remember, however, that your neighbor can also contribute as he sees fit. By going 30 miles per hour in that speed zone instead of 60 miles per hour, I am keeping my end of the bargain. That is where yours begins.

If my democracy ever needed me, it is now; for she is faced headon by a treacherous foe that will stop at nothing to conquer us. I proclaim that this—the greatest Nation on earth—just cannot fail, at least not so long as a breath is left in this loquacious body.

So much can be done if more people would rise and say, "I am for it." This Government can never be perfect because it is instituted among imperfect men. This does not mean we must stop striving toward Utopia.

My generation, because Vietnam suddenly appeared before me, is startled into the greatest controversy in years. We will probably be called upon to be the voices of democracy. I can guarantee that there will be one loud voice crying above the chaos: "Here I am, take me."

The task of the future for my generation will be to fill positions of the greatest honor to the best of our ability.

Teaching our children of this country's majesty from sea to shining sea and telling them of how it was and how good it is now, this will be the charge of the people.

My duties and privileges—past, present, and future—lie in my faith in our democracy and my work in preserving the good of America.

So that when our children are to be inaugurated leaders my generation will not have to say:

"From failing hands we throw the torch,
 Be yours to hold it high."

"Am I My Brother's Keeper?" Bellmore, N.Y., Merchants Answer "Yes" With 4–S Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, Bellmore is in the Fifth Congressional District, New York, on the south shore of Nassau

County, an unincorporated village of more than 14,000 persons.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a unique, commendable, and beneficial plan initiated by citizens of Bellmore to help their fellow citizens. What is being done in Bellmore makes me mighty proud of my constituents because they do not want to live in a cold society and because by an overwhelming majority, they are people who care.

Recognizing that our senior citizens receiving social security and other persons living on fixed incomes have an annual reduction in purchasing power by virtue of rising costs, Joseph and Miriam Morales, residents and local merchants, made a proposal to their fellow members of the Bellmore Chamber of Commerce, which was readily adopted and implemented.

The letter explaining the Morales plan dated August 1, 1965, which outlines a community program to help its senior citizens and its retail merchants, was printed in the Bellmore Home News, and because it tells the story of people who care, I quote it here in full:

[From Bellmore (N.Y.) Home News, Sept. 17, 1965]

August 1, 1965.

Bellmore Chamber of Commerce,
Bellmore, Long Island.

Gentlemen: As new members of the Bellmore Chamber of Commerce the following ideas and observations are most respectfully submitted for consideration:

My family and I have been residents of Bellmore for the past 7 years. My wife and I have been in business in Bellmore for the past 3 months. Considering these two facets—our life as residents, and our life as merchants, we have come to the following conclusion: our town is made up of two groups—the younger group that goes out of town to shop, use the discount houses and compare prices. The second group are the older people who do not leave the community to do their shopping either due to lack of transportation or habit. They are the bulk of the steady customers. We, as merchants, should gear our overall approach to this captured audience.

There have been several ideas suggested as a means of bringing in new business to our town. The following two ideas are submitted for consideration by the chamber of commerce.

IDEA NO. 1

As I stated we have a captured audience. Many of these older people are retired and are on social security. A lot of them have a hard time making ends meet. Let us help them and at the same time help ourselves. Let us give any person on social security or retired a 10 percent discount on sales. Let us advertise the fact. Not only would we get our own people but also the older residents of neighboring towns. Every other community gears all their ideas and sales to only the young people. We can do the reverse. Let us try to attract the older people and let us not forget that we have the national picture to help us. The Presidents aims to help the older people, his war on poverty and also the new sales tax. This idea would help the older people in this respect. All of these ideas would help the older people in this respect. All of these happenings can be used to our advantage if we advertise the fact. Not only in our own newspapers locally, but this would certainly attract national news coverage—the only chamber of commerce in the United States to help its older citizens. It is our desire to have 100 percent membership in our chamber of commerce. With this plan there is not a single merchant in Bellmore or professional man or service man that could afford not to belong to the chamber.

IDEA NO. 2

Not only is it our wish to attract the older people but also the younger people. To attract these young people to our town let's run a promotion to last through the fall and Christmas shopping. Each month raffle off a small prize and then on Christmas Eve a color TV. Every purchase made in town would be entitled to a ticket on the raffle. This could apply to all services, etc. With 100-percent membership our treasury would be full and we could afford to purchase these things from the treasury and there would be no additional expense for the merchants. This plan would be attractive to them.

This is a tremendous venture for us. We are extremely sincere in our enterprise. We are asking all of you to cooperate with us. Together we can bring the people of Bellmore to Bedford Avenue to do their shopping. We have the variety of business and we can service them at today's competitive prices. We are sure we can accomplish this if all of you will join us as a member of the Bellmore Chamber of Commerce

We have discussed these ideas with Mr. Sam Berger and it was at his recommendation that they are being submitted. It is our pleasure to be a member of the Bellmore Chamber and are proud of it and sincerely feel that we will get out of our membership only what we put in.

Sincerely,
Joseph and Miriam Morales.

The Bellmore Chamber of Commerce heartily endorsed the Morales proposal and adopted the plan to make it convenient as well as profitable for senior citizens to shop in their local communities, and accordingly a social security savings stamp plan was adopted and participated in by merchants of the village of Bellmore. Under the plan, social security recipients receive without cost an identification card and a stamp book. For every dollar of merchandise purchased in participating stores, the eligible purchaser receives one stamp worth 10 cents. When a book is filled, the purchaser may redeem it at the local bank for $10 cash. The plan is optional—there is no compulsion.

The discount which the Bellmore plan furnishes to senior citizens serves to augment the buying power of those living on social security or fixed incomes and while "casting their bread upon the waters" of our society, the small businessmen of Bellmore as well as the senior citizens of the community will benefit thereby. This splendid program was implemented and successfully operated to the entire satisfaction of the residents of Bellmore and the following articles illustrate the history and development of this interesting experiment:

[From the Bellmore (N.Y.) Life, Dec. 1, 1966]

SAVINGS FOR SENIORS

The 4–S plan which goes into effect in Bellmore today is a noteworthy innovation suggested by a Bellmore business couple, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Morales, of Bellmore Floors. They knew that many retired people live in the Bellmores and often find it hard to make ends meet, living on fixed incomes in a period of slow but steady price increases.

They suggested to the Bellmore Chamber of Commerce that a 10-percent discount to social security recipients would be a significant help to the seniors, and would not be too burdensome for the merchants. It might even be good business because it would encourage shopping in member stores. Much appreciation for the idea has been expressed. A committee, headed by Joseph Galinski, of Baer's Five & Ten, has worked assidiously on the details, and, as reported in last week's Bellmore Life, a total of 14 stores joined as charter members of the plan.

The mechanics of the plan, as described in last week's issue, are quite simple. For each dollar purchase the senior citizen gets a stamp, and when he has 100 stamps he get $10 in cash.

It is a plan which should go over well. As far as is known it is original for Bellmore. It is a commendable step and should even attract some out-of-towners to come into Bellmore to take advantage of the offer.

Just recently the president of the Bellmore Chamber of Commerce informed me about the program and I set forth at length his letters to me dated February 7 and 28, 1966:

Bellmore Chamber of Commerce,
Bellmore, N.Y., February 7, 1966.

Congressman Herbert Tenzer,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: We would like to bring to your attention a new program which was instituted by the Bellmore Chamber of Commerce on December 1, 1965.

The merchants of Bellmore were aware that the rising cost of living and increase in taxes were causing a hardship to the majority of local social security recipients. To augment the buying power of these senior citizens who depend largely on social security for their means of livelihood, the social security savings stamp plan was initiated. Social security recipients receve identification cards and a stampbook. For every dollar's worth of merchandise purchased in participating stores, they receive one stamp worth 10 cents. Thus, in effect, the plan means a 10-percent discount to senior citizens. When the book is completed (100 stamps), it is exchanged for $10 in cash.

The first reports from the senior citizens have been uniformly enthusiastic.

With the knowledge of your sincere interest in the welfare of senior citizens of our area, we felt you would be interested in knowing of our program.

Sincerely yours,
Louis Gennaro,
President, Bellmore Chamber of Commerce.

Bellmore Chamber of Commerce,
Bellmore, N.Y., February 28, 1966.

Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Tenzer: With reference to our telephone conversation I am pleased to enclose material regarding Bellmore's 4–S Club (social security savings stamps).

The material consists of a copy of the registration card and a file of news clippings. The plan's origin was a proposal by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Morales, new members of the chamber. As president of the Bellmore Chamber of Commerce, I appointed a committee, headed by Joseph Galinski, of Baer's Five & Ten, to look into the matter. Upon the recommendation of this committee, the chamber voted to establish the plan with a charter membership of 14 merchants.

We have had much praise locally for our initiative and many senior citizens have let us know they appreciate the consideration being given them. Outside of Bellmore the plan has not been noticed much, although we think it deserves it. We had hoped that perhaps some other communities might find it a good idea to adopt a similar plan.

For this reason I was delighted to know of your interest and any cooperation you may be able to give in making the plan known to to a wider circle, will be much appreciated.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS GENNARO,
President, Bellmore Chamber of Commerce.

Thus the residents of Bellmore in my district answered the question "Am I my brother's keeper?" with a resounding "yes," and I commend to my colleagues that they recommend the Bellmore 4–S plan to merchants in communities in their districts.

Special Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the Members' attention to a letter just received from Mrs. Isabell Eaton, president of the Illinois School Food Service Association.

Mr. Speaker, this letter shows the effect which the cutback in funds for the national school lunch program and the special milk program will have on the children of my State. I am certain that we are not unique in Illinois and that similar detrimental experiences will occur in every other State.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot go along with the administration in this instance. I feel that it would be sheer folly to curtail or eliminate such highly successful programs as these, both of which have played a major role in combating poverty among our school-age population, in order to substitute new and untried programs. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will demand that these programs continue unabated.

Mrs. Eaton's letter follows:

ILLINOIS SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
Springfield, Ill., February 18, 1966.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: As president of the Illinois School Food Service Association, I am writing you relative to the National School Lunch Act of 1946, and the budget made recently by President Johnson.

Since 1946, schools have been feeding needy children of the school district as well as those whose mothers worked, children who came to school by bus, and those who stayed at school because of the nutritious lunch.

For the past 3 or 4 years, funds allotted for Illinois have not been adequate to pay even a 5-cent-per-meal subsidy for any month during the school year, nor any reimbursement for May or June and only a partial payment for April.

Due to the high and still rising cost of food, high wages, high Federal taxes, and low meal charge to the students, school districts are faced with problems beyond their control. Many school districts are now subsidizing the school lunch program to the limit of their resources. After all, children must be taught as well as fed.

The cut of $80 million in the special milk program funds will drive our State of milk drinkers back to soft drinks. The cut in the school lunch program fund of $19 million will necessitate schools going into purely snack service and our health-education program will go down the drain. The increased cost of the lunch to the hcildren will mean that more and more children will be unable to pay for their meals and will have to be fed free. Is this what Congress really wants? Will the proposed Child Nutrition Act do more for our children than the 20-year operation of the school lunch programs have proved?

We are asking your help in combating these drastic cuts in appropriations for such vital programs as the school lunch, special milk, and Government-donated commodities.

Sincerely,

ISABELL EATON, *President.*

Pacoima Youth Opportunity Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, slightly more than a year ago I had the pleasure of announcing plans to establish a federally financed youth opportunity center in my district to assist young people in finding gainful employment.

This center is supported by funds authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act and is managed by the California State Employment Service.

The youth opportunity center, located in the community of Pacoima, has been in operation for nearly 3 months now, and I am most encouraged by the almost-instant success it has achieved.

An article in the Valley News and Green Sheet of February 17 reported that between January 1 and February 17, the center had placed 183 youths on jobs and had applications on file for 600 others seeking employment.

Businesses in the San Fernando Valley are being asked to contact the center when employees are needed, and the response thus far has been most favorable.

I am confident that this initial success will continue and that my colleagues will agree that such Federal assistance is, indeed, money well-spent. I cannot overemphasize the importance of developing the talents of our Nation's youth, and I firmly believe that centers such as these can make a vital contribution to this development.

At this time, I wish to call the attention of the House to the newspaper account of the progress of the Pacoima Youth Opportunity Center:

NEW PACOIMA CENTER PLACES 183 YOUTHS IN VALLEY EMPLOYMENT—JOBSEEKERS ON ROLLS NOW NUMBER 600—SKILLED, UNSKILLED WORKERS AVAILABLE

(By Betty Katz)

A total of 183 youths has been placed on jobs since January 1 by the California State Employment Service's new youth opportunity center in the valley. The youth opportunity center at 11035 San Fernando Road, Pacoima, opened December 15 but had few applicants registered until after the holidays. It now boasts 600 applicants, age 16–21 years seeking part- or full-time employment.

SOME SEMI-SKILLED

This week, in an occupational breakdown of youths registered for full-time work, it is noted by youth opportunity center manager Richard S. Ojeda that 101 have some previous work experience or skills.

Announcing that jobs are needed for the 600 young applicants, Ojeda said 30 of them are skilled in clerical and sales work, 60 in service trades and one is a rough carpenter.

The breakdown also reveals 35 semiskilled workers and 239 unskilled.

"There are a number of high school graduates registered who have either no experience or limited experience but who have significant training. These include typists, stenographers, light bookkeepers, and office machine operators.

DEAF BOY PLACED

"Also there are a number of high school graduates and dropouts with two or more semesters in electric shop, electronics, woodworking, metal shop, auto mechanics and drafting, upholstering, printshop, and others," Ojeda reports.

A number of high school and college students with office experience and good skills are also available for part-time work as stenographers, typists, machine shop work, and service station attendants, he said.

The 183 now working were placed by the youth opportunity center as clerks or assembler trainees in factories and offices and some have been successfully referred to apprenticeship machinist jobs.

This tally includes placement of a deaf boy in an organ assembly plant, after the initial difficulty in obtaining employer acceptance was overcome, and a youth from Mexico who speaks no English as a machine shop trainee. Both employers report satisfaction with their new employees.

An employer relations representative since January 1 has been in the field in northeast valley communities contacting potential employers.

DISADVANTAGED HELPED

Sometimes it's a case of that representative selling an employer a specific applicant which seems to match up with his requirements even though he has no job opening at the moment, and other times it's selling an employer who does have a bona fide opening that properly screened youth can fill his needs.

Typical of the variety of applicants and skills represented in the youth opportunity center files is Cathy Davis, 19, who has completed one semester at Valley College and is continuing there in night classes to further her ambition to be a therapist for handicapped children.

Miss Davis desires a full-time day job now. She has had some sales experience.

MAJORED IN BUSINESS

Another jobseeker is Richard Olguin, 19, who dropped out of San Fernando High School but is now attending night school to obtain his diploma. He has had six semesters *of upholstering* and wants to secure an on-the-job training opportunity to develop marketable skill in this occupation.

A William S. Hart High School graduate Vernalyn Flanagan, 18, was a business major and took 2 years of typing. The Youth Opportunity Center aptitude tests clock her speed at 45 words per minute. She seeks a permanent office job.

The youth opportunity center, one of six in Los Angeles County, is designed to serve all youth 16–21 years of age regardless of educational or economic status. Special emphasis is placed on aiding the disadvantaged. Key words in the Youth Opportunity Center philosophy are "job preparation" and "counseling."

Employers wishing to place a job order for applicants registered at the youth opportunity center may call 896-8111, Monday through Friday, hours 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Dr. George D. Grice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George D. Grice, president of the College of Charleston, will retire soon after a long and illustrious career as "head of the college family."

And this affectionate title given him by his devoted students is indeed true.

He has been father, mother and guardian angel to countless boys and girls as they strove for a quality education at his institution.

Joining the faculty in 1932, Dr. Grice has served the college, his community and his beloved Palmetto State with distinction. Unceasingly pouring his talent, energy and love into this venerable institution, he has been instrumental in seeing the college achieve high academic honors throughout the Nation.

Although he may leave the campus in physical presence, he will forever leave his heart there.

As he hands over the arduous reins of leadership, he can acknowledge with pride his role in molding leaders for South Carolina and the Nation. Every aspect of community life is richer through the knowledge instilled by his sage counsel in the minds of our youth.

The News and Courier recently devoted editorial comment to some of the achievements of the college under his presidency. Under unanimous consent, I take great pride in including the editorial with my remarks:

ACCOMPLISHING MISSION

Two news articles concerning the College of Charleston testify to its success. One reported that the college was highly commended by a visiting committee of the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges. The other recounted praise of the current student body by President George D. Grice for "achieving the best semester academic standings since I joined the college faculty in 1932."

These two commendations, one regional and one local, confirm the College of Charleston's sincerity in offering quality education to young people who are able and willing to work for it.

The college has been a part of the Charleston scene since just after the Revolutionary War. Today it has 1,776 living alumni in the Charleston area. They form an important and active segment of the population.

In 1951, the Scientific American Journal listed the college as 29th in the Nation in production of natural scientists. In 1960, the U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare Department cited the college for being third in the Nation in per capita male students who become medical doctors. Another report placed it in the top 50 colleges in production of law students.

The Southern Association's report indicated that the college faculty is eager to teach and the students eager to learn. Of such elements is true education formed. We congratulate the college—its faculty, students, and staff—on receiving such high praise. We trust the college will continue its quiet but effective pursuit of knowledge. The education of young people is among the most important missions of society. We are happy that the College of Charleston has been recognized for its part in this work.

Lithuanian Independence Day—Address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, since 1961 the Honorable G. Mennen Williams has been Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. Faced constantly with the strong desires of the African peoples for independence and the often conflicting forces of African nationalism, Governor Williams has exhibited tactful diplomacy and an astute grasp of the significance of these new nations. The effective manner in which he has carried out this important assignment confirms the fact that he is a man of unusual skill and talent.

He has an impressive record as a dedicated public servant. He began his career in 1936 as an attorney for the Social Security Board. In the following years he has held various other important public positions including assistant attorney general for the State of Michigan, Special Assistant to the U.S. Attorney General, and Deputy Director of the OPA for Michigan.

He was elected Governor of Michigan in 1948 and was returned to that office by the people of Michigan for each succeeding term through 1960. He then rereceived his Presidential appointment as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.

His military service record is of equal honor and rank. He entered the U.S. Navy as a lieutenant, junior grade, and he received 10 battle stars, the Legion of Merit with Combat V and participated in three Presidential Unit Citations. In 1946 he was honorably discharged from the service, having risen to the high rank of lieutenant commander.

G. Mennen Williams has demonstrated his courage, integrity, intelligence, and understanding in each of these endeavors.

He possesses an innate sense of humanism that responds immediately and overwhelmingly whenever and wherever he meets the struggling aspirations of his fellow man. He shares in a deeply personal manner the aspirations of each human being for a life of freedom, independence, and human dignity. Pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD an address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams at the 48th Lithuanian Independence Day ceremonies of the Detroit Lithuanian Organization Center in which he so well expressed these sentiments.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AFRICAN AFFAIRS, AT THE 48TH LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CEREMONIES OF THE DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATIONS CENTER, DETROIT, MICH., FEBRUARY 13, 1966

It was a pleasure to accept Ralph Valatka's invitation to be with you for the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. Being here brings back a flood of happy memories of my years as Governor of Michigan, when I was frequently in the company of the many fine Lithuanian-Americans in this State. Particularly do I recall my good friend, Joe Kowalski, who was Democratic leader in the Michigan House of Representatives and now as speaker of the house. We worked very closely together for many years while I was Governor.

Over the past 5 years, my work has been concerned with the great continent of Africa, where freedom is forging a new way of life. But I have not forgotten my friends from Lithuania, where force has dimmed freedom's flame for a quarter century.

Although it is good to be with you once more, it is no pleasure to commemorate a birthday and have no cause for celebration. Many of you have witnessed two occupations of your homeland. Practically all of you have friends or relatives who have been jailed, deported to Siberia, or executed. Many of you have lost your homes, your positions, and your country. Clearly—and regrettably—the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is not an occasion for joy and thanksgiving.

Nevertheless, that does not mean it is a time for despair. There has been a rebirth of freedom in many parts of the world since World War II. In Africa alone 33 new nations have shed colonial status in the last 15 years, and others are on the way to independence. For that reason, Lithuanians know they must keep the spark of hope alive.

The U.S. Government has long been concerned with Lithuania's status. This past week, Secretary of State Dean Rusk sent this message to my good friend, the Lithuanian Chargé d'Affaires, Joseph Kajeckas:

"Our country has consistently espoused the principle that all peoples have the right to determine the form of their national existence. In Lithuania's case, we have applied this principle by refusing to recognize the forcible incorporation of that country into the Soviet Union. We fully support your continuing efforts to marshal world public opinion and to bring it to bear on the issue of self-determination for the people of Lithuania.

"In view of the courage and fortitude shown by the Lithuanian people during these years of foreign domination, I am confident that their just aspirations for freedom and national independence will ultimately be realized."

The people of Lithuania and you in this country should know that Lithuania is not forgotten in the press of the many other foreign problems the United States faces today. There are a number of troubles throughout the world—and—the most important of which is the maintenance of freedom from communism in Vietnam—all of concern to this country. In Africa, too, there are troubles—in Southern Rhodesia, for example. There are many situations of major concern to the United States in every part of the globe. Nevertheless, we in this country still have deep concern for the fate of Lithuania and look forward to the day when its people are released from bondage.

President Woodrow Wilson espoused the cause of national self-determination in his famous Fourteen Points, and we were happy to see the formation of an independent Lithuania and the other Baltic Republics of

Estonia and Latvia. By that time, many Lithuanians had made their homes among us, and it was a source of satisfaction to other Americans to see how Lithuania progressed and prospered.

Thus, when the Soviet Union took over Lithuania and the other Baltic States in 1940, Americans viewed it with profound shock and a deep sense of personal grief. Acting Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, spoke for all Americans when he stated the U.S. reaction to the seizure:

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak."

The United States continues to adhere to that fundamental doctrine. We have never recognized the illegal annexation of the independent Republic of Lithuania and her sister Baltic States into the Soviet Union, and we shall not change our stand on that position. We continue to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of Lithuania in the United States as the legitimate officials of the Republic of Lithuania.

The Soviet Union, since its seizure of the Baltic States, has made determined propaganda efforts to break the spirits of the area's highly individualistic peoples. And its failure to do so has been evident since 1941, when the Soviet rulers had to resort to the deportation of recalcitrant and "unreliable" elements. At that time, Lithuanian and other Baltic peoples in large numbers were forcibly torn from their homes, separated from their families and sent into the Soviet vastness never to be heard from again. Fortunately, however, considerable numbers of the Lithuanian people escaped from their homeland during World War II and made their way to Western Europe.

The United States has been foremost among the countries of the new world in providing a haven for Lithuanian refugees.

Under the Displaced Persons Act, the United States admitted thousands of refugees of Lithuanian nationality for permanent residence. They are a welcome addition to the approximately 1 million U.S. citizens and residents of Lithuanian descent who were in this country before World War II.

America is grateful for the skills and craftsmanship which Americans of Lithuanian birth have brought to us. Not only have they brought a tradition of industriousness and love of work, but they brought us their finest in music, poetry, and art.

One measure of the continuing active interest which this Government and the American people have in the welfare of the Lithuanian people is indicated by the fact that the Voice of America has been broadcasting in the Lithuanian language since 1951. Americans applaud the efforts of people of Lithuanian birth or descent who continue to seek assistance for their friends and relatives now completing 25 years of living under Soviet control. Americans rejoice in the continued evidence demonstrated by the people in Lithuania of a national spirit and an undying desire for living as free men. Those freedom-loving people need our continued help in the form of an expanded flow of facts, food, medicines, and clothing.

Self-determination for the Baltic peoples is a firmly established U.S. policy and one that this Government has never failed to keep on record before the world. The United States has, in fact, always led the nations of the free world in the degree of consistency and thoroughness with which this policy of nonrecognition has been applied.

This has been seen in repeated statements by the President, the Secretary of State, and other spokesmen of this Government. We also have shown our determination through specific acts rejecting the validity of Soviet atuhority in the Baltic States and by actively carrying this issue before the forums of the world, particularly in the United Nations General Assembly, where U.S. diplomatic action has been brought to bear in the question of the Baltic nations. Our mission to the United Nations has on appropriate occasions repeatedly sought to direct the pressure of world opinion against Soviet rule in the Baltic States and other subjugated areas. And there continues to be strong congressional pressure to bring relief to the so-called captive nations and obtain remedial action for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia through international tribunals.

In conclusion, let me assure you that the U.S. Government will take every occasion it can find to press the case for self-determination for the people of Ltihuania. We may negotiate with the Soviet Union, but we will never give up our principles in such negotiations.

We look forward to a world free from war, free from poverty, free from discrimination, free from man's inhumanity to man. And in that world we are confident that the free Lithuanian people will take their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Freedoms Lose Meaning in Humdrums of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Yazooan, student newspaper at Yazoo City, Miss., High School, has again received an award from the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge. An inspiring editorial which appeared in the March 4, 1965, edition of the newspaper was judged winner of the George Washington Honor Medal.

The editorial entitled "Freedoms Lose Meaning in Humdrums of Life" was written by Miss Caroline Barbour. She is now a student at the University of Mississippi where she is a staff member of the student newspaper, The Mississippian.

The award-winning editorial by this talented young writer contains a meaningful message which should be significont to all Americans. It is fitting that Miss Barbour be recognized for her timely and thought-provoking comments.

The editorial follows:

Freedoms Lose Meaning in Humdrums of Life

(By Caroline Barbour)

In the course of everyday life, most Americans tend to take for granted the freedoms upon which their heritage is based.

A happy-go-lucky high school student passes the days casually unaware of all that he has to be thankful for. Though he is familiar with the facts of his freedom through history texts, does he realize the influence of these liberties on his own life? Is he cognizant of the ominous threats to the vary foundations of his liberty?

Does he swell with pride each time he sees Old Glory waving in the breeze? Does he stand tall when he hears "The Star Spangled Banner"? Does he realize the impacts of his words when he pledges his allegiance to the flag? Does he merely endure these rituals or does he treasure them as evidence of the struggles of dedicated patriots to make America the land of the free and the home of the brave?

Who made the Constitution, which has been the basic rule for all government? Was it to be a masterpiece of literature? How little in all the years has it been altered? How long can man see eye to eye that government which governs best for the majority is good government and compliance with its tenets will create harmony in State and Nation?

Only when the young adult wakes up to the fact that his individual rights are the products of toil and strife bequeathed him by his forefathers, will he gladly give of himself to protect his invaluable inheritance.

Statement of Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio, of Newark, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, under the able leadership of the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, is holding hearings on the city demonstration programs and related housing legislation. On March 1, 1966, the Honorable Hugh J. Addonizio, mayor of Newark, N.J., appeared before the subcommittee as the first non-Federal witness at the hearings.

As a member of the Housing Subcommittee during his almost 14 years' service as the Representative from the 11th Congressional District, Mayor Addonizio made a substantial contribution to the valuable housing acts enacted from the 81st Congress through the 87th Congress. His broad grasp of housing problems, gained during those years, has been a tremendous asset to him in guiding the affairs of Newark since he assumed the office of mayor in July 1962.

Likewise, his experience as mayor of a large city, plagued with all the ills of our teeming urban centers, has given Mr. Addonizio an intimate awareness of what must be done to rebuild our cities and how it must be done. If the Congress helps to make the tools available, those cities that want to help themselves, such as Newark under Mayor Addonizio's dynamic leadership, can truly become places worth living in for all their residents.

Mayor Addonizio's counsel, based upon his long experience as legislator and administrator, was, I know, of immense value to the subcommittee and will be of deep interest to all our colleagues. I am therefore inserting below the full text of the mayor's statement:

Statement of Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio, of Newark, N.J., March 1, 1966

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am honored to appear before this subcommittee on which

I had the great privilege of serving for many years while a Member of Congress. For the past 4 years, as mayor of the largest city in New Jersey, I have witnessed the satisfying results of legislation which was fashioned in this subcommittee.

Today, I would like first to pay tribute to President Johnson, not only for recognizing the great problems that confront the cities of America, but resolving to meet these problems with a comprehensive and coordinated Federal-city partnership.

The strengthening of this partnership is the heart of the legislation before us.

I would also like to commend Congressman PATMAN for introducing the Demonstration Cities Act and Congressman BARRETT for speedily summoning a meeting of this subcommittee.

In the last few years, many Federal programs have been designed to meet specific goals and objectives in our cities. They have been helpful, but often too scattered or too small to make a major impact. The time has come to ascertain the effectiveness of all of these programs when they are effectively combined in a broad problem area.

The Demonstration Cities Act will provide this challenging test. It is vital that we learn to centralize responsibility and achieve the highest level of coordination and it is vital that we do it now. The immensity of the problems of our major cities today leaves little choice. My own city is a prime example.

Newark is a 300-year-old city, with a population of over 400,000 people. It is land poor and tax poor. Only 5,000 of its 15,000 acres are available for residential living and industrial locations. Over 10,000 acres are occupied by tax-free educational institutions, hospitals, parks, public buildings, and vast land areas occupied by the Port of New York Authority at Port Newark and Newark Airport.

Like most major cities, Newark has attempted to face up to its responsibilities in providing public housing, urban renewal, job training, economic development, and a long list of social and welfare programs.

These efforts have helped overcome a history of slums, inadequate school building, and the problems of a large minority population suffering from the wounds of a disgraceful national legacy of neglect and prejudice.

But all these efforts are not enough to create what we need in our cities today—a total recasting of urban life, from housing to health, from education to recreation, from work to pleasure.

Through our urban renewal program we have obtained a grant reservation of $120 million. This represents a grant reservation of $300 per person, the highest in the Nation. It is not enough.

Through the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Commerce Department and the Office of Economic Opportunity, we have received over $35 million. With these funds, we have established skills training centers, youth opportunity centers, on-the-job training programs, year-round preschool programs, neighborhood youth corps programs, tutorial and remedial educational programs, recreational programs and a host of others. And they are not enough.

We have provided 13,713 public housing units. We have relocated close to 50,000 persons. We have embraced citizen participation in all programs. We have offered generous tax abatement programs for new construction, as permitted under special State law. We have constructed new schools, built new sewers and we have overhauled and vigorously enforced our inspection and housing ordinances. And still it is not enough.

With all these things, more than 100,000 persons continue to live in blighted and substandard neighborhoods, bearing the crushing burdens which flow from an unhealthy physical and sociological pattern of life.

If cities are to avoid catastrophe, we must not only overcome the effects of decay, but we must obliterate them forever. Intelligent and massive Federal aid is the best answer.

The legislation before you, inspired by the President of the United States in his forthright expression of concern for urban life, brings to us a method for testing various means of bringing Federal aid to our cities.

We must now pinpoint the interrelationships between various Federal programs. We must devise new combinations of old programs and develop totally new programs. Only in this way can we develop a long-range approach to merging the social, physical and economic considerations that are all-important to the survival of our cities.

Now let me turn to details of the bill itself.

I believe, first of all, the objective of the act must not be simply to warm over public housing or spruce up urban renewal. The act must go beyond the existing array of Federal programs. It must remain a unique program—a demonstration program. It must be concerned with action beyond the rebuilding and rehabilitation of slum structures. It must demonstrate that urban life is for all people, the rich as well as the poor, the executive as well as the laborer and that there is a place for the great mass of middle-class citizens that make up the backbone of our Nation. The act must remain flexible and it must remain experimental. Its objective is the rebuilding of a total city life, not the simple physical rebuilding of a neighborhood or the mere providing of supportive social services.

As to the planning and selection of cities contemplated by the act, I submit it is in keeping with the experimental character of the legislation to open the planning phase to wide participation by many cities.

It has been a source of much concern that the program appears to be designed for a small number of cities. Many cities already fear that they may not be "among the chosen."

To set this fear at rest, and to provide a genuine burst of new ideas and new projects, I believe every city in the Nation should be allowed the opportunity to participate in at least the planning phase of the program. We need as many novel ideas and new techniques as we can get.

To finance the expansion of the planning phase, I suggest the Housing Act of 1949 be amended to permit at least $50 million of demonstration city planning grants out of title I grant funds. In addition, I suggest also that there be an appropriation of $12 million, as suggested by the President, available to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for grants to cities in cases of special need and special significance. Through this total approach, this broadening of the planning portion of the program, we will, at the very least, produce in many cities a new awareness of Federal resources and the need for coordination.

However, in selecting cities for carrying out demonstration projects, I submit that the selection be strictly limited—that the number of cities chosen be few.

I suggest that demonstration projects be approved only if they are of sufficient magnitude and complexity to produce an end result which can be intelligently evaluated in terms of massive impact and which offers solutions which are meaningful in terms of major urban centers.

It seems to me that a program which is designed to demonstrate new approaches cannot—and should not—be applied across the board to all municipalities. It can only lead to the reduction of this novel bill to just another in a long list of Federal aid programs which skim the surface but do not cut to the core of the matter.

In funding demonstration city projects I suggest that the Federal Government must first adopt the same maintenance of effort provision it requires of cities. That is, it is imperative that in all departments and agencies participating in the project, that demonstration funds be made available in addition to existing appropriations.

The appropriation for the demonstration act must add directly to the level of assistance provided by existing Federal programs. In addition, the act must provide enough money to meet the cost of component programs in cases where there are no existing Federal aid programs.

It is well to provide 80 percent of the local share of projects and activities which can be readily committed to the demonstration project, but I believe that there should be sufficient funds in the act itself to provide 90 percent of the total cost of all other projects for which no Federal aid is available.

Furthermore, it is clear that unless all time limitations on urban renewal authorizations in the 1965 act are waived, the demands of demonstration programs for urban renewal grant commitments will surely build up a troublesome backlog of applications.

I recommend such limitations be waived.

Finally, in terms of funding, I suggest there needs to be an increase in the $2.3 billion rdecommended for the life of this program.

Fully aware of the great demands being made in Vietnam and elsewhere, it is nevertheless clear that a more realistic level of expenditures would be $2 billion a year for the 5 action years of the program, beginning next year. This is based on our own projections in Newark where we are considering a program involving 30,000 dwellings and not more than 100,000 people.

It is our estimate that any program of the magnitude we are considering will cost no less than $200 million. If only 50 cities are chosen to participate during the 5 action years of this program, similar expenditures on their behalf would run the total cost to an excess of $10 billion. It is upon these figures that I predicate my recommendation that the total cost of the demonstration program might be set at $2 billion per year for 5 years, beginning next year.

Finally, I would like to touch on the proposed administration of this program.

I know Dr. Weaver has been concerned with the fact that mayors and other officials may not be amenable to the creation of local Federal coordinators. As for myself, I welcome a local Federal coordinator. I think it is imperative, if this program is to be successful, that there be a system of coordination outside the normal channels now available to us. It is vital that there be a Federal man on the scene to expedite programs and provide direct communication between the cities and Washington.

I will go one step further and propose that each and every department and agency that participates in demonstration city projects assign an assistant secretary, or an assistant director, as liaison for the demonstration cities act. Together these officials would represent a total Federal task force on demonstration city projects. A Federal coordinator reaching out of his locality to assist his project would be able to touch directly the highest ranking policymakers in other departments, all devoted to the successful completion of a demonstration city project.

The Demonstration Cities Act, ladies and gentlemen, is a bold experiment.

It challenges the cities to prove they have a right to survive.

It challenges the Federal Government to prove that the hundreds of programs it has devised and the millions of dollars it has spent make sense.

This legislation can be a key instrumentality in bringing back to the cities of America thousands of our citizens who were forced to flee because of intolerable conditions, but who genuinely desire to live in the heart of an active and healthy urban center.

I believe in the future of our cities.

I believe people truly want to live in our cities.

But I believe our cities can be reclaimed only if we can provide in its streets and in its homes, the kind of life to which people in our Great Society are entitled. This act can help bring a new day to our cities. It deserves your support.

Thank you.

Steady Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, in the proper exercise of their editorial responsibility, the great newspapers of the country have joined in the crucial dialog over the course we should pursue in Vietnam. Like the readers they serve, the papers themselves reflect and espouse all shades of opinion. That is as it should be.

One of the outstanding metropolitan papers from my area—the Denver Post—has alined itself with President Johnson's policy of "prudent firmness under careful control."

I subscribe to the editorial's appraisal that "none of the President's objectives can be accomplished speedily. But if he continues to move forward with both determination and caution on the military, peace and reform fronts, the ends we seek in Vietnam may be in sight a year from now."

Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my colleagues to this thoughtful article from the Denver Post:

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 25, 1966]

L.B.J. HOLDS TO A STEADY COURSE

President Johnson has given the Nation important new assurance that his use of American military might in Vietnam will be limited and cautious and that he does not intend to stumble into an all-out war.

"Our measured use of force must be continued," he said in New York Wednesday night. "But this is prudent firmness under careful control. There is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation."

A policy of "prudent firmness under careful control" will be especially important during the coming year when the size of the U.S. forces in Vietnam is expected to increase from 200,000 to at least 400,000.

If the tide has turned permanently in our favor—as the President and Vice President have suggested—there will be great temptation to use our larger force in ways that would risk the Red Chinese intervention Johnson now believes can be avoided.

There will also be temptation to push our military offensive at the expense of our peace offensive, making it more difficult to bring the Communists to the peace table to work out the negotiated settlement the President has called for.

In his speech Wednesday night, President Johnson showed himself fully aware of the temptations and the risks and fully familiar with the arguments which have been raised by both the hawks and the doves in favor of a change of course in Vietnam.

That no such change is in prospect was clear from the President's words. He will continue to stand on the sensible middle ground which has proved most comfortable for him throughout his long public life.

He will not withdraw, and he will not deliberately escalate. Neither will he dig in and abandon his continuing effort to find a peaceful settlement through negotiations.

The President, in short, has considered the arguments of critics on both sides and decided to go ahead as before. If there is change, it is in the administration's new emphasis on social and economic reform in South Vietnam and on building the kind of government the people will be willing to fight for.

None of the President's objectives can be accomplished speedily. But if he continues to move forward with both determination and caution on the military, peace and reform fronts, the ends we seek in Vietnam may be in sight a year from now.

In any case, we believe the President is following the most practical course, and we have no doubt that most of the American people believe that, too.

World Hunger: Enemy of U.S. Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's proposed food-for-freedom program has often been attacked as a gigantic giveaway program which will be a drain on the American economy.

This view is refuted in the current issue of Forbes, a leading business magazine. Forbes has published a fine article, "World Hunger: Enemy of U.S. Prosperity." The article shows that well-fed and prosperous nations are the best markets for U.S. products.

Forbes has performed a great service in pointing out that an expanded program of American assistance to overseas agricultural development will not only be a great humanitarian undertaking, but will bring increased prosperity to American businessmen and farmers.

Under unanimous consent I insert the article from Forbes in the RECORD:

WORLD HUNGER: ENEMY OF U.S. PROSPERITY

One billion people, a third of the world's population, drag themselves through the day weak from hunger, an easy target for disease and frequently for death from starvation. Another billion are badly malnourished, almost on the borderline of starvation. What we call progress, civilization, prosperity is meaningless to two-thirds of the human race. These people are only half alive. They are half dead from hunger.

The average American consumes 3,100 calories a day in food rich with proteins, vitamins and minerals. In the underdeveloped nations, the average person must drag his body along on a mere 2,030 calories a day, and his food usually is deficient in those nutrients. While the United States, Western Europe, Japan, and a few other nations get richer, the hungry get hungrier, because, in the underdeveloped part of the world, human fecundity is outstripping agricultural fecundity. In Asia and Latin America in the past 5 years the population has risen by 12 and 17 percent, respectively. In contrast, production of food has risen by only 10 percent. The result is that per capita food production has fallen by 3 percent in Asia, by 7 percent in Latin America.

The deadly effects of the population explosion aren't for tomorrow. They are here and now. Today.

As Chairman Robert S. Stevenson, of Allis-Chalmers, puts it: "The United States, Canada, and Australia are going to have to feed the world, or we're going to have to help the world feed itself." Nobody realizes this more keenly than President Lyndon B. Johnson and his top aids. The more newsworthy problems of Vietnam and inflation have not, even for a day, crowded it out of their deliberations.

Humanitarian motives aside, the President and his aids know full well that the U.S. economy cannot continue to grow without an expanding world market. Moreover, as the President has noted, quoting Seneca, "A hungry people listens not to reason, nor cares for justice, nor is bent by any prayers."

The malnourished masses love their children as intensely as well-fed Americans love theirs. They are not about to starve peacefully and quietly, in patience, resignation, and fatalism, as their ancestors might have done. They know there is a world without hunger somewhere outside their dusty villages. They have transistor radios, and they have bumped in rickety buses into market towns. They have taken seriously the politicians' promises of a better life. They will riot and kill to achieve it. They are doing so right now.

ESCALATION

Almost in desperation, the United States plans to escalate its efforts to deal with the world hunger problem. In so doing it will create tremendous opportunities for businesses that have the know-how, the foresight, and the capital to help end hunger.

President Johnson fired an opening gun in the stepped-up war against hunger when he sent a message to Congress last month, asking for a new food program to replace the present food-for-peace program, Public Law 480, which expires this year. The President did not spell out all the details of his food-for-freedom program, but, even so, agricultural experts agree that it eventually will have an enormous impact on the entire U.S. economy. For one thing, it will change the whole direction of the foreign aid program. Until now, foreign aid has gone primarily toward industrial development; hereafter, it will be directed more toward agricultural development.

The food-for-freedom program will have an even greater impact on U.S. agriculture. Since the first Agricultural Administration Act, the U.S. Government has attempted to keep food production down. Now, the Administration plans to offer inducements to farmers to raise production of certain foodstuffs.

Under the food-for-peace program, the United States sent abroad primarily those agricultural products it had in surplus in Government warehouses. Now, it will gear its production more directly to the needs of the hungry, using incentives to increase production of certain foodstuffs when necessary.

Out of this inevitably will come several other developments: Little by little, land which has been retired from production under the present farm program will be brought back into cultivation. The exodus of marginal farmers into the cities will be speeded up, since they will not have the capital to expand production as the Government requires. The big farmers will get bigger. Even if world prices of agricultural products don't rise, the big farmers will become so efficient and have such an enormous market they will be able to prosper with lower subsidies—or even without them.

One expert, Don Lerch, a Washington management consultant who specializes in agriculture, believes that by 1976 there will be only 500,000 farmers in the United States (as compared with 3.2 million today). But, he quickly adds, they will all be immensely prosperous.

The farmers of Canada and Australia also will benefit. Both countries, as a result, are likely to keep booming.

The United States plans to fight the war against hunger on two fronts. The first will be a crash program to supply the underdeveloped countries with food. The United States has been giving away $1.5 billion worth of food abroad every year under Public Law 480. If Congress approves the President's new program—as seems all but certain—food shipments could rise to $3.3 billion by 1967–68. This move is designed to cope with such emergencies as the recent drought in India, which already has led to Communist-organized riots in the State of Kerala.

In the long run, the second front will be the decisive one. This is the self-help part. Every nation receiving U.S. aid will have to promise to build up its own agriculture as swiftly as possible. Not only promise, but show results. The reason for this is simple. "We don't have enough capacity to feed all these people," says Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. "Unless they learn to feed themselves, there will be world famine. The estimated increased needs between now and 1980 are in the neighborhood of 300 million tons. The potential reserve productive capacity of this country is 50 to 55 million tons more. There is a 250-million-ton gap here that only the underdeveloped nations themselves can fill."

Along with the food, therefore, the United States will send the underdeveloped nations fertilizer and farm equipment. It will also encourage U.S. companies to build fertilizer plants and farm equipment factories abroad. It will teach farmers in Asia and Africa and Latin America how to make the most of the land they have. It will urge—and even armtwist—governments to rerig archaic policies in the field of price incentives, farm credit and land reform. This will all be done under the Agency for International Development (AID).

Increasing food shipments abroad will mean increasing production at home, for, according to Freeman, the reserves in Government storage don't come anywhere near the world's requirements. "Our reserves are now in the land rather than in the storage bin," he says. Grain in storage has been dropping steadily since 1961—wheat, from 1.4 billion bushels to 800 million; feed grains, from 77 million metric tons to 50 million.

This means that millions of acres of land that have been retired under the present farm program eventually will be brought back into production as needed. It will be done gradually, Freeman says, first to prevent chaos in the marketplace, and second because there isn't enough shipping to handle all the food the U.S. farmer could produce if the wraps on him were taken off all at once.

All told, there are now nearly 57 million acres of U.S. farmland "in reserve." Freeman won't reveal just how many he intends to put back into production, but some government officials believe it will be somewhere between 5 million and 7 million acres. He already has taken a small step in that direction. "Just last month," he points out, "I discontinued the alternative of voluntary acreage reduction whereby a spring wheat producer could take 10 percent out of production and get paid for doing it. The producer no longer has that option. He has to plant his full allotment."

MORE TO COME

The acreage allotment for rice will be increased this year by 10 percent. Many experts believe it will eventually be necessary to increase the allotment for winter wheat. Says Claude W. Gifford, senior economist of Farm Journal: "A shortage in wheat is only a few years away."

Freemen's guideline will be the President's promise to Congress to "bring these acres back into production as needed—but not to produce unwanted surplus." In short, to change the very nature of U.S. agricultural policy but without causing chaos on the farm and in the marketplace.

In his message, Johnson called for increased production of soybeans. The Secretary of Agriculture believes this can be achieved by the judicious use of incentives—more acreage with guaranteed prices. "In corn," he says, "we have too much. We still have a surplus. We'll do something which will make it possible for those farmers to plant soybeans on those acres and come out just as good. We need the soybeans. We don't need corn." Soybeans produce a high-protein, low-cost diet meal for animals. They also are one of the richest sources of protein in food mixes for humans.

Robert W. Engle, manager of marketing of Allis-Chalmers farm equipment division, believes that increased production will have to come from improved farm equipment and improved farm techniques, as well as from greater acreage. "One area where output per man-hour has been neglected is farm materials handling," he says. "There are going to be some giant strides made in coordinating a farmer's growing system with a pushbutton, automated method of handling and storing his crop.

"Another way of increasing farm production is * * * by growing two stalks of corn where only one grew before. Instead of growing corn in the standard 38- or 40-inch rows, we've tried it in 30 or 20. Yield often increases 10 to 15 percent."

CHANGE IN POLICY

Under Public Law 480, the United States has either been giving the food away or else selling it for local currency. In simple fact, selling it for local currency almost invariably has meant giving it away, because so little of the currency can be used. According to Sam I. Nakagama, a senior economist of the First National City Bank of New York, the United States now holds an amount equivalent to two-thirds of the currency of India as a result of selling the Indians food. Most of this money obviously can't be used; spending it would create horrendous inflation. Under a tacit agreement with the Indian Government, therefore the United States simply hoards it. The United States now holds $2.8 billion in counterpart funds.

Under the food-for-freedom program, food will no longer be sold for local currency and only a maximum $800 million worth will be given away. Only those nations which clearly can't subsist except on charity will receive free food. The United States will grant the others—nations like Taiwan, Spain, Greece and the United Arab Republic—long-term credits at low interest, perhaps 2 percent, to buy the remaining $2.5 billion worth. They will have to pay the world market price. They will be required to repay the money in dollars.

Prices also should be bolstered by the fact that, at times, the United States will have to get the food on the open market.

There are those who fear that, by helping other nations increase their food production, the United States will destroy its own commercial food-export market, which now amounts to about $4.5 billion a year. According to Freeman, these fears are groundless. Experience proves, he says, that, as a country raises its production of food, what it does is switch to importing other U.S. agricultural products like animal feeds. The result is a net gain for the U.S. farmer. Freeman cites the case of Japan. That country used to get massive agricultural aid from the United States. It soon may be buying $1 billion worth of U.S. farm products annually on a straight cash basis. Western Europe, which also used to receive agricultural aid, is now this Nation's biggest customer of feed grains and poultry. In 1964, U.S. food exports to Western Europe totaled $2.3 billion.

As Freeman sees it, prosperity abroad, therefore, will mean prosperity at home. "Every 10-percent increase in per capita income (abroad) results in a 16-percent increase in the commercial imports of our products," he says.

In the fight to increase production of foodstuffs abroad, the United States will count particularly on the manufacturers of fertilizer. Says David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development: "Fertilizer will be our biggest need." Dr. Lester R. Brown, staff economist of the Department of Agriculture, adds: "Ironically, the less developed regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which contain two-thirds of the world's people and where the food needs are greatest, use only 5 million tons of the 35 million ton annual world total. In other words, only one-seventh of the world fertilizer supply is used in the regions containing two-thirds of the population. As the supply of new land that can be brought under cultivation diminishes, fertilizer becomes the principal substitute for land in the food production process."

FERTILIZER BOOM AHEAD

The United States is now shipping about $325 million worth of fertilizers abroad every year through foreign aid and commercial channels. By 1970, it will be shipping about $1 billion abroad each year. In addition, the United States will spend about $250 million to help build fertilizer plants in partnership with natives in the underdeveloped countries such as Gulf Oil's project in Korea.

Says an AID chemical engineer: "$1 million worth of food aid will feed 70,000 people for a year, but the same $1 million put into fertilizer would help feed 200,000 people for a year."

AID's Bell is also counting on farm equipment manufacturers and food processors to help beef up the agriculture of the underdeveloped countries. The farm machinery makers will have to develop equipment especially designed for their needs, he says, pointing out that in India, for example, "the land holdings are very small. Farming takes on the characteristics of gardening. You need small power units, hand equipment almost."

A great deal rides on the success of this new program—which partly explains why support for it seems to cut across party lines.

President Johnson's proposals have the support of many Republicans, who in the past were leery about foreign aid. Much of the Republican leadership in Congress comes from farm States, where food-aid programs naturally have strong support. Moreover, as Senator Milton R. Young, of North Dakota, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Committee, points out, "Republicans originated the whole food-for-peace program back in the Eisenhower administration." He adds: "I think the President will get substantially what he wants. Giving people food and helping them produce more food is the best kind of foreign aid program."

Is the food-for-freedom program alone big enough to deal with the problem? No. The sad fact is that, no matter how generous it is, it can only supplement the efforts of the underdeveloped countries themselves.

Some pessimists think that the problem is hopeless; that the population explosion is now out of hand. But some very hardheaded experts think otherwise. To quote Bryson M. Filbert, vice president and director of Esso Chemical Co., a big factor in the world fertilizer business, "It is possible to double or even triple agricultural production in all of Asia, Africa, and Latin America through the use of more fertilizers, more irrigation, better seed varieties, more pesticides, and other improved farm practices. I have been told by experts that four times the present world population could be supported by widespread use of improved farming methods."

But the key word is "could." To turn "could" into "will" is going to take some very drastic, very fast changes in the underdeveloped countries themselves. Almost without exception they misread the economic history of the prosperous nations. They only noticed that these countries built industries and turned farmers into workers. What they failed to note was that in most cases such countries did so only after developing a prosperous agriculture first. In part this misreading of history was due to an obsession with the "Soviet experiment."

RUSSIA'S BAD EXAMPLE

The Soviets reversed the normal process of economic development. By starving agriculture of capital and by keeping food prices artificially low, they made the farmers bear the cost of building hydroelectric dams and plants and steel mills. The Soviet Union became a great industrial power, and this bedazzled the underdeveloped nations. What they failed to realize was a fact that has since become obvious to everyone: The Soviet Union produces more steel than it needs, but it can't feed its steelworkers without importing food.

India is the classic case of a country that was misled by the "Soviet experiment." India concentrated all its capital and most of its foreign aid into building up industry. It used the free food it received from the United States to keep food prices low for industrial workers. The program has proved self-defeating. Low food prices have kept the Indian farmer too poor to provide a market for the goods the industrial workers are producing. At the same time, the low prices have discouraged the farmer from attempting to increase production.

Says Richard W. Reuter, director of food-for-peace: "The Indians said they were putting priority on agriculture in every one of their 5-year programs, but agriculture was always the first place to get shortchanged when they ran out of money. This year, according to the Indian Government's own minimum goals, there should be production of 1 million tons of nitrogenous fertilizer. In fact, production is less than 400,000 tons."

The United States, Bell says, is not without blame for this situation. "We didn't use our maximum leverage to get the Indians to put more emphasis on agriculture. We saw what was wrong, but we didn't do enough about it."

Under the food-for-freedom program, the United States plans to get tough with India and the other underdeveloped nations. They will have to put agriculture first or they won't get aid. As a Department of Agriculture official puts it: "The President is going to lean hard on them."

The job of educating the Indian farmer to farm more efficiently will be a staggering one. There are 60 million farmers in the country, spread over 300 million acres of cropland. They speak 14 different languages. The overwhelming majority of them are illiterate.

BREAD VERSUS BULLETS

And yet, to say that India is hopeless is almost the same as saying that one day Red China will dominate all of Asia; India is the only other potential world power on the continent. Neither President Johnson nor Congress is willing to concede Asia to Red China, and, while they realize the difficulties in raising food production in underdeveloped countries, they can point to several notable triumphs in the past. In Greece, for example, the United States persuaded the Government to give wheat farmers a better price and a guaranteed market, and the results, says Food-for-Peace Director Reuter, "were next to miraculous. They're now producing wheat till it comes out of their ears."

Undaunted by the difficulties, therefore, at least half a dozen Congressmen already have introduced bills to implement the President's program. One of the first was Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agricultural Committee. "I am convinced that, in the end, bread will be more important than bullets in bringing peace to the world," he says.

To be perfectly blunt about it, bread will be more important than bullets in assuring that the economic growth of the United States itself will continue.

Proposed Cuts Would Cripple Milk and School-Lunch Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I was very grieved to learn that the budget recently submitted to Congress provided for a drastic cut in the schoolmilk program and a smaller cut in the school lunch program. The explanation given us is that henceforth greater attention will be given to needy children.

To my way of thinking, it would stand to reason that we should expand these programs so that all children throughout the country who wish to partake of either or both of these programs may do so. Investing in the health of our children is a most worthwhile thing because it means greater assurance for the health of our Nation, its strength, and its security. If the children of poor families are in greater need, we should provide for that need so that no child should go hungry.

The Federal Government is spending $103 million in the current fiscal year for the milk program. Under this program more than 92,000 schools and child-care institutions in the country were provided with nearly three billion half-pints of milk. An estimated 17 million schoolchildren benefited from this nutritious energy-giving food every day during the school year. The budget for the coming fiscal year proposes to cut this program from $103 million to $21 million—a reduction of $82 million, or approximately 80 percent of the total program.

Needless to say, this will seriously affect the schools in Connecticut. Last year, Connecticut schools received a total of $1,509,000 toward the milk program. This sum helped to provide 50.4 million half-pints of milk for 1,276 schools and institutions in our State. A reduction of 80 percent will mean that Connecticut will receive only about $300,000 which will help to provide only about 10 million half-pints of milk for the children in our schools.

Fortunately, the school hot lunch program is not being cut as drastically as the milk program. In the current year the school lunch program is costing the Government $203 million and the budget for next year proposes that it be cut to $183 million. Thus, the total cut for the Nation is approximately $19 million in round figures. It is estimated that some 18 million children receive either low-cost or free meals, which also include milk, under this program.

As far as Connecticut is concerned, it received $1,350,247 toward the school lunch program in the current year and $1,135,000 in the previous year. A total of 705 schools in our State benefited under this program. The actual figures quoted to me by the Department of Agriculture, which has jurisdiction over the lunch program, were as follows: 29.4 million lunches were served during the school year 1964–5 to 172,290 children in Connecticut.

The cut recommended for the school lunch program in the budget for the coming fiscal year will mean that Connecticut's share of these will be decreased by $210,834. This means that thousands of schoolchildren in Connecticut schools may be deprived of a free or a low-cost meal.

Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from principals, school superintendents, PTA officials and others protesting the proposed cuts in both programs. Here are brief quotations from some of the letters:

> Many children in the Nation's schools receive one good meal a day and that is provided by the hot lunch program.
>
> ---
>
> Our school lunch program is basically and primarily a health program, not a welfare program.
>
> ---
>
> Many of our young people are on the brink of malnutrition now because they are being filled with convenience foods.
>
> ---
>
> You must know that without Federal aid we cannot provide an adequate lunch at a price families with young and growing youngsters can afford.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it makes good sense to continue both of these programs, since they both add to the health, vitality and energy of our children. The total cost involved here is relatively very small, when we consider the benefits and the health needs of our younger generation. A reduction of these programs will indeed constitute a false economy, one that is bound to cost us many times over in the future health—or lack of health and energy—for countless numbers of young Americans.

The proposed cut in the milk and lunch programs will undoubtedly cripple these programs at a time when they are needed most. If anything, I should like to see where these programs expanded to include every school and every child care institution in the country. Every child that needs or wants to have a hot lunch each school day or a glass of milk should be able to get it. The savings involved in the proposed cuts are so small by comparison with some of our expenditures for projects and programs in this country and abroad where the results are at best of a doubtful nature.

In his state of the Union address in January, President Johnson said:

"There are men who cry out that we must sacrifice. Well, let us rather ask them, who will they sacrifice? Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning?"

I would think that such programs as milk and hot lunches for our schoolchildren would be among the last to be sacrificed. To me, our best investment in the future of America is to raise our children as healthy, well-nourished, wholesome citizens. I would therefore prefer to see these programs established on a permanent basis and on a wide national scale to benefit all American children, rather than that they be curtailed and limited in scope to benefit only a small number of children.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the Record the texts of several letters on the subject which I have received from school officials, as well as a news story on the same subject which appeared in a recent issue of the Middletown, Conn., Press:

Woodrow Wilson Junior High School,
Middletown, Conn., February 11, 1966.
Re special milk program.
Hon. William St. Onge,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: Again I find it necessary to write to you concerning our school lunch program.

According to our school lunch bulletin of February 1966, the President requests a cut in the national school lunch funds for the next fiscal year. The President also requests a cut in the special milk program budget.

I feel the money allocated for the direct welfare of our children is money well spent. You must know that without Federal aid we cannot provide an adequate lunch at a price families with young and growing youngsters can afford.

Please use your influence to help us in this area.

Sincerely,
Edward P. Collins,
Principal.

Sayles Elementary School,
Baltic, Conn., February 11, 1966.
Representative William L. St. Onge,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Representative St. Onge: We feel that the proposed cut in the Federal funds for the national school lunch and special milk program would be a great injustice to the youth of our country.

This program is and should be a health program and not welfare. Many children in the Nation's schools receive one good meal a day and that is provided by the hot lunch program.

We urge you to vote to increase the budget requests for the national school lunch funds instead of decreasing it as proposed.

Thank you for your interest and attention.

Yours truly,
Anthony R. Angelo,
Principal.

State of Connecticut,
Bureau of Field Services,
Hebron, Conn., February 10, 1966.
Hon. William L. St. Onge,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. St. Onge: The Andover Board of Education, at its regular meeting held on Tuesday, February 8, 1966, discussed the proposed cut in the national school lunch funds for the next fiscal year in President Johnson's budget. The board voted unanimously (1) to express its deep concern if this request were to prevail and its effect on an important phase of our school program, (2) to write to you protesting such a proposed cut, and (3) to request that you vigorously support action in Congress to restore funds to last year's level.

Our school lunch program is basically and primarily a health program, not a welfare program. The President's special extension of the national school lunch program for the needy should be in addition to the basic sound program so important for youth fitness. It is most disturbing that efforts are being made to reduce funds for such a well-established, sound, on-going program which has so many values in our total educational program for the nutrition and health of our boys and girls.

Sincerely yours,
Aram Damarjian,
Superintendent of Schools, Regional No. 8.

Windham Public Schools,
Willimantic, Conn., February 8, 1966.
Congressman William L. St. Onge,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I wish to protest the action of President Johnson in considering a cut in funds and commodities for the school lunch program.

Millions of dollars are being spent on physical fitness programs throughout the country. Let us help build healthy minds and bodies by stressing the essentials of of good nutrition, provide students with low-cost, nutritious, well-balanced meal, and not resolve the school lunch program to a battery of machines or brown bags.

Many of our young people are on the brink of malnutrition now because they are being filled with convenience foods.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Helen Jensen,
Windham Schools Lunch Director.

Parent-Teachers Association,
Borough School,
Stonington, Conn., February 21, 1966.
Re school lunch Bulletin No. 6, February 1966, Connecticut State Department of Education
Representative William L. St. Onge,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative: It has come to our attention, through local publication of our State education department, that a proposal has been sent to Congress requesting a cut in the hot lunch and milk program for the new fiscal year.

As a representative of our local Parent-Teachers Association I would like to seek your assistance in opposing this budget cut. Myself, as well as other concerned parents, support this program as it now stands and believe that if changes are to be made they should be of a positive nature and not one of reduction in total funds.

I would appreciate any effort on your part to make our views known to your fellow Representatives.

Thanking you for your consideration in this matter, I remain,

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. John Mellow,
Secretary.

Board of Education,
Fanklin, Conn., *February 10, 1966.*
Re proposed cuts in Federal funds.
Congressman William L. St. Onge,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman St. Onge: We are writing in protest to the proposed cut in Federal funds for the national school lunch program for the next fiscal year. We do not feel there should be a cut in the special milk program budget either.

We feel the national school lunch program is basically and primarily a health program, not welfare. We would appreciate your efforts in our behalf toward restoring funds to last year's level or increases extended if possible. We hope you will do your utmost toward this end.

Very truly yours,
Joyce S. Havens,
Secretary.

Willimantic, Conn.,
February 3, 1966.
Congressman W. L. St. Onge.

Dear Sir: As a hot lunch school worker for 18 years I would like to put in a protest to President L. B. Johnson's ideas on cutting school commodities. Come in someday, at lunchtime, in any school under the lunch program. See the happy faces and well-cooked meals being served them.

We want strong Americans, yes. How else than to feed them well-balanced meals with the extra supplies we receive from Government, we can do this, and charge only 35 cents. Cut us down and with the food market sky high, only very frugal meals can be served. Yes, our slums are underfed and need extra food. Why not a program to educate these parents in good nutrition—it can be done. Why build strong bodies for our enemies. Serve American youth first.

Back our school lunch program, Mr. St. Onge. We need you. Start a program to have our allies raise their own wheat and have better cattle. It can be done if we get a little tight with them. America first—especially our youngsters.

Sincerely,
Mary J. Benoit,
Cook and Food Manager, Windham High School.

Connecticut School Food Service Association,
Seymour, Conn., March 1, 1966.
Hon. William L. St. Onge,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. St. Onge: The President's proposed reductions in the budget for the school lunch and special milk programs is cause for great concern for the future of these programs in Connecticut.

The school lunch programs have made great progress in the past 20 years, and have contributed immeasurably to the nutritional health and education of our youth. This progress has been possible with the aid of the support in cash and food commodities received from the Federal Government. Now, if this support is greatly reduced at this time, millions of children will not be able to participate because it will be necessary to increase the charge to the child. This noon meal which millions of children get through the lunch programs is most often the only nutritionally balanced meal received during the day, and sometime the only meal. Even in our flourishing economy here in these United States, we still have "starvation without hunger," therefore, the contribution of the school lunch programs cannot be overlooked as a great asset to our Nation.

If support to th special milk program is curtailed to the degree that only those areas not served by the lunch programs will receive aid, millions of children who have learned to drink adequate amounts of milk will no longer do so, because of increased costs.

Established programs should not have to be sacrificed, especially if they have been successful ones, for poverty programs that will not be available to all children.

We earnestly seek your support in this matter and truly hope that you will exercise all influence you may have to see that the coming budget will provide these programs with increased support in cash as well as commodities so that our youth will be well equipped physically to meet the challenge of our Nation to keep peace in the world.

Very truly yours,

HARRIETTE MARTIN,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

CLINTON, CONN.,
March 1, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ST. ONGE: I have just learned that the proposed 1966–67 Federal budget would cut $82 million in funds from the special milk program. This cut of almost 80 percent would have a devastating impact on the availability of milk to the children of Connecticut. It is difficult for me to understand why the Federal Government is attempting to destroy a program which has proven to be a great success, in favor of untried and unproven programs under the antipoverty program.

I wish to urge your support in restoring this $62 million to the budget for the special milk program.

Very truly yours,

R. G. HELMBOLDT.

[From the Middletown (Conn.) Press, Jan. 24, 1966]

SURPLUS SQUEEZE—U.S. LUNCH AID THREATENED

(By Ross Drake)

The federally subsidized hot lunch program that has enabled schoolchildren across the Nation to purchase low-cost school cafeteria meals is in jeopardy because of diminishing Government food surpluses, a nationally distributed newsletter reported today.

The Insider's Newsletter, a publication of Cowles Communications, Inc., said the Government estimates that by September it will no longer be able to supply as much food as it has in the past.

Under the terms of the national school lunch program, started in 1946, the Government is supposed to supply 8 cents worth of surplus food, plus 5 cents in cash, per child per meal.

IN DOUBT

According to the newsletter, President Johnson is expected to ask Congress to increase the cash appropriation as a means of balancing the decline in available food surpluses, but congressional appropriations committees are not expected to comply.

Assistant Superintendent of Schools Clement D. Shaw said this morning that a hot lunch in Middletown schools costs either 30 or 35 cents, with the most selling at the higher price. He indicated a reduction in Fedral support for the lunch program would force an increase in cost.

"It goes without saying that you can't cook a meal, obtain the food, pay your cafeteria personnel and all the other costs of running the program without raising the cost," he explained.

FEDERAL SLICE

Shaw said the Federal Government is currently paying Middletown 4 cents per lunch for food and about 3 cents for milk. He said the milk subsidy is subject to fluctuation, and has in the past risen as high as 4 cents.

In addition to the cash subsidy, the Government also contributes a significant portion of the local schools' food supply, the assistant superintendent added. He said supplies of virtually every staple food, including meat, butter, flour, and sugar, are included in the subsidy.

He said he received no information to the effect that the Government program was in danger of being sharply curtailed, but that cash payments in the last few months have been cut back from 100 percent of the city's claim to only 90 percent.

Shaw said this meant that if the city claimed a subsidy of 3 cents per every bottle of milk, the Government would pay 2.7 cents per bottle.

INCONSISTENT

He indicated he would be dubious of the philosophy behind any more extensive cutback of Federal support for the lunch program. He said the program had ben instituted originally to guarantee disadvantaged schoolchildren at least one balanced meal per day, and indicated he felt a reduction of the program would be inconsistent with the aims of more recent Federal antipoverty legislation.

The Insider's Newsletter noted that the Department of Agriculture recently sponsored a project in which the hot lunch price at one school was reduced to 10 cents. The reduction was reportedly attended by a dramatic increase in school attendance and a decline in the number of dropouts.

Congress has been asked to appropriate $25 million for the expansion of this program to other slum schools, the newsletter said.

Supplementary Foreign Assistance Authorization, Fiscal Year 1966

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12166) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, in considering the present legislation, I would like to point out what appears to be a significant and encouraging new U.S. foreign policy emphasis on active assistance in the process of peaceful social and political reform and economic development in southeast Asia.

Most Americans, I am sure, will applaud this hopeful sign of our determination to provide forward-looking leadership in that troubled part of the world for the struggle to conquer the age-old enemies of hunger, disease, and ignorance, and to build the basis for democratic institutions and free elections.

This more positive attitude toward solving the problems of the underdeveloped world is certainly welcome, for it seems to represent a major public shift in our foreign policy approach. And it could well mean a move away from what had come to be viewed as a basically defensive post-Korean conflict stance—aimed primarily at stabilizing the status quo in Asia.

The new approach calls for a more dynamic attitude designed to help meet the rising expectations of Asia's restless millions by providing urgently needed self-help assistance in such important fields as education, health, agricultural production, industrial development, community water and sewage facilities, village security, refugee resettlement, and tax and land reform.

In addition, we are now actively promoting the spirit of regional cooperation in southeast Asia by participating in the huge Mekong River development project, which will provide tremendous power, irrigation, flood control, and related economic benefits to each of the neighboring Mekong Basin countries of Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam.

Another very promising endeavor which we are fully backing is the newly created 27-nation Asian Development Bank with headquarters in Manila. This further example of worthwhile regional cooperation may prove to be one of the most effective long-range financial tools to develop Asia's virtually boundless human and natural resources—and help lift the burden of poverty that has been her lot since ancient times.

A fourth new U.S. foreign policy initiative is also designed to meet the turbulent challenge of the emerging nations. This is the recently announced food-for-freedom program to greatly increase American agricultural exports to food-shortage countries.

Besides harnessing our own amazing food-producing capacity to help fulfill the immediate pressing needs of an exploding world population, this program will also serve as a means to stimulate expanded local food production in the underdeveloped nations themselves.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am, of course, vitally concerned with these significant events on the international scene, for they seem to foreshadow a more dynamic American leadership role in promoting the cause of freedom.

Success in this progressive and forward-looking program of social reform and economic development, together with an end to the conflict in Vietnam, could help build strong and firm foundations for peace among all the nations of the world.

For that reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to give their overwhelming support to the supplemental foreign assistance authorization measure presently before the House—as an expression of endorsement for this hopeful and encouraging development in American foreign policy.

Edison as I Knew Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, retired senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries, West Orange, N.J., delivered a characteristically illuminating address on the occasion of the 119th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison with whom he was closely associated for many years as a brilliant executive and loyal friend. His own notable career and zealous contributions to numeorus civic, medical, humanitarian, and fraternal causes reflect Mr. Stringfellow's adherance to the ideals and philosophy of the genius with whom he spent his formative years in the business world. Like the great inventor, Mr. Stringfellow has used his enormous talents for the betterment of mankind and has been guided by Edison's statement which he quoted in his stirring talk:

> Be courageous—history repeats itself again and again. Be as brave as your forefathers. Have faith. Go forward.

It is a great pleasure to insert below the text of Mr. Stringfellow's address:

EDISON AS I KNEW HIM

(Address by George E. Stringfellow, longtime business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, and past imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America, delivered aboard the SS *United States* before the members ofthe imperial potentate's shrine cruise to the Caribbean, February 11, 1966)

(NOTE.—In introducing the speaker, Noble Don Albertsen of the Albertsen Travel Service, said: "We are delighted to have with us on this occasion Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow who will speak on the subject of 'Edison as I Knew Him'. Noble Stringfellow has received many honors from colleges and industry and I can think of no one better qualified to speak on the subject than Noble Stringfellow, whom I am happy to present.")

Imperial sir, nobles, and gracious ladies. Thank you, Don, for your complimentary introduction and thank you nobles and ladies for the warmth of your reception.

The three men who, in my opinion, made the greatest overall contribution to the United States and, through their conduct and example, to the world, were born in February—Washington, Lincoln, and Edison.

Washington provided leadership and inspiration that gave us our way of life.

Lincoln provided the courage and statesmanship that held together our way of life.

Edison gave us a system of research and a philosophy of business that increased our wealth and elevated our living standard to a point unequaled in the annals of history.

Any success which I may have attained in the business world is due, in a large measure, to my daily business association with this great genius during my formative years. It has been my sincere effort since Edison passed on to his rich reward to do all I can to perpetuate his ideals, his philosophy, and his memory.

As far back as the history of the Edison family is traceable, one characteristic stands out. The Edisons were nonconformists. We encounter this trait first among the English forebears who, in the middle 1600's migrated to Holland in protest against religious and other restrictions of Oliver Cromwell. The first Edisons arrived in the new world in 1730 from Holland. They settled in Caldwell, N.J., which, coincidentally, is hardly more than a stone's throw from West Orange where 150 years later, Thomas Edison established his home and laboratory.

During the American Revolution, one branch of the Edison family remained loyal to the crown. John Edison, a practicing Tory—Thomas Edison's great grandfather—was sentenced to death but his sentence was commuted. After the Revolution, he and his family settled in Nova Scotia, Canada.

Edison's grandfather, Capt. Samuel Edison, served with the British in the War of 1812. Edison's father, Samuel, following an unsuccessful local rebellion, with a price on his head, fled from Canada and established his family in Milan, Ohio, where Thomas Alva Edison was born, 119 years ago today.

It was my privilege to have worked for and with Thomas Edison for more than a decade and I can assure you that nonconformity motivated many of his decisions. Although he was not a revolutionary in the sense of battles and plots, he was a revolutionist in his approach to science. Had he been a conformist, he could not have compiled his stupendous record of achievements. Had he been a conformist, he would have accepted as truth the myths of the then prevailing scientific knowledge. Only the strong swim against the current. Thomas Edison was strong. He swam upstream to establish new scientific truths and to open new vistas of progress.

Although Edison's efforts accounted for more than 1,100 patents, which produced millions of jobs and billions in wealth, his greatest contribution to society, in my opinion, was organized research.

For a decade, Edison labored long and effectively in his Menlo Park, N.J., laboratory. Here the phonograph, the electric light, a system for the generation and distribution of electric power, were born. Still he saw in his Menlo Park laboratory the inadequacy of the facilities. He envisioned the establishment of an "invention factory," which was his descriptive term for "organized research" which term was not used until many years later.

In 1887, Edison opened his laboratory at West Orange, N.J. This laboratory is now a museum operated by the Federal Government as the Edison National Monument.

How well Edison planned for and succeeded in his invention factory is attested to by the fact that during the last 44 years of his life spent in West Orange, he was granted 520 patents. These covered, among other things, improvements in electric motors and generators, improvements in the incandescent and fluorescent lamps, continuous nickel and copper plating, the depositing of metals in a vacuum, magnetic concentration, briquetting of iron ore, improvements in recording and reproduction of sound, primary and storage batteries and the "move" camera which gave birth to the motion picture industry.

Edison believed in, subscribed to, and practiced the philosophy that generally speaking there are four basic principles in management: (1) Plan, (2) organize, (3) delegate, (4) supervise.

Edison always had plans of action. He built an organization of men and equipment to carry out his plans. He delegated ample authority to his subordinates to the end that they could effectively discharge their responsibilities. Having planned, organized, and delegated, he exercised intelligent supervision to the end that the plans were carried out.

My association with Mr. Edison dealt principally with his unique nickel iron alkaline storage battery. In this connection, you may be interested in a ghost story involving Mr. Edison, his storage battery, and myself.

I had recognized for several years before Mr. Edison passed on to his rich reward on October 18, 1931, that time, the inevitable reaper, would someday catch up with him. Realizing that a great amount of important data concerning this product was contained in his fertile mind, I worked out with him a plan whereby, over a period of months, I would submit a series of questions which he would answer. These questions and answers were carefully filed. This led, 5 years after Mr. Edison's passing, to the publication by Howard Blakeslee, science editor of the Associated Press, the story of how Thomas Edison, though dead, continued to serve as a consultant to the management of one of his largest business operations. When problems arose, we, who survived Mr. Edison, frequently found answers to those problems in his answers to my questions, and thus eliminated costly delays.

Edison was a man of great integrity and industry. A thing with him was either right, or it was wrong. If it was wrong, he wanted nothing to do with it. He was never given to compromise. As an example, on learning that a product bearing his name had developed defects in service, he closed his factory and requested his customers to return their purchases and get their money back. He offered no adjustments. He offered no compromises. He offered to refund all the money they had paid. He felt that his integrity was involved, which he determined to preserve at any price.

I am sometimes asked if Edison was a religious man. He was indeed, but he cannot be made to fit into the frame or pattern of any of our orthodox denominations.

Edison was not a materialistic thinker. While he was a master at dealing with material things, he was awed by what he called the mystery of life. This he was never able to understand in terms of matter or physical concepts. He believed in the basic premise of eternal life.

If it were possible for us to ask him, "What is wrong with this war-weary world?" I am sure his answer could be, "Nothing that the application of the principles of the Golden Rule and hard work won't correct."

I close my remarks by quoting a statement made by Edison near the end of his life:

> "Be courageous. History repeats itself again and again. Be as brave as your forefathers. Have faith. Go forward."

The Declaration of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Manolo Reyes is a distinguished Cuban newsman now living in exile in Miami, Fla. His efforts on behalf of the cause of Cuban freedom have been tireless. In September he was elected first president of the Cuban Sertoma Club of Miami, a civic association of Cuban exiles interested in education.

Mr. Reyes recently sent me a copy of a very significant document. I refer to the "Declaration of Freedom" adopted by 1,500 Cuban exiles at a rally held at Key West on January 23 of this year.

The declaration was adopted at the San Carlos Club from the same balcony where in 1893 the great and eloquent Jose Marti' changed the course of history by proclaiming Cuba's independence from Spain. In one of his powerful editorials drafted from New York City Marti' once wrote:

> Es como el aire la libertad para nosotros (For us, liberty is as the air).

This "Declaration of Freedom" is stirring testimony to that continuing and unquenchable Cuban love of liberty.

The declaration follows:

DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

In the city of Key West, Monroe County, State of Florida, United States of America, we, the Cuban exiles in the United States, in the name of God Almighty, and speaking both for ourselves and the oppressed people in Cuba, the Martyr Island, do say:

That on January 1, 1959, the slavery yoke that came from Europe and was extinguished in Cuba at the end of the 19th century, was resumed.

That those responsible for this high treason to our fatherland and to our people are just a score of traitors who, usurpating the Government of the country have been acting as mercenary agents for the Sino-Soviet imperialism, and have surrendered to that imperialism our freedom and our dignity, also betraying the American hemisphere.

That as a consequence of this high treason, those who are usurpating the power in Cuba (as they were never elected by the people), are imposing a regime of bloodshed, terror, and hate without any respect or consideration to the dignity of the human being or the most elementary human rights.

That in their hunger for power, these traitors, following the pattern of totalitarian regimes, are trying, within Cuba, to separate the family, which is the cornerstone of actual society, and at the same time, are poisoning the minds of the Cuban children and youth, in their hope of extending the length of time for this abominable system.

That the rule of the law has been wiped out in Cuba, and it has been replaced by the evil will of this score of traitors, who are acting under orders from their masters, the Sino-Soviet imperialists.

In view of the aforegoing, we declare:

First. That the actual Cuban regime is guilty of high treason to our fatherland and to the ideals of the freedom revolution which was started in October 10, 1868.

Second. That this score of traitors who have committed treason against our fatherland, in case they survive the downfall of their regime, will have to respond, even with their lives before the ordinary courts of justice of Cuba.

Third. That as the noble Cuban people will *not ever surrender, because that nation* was not born to be slave, we, the Cuban people, hereby make the present "Declaration of Freedom."

We hereby swear before God Almighty to fight constantly, until death comes to us, to free Cuba from communism.

The fundamentals of this revolution *for freedom are:*

First. God Almighty, above all things, in whom we believe as the essence of life.

Second. The fatherland, with all of its laws, traditions, customs, and history as a spiritual value, only surpassed by the concept of God.

Third. The family, as the cornerstone of the human society.

Fourth. Human rights, for each and every citizen, regardless of race or creed.

Fifth. The law, as the foundation for the proper development of the human society.

Sixth. Democratic government, with its three independent branches: legislative, executive, and judicial.

Seventh. Representative democracy, through the exercise of universal suffrage, periodically, free, and secretive, as the expression of popular sovereignty.

Eighth. Freedom of worship, freedom of teaching, freedom of the press, and free enterprise.

Ninth. Private property and ownership, as the basic expression of liberty.

Tenth. The improvement of living conditions for both rural and city working masses, with the just and necessary measures, keeping in mind the legitimate interests of both labor and capital.

Eleventh. The derogation and eradication of anything which is opposed to the political and religious fundamentals aforementioned, and specifically, the abolition of communism and any other form of totalitarian manifestation.

Signed and sealed in Key West, Fla., on the 23d day of January 1966.

Profile of a Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, too often when people talk about politics and politicians they do so by first making apologies for anything they may say that is complimentary and they try to make it clear that they themselves are either not politicians or if they are politicians are somehow of a higher type.

This is, of course, so much nonsense. We are all of us professionally or otherwise politicians and there is nothing wrong with that.

The following article from the February 26, 1966, edition of the weekly Kings Courier, of Brooklyn, N.Y., makes some very pertinent points about this matter of being a politician and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

PORTRAIT OF A POLITICIAN

(By Yvette Scharfman)

We watched Stanley Steingut under the microscope last Sunday; that "hot seat" they call a television interview. We listened intently. He acquitted himself nobly. It *must be evident to all who witnessed this* matching of wits, the interviewers armed with rapier-like questions thought out far in advance; where the odds were 3 to 1, why Stanley Steingut won a 2-year fight against the greatest obstacles stacked up against a politician. And we are not apprehensive about using the word "politician." *After all, we are all politicians.* Be not embarrassed, offended or even, surprised.

From our education courses specializing in "early childhood," we are taught that the infant in its crib begins to politic from the moment it becomes aware of its environs. Only the books don't call it that; they use the word "testing." We are constantly testing those around us—just to see how far we can go in our relationships with human beings, and how we can derive the best possible benefits out of any given situation.

This, the books tell us, makes for normalcy and good mental health from infancy through senior citizenry, so that actually "politicking" is normal; only some politicians hold politicial office while some are engaged in other pursuits * * * but politicians are we all.

Now let us discuss the word "boss". In the political arena the word "boss" or "bossism" is always used by the other side. To his own group he is a "leader" or sometimes even a "statesman," depending upon the rank he achieves. Not so with the opposing faction, which is why we witnessed the ridiculous situation wherein former Mayor Wagner, a self-appointed party boss, hurled the "epithet" at the man who was duly elected, through the democratic process as we know it, to county leader of Kings. And why a leader altogether? Thousands of philosophical, psychological and historical volumes have been written on the subject. Suffice it to say that where there is no leadership whether the organization be political, philanthropic, social and/or cultural, there is nothingness at best; chaos and misery at worst. And so society has chosen to have leaders.

There are those among us who want nothing to do with the choosing of these leaders. That, too, is our privilege in a democracy. On the other hand, there are those who wish we could be even more closely interwoven in the fabric of the body politic; there is nothing to prevent us from immersing ourselves as deeply as we wish.

Stanley Steingut was born and reared in this atmosphere. His late father was speaker of the assembly. It is completely natural and logical that he should wish one day to fill that post. And why not? He is completely qualified to serve the people of this State * * * and we mean all the people. If you saw him as we did under the television microscope you must know there was neither rancor nor vindictiveness in his remarks about the new mayor, nor has there been any such sign against any leader who deserted him when the going was rough. He is interested in peace and unity in the party and has been the first one to extend the olive branch. What is more, he is approachable * * * a most important virtue in a leader. At this point he is probably wondering why we are writing this at all. We're only saying this becaues it's true, Stanley, and we feel members of the fourth estate have an obligation to clear the cobwebs and let the light shine through. Kings County is proud of its leader, its borough president, its county officers and its own special private citizen, Hon. Abe Beame.

An Open Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. *CUNNINGHAM.* Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roy M. Harrop, the executive chairman of the Western States Mining and Business Men's Association, recently brought to my attention an open letter his organization has directed to the President. This letter outlines some of the conditions now faced by the western States mining industry and the business community with which they are associated.

I offer this letter for inclusion in the Record in the belief others will want to study its contents:

An Open Letter

Western States Mining & Businessmen's Association,
Omaha, Nebr., December 25, 1695.
Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President: We were pleased to note that in the 89th Congress session you sent a recommendation for the adoption of the war on poverty bill which was adopted by Congress.

Many persons do not know that we have numerous poverty areas in our western mining States, that most of the western gold and silver mining communities are ghost towns for reason that the mine owners cannot produce gold and silver at a profit at the present set market price; labor costs, taxes, supplies, etc., have so far outdistanced these prices that it is impossible to produce gold at a profit for $35 per ounce and silver for $1.29 per ounce, and must be increased to $70 for gold and $3 per ounce for silver, to provide more liquid money for developing western mining areas.

The seven big antipoverty plans do not provide a program for the opening of these closed mines or development of new mines in the western mining States, including Alaska; in these Western States the Federal Government owns two-thirds of the total land area with an estimated mineral wealth of $1,500 billion, which if properly developed would pay off the national debt, and would reemploy 2 million of the unemployed in these areas, and another 2 million in allied industries.

Perhaps you do not realize that within the past 50 years, since the Federal Reserve Bank System, a privately owned banking corporation ever since 1913 when the Federal Reserve Act was passed, has controlled the money and credit market of this Nation and has become more and more concentrated into fewer hands. The 12 men who actually run the United States are the 12 presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve districts plus the 7 men appointed for 14-year periods to the Federal Reserve Board by the President of the United States, and when Mr. Balderston retires January 31, 1966, there will be a vacancy for Presidential appointment, and the time has arrived for appointment of a western man to this Board to represent western mining interests.

Mr. President, the issue of bank credit and setting of bank interest rates has become a giant monopoly, which controls the economic resources of this Nation. It is surely quite obvious that the Federal Reserve Bank System, based on debt, will ultimately ruin this Nation, and every person in the Nation, except the credit lenders. Then for whom are the people of this Republic working? The logical answer is: For the Federal Reserve bank, a system of debt which can never be paid by any generation of Americans; this means we are enslaved to a private banking system, which can only be remedied by the U.S. Government purchasing the capital stock from its stockholders.

The original capital stock of the Federal Reserve Board was $147 million, owned by the class A stockholders. The class A and class B stock can be purchased for $340 million. This provision was put into the original bill by William Jennings Bryan so Congress could purchase and operate the system, if desirable, under the U.S. Treasury. The Voorhis bill, H.R. 8209 should be reintroduced and all this could be accomplished with your assistance and approval.

The Federal Reserve Board has managed to stop development of the gold and silver mines in the United States, through controlled prices for gold and silver, and stopped the coinage of these monetary metals until we do not have a gold coin in existence, the silver half dollar is reduced to 40 percent silver, and the dime and quarter contains no silver; no silver dollars will be coined within the next 5 years, all this by an act of Congress, the 89th.

In 1934 President Franklin D. Roosevelt, by Presidential proclamation, increased the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per ounce, and when he did this he disregarded the demand of international bankers that gold be kept at the old price of $20.67 per ounce. At about that time President Franklin D. Roosevelt made the following statements:

"Sixty families in America control the wealth of the Nation;

"One-third of the Nation's population is ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clad;

"Twenty percent of the men working on WPA projects are in such an advanced state of malnutrition that they cannot do a day's work;

"I intend to drive the money changers out of the temple."

In the year 1934 the United States had approximately 10 million unemployed, hungry workers. The National Research Committee, engaged by Congress to make a national survey at the time states: "Purchasing power must be gotten back into the hands of the people if this Republic is to survive and our entire economic future is at stake. Opening and developing the gold, silver, and other mining resources of the Western States (an undeveloped empire) and America's greatest asset is imperative. Therefore, the price of gold should be raised to $70 and silver to $3 per ounce by Presidential proclamation. This would not be a subsidy to gold and silver mining interests and would not cost the U.S. taxpayer 1 cent. If the gold and silver were not coined, Abraham Lincoln U.S. notes, legal tender at its face value for all debts public and private, could be issued.

In 1953 our gold reserve in Fort Knox was $23.3 billion, in 1965 has dropped and the U.S. Treasury gold stock is only $14.39 billion and of this stock only one-fourth, or $3.87 billion, backs our paper currency. International bankers claim the remaining $10.05 billion of gold dollars. We must mine more domestic gold and silver now. Our total indebtedness, national and personal approximates $1,500 billion. It breaks down something like this:

1. Federal, $320 billion.
2. With $12 billion annually for interest, paid by taxpayers. (This sum paid to keep a bank credit system medium of exchange in circulation, in violation of art. I, sec. 8, par. 5 of the U.S. Constitution, which says: "Congress shall have the power to coin money, and regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin.")
3. State and local, approaching $100 billion.
4. Corporate, moving toward $500 billion.
5. Individual, more than $400 billion.
6. The Federal Reserve Bank System, a privately owned banking organization, controlled by international bankers and since 1912 licensed by the Government to do the Nation's banking and this privately owned banking system has never paid any Federal income tax to the U.S. Government on its enormous profits, for this privilege. (It is time Congress, and the President exercise their sovereign rights under the U.S. Constitution; take over under the U.S. Constitution the Federal Reserve Banking System, and operate it under the U.S. Treasury—under United Postal Savings Banks, and pay our national debt and restore our freedom and prosperity again.)

President Andrew Jackson said: "If Congress has the right to issue paper money, it was given to them to be used by themselves, not to be delegated to individuals or corporations." The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1934 (293 U.S. 388)—"The Congress manifestly is not permitted to abdicate or transfer to others, the essential legislative functions with which it is invested." Congressman Wright Patman, of Texas, and chairman of the Committee on Banking and Finance, said: "Why in the world doesn't the Government issue its own credit instead of (1) Creating debt bonds, (2) giving the bonds to the banks, and (3) paying the banks interest on the Government's own credit." (Editor.—Such Government credit being a medium of exchange of the people of the United States.)

Our huge national debt is the cause of most of our inflation, which has decreased the purchasing value of the dollar to 37 cents. We need increased output of gold and silver to help off this debt and provide more jobs for our unemployed and open up our vast mineral resources.

With our Government facing bankruptcy under financial control of the Federal Reserve System, here is the real danger to our country. By 1968 Communist nations will control the United Nations and Communist China will be a member of the U.N. We will fall into the United Nations-sponsored economic system, financed by international bankers which is the Communist system to rule the world. If you will recall, Baron Rothschild said: "I care not who rules a nation if I can but control that nation's money system."

The prearranged plan to "expand" the United Nations into a "one world government was thwarted because of Russia's refusal to agree to relinquish their sovereignty and issuance and control of their money. (Russia in 1964 produced $175 million in gold, the United States, $32 million.)

This association, the Western States Mining & Business Men's Association, met at Deadwood, S. Dak., June 2, 1965, at the Franklin Hotel, and adopted the following resolution:

"RESOLUTION OF THE WESTERN STATES MINING & BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE AT DEADWOOD, S. DAK., JUNE 2, 1965, HELD AT THE FRANKLIN HOTEL

"Whereas our entire economic future is at stake in opening and developing the gold and silver mining and other mining resources of the 15 Western States—an undeveloped empire—America's greatest asset; namely, Arizona, Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska*, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming (*Nebraska, largest gold and silver smelter in the United States); and

"Whereas in these Western States the big landowner is the Federal Government, owning nearly two-thirds of the total land area therein, and these States are the main sources and produce practically all the gold and silver as well as the strategic minerals which have an estimated mineral value of $1,500 billion in value which is lying there undeveloped and unused, no taxes being received by the Government excepting small sums to the local subdivisions of government, and all of this because the administration and the Congress of the United States have for more than 50 years put a ban on the mining of gold and silver and are operating the Government on a deficit spending basis, borrowing credit from the Federal Reserve Bank System, a privately owned banking organization, controlled by the international bankers, and since 1912 licensed by the Government to do the Nation's banking business, and this privately owned banking system pays no income tax on their enormous profits for the use of this privilege; and

"Whereas in 1934 President Franklin D. Roosevelt increased the monetary value of gold from $20.67 to $35 per ounce by Presidential proclamation; and today the price for labor, taxes, supplies of all kinds have risen to a point where gold and silver cannot be mined at a profit; the gold and silver mining industry is dead in these western mining States and has been for 30 years; and

"Whereas our indebtedness tops a trillion dollars—do you know that the U.S. Treasury gold stock is only $14.39 billion—only one-fourth of which, or $3.87 billion backs our paper currency. Foreign nations claim the remaining $10.05 billion in gold, which makes it mandatory that we mine more domestic gold and silver—and now.

"It breaks down something like this:

"1. Federal, $320 billion.

"2. With $12 billion annual interest paid by taxpayers.

"3. State and local, approaching $100 billion.

"4. Corporate, moving toward $500 billion.

"5. Individual, more than $400 billion.

"This huge national debt is the cause of most of our inflation, which decreased purchasing value of the dollar. We need increased output of gold and silver to help pay off this debt and provide more jobs for our unemployed and open up our vast mineral resources; and

"Whereas the only solution to our problem is an increase in the monetary price of gold to $70 per ounce and silver to $3 per ounce, and our country's gold reserves have been depleted by foreign raids, the only way to remedy this condition is to mine more gold and silver, and this cannot be done unless President Lyndon B. Johnson issues a proclamation to raise the value of the gold and silver dollar. Higher prices of these metals will serve as an incentive in these stagnant mining areas, make work available for 2 million unemployed persons in mining and related industries, and local business will be brought to life: Therefore be it

"*Resolved:*

"1. We propose to revitalize the American gold and silver mining industry of the United States and to compensate the domestic producers of gold and silver, for the difference between the present monetary valuation of gold and silver, created by President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Presidential proclamation in 1934, since these minerals cannot be produced at a profit today.

"2. Statement of purpose: To aid and restore to profitable operation the domestic gold and silver mining industry of the United States, more especially in the 15 western mining States, including Alaska and Hawaii; to coin $2 billion in silver, to be paid into circulation for public improvements and employ 2 million jobless men, by Presidential proclamation of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

"3. In order to compensate the new domestic gold and silver mining and allied industries for expenditures, amortization of such expenditures until all costs are recovered, for income tax purposes for the said industries.

"4. Place an embargo on all shipments of gold from the United States to all foreign nations now in arrears on their debt payments to the United States, in order to protect the Gold Act of 1934, which is adversely affected by the depreciation of the value of foreign currency in relation to the monetary value of gold, that an economy emergency exists, and we deem it necessary that President Lyndon B. Johnson, by Presidential proclamation, fix the monetary value of the gold dollar at $70 per ounce and silver at $3 per ounce in the United States of America for all newly mined domestic gold and silver in the United States; this would reemploy 2 million of the 6 million unemployed in the United States and increase the purchasing power of the dollar to compensate for the depreciated value of the dollar.

"5. We endorse the making, and an appropriation by Congress, of an official survey of the mineral resources of the Black Hills of South Dakota for the purpose of ascertaining whether the amount of ore available there will warrant the construction of a smelting and refining plant or mills necessary for the area. If adequate ore resources are determined, such renewal of the mining industry will reemploy thousands of the unemployed in the Black Hills area of South Dakota.

"6. Debased coins: Whereas the administration's proposal to adulterate, cheapen the intrinsic value of dimes, quarters, and half-dollars should be publicly condemned by every American who believes in sound national gold and silver coined money as the Constitution provides under article I, section 8, paragraph 5: 'Congress shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coins.' It is an axiom that bad money drives out good money and reduces the purchasing power of the dollar which is now reduced to 37 cents by increased debt inflation, caused by acts of Congress in continually raising the national debt limit. The sovereign right of Congress to coin money should be exercised, then there would be no national and almost no private debt burden—and no interest charge permanently crippling the public purchasing power and destroying this Republic.

"7. Silver dollars: Whereas President John F. Kennedy's last official act was a request of the Congress to adopt an appropriations measure which would resume the minting of silver dollars; and

"Whereas this request was followed by the 1965 appropriations bill of the Johnson administration, which included another and larger minting of silver dollars and subsidiary silver coins.

"Whereas the silver dollar is an important economic asset of some Western States and an equally important part of the heritage which all Western States share; and

"Whereas the coinage of silver dollars would be multibeneficial in that it would provide needed coin for commercial and trade circulation, provide such coin at lower cost than the greater cost of recurrent printing and reissue of paper money of similar face value, and provide a useful store of value of the metal even while it was being used for money; and

"Whereas many of the Western States are silver producers whose mining industries would benefit from increased use of silver: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That this Western States Mining & Business Men's Association urge Congress to provide funds for the minting of 2 billion silver dollars and subsidiary 10-, 25-, and 50-cent coins, requested in the 1964 supplemental appropriations bill and the 1965 appropriations bill.

"On motion, approved and adopted unanimously.

"Western States Mining & Business Men's Association.
"By Roy M. Harrop, *Executive Chairman, Omaha, Nebr.*

"Attest:

"Hubert V. Williams,
"*Executive Secretary and Treasurer, Lead, S. Dak.*"

CONCLUSION

Now, Mr. President, you have the power to solve this colossal economic problem and free the Americna people from the strangling debt (public and private) $1.5 trillion, on which the people are forced to pay an interest total which is greater than the annual gross national product of the labors of about 70 million workers. Bear in mind the proposals of the Western States Mining & Business Men's Association (includes 18 Western States and Alaska) in its adopted resolution heretofore set out, requested that you, President Lyndon B. Johnson, issue a Presidential proclamation raising the monetary price of gold to $70 and silver to $3 per ounce. This would not be a subsidy and will help replenish this country's gold reserves, which has been depleted by foreign raids, and such an increase is the only way to remedy the chaotic conditions in these Western States, which are dependent upon the gold, silver and other metals which can be produced where the Government owns two-thirds of all the land. This act would result in the employment of two unemployed miners and their suppliers, revive the ghost mining towns of the West and restore prosperity to this section of the United States and enable your Great Society program to function for these people. This is the first time in the history of our Nation that a President, in his capacity as Chief Executive, has had the opportunity to help provide aid in a more rapid development of the stagnant Western States, help save lives or our poverty stricken and hungry, jobless workers, who have the right to expect jobs in private industries. These jobs have been wiped out so far because the price of gold and silver wil not permit mines to operate at a profit, and restore economic prosperity to this Nation.

No place in the world is gold and silver priced as low as our artificial price in the United States and there is no reason for this condition except that the bankers (national and international) do not want gold and silver money to be used as a medium of exchange. (They cannot collect interest on gold and silver money). The Creator placed these precious metals in the earth for men to use as a medium of exchange, for goods and services. The use of these metals as medium of exchange would help replace Federal Reserve notes now outstanding and relieve the great interest burden under which we are laboring.

Now, Mr. President, you as the elected representative of the people of these United States (a government of the people, for the people, and by the people) have the power to wipe out this poverty of the mining areas in the 18 western mining States, by raising the price of gold to $70 per ounce and silver to $3 per ounce, by Executive order, and we request that you use your authority to do so. With your help we can win this war against poverty in these mining States. You can be sure that the people of the United States will know how to show their appreciation for the added purchasing power made possible by this act and we trust that this proposal will be received favorably by you and placed in effect in the very immediate future.

Yours sincerely,

Roy M. Harrop,
Executive Chairman.
George Bendel,
Executive Vice Chairman.
Angelo Rich,
Executive Vice Chairman.
Benjamin Rice,
Director.
Harry Daniels,
Director.
Ralph Canary,
Director.
W. O. Fillmore,
Director.
Hubert V. Williams,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Indiana Air National Guard Impressive in "Tropic Lightning" Exercise

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, members of the Indiana Air National Guard are playing a key role in bolstering this Nation's military preparedness.

The contribution that these air guardsmen and their counterparts in other States are making is vividly described in an article which appears in the February 1966, issue of the National Guardsman.

The article relates the close air support missions in which air guardsmen from Indiana, Ohio, and New York engaged as infantrymen of the Army's 25th "Tropic Lightning" Division trained for duty in Vietnam.

Because of the great significance of Air National Guard exercises as a part of our overall military effort, I insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TROPIC LIGHTNING

When infantrymen of the Army's 25th "Tropic Lightning" Infantry Division landed in South Vietnam in January, their arrival was of more than just casual interest to air guardsmen from Indiana, Ohio, and New York.

They had a personal interest in it.

The guardsmen of Indiana's 122d Tactical Fighter Wing and New York's 107th Tactical Fighter Group had just completed a 4-month series of close air support missions with the brigades of the 25th Infantry Division on the slopes of the world's most active volcano: Moana Loa, on Hawaii.

There in the Pohakuloa training range, located at 6,000 feet in the saddle between Moana Loa and Mauna Kea, the air guardsmen and the 25th Infantry Division soldiers had fought a simulated enemy under the most realistic combat conditions.

As the brigades of the "Tropic Lightning" division shifted to attack and defensive positions within the rain forest and across the rock lava-strewn surface, the supersonic Air Guard jets screamed overhead on call from Forward Air Controllers to deliver napalm, bombs, rockets, tear gas, and 20-millimeter cannon fire in high angle and tree-top attacks.

The joint exercises, dubbed "Tropic Lightning" by the Air Force and "Long Sabre" by the Army, were designed to give the Army troops the sight, sound, smell, and feel of what devastating airstrikes are really like and what they can do for them, while giving the Air Guard's combat pilots in the air a degree of experience as close to combat as possible.

FIRST CROSS-PACIFIC JET DEPLOYMENT

It was the first time in history that Air Guard jet fighter aircraft had deployed to the Pacific in support of a joint exercise. It was the first time for Air Guard F–100's (from New York's 107th Tactical Fighter Group) and F–84's (from Indiana's 122d Tactical Fighter Wing) to make a transpacific crossing.

The 25th Infantry Division had been undergoing joint maneuvers with Air Force fighter units since September 1964, with Active Air Force squadrons flying the missions. But as events in southeast Asia warmed up, those Regular units moved to the Far East, and the Air Force role in the Strike Command exercises was turned over to the Air Guard.

Another series of "Tropic Lightning" exercises is being planned for the fall of 1966, and again the Air Force role is being planned for units of the Air Guard.

The "Aloha State" visit wasn't all hard work and grind. For most of the air guardsmen, it was their first visit to the 50th State. On what free time they had, the guardsmen sampled everything from pineapple pupu to pell mell paddling through the surf at Waikiki, and toured the set of James Michener's "Hawaii," which was being filmed at the time.

The deployment to Hawaii by the Guard organizations gave the Air Guard the chance to test some ideas on forming composite task forces to support to Air Force activities which extend beyond the normal 2-week training period.

And from August through early December the Air Guard maintained six fighter aircraft and support personnel in Hawaii to support the exercises. New York's 107th Tactical Fighter Group, with additional men volunteering from the 121st Tactical Fighter Group, Ohio; the 140th Tactical Fighter Group, Colorado; the 177th Tactical Fighter Group, New Jersey; the 113th Tactical Fighter Group, District of Columbia; and 185th Tactical Fighter Group, Iowa, made up the first elements of 165 officers and airmen for "Tropic Lightning I" from August 14 to October 2.

Overlapping their final days was the arrival September 30 of Indiana's 122d Tactical Fighter Wing, which supported "Tropic Lightning II" with six F–84F Thunderstreaks through December 4, with men drawn from its three groups: the 122d, Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Ind.; 181st, Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Ind.; and 180th, Toledo Express Airport, Toledo, Ohio.

In each case, support personnel and extra pilots were flown to Hawaii by the Military Airlift Command. Pilots and support personnel were rotated through the period by each group, with some men staying on for more than one 2-week period. For the 107th, the average number on duty in Hawaii was 8 pilots and 50 support personnel.

The exercises were a demonstration of Air Guard-Air Force cooperation. Airlift support was furnished by the Military Airlift Command's Regulars and Air Guard units. Air Guard KC–97–L's refueled both elements to and from Hawaii. The Air Force provided a C–135 aerial command post and various bases contributed support.

The first six F–100's headed west August 12 from Niagara Falls Airport, N.Y., toward Oxnard AFB, Calif., their jumpoff spot for the overwater portion of the 4,500-mile trip. First stop was a refueling one at McConnell AFB, Kans., courtesy of Air Defense Command's 414th Fighter-Interceptor Group.

The same day saw four C–130's head for Hickam AFB, via Travis AFB, carrying 28 airmen and 91,822 pounds of equipment, including the aircraft's M-kits, as the support troops for the exercise.

Another C–130 with 22 airmen and 5,000 pounds of equipment accompanied the flight element as its en route support team. Personnel of the 184th Tactical Fighter Group, Kansas, provided an en route turnaround during the deployment, enabling the en route support team to proceed directly on to Oxnard and be on hand for arrival of the flight echelon.

Two additional F–100's arrived at Oxnard on August 13 as ground spares. Oxnard was a planned overnight stop. On the morning of the 14th, the eight crews got an early morning briefing on weather, tanker rendezvous, rescue procedures, communications, and the many details involved in the long transpacific flying.

Leading the flight was Col. John E. Blewett, the task force leader and group commander, with Lt. Col. Verne J. Donner, commander, 136th Tactical Fighter Squadron, as deputy flight leader. Hawaii was 2,550 miles away.

Waiting were two cells of KC–97–L tankers of the 126th Air Refueling Wing, Illinois, supplemented by the 134th Air Refueling Group, Tennessee. Initial refueling rendezvous was made with five KC–97–L's 327 miles from California with the fighters staying with the tankers until completion of the second refueling at 680 miles from Oxnard. The first cell of tankers returned home then, accompanied by the two airborne spares which returned to Nellis AFB. The TAC Airborne Command Post, aboard a C–135, accompanied the flight to Hickam.

TEN HOURS TO HAWAII

The remaining six F–100's made their second rendezvous 845 miles from the coast with seven tankers, staying with the tankers for their final drink at 1,077 miles from base. Five hours and 45 minutes after departing Oxnard, the "Supersabers" touched down at Hickam. It had taken some 10 hours of flying time from New York to Hawaii.

As the aircraft taxied up and parked on the Hickam ramp, ground crews who had arrived the day before greeted the pilots with a typical Hawaiian welcome, including the traditional orchid leis. Ahead lay 6 weeks of daily sorties, but behind them lay a smooth and precise overwater deployment.

"Though this was the first such flight for us, we accepted the challenge," commented Colonel Donner, "knowing that our training and practice flights had been thorough."

"WELL DONE," SAYS TAC COMMANDER

Shortly after their arrival, a "well done" message was received from Gen. Gabriel P. Disoway, TAC Commander: "The outstanding success of the Tropic Lighting I deployment clearly demonstrates the capability of the National Guard forces, in particular the 107th Tactical Fighter Group and 126th Air Refueling Wing. The flawless execution of this mission testifies to a thoroughly coordinated team effort by 9th Air Force and National Guard personnel."

Programed for the 107th's 6-week tour in Hawaii were more than 150 combat missions, each meaning a 400-mile round trip from Hickam to the target area. For the pilots it meant more realistic combat flying than they had seen since World War II or Korea. For the ground crews, it meant long hours that would link days into nights, servicing and maintaining the fighters and arming the birds for multiple daily missions with a variety of ordnance.

The day after arrival, the 107th pilots were in the air over the Pohakuloa Range, flying route and area checkouts between the island of Oahu, where Hickam is located, and the "Big Island" of Hawaii, some 210 miles distant, where the maneuvers were held.

Direct support operations began on August 17 and continued until noon on September 30. Of the 219 sorties scheduled, 206 were flown, 4 being aborted because of mechanical difficulties and 9 because of target area weather, for a average of 4 a day.

Both "live" and "dry" support missions were flown. Using live ordnance, the pilots blasted and strafed the "enemy" resistance positions—often hulks of junked automobiles the Army had piled around the "puu" or cinder cones of the lava desert. General purpose 750-pound bombs, napalm, rockets, and 20-millimeter cannon fire cleared the way for advancing infantrymen.

In its 94 "live" sorties, the 107th dropped 176 750-pound bombs and 126 tanks of napalm, and fired 940 2.75-inch rockets and 18,000 rounds of 20-millimeter ammunition. Getting to work with the 750-pound bombs was a satisfying experience for the New Yorkers; they got much more accurate results with them than the 25-pound practice bombs to which they were accustomed.

GROUND CREWS GET WORKOUT, TOO

On the flight line, it was hard work, too, for the maintenance, ordnance, radiomen, and other ground technicians. Floodlights burned far into the night to keep the "Supersabres" operational and to load the bombs, napalm tanks, and rockets for the next day's early morning missions. No unusual aircraft maintenance difficulties were encountered, even though the aircraft chalked up 392.2 hours with an incommission percentage rate of 87.9.

Rotation of the group personnel took place on August 30 and September 20, with new men being flown in and old ones out by C–97's of New York's 106th Air Transport Wing.

After getting set in Hickam, the New Yorkers had to move to a new airfield on September 22, when the long runway at Hickam was closed for repairs. For the remainder of "Tropic Lightning I," the unit operated from Barbers Point Naval Air Station, with support of Navy personnel, after being transported there by Army men.

Ground people welcomed the move. The parking area at Hickam was far from the maintenance complex, causing problems in arming and dearming aircraft, as well as getting back and forth between the planes and the maintenance shops.

On October 2, the New Yorkers headed back home. The en route support team again accompanied the flight echelon, staying with it to Cannon Air Force Base. The balance of the support personnel were airlifted by MAC C–130 to Buffalo, N.Y.

Initial rendezvous with four KC–97–L tankers was made 318 miles from Hawaii, the fighters remaining with the tankers for another drink at 700 miles out. A second cell of four tankers was waiting at 790 miles with a fourth refueling at 990 miles out. The final cell of four tankers was made at 2,051 miles from Hawaii, off Santa Barbara, with the fighters proceeding to Cannon AFB, landing 7 hours and 15 minutes after takeoff.

Colonel Donner led the flight to Cannon, where Colonel Blewett, who had monitored its progress from the Cannon AFB Command Post, joined it for the return home. From Cannon, the flight left on October 3, refueling from four tankers near Oklahoma City, and landing at Griffiss AFB, N.Y., 3 hours and 40 minutes later. The flight returned to Griffiss because of runway construction at their home base at Niagara Falls.

Already on hand in Hawaii when the 107th headed eastward were Indiana's six F–84–F's, of the 122d Tactical Fighter Wing, having landed at Hickam on September 30, led by Lt. Col. Dale W. Smiley, group commander, of Fort Wayne.

Eight of the "Thunderstreaks" had departed Baer Field on September 28—again the six strike aircraft and two spares. And again, MAC airlifted the 60 ground personnel, extra pilots, and equipment, this time in two C–130's.

The "Hoosiers" jumped off for Hawaii from Castle AFB, Calif., on September 30, after a 24-hour crew conditioning period. The two spares, piloted by Capt. Clyde M. Haugan and Capt. Richard E. Prescott, both 122d Tactical Fighter Group, stayed with the flight until the second aerial refueling, some 1,000 miles off the California coast, then returned to Castle.

Two inflight refueling rendezvous were made during the 5-hour flight with KC–97–L's of Illinois' 126th Air Refueling Wing. The jets were met at Hickam by their ground crews which had arrived 2 days early to prepare maintenance facilities for immediate operations.

Missions began on October 1, and by November 23, the 122d Tactical Fighter Wing's jets had delivered 17 2.75-inch rockets, 88 napalm tanks, 62 750-pound bombs, and more than 19,000 rounds of .50-caliber machinegun ammunition.

Throughout the 72-day exercise, fighter pilots from all three tactical groups were exchanged frequently to participate, with travel courtesy of MAC's transport fleet. The 70 support personnel who made the original trip were exchanged once during the period at the half-way point, with the exception of a few key noncommissioned officers who remained for the entire preiod.

At exercise end, the 122d had furnished 11 pilots; the 180th, 6, and the 181st, 10, in addition to the wing commander, Brig. Gen. William R. Sefton; deputy wing commander, Col. Robert H. Hormann, and Brig. Gen. Allison Maxwell, commander, Headquarters, IndANG, all of whom arrived in November.

The 122d Tactical Fighter Wing Task Force began its return on December 4, using inflight refuelings from two cells of KC97L tankers of the 126th ARW, enroute to George AFB. After the 5-hour overwater hop, led by General Sefton, the flight element remained at George AFB overnight and left for Baer Field early Sunday morning, December 5.

The 75 support personnel returned in two C124 "Globemasters," directly from Hickam to Indiana.

PERFORMANCE PRAISED

The Air Guard's performance drew high praise from many sources. Especially significant were the laurels bestowed by Lt. Col. Thomas R. Fowler, commander of the 7th Direct Air Support Flight, 326th Air Division (PACAF), Wheeler AFB, the man who heads the FAC's who worked with the Air Guard pilots and who had been working with Regular TAC units the previous 10 months.

Of the New Yorkers, Colonel Fowler said that they "made some of the best scores yet in the 'Tropic Lighting' series," and praised the pilots for their "outstanding" accuracy.

"* * * pilots of the 107th have done an excellent job of providing close air support. Their accuracy is outstanding and they have met all requirements placed on them," he added.

After the "Hoosiers" had departed, he had this to say:

"The close air support provided by the air guardsmen from the 122d Fighter Wing has been outstanding, with the weapons delivery accuracy in many cases better than that provided by active duty force units."

New GI Bill of Rights Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the President has today signed the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. The concept of veterans readjustment assistance has been validated by experience and its utility has been proven. Its extension by this act is well deserved. Dating back to the time when President Roosevelt was confronted with the necessity of drafting 18-year-olds, and spanning both World War II and the Korean conflict, GI bill benefits have provided business, educational, and homeownership assistance to hundreds of thousands of deserving veterans, and the dividends paid on this investment in the form of increased earning power and expanded homeownership of ex-servicemen have amply justified the expenditures involved in implementing this legislation.

The outstanding record of GI bill assistance speaks for itself. The development of talent through readjustment assistance since the end of World War II has strengthened the fiber of the U.S. economy and enhanced the welfare of its citizens with the provision of almost a half million engineers; over 180,000 doctors, dentists and nurses; 360,000 schoolteachers; and hundreds of thousands of other vitally needed trained personnel. In addition to filling critical manpower needs, the GI bill's provision of almost 5 million home and business loans served to stimulate housing construction activity which provided a substantial support for our economy at a time when many feared a recession.

The need for readjustment assistance, and its salutary effect upon our GI's and our Nation as a whole has always been widely recognized. Today marks the reaffirmation of our confidence in this program, and it demonstrates our determination that the enormous debt we owe to our citizens in uniform shall not go unpaid.

I am including the following letter which I received from Andy Borg, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in response to the favorable congressional action taken on this bill:

Veterans of Foreign Wars
of the United States,
February 16, 1966.

Hon. John S. Monagan,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Monagan: The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was extremely pleased with the prompt and expeditious passage of legislation (S. 9; H.R. 12410) authorizing a cold war GI bill for all post-Korean veterans.

One of our key legislative goals for this year of 1966 has now been accomplished.

This is to extend, therefore, the deep appreciation and sincere thanks of the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for your support and vote in favor of this legislation.

Sincerely,

Andy Borg,
Commander in Chief.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181, Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b, Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

Appendix

"DeMolay: Character Builder"—Address by Barney W. Collins, Imperial Potentate, AAONMS, of Woodside, Calif., and Mexico City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1966

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in July 1965, the 91st session of the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine of North America was held in our Nation's Capital.

On that occasion, a distinguished constituent of mine, Mr. Barney W. Collins, was elected imperial potentate.

Senators are acquainted with the great and successful labors which the Shrine has undertaken in America. Its hospital program merits the most profound respect and gratitude of the American people.

On the occasion of Mr. Collins' election as imperial potentate, he made a speech on the subject of "DeMolay: Character Builder."

Mr. Collins divides his time between California and Mexico. He is in a unique position to know the manner in which DeMolay has built character.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address on that occasion appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOLAY: CHARACTER BUILDER

(An address by Barney W. Collins, imperial potentate, AAONMS, of Woodside, Calif., and Mexico City, 91st session of the Imperial Council, Friday, July 16, 1965, Washington Hilton Hotel)

In Chicago in July of 1955 you elected me to the position of imperial outer guard, and when I was asked if I would accept, I answered in Spanish, "si, senor." Every year since then you have advanced me through the line, and now you have bestowed upon me the highest gift within the scope of your authority. So now, in addition to "si senor," I will now add, "muchas gracias" and promise you that I will go all out to serve you and the Shrine as your imperial potentate. [Applause.]

During the coming year, I will continue to support and work for our hospital program, with special emphasis to complete our three burns institutes. As you know already, our Imperial Potentate O. Carlyle Brock, dedicated the Galveston unit last May, and when the doors are opened in March of 1966 I will be there to greet, on your behalf, our first patient-guest.

We will go ahead to expand our public relations department, to bring the Shrine into better focus, and to continue to improve our image throughout North America. I believe that there is nothing finer in North America than Masonry and the Shrine. And if our great nations, the Dominion of Canada, the United States of America, and the United States of Mexico, are to continue in the vanguard of the world, they must be led by men of the same fraternity that founded them.

Ten years ago, I resolved that if I ever made it to the top that I would do whatever I could to advance the cause of DeMolay. How many of your representatives out in the audience were DeMolays? Would you be kind enough to stand up so we can see how many we are? (Approximately one-third of the representatives stood.) [Applause.] Thank you fellow nobles. I wonder if you know how much men of the Shrine are doing now for DeMolay. I wonder if you know that our imperial recorder, George M. Saunders, now occupies the position as grand secretary, once held by our beloved past imperial potentate and founder, Frank S. Land; that Imperial Sir George serves in that capacity without pay.

I wonder if you know that the first DeMolay to become imperial potentate was Past Imperial Potentate George M. Klepper. It may interest you to know that your imperial potentate-elect is a senior DeMolay, is also DeMolay executive officer for the United States of Mexico, and currently is a grand fourth preceptor and sponsor of the annual DeMolay oratorical contest held throughout North America.

The Order of DeMolay is good for a boy. The lessons taught at the altar of DeMolay start him off on the right path through life. The DeMolay is also good for masonry. Statistics show that 50 percent or more of DeMolays become Masons. Three million DeMolays have been initiated into the youth movement since the beginning of the order. It is DeMolay law that all DeMolay chapters be sponsored by recognized Masonic groups and I urge your Shrine clubs actively to assist the Blue Lodges in their community to establish and maintain the Order of DeMolay.

Further, I believe that we should encourage our ladies to join the women's organizations which were inspired by noted Masonic leaders, and whose rituals were written by Masons. Let's face it, nobles. The women are here to stay. They make our homes, they give us our children, and if they want to help us as they do, let us help them all we can.

And by the same token, I advocate that young girls join Rainbow Girls, Jobs Daughters and similar groups. In this way we create a homogeneous Masonic-inspired family, with common goals.

You gentlemen know that I live in Mexico City, where I settled over 40 years ago. Everything I have in a material way I have earned in Mexico. My entire Masonic life is wrapped up in Mexico. In many ways I act and think like a Mexican. I invite you to learn more about Mexico, to learn a few phrases in Spanish, perhaps suggest a visit to Mexico City to see our pyramids which are as large as those in Egypt. I invite you to know the Mexican people, whose customs were already centuries old when the pilgrim fathers landed on Plymouth Rock.

Mexico has a fabulous Masonic history paralleling that of the United States. The fight for Mexican independence from Spain was started by Masons. The famous reform laws of 1857 were put into effect by Benito Jaurez, President of Mexico, who, at the time, was master of his lodge in Mexico City. Many hundreds of Mexican Masons have become Governors, Senators, and Congressmen. Several Presidents of Mexico have been Masons and throughout the years four Mexican Presidents have become Shriners who are or were members of Anezeh Temple.

To the north of the United States we have the Dominion of Canada and to the south, the United States of Mexico, two borders that are not fortified nor occupied by soldiers. This is something to think about in these days of national suspicions and hatreds.

Our beloved Shrine enjoys excellent relations with the grand lodges of North America, and our Masonic relations committee includes dedicated men who will strive to keep them that way.

You who are representatives to this imperial council are very important persons. You have been elected by your temple to represent it in this body. It is not easy to be elected as a representative as many of you know. The responsibility is great and the pay is poor, but the honor is commensurate with both. But, you must also remember that you are not only representatives of your temple to this imperial council, but you are at the same time representatives of this imperial council to your temple.

Three Local Jaycees Are Among America's Outstanding Young Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, one of the fastest growing communities in the United States is the city of Bowie, in Prince Georges County, Md. Since 1961 the population of this city has grown from about 1,000 to more than 25,000. Most of this growth has taken place in the Belair subdivision built by the firm of Levitt & Sons.

More than 4,500 families have moved into the subdivision since the first family came to Belair in October 1961. Among these families are some of the most dynamic and vital citizens to be found anywhere in the United States.

Recently three young men, none of whom have reached the age of 35, were nominated by the Bowie-Belair Jaycees for inclusion in the 1966 edition of Outstanding Young Men of America. Two of these nominees are employed here on Capitol Hill. Gerard F. Devlin, who also serves as chairman of the Prince Georges County Board of Supervisors of Elections, is the legislative assistant for our distinguished colleague, DOMINICK V. DANIELS, and R. Spencer Oliver, the first vice president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, is the press secretary for the beloved President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. Speaker, one of the newest and most influential weeklies in Prince

Georges County is the Bowie Post-Times, published by Robert L. Herring, an outstanding young man in his own right. Mr. Herring's newspaper has published an interesting story about the three outstanding young men who typify the spirit of the Bowie-Belair community.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this story at this point in the RECORD:

THREE LOCAL JAYCEES ARE AMONG AMERICA'S OUTSTANDING YOUNG MEN

Gerard F. Devlin, 2507 Kitmore Lane; Thomas Lee, 12707 Kingsfield Lane; and R. Spencer Oliver, 2617 Felter Lane; all of Bowie, have been selected for inclusion in the 1966 edition of Outstanding Young Men of America. The 3 men were nominated earlier this year by the Bowie-Belair Chapter of the Jaycees and have been selected by a 13-man National Board of Editor's for the publication.

Doug Blankenship, past president of the U.S. Jaycees (1962–63), who is serving as chairman of the board, stated that men were selected who were between the ages of 21 and 36 who had "distinguished themselves in one or more fields of endeavor to the point of being outstanding."

Devlin, 32, is a graduate of Suffolk University and the University of Maryland's Graduate School of Business and Public Administration. He is a former instructor at the University of Maryland and at Gonzaga College High School. He is presently employed as legislative assistant to New Jersey Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS and he also serves as chairman of the Prince Georges County Board of Supervisors of Elections.

Lee, 30, is a graduate of the Polytechnic Institute of the city of Baltimore and the University of Maryland where he earned his B.S. in engineering. He is employed as an engineer with the Bureau of Weapons of the Department of the Navy.

Oliver, 28, is a graduate of Woodrow Wilson High School, Washington, D.C. and Texas Christian University and is presently attending the George Washington School of Law. He is employed as press secretary for U.S. Senate President pro tempore, CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona. Oliver is presently serving as first vice president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America.

All three men are active in numerous civic, social, and political organizations in Bowie and Prince Georges County.

The Jaycees have long been active in the recognition of achievement among America's young men. Each year since 1938 the U.S. Jaycees have selected the 10 outstanding young men of America. Past winners have included the late John F. Kennedy (1946), Nelson Rockefeller (1941), and Henry Ford (1945). President Lyndon B. Johnson will write the foreword for Outstanding Young Men of 1966.

The All-American Small Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1966

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD the original oratory written by William Poppen, of De Smet, S. Dak., who is a junior at Huron College and who presented this oration at the intercollegiate forensic tournament at the University of Omaha in which he won first place.

It is an excellent oration on the need for rebuilding the small towns of America. America was built on the premise of the small community with all peoples working together to build a better community for themselves and their children. Small towns made America. They are the backbone of America and its economy. I have spoken throughout this country on the strength of the United States and its small towns. I am most happy that an oration on the need for rebuilding the small town won first place in this forensic tournament. I commend it to all Senators.

There being no objection, the oratory was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINUANCE OF SMALL CENTERS A CONTRIBUTION TO PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

(By William Poppen)

One of the major characters in Sinclair Lewis' book, "Main Street," is Carol Kennicott. Her sensitive nature, conjured up by Lewis, is used as a vehicle to express the emptiness and vast loneliness of the land. Her frustrations create attitudes. To her, the windmill, a romantic symbol on a Dutch landscape, looks "like the ribs of a dead cow."

Loneliness, frustration, and deprivation have magnified an attitude that has become a 20th-century Pied Piper, piping the people into urban areas, causing the small town to become smaller, the large city to become larger.

However, emptiness and loneliness have not been eliminated, only condensed. If the products of small towns are ones of gossip and jealousy then I believe the small town, like old bones, should be eliminated. Progressive America does not have a place for the gossip of "old wives" tongues.

If the schools are retained, not for unique service, but only because of tradition or the hopes of a basketball team of fame that it may someday produce, then its purpose is lost. Then I say these institutional halls have become more hollow than old bones. They are a deterrent to the development of thoughtful, young Americans.

If what seems to be friendliness in the small town is just noisiness; if what seems to be concern for others is just scrutiny, then a small town has become a stalemate on the landscape of American society.

The question that one asks today is: Does the small town make a contribution? Is it a unique contribution? Should we attempt to counteract the flow of the population into urban areas or should small towns, like old bones, be removed from the landscape of a progressive American society?

However, it is my opinion that if the small town disappears, we will lose the contribution of the open country to America's culture. It is my belief that this contribution is valuable and unique—that in losing the small town, we will lose much more than the country store with its cracked windowpane, the one-pump gas station, the faded red depot, the elevator, the church with its steeple.

No one can deny that these are changing times. Fifty years ago 95 percent of our population lived in small communities. Today nearly two-thirds of our population live in urban-suburban communities. Farm population today comprises approximately 8 percent of the total. The dreams of the townsman, sitting on a peach crate in front of the general store, are as passé as the village blacksmith, smithing under a spreading oak tree.

The attitude toward the small town must be rebuilt if we are to retain and maintain its contribution. The image of the small town must be one of practical human value, with a respect for achievement and a sensitivity for social significance.

There are several ways that this can be done. Television programing is constantly piping toward urban points of concentration in TV drama. The rural youth is a country bumpkin, void of the sophistication of a switch blade and a duck-curl haircut. And the situation comedy finds Clem and his counterparts heavy footed and slow witted.

If the American public could grasp the social significance of such distortion, I'm sure that our programers would be the first to reflect the public's recognition of achievement at the local level.

It seems to me that the American character of the 20th century grew out of its rural heritage. The traditions of freedom, of resourcefulness, individual initiative, free enterprise, a high regard for moral living: these are traits that need to be nurtured apart from the mundane mass of common, crowded living.

The small town is a good place to practice concern for others. When the man on the street corner tells you he is proud of what you have done, or when he tells you he was hoping that you could have done better, it makes quite an impact. When the banker extends the note another year, because he knows its been a year of bad luck for the Joneses, he makes the word motivation wear a human face.

It seems to me that it was in this family atmosphere of human relationships that American political ideology was formulated. Men were interested in those chosen to serve them. The governmental official represented the hopes and aspirations of his people. But so often in the city, because of the very nature of the city, government becomes far removed from the hands of the common man. He has little to do with its operations. Government is no longer a deep concern to him. Thus he becomes only an instrument of the political bosses. When the government loses its personal contact with its constituency, it loses the purpose for which it was created.

I do not believe that the necessary contributions can be made by the large city alone. If we are to preserve the basic principles of our social and political democracy, it is necessary that we preserve, in its most vital form, our rural America.

Therefore, each of us must dedicate ourselves to the task of preserving this important aspect of our culture. We must conceive a way in which the small town's economy can be strengthened. The natural resources, marketing possibilities, and available transportation of the areas must be analyzed and studied.

Already steps are being taken to aid the small town. In South and North Dakota, the Missouri River development is providing cheap power. There are many advantages to this new development—more water and better water, flood control and recreation areas, and irrigation. The imbalance of population concentration is, in my opinion, a deterrent to American progressive thought.

It was Vachel Lindsay who said: the things most worthwhile are one's own hearth and neighborhood. The children growing up should find their own talent and nurse it industriously. They should wander over the whole Nation in search of democratic beauty with their hearts at the same time filled to overflowing with the righteousness of God.

Then they should come back to their own hearth and neighborhood and gather a little circle of their own sort of workers about them to strive to make their neighborhood more beautiful, more democratic, and holy with their special art.

The son of the farmer will be no longer dazzled and destroyed by the fires of the metropolis. Just as his father sends half way across the continent for good corn or melon seed, so he will make his village famous by transplanting and growing this idea or that. He will make it know for its peacocks its music, or its swans, its golden roofs, or its great union cathedral of all faiths.

There are a thousand miscellaneous achievements within the scope of the great-hearted village.

Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 3, the President, in an impressive ceremony in the East Room of the White House, signed the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1966, and this has been designated as Public Law 89-358. Members will recall that this legislation passed the House on February 7, 1966, by the unanimous vote of 381 yeas to 0 nays.

Mr. Speaker, the President was particularly eloquent in his remarks on the occasion of the signing of this important measure, which I was privileged to witness, and I include as a part of my remarks the statement made by the President on this occasion:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING THE COLD WAR GI BILL IN THE EAST ROOM

Members of the Cabinet, distinguished Members of the Congress, invited guests, ladies and gentlemen, during World War II when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the first Veterans Readjustment Act, he stated on the occasion of that signing, "This law gives emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people never intend to let them down."

That first GI bill, and later the Korean GI bill, brought, out of the hardship of war, hope for all of our American service people. They returned home to find not just gratitude but concrete help in getting a fresh start with educational assistance, with medical care, with guarantees that permitted them to buy homes to live in.

They found opportunity which they used to enrich themselves and to enrich the Nation.

As we meet here today in this historic East Room and look around and see our friends gathered, we see the results of that first legislation.

One hundred and sixteen Members of the House of Representatives, in our Congress, received training under the GI bills, as did 11 U.S. Senators, 12 of the Governors of our States, 3 members of the President's Cabinet, 1 Justice of the Supreme Court, 6 of our astronauts, and 5 of the President's special assistants here in the White House.

The first GI bills cost $21 billion. Our economists now estimate they resulted in a return of some $60 billion in Federal taxes for that $21 billion invested.

The educational level of World War II and Korean war veterans averages about 2 years above the level of nonveterans. This difference exists primarily because of what the GI bills were able to do.

We made the most promising investment that a nation can make, an investment in the talent and the ambition of our citizens. The return on that investment has doubled and has redoubled ever since.

Today we come here in a time of new testing. Today, by signing a new Veterans Readjustment Act that was authored in the Senate by my colleague and friend of many years, Senator YARBOROUGH, and reported in the House by Chairman TEAGUE, with the unanimous support of his committee, we are reaffirming President Roosevelt's pledge of 22 years ago. We are saying to the brave Americans who serve us in uniform, in camps and bases, in villages and jungles, that your country is behind you; that we support you; that you serve us in time of danger.

To say this does not mean that all Americans agree on everything that is done or on every policy or on every commitment. But it does mean that once that policy is established, once that commitment is made, once that pledge is given, we support fully the young men who are the spearhead of that policy.

The Congress has passed this legislation. It passed it without a single dissenting vote. In doing so, it said we will support these men who are defending our freedom to debate, who are joining in a most historic protest for their country, a protest against tyranny, a protest against aggression, and a protest against misery.

The budget I sent to Congress this year resulted from a very careful study of the Nation's resources. My Cabinet officers brought to my home in Texas, where I was recuperating from an operation, budget requests that they had gone over very carefully that amounted to $130 billion. They felt that they could not reduce beyond this amount. It was my sad duty to bring those requests in line with what I thought our resources were and what I thought the Congress would approve. We reduced them down to a little under $113 billion.

Of that $113 billion, over $10 billion—$10.2 billion to be exact—will go this year to education and training. When I became President in fiscal year 1964, we were spending $4,750 million. Although I have been in the Presidency just a little over 2 years, we have more than doubled the amount that we are spending for education and training, from $4.75 to $10.2 billion, from fiscal 1964 to fiscal 1967.

Education gets more money in this budget than any other items except interest on the public debt, some $12 billion, and the Defense Department, which, as you know, exceeds $50 billion.

I must be frank. I had felt that we could start the new GI program, and that we should, by providing special funds for soldiers who served in combat areas. Others could be provided opportunity grants through the Higher Education Act. In that way, I was hopeful that we would not ask for more than we could get, or bite off more than we could chew in educational costs.

The Congress considered these measures, and in their judgment, as I say, passed this by a unanimous vote. They felt that we should go far in excess of what I asked for this year. The bill before me this morning exceeds my budget request by more than $245 million for fiscal year 1967, and by more than $1,800 million over the next 5 years.

Because it is for education, I am going to sign this bill, even though it provides hundreds of millions of dollars more than I thought it advisable to recommend or to ask for this year.

This is the first major measure enacted in this session of Congress, and a President just must not ignore the unanimous vote of both Houses of the Congress, the 2 Texas chairmen, YARBOROUGH and TEAGUE, and some 5 million men who will be the beneficiaries who have worn the uniform.

I want to call attention, however, and make a most solemn warning about future legislation. Unless we can balance our requests with prudence, and our concern with caution, then we are likely to get our figures back to that $130 billion which came over from the departments.

I am going to sign this measure this morning notwithstanding the fact that it goes further than I was willing to ask for this year, because, paraphrasing what Secretary Rusk said the other day in response to a question from Congress, he said, "Well, Senator, could it be that they could perhaps be wrong?" It just could be that the President was wrong when he made his original request.

I supported this legislation when I was a Member of the Senate, and sometimes you look at things a little differently from one end of the avenue than you do from the other end.

I have tried to take into consideration all of the factors that should be weighed. I have heard the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, and every commander—General Walt this week, General Westmoreland a couple of weeks ago—tell me about the dedication of our fighting men. I am convinced that these brave Americans who serve us on many fronts today, particularly in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, and others, are the very best men that our country has ever produced. They are great soldiers.

I am going to resolve this doubt in behalf of the Congress, which has spent more hours considering this than I have, and sign this legislation in the hope that when the peace is won, we can provide the means of making great civilians in time of peace out of these great soldiers who served us in time of need.

Thank you very much.

The Veterans' Administration has given me a list of distinguished individuals who have been trained under this law, and I include this list as a part of my remarks:

GOVERNORS WHO RECEIVED SCHOOLING UNDER THE PRIOR GI BILL

Edward T. Breathitt, Kentucky; University of Kentucky, 1948, B.S.; 1950, LL.B.

John Chafee, Rhode Island; Yale, 1947, B.A.; Harvard, 1950, LL.B.

Daniel J. Evans, Washington; University of Washington, 1949, M.A.

Philip H. Hoff, Vermont; Williams College, 1948, A.B.; Cornell University, 1951, LL.B.

William L. Guy, North Dakota; University of Minnesota, 1946, M.S.

Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon; Stanford University, 1948, A.M.

Samuel P. Goddard, Jr., Arizona; University of Arizona, 1948, LL.B.

Robert E. McNair, South Carolina; University of South Carolina, 1947, A.B.; 1948, LL.B.

Karl F. Rolvaag, Minnesota; University of Minnesota, 1945; Norway, 1949 (graduate study, political science); University of Minnesota, some additional graduate studies.

Carl Sanders, Georgia; University of Georgia, 1947, LL.B.

Grant Sawyer, Nevada; Georgetown University, 1948, LL.B.

William Scranton, Pennsylvania; Yale, 1946, LL.B.

Warren E. Hearnes, Missouri; University of Missouri, 1952, A.B., LL.B.

Otto Kerner, Illinois; Lawyer's Post Graduate Clinic, Chicago, 1946.

CABINET MEMBERS WHO RECEIVED SCHOOLING UNDER THE PRIOR GI BILL

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, the Attorney General.

Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior.
Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

SUPREME COURT MEMBER WHO RECEIVED SCHOOLING UNDER THE PRIOR GI BILL

Justice Byron Raymond White.

U.S. SENATORS

Birch Bayh, of Indiana.
Daniel B. Brewster, of Maryland.
Frank Church, of Idaho.
Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania.
Vance Hartke, of Indiana.
Daniel K. Inouye, of Hawaii.
George S. McGovern, of South Dakota.
Jack Miller, of Iowa.
Walter F. Mondale, of Minnesota.
James B. Pearson, of Kansas.
Joseph D. Tydings, of Maryland.
Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVES

Brock Adams, of Washington.
John B. Anderson, of Illinois.
Mark Andrews, of North Dakota.
John M. Ashbrook, of Ohio.
Thomas L. Ashley, of Ohio.
Bert Bandstra, of Iowa.
James F. Battin, of Montana.
Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York.
John Brademas, of Indiana.
Clarence J. Brown, Jr., of Ohio.
John H. Buchanan, Jr., of Alabama.
Laurence J. Burton, of Utah.
Phillip Burton, of California.
Charles E. Chamberlain, of Michigan.
Donald D. Clancy, of Ohio.
Frank M. Clark, of Pennsylvania.
James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire.
Raymond F. Clevenger, of Michigan.
Barber B. Conable, Jr., of New York.
Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts.
James C. Corman, of California.
Eligio de la Garza, of Texas.
Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois.
William L. Dickinson, of Alabama.
Charles C. Diggs, Jr., of Michigan.
John D. Dingell, of Michigan.
Robert Dole, of Kansas.
Thomas N. Downing, of Virginia.
John J. Duncan, of Tennessee.
Robert B. Duncan, of Oregon.
Ed Edmondson, of Oklahoma.
Edwin W. Edwards, of Louisiana.
Jack Edwards, of Alabama.
Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas.
John N. Erlenborn, of Illinois.
Frank E. Evans, of Colorado.
William D. Ford, of Michigan.
Donald M. Fraser, of Minnesota.
Peter Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey.
Richard H. Fulton, of Tennessee.
Don Fuqua, of Florida.
Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey.
Sam M. Gibbons, of Florida.
John J. Gilligan, of Ohio.
Bernard F. Grabowski, of Connecticut.
George W. Grider, of Tennessee.
Robert P. Griffin, of Michigan.
James R. Grover, Jr., of New York.
Edward J. Gurney, of Florida.
G. Elliott Hagan, of Georgia.
Richard T. Hanna, of California.
George V. Hansen, of Idaho.
William H. Harsha, of Ohio.
James Harvey, of Michigan.
William D. Hathaway, of Maine.
David N. Henderson, of North Carolina.
Floyd V. Hicks, of Washington.
Frank Horton, of New York.
James J. Howard, of New Jersey.
William L. Hungate, of Missouri.
Richard Ichord, of Missouri.
Donald J. Irwin, of Connecticut.
Andrew Jacobs, Jr., of Indiana.
John Jarman, of Oklahoma.
Robert W. Kastenmeier, of Wisconsin.
Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts. (Asked that his name not be used for any purpose in connection with this list.)
Horace R. Kornegay, of North Carolina.
Delbert L. Latta, of Ohio.
Robert L. Leggett, of California.
Speedy O. Long, of Louisiana.
Richard D. McCarthy, of New York.
Robert C. McEwen, of New York.
Thomas L. McGrath, Jr., of New Jersey.
Clark MacGregor, of Minnesota.
James A. Mackay, of Georgia.
John O. Marsh, Jr., of Virginia.
Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland.
Spark M. Matsunaga, of Hawaii.
Lloyd Meeds, of Washington.
Robert H. Michel, of Illinois.
Arch A. Moore, Jr., of West Virginia.
William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas G. Morris, of New Mexico.
F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts.
Lucien N. Nedzi, of Michigan.
James G. O'Hara, of Michigan.
Otis G. Pike, of New York.
Richard H. Poff, of Virginia.
Graham Purcell, of Texas.
Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota.
Thomas M. Rees, of California.
Ben Reifel, of South Dakota.
Ed Reinecke, of California.
Paul G. Rogers, of Florida.
Daniel J. Ronan, of Illinois.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, of New York.
J. Edward Roush, of Indiana.
Edward R. Roybal, of California.
Donald Rumsfeld, of Illinois.
William F. Ryan, of New York.
Fernand J. St Germain, of Rhode Island.
William L. St. Onge, of Connecticut.
David E. Satterfield, of Virginia.
James H. Scheuer, of New York.
Gale Schisler, of Illinois.
John R. Schmidhauser, of Iowa.
Richard S. Schweiker, of Pennsylvania.
Armistead I. Selden, Jr., of Alabama.
George F. Senner, Jr., of Arizona.
Carlton R. Sickles, of Maryland.
Neal Smith, of Iowa.
J. William Stanton, of Ohio.
Robert E. Sweeney, of Ohio.
Burt L. Talcott, of California.
Paul H. Todd, Jr., of Michigan.
Morris K. Udall, of Arizona.
Joseph P. Vigorito, of Pennsylvania.
Weston E. Vivian, of Michigan.
Albert W. Watson, of South Carolina.
Richard White, of Texas.
John W. Wydler, of New York.

The Louisville Courier Journal, in the issue dated June 22, 1964, the 20th anniversary of the World War II Act, summed up very well the accomplishments, in an editorial entitled "There Is a Solid Moral":

> Under the educational section 1,400,000 veterans were given on-the-job training, 70,000 got on-the-farm training, and 2,200,000 went to college. Classrooms bulged and groaned, GI villages sprang up amid acres of mud, and hundreds of thousands of young couples raised babies while seeking degrees, but when it was over America had been given 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses, 360,000 teachers, 150,000 scientists, 107,000 lawyers, 243,000 accountants, 36,000 ministers, 288,000 metalworkers, 138,000 electricians, 83,000 policemen and firemen, 700,000 businessmen, 17,000 writers and journalists and goodness knows how many TV and appliance repairmen.

Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to the memory of the late Albert Thomas, of Texas. Albert Thomas was one of my personal heroes and one of the finest Congressmen that any State of the United States has ever sent to Washington. He was a gentleman and a very gentle man. At the same time he was forceful, quick, brilliant, gracious, and always kind.

Before it became my honor to serve on his subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I remember watching him with awe and I marveled at his masterful annual presentation of the complex independent offices budget on this floor. In the brief time that it was my pleasure to serve with him on this subcommittee I realized fully the extent of the work that he put into this task and his incredible and brilliant understanding of the complex workings of the many executive agencies under his committee's jurisdiction.

In the three decades that Mr. Thomas served in Congress he has put his personal stamp on much of the good legislation which has come through this Congress. Albert Thomas did not seek headlines or personal fame. I believe he viewed his task in Congress as a personal responsibility to work for the betterment of all people, for the increased effectiveness of our Government, and for the recognition of innovation and of the necessity for progress. Mr. Thomas was a hard and tireless worker even while undergoing personal suffering which would have shattered a lesser man.

It was really an honor to know this man and to have him as a friend.

Mr. Speaker, to his widow and his daughter I extend my deep sympathy and prayers.

Idaho: Good Place To Build, Commerce Development Department Tells Rest of Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1966

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Saturday Evening Post published an article a few years ago entitled "Timeless Idaho." Its theme was that Idaho was cut off from the economic mainstream of the United States. Now the citizens of my State are taking steps to broaden their economic base without giving up the values and advantages they have enjoyed in the past.

During 1965, the gain in personal income in Idaho exceeded that of any other State. This is but one indication of the tremendous strides Idaho is making in manufacturing, agriculture, and tourism.

The complete story of what Idaho has to offer was recently published in a booklet entitled "Idaho Industrial Opportunity." Some of the same information appeared recently in the Idaho Falls Post-Register. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IDAHO: GOOD PLACE TO BUILD, COMMERCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT TELLS REST OF NATION

(By the Idaho Department of Commerce and Development)

In a national advertising campaign sponsored by the Idaho Department of Commerce and Development, Morrison-Knudsen Co. president, J. B. Bonny, is quoted as saying, "A good place to build is Idaho. Why? Because virtually everything needed is here—an energetic and productive labor force, almost limitless future potential in power, water, land, and energy development, abundant natural resources and close proximity to all markets in the expanding West. Idaho's government and its people welcome industry and new development.

"They've maintained a debt-free State with a sound business climate that looks to tomorrow. Investigate Idaho for your future plans. There are plenty of reasons to grow—and plenty of room, too."

This type of statement is echoed by many other Idaho business leaders in similar ads in the same series with H. W. Morrison, chairman of the board of the same company, pointing out that Idaho is an ideal location as it is in the center of the growing intermountain West where development potential is as broad as the horizon.

Robert V. Hansberger, president of one of the Nation's most rapidly growing companies, the Boise Cascade Corp., puts it this way: "Big timber, big mountains, big waters, and big sky nourish a pioneering spirit. They all exist in Idaho. They inspire our company and attract the kind of men and women who think big. Our people seem to thrive in this special atmosphere, where the satisfactions of building something new and vital are everywhere apparent.

"Some companies prefer to be located near the crowded centers of finance and industry. Fact is, the phone and jet have made us neighbors to just about anybody on the globe."

J. L. Berlin, immediate past president of Albertson's, Inc., says, "We're often asked why an expanding company like Albertson's doing a quarter-billion-dollar business in eight Western States has its head office in Boise. If we headquartered elsewhere and knew what we know about Idaho, we'd very likely locate there." Fred Rooney, resident manager of FMC Corp., says, "We're making good use of Idaho's huge reserve of phosphate ore, abundant water, electric power and stable, energetic work force. It's a great place to do business and a wonderful place to live."

Internationally known industrialist J. R. Simplot states that his Idaho base company has grown bigger and faster than most for the principal reason that Idaho has provided a combination of natural resources, untapped mineral wealth, fertile soil, excellent growing climate and a breed of hardy westerners that are eager to work, challenge, and build the future. C. E. Schwab, president, the Bunker Hill Co., reports that, "Production at our operations in Idaho's famous Coeur d'Alene mining district, where over $2 billion in lead, silver, and zinc has been extracted from the earth, has been consistently high.

Mining has played a big role in the development of Idaho in the past and will do so in the future because this Western State is alive and responsive to the challenge of tomorrow. Its people and its land are productive. Idaho's governmental attitude have resulted in a sound, progressive business climate. It's a great State to live, work, develop, and grow in." C. E. Fisher, president of Pendar Corp., says, "The clean air, general working conditions, and excellent transportation facilities are conducive to electronics manufacturing. We have also discovered that the world's greatest natural recreational facilities are in Idaho. I would highly recommend, to everyone, the State of Idaho."

ANSWERS GIVEN

These industrial leaders capsulize the reasons why 1965 was able to bring to fruition several years of planning and hard work in the field of industrial development. In 1965 Idaho's production, trade, construction, and income ran well above the excellent gains averaged by the Nation. For the first time, Idaho took the lead over all other States in gain and personal income.

By September, ending the third quarter of the year, Idaho's gain for the month was 15.1 percent as compared to the average of 7.9 percent for the entire Nation. The overall personal income gain in 1965 was 48.75 percent above the national average. During the past 10 years Idaho's average gain in personal income has been $51 million annually. In 1956, it was $154 million or three times the annual average.

The highest previous gain in this period was in 1962, with $109 million gain over 1961 at 8.8 percent.

Idaho's manufacturing and industrial gains, principally those of processing mineral and agricultural products, continue to show increased employment, value, and production. An alltime low for the past decade was shown in unemployment which had dropped to 2 percent of the work force by late in the year.

The most dramatic indicator of Idaho's economic well-being is that while most of the States show a rate of growth in personal income directly related to the amount of Federal funds being pumped into the economy, in Idaho the rapidly accelerating growth in personal income has occurred during a drop of 65 percent in the amount of Federal defense funds coming into the State.

One of the major reasons for Idaho's unusual and rapid growth is the fact that this State has more water dropping a greater distance than any other State in the Nation. Blessed by nature with an enormous hydropower potential, Idaho well realizes that there is a very close relationship between water quality and industrial development. In fact, water quality is at the heart of our country's future * * * cannot flourish without quality water, and some cannot even exist without it.

While Idaho now ranks seventh in the Nation in hydroelectric resource potential, less than 10 percent of the total potential of 11,729,421 kilowatts is now realized while on a national scale the problem of water resources today has grown into one of major dimension. Every day Americans make more demands on water supplies for industrial agricultural, personal, and recreational uses. In all these facets Idaho has unlimited supply. But this source of development is not being taken for granted and an active interest is taken by most Idahoans in the use of this vital resource.

While spectacular gains have been made by manufacturing, mining, tourism, and the timber industry, agriculture remains Idaho's greatest source of income. While Idaho's increasingly large farms have employed fewer workers, an increase in nonagricultural jobs have been created by expansion in related fields. The food-processing industry, grown up in recent years, has a tendency to distort the statistical picture through its creation of thousands of jobs which did not previously exist.

Processing employs many women workers in the winter who are not in the job market in other seasons and when they are idle this production drops in the summer, statistics show an unemployment figure actually created out of an employment plus.

Nonagricultural totals will average around 200,000 for the year. This represents an increase of nearly 7,000 workers which is the result of steady growth, well distributed throughout all parts of the State. On the national level, Idaho is processing nearly two-thirds of all the Nation's potatoes used for food, exclusive of chips.

Potato processing plants throughout the State are expanding, as are food processors in general; Simplot's operations in Pocatello and Rogers at Rexburg as well as the storage expansion in Caldwell are examples. In mining, all interests are digging deeper and producing more. Bunker Hill's $8 million expansion program is underway and will increase zinc production more than 20 percent by mid-1967. Production of sulfuric acid will be boosted and demand for this product is growing. Prices are advancing in the world market and Bunker Hill sulfuric acid production will be running 50 percent better than currently.

El Paso Natural Gas plant at Conda is ready to process its half billion tons of phosphate rock per year and word persists that its capacity will be increased by as much as 100 percent in a few years. Idaho's new Freeport law in which the storage business is expanding, continue to see new gains.

This positive measure, which has changed the economic complexion of warehousing operations in Idaho, exempts certain property from inventory taxation. Among these are "personal property manufactured or processed in the State and actually sold and shipped out of the State" or "personal property shipped into this State, stored in a public or private warehouse structure but not offered for sale in Idaho and designated for reshipment outside the State."

Also exempt from taxation are fruits, vegetables, and seeds held for shipment out of the State. The shipper, manufacturer or processor may label, package, disassemble, relabel, or repack without loss of exemption. Through this new law Idaho now offers a basic and essential inducement to expanding industry.

Thousands of acres of new farm lands are being developed through underground pumping and sprinkler systems in Idaho. The steps taken in the fifties are paying off handsomely in the sixties with the emergence of sweeping row crop farms of alfalfa and wheat in the Snake River Valley and in the wide reaches of Owyhee, Elmore, and Canyon Counties.

A total of $175 million is estimated for 1965 income from tourism in Idaho. With the increase participation in fall hunting and fishing and winter sports, Idaho has truly become a four-season vacation State. November of 1965 produced such figures as a 25.3 percent increase in gasoline sales and saw highway usage ahead at nearly 10 percent more than that of the previous year. Both these gains are peaks of trends which have continued for long enough periods of time to establish a dependable pattern. Idaho's growth from a $50 million a year expenditure to $175 million annually from tourism in only 10 years shows what can be done in this field in the future.

The outlook for Idaho in 1966 is favorable. The horizon is so bright that it appears that only inflationary forces can reduce the real value of increases in income and output in Idaho.

Tribute to Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Corn Industries Research Foundation recently paid tribute to Henry A. Wallace for his service to American agriculture. The foundation's publication tells of Mr. Wallace's significant contributions to corn production by developing and promoting the use of hybrid seed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Henry Agard Wallace: Editor and Plant Breeder

In late 1920 or early 1921, shortly after the election of Warren G. Harding as the Nation's 29th President, the 32-year-old associate editor of a respected Iowa farm journal came to Washington on business. At his father's suggestion he visited the Department of Agriculture to learn more about the men in charge of USDA's corn-improvement work.

The young Iowan had literally grown up with corn. Well traveled, he was quite familiar with the work in developing hybrid corn that was underway in Connecticut, Nebraska, and other parts of the Nation. For a half dozen years he had conducted corn inbreeding and controlled-cross experiments of his own on a small garden plot in Des Moines. Sixteen years earlier he had astounded Prof. P. G. Holden, the well-known Iowa corn evangelist, by proving that the best corn-show ears judges can pick do not yield the best or even the most corn when planted the next season.

Best of all, young Henry A. Wallace could make the sleuthing expedition for his father without the handicap of public knowledge that the senior Wallace had been tapped by President-elect Harding to be the Nation's seventh Secretary of Agriculture.

DIFFERING VISIONS

Exactly what Henry A. Wallace told Henry C. Wallace is not known, but records in the U.S. Department of Agriculture faithfully recorded the elevation of F. D. Richey to the post of principal agronomist in charge of corn investigations in USDA's Office of Cereal Investigations on February 16, 1922. Much, however, is revealed by the visions of the two USDA agronomists.

C. P. Hartley, Richey's predecessor, did a limited amount of inbreeding work with corn shortly after 1900. He came to the conclusion that it "offered no possibilities for corn improvement at that time," A. Richard Crabb noted a quarter-century after the job shuffle in his book, "The Hybrid-Corn Makers: Prophets of Plenty." Discouraged by his own findings, Hartley subjected the significant work of Edward M. East, George H. Shull, and others of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station to heavy skepticism.

Richey, however, who had joined Hartley's staff in 1911, followed the work of East, Shull, and others with great interest. In 1916 Richey began inbreeding corn on a limited scale—on his own responsibility.

Richey's work was not unknown to Wallace prior to this Washington visit. In May of 1920 Wallace received from Richey some lines of corn that had been inbred once or twice, including a selection from the Chinese corn, Bloody Butcher, which produced an inbred of copperish color very unlike the other varieties of corn with which Wallace had been working.

Once he assumed his new post in 1922, Richey moved rapidly to develop hybrids from inbred lines rather than emphasize the improvement of open-pollinated varieties, as Hartley had been doing.

"Richey's vision of the possibilities of the new hybrid corn was an important force in its further development," noted Crabb.

CORN WAS REVERED

Young Henry A. Wallace had excellent credentials with which to judge the effectiveness of the Department's corn-improvement program. His family had put down roots in Iowa's corn country three generations earlier. His grandfather, who had earned the nickname of "Uncle Henry," was reared in western Pennsylvania. He went West to attend a small Presbyterian theological seminary at Monmouth, Ill. In his "Letters to My Great Grandchildren," Uncle Henry reflected his awe of the agricultural wealth of the Corn Belt:

"It seemed as if the State was literally full of corn. It was piled up in rail pens, without covering, around the houses and other buildings, and sometimes in the fields. * * * The next winter I spent a Sabbath in the country, and sat by a stove burning corn for fuel. * * * The town itself was full of corn; corn everywhere. And it was also full of rats."

Uncle Henry took his ministry to Iowa in 1862, but ill health forced him to give up his pulpit for the out of doors, and farming. His health improved, he founded Wallaces Farmer, a widely read agricultural publication edited successfully by his son and grandson. In 1908 President Theodore Roosevelt appointed Uncle Henry to the influential Country Life Commission, which made a widely recognized survey of rural life in America. This gave the Wallaces their first taste of national recognition.

Wallace, born on the family acres in Adair County—about 100 miles west of Des Moines—on October 7, 1888, acquired deep interest in corn while still a boy in high school. In 1904, when he was 16, he watched intently one day while the famed Professor Holden judged a corn show. When Holden asserted that the ten best ears, if planted the following spring, would produce a better corn crop than those judged last, Wallace asked him how he knew this. Crabb continued:

"The elder Wallace, seeing that his son was not entirely convinced with Holden's explanation and in all probability having some misgivings himself, suggested to the youth that he take some ears from the lowest ranking 10-ear samples and plant them side by side the following spring and see what they would do."

Holden endorsed the project and provided Wallace with prize corn samples as well. That summer of 1904 Wallace tended his corn plot with the aid of a single horse. In the fall he shucked his corn, weighed the corn from each row separately, and made accurate comparisons of yield. "The results," Crabb reported, "were a revelation to Wallace and his father and a great surprise to Professor Holden."

YIELD UNRELATED TO LOOKS

Wallace found that the best yield came not from one of the pretty, precise ears judged best by Holden but from one of the tailenders, an ear that was long, broad-kerneled, and which had only 16 rows of kernels—too few to win a ribbon in a corn show.

For years afterward Wallace campaigned against corn shows, declaring they were a poor way to judge corn's potential.

During the next 15 years Wallace graduated from the Des Moines public schools and Iowa State College in Ames and joined Wallaces Farmer as associate editor. While at Ames, he developed a friendship with the Iowa State College agronomist, H. D. Hughes, whom Wallace much later credited with giving him "splendid encouragement and cooperation" in his early work with hybrid corn.

In 1913, 3 years after his graduation from Iowa State, Wallace planted a small crop of corn in a plot of his Des Moines garden. He sought to experiment with corn inbreeding and controlled crosses. He made his controlled single crosses between varieties found in other States by detasseling one of them so the other variety could receive pollen from only one source.

TIMELY NEW DISCOVERY

Ironically, by 1919 Wallace reached the same conclusion Hartley had reached years earlier: that inbreeding by itself had little promise.

In 1919, however, Wallace learned of Donald Jones' discovery of the double-cross hybrid. This, according to Crabb, made him "look upon corn inbreeding and hybrids from inbred lines in a different light." In the summer of 1919 Wallace began making single crosses with inbreds obtained from East and Herbert Hayes in Connecticut and some inbreds received from the Nebraska Experiment Station.

M. T. Jenkins, a prolific chronicler of hybrid corn development, credits Wallace with going about his work "systematically" starting in 1919.

A year later Wallace arranged for more help, more land, and broadened his inbreeding. He also urged the Iowa State Department of Agronomy to collect from all corn show exhibitors samples of their best and worst 10-year exhibits and plant them competitively to determine the highest yielders and most profitable strains of corn for Iowa farmers. Later called the Iowa corn yield test, this project revealed the best strains of open-pollinated corn. It also provided a good means for comparing new Wallace-developed hybrids with the best of the open-pollinated Iowa strains.

Wallace entered his own hybrids in the 1921 and 1922 Iowa corn yield tests without measurable success. The next year, however, he entered a strange single cross he called Copper Cross—a product of mating one of East's Leaming inbreds with the Bloody Butcher inbred Richey had sent him in 1920.

A year later, in 1924, Copper Cross won a gold medal in the Iowa corn yield test.

PROMOTION SUCCEEDS RESEARCH

George Kurtzweil, an official of the Iowa Seed Co., saw Copper Cross in 1923. Impressed, he signed a contract with Wallace permitting him to produce and sell it. Wallace gave him all the foundation inbred seed he had—enough to plant a 1-acre plot—and in the spring of the following year Iowa farmers read the first advertisement of hybrid corn seed ever published.

"A novelty never before offered by a seedsman," the advertisement claimed. "The seed we send you is yellow—the corn you will harvest will be a yellow-capped copper." The advertisement told of yields "trebled, quadrupled, and in some cases increased by seven or eightfold." Warming to his subject, the copyrighter added:

"If you try it this year you will be among the first to experiment with this new departure, which will eventually increase the corn production of the United States by millions of bushels."

Wallace, meanwhile, kept to his inbreeding. Always an innovator and promoter of corn, he worked over inbred lines to fit them for greater usefulness to Iowa farmers, combining them more effectively. His family made substantially larger acreage available to him and he formed the Hi-Bred Corn Co. in 1926, later renaming it the Pioneer Hi-Bred Corn Co.

Jay Newlin, a Wallaces Farmer editor, and Simon Casady, a Des Moines real estate man, joined him in forming the firm, the first company ever established for the exclusive purpose of developing strains of hybrid corn and for the production and distribution of the seed. Mrs. Henry A. Wallace invested a large portion of a family inheritance in the company.

OTHERS CONTINUE WALLACE'S WORK

In the spring of 1928, Raymond Baker left Iowa State College in his senior year at

Wallace's invitation and joined Pioneer. Baker, one of many Iowa youths who experimented with Wallace inbreds in various parts of the State during their summer vacations, developed rapidly and, in 1929, Wallace asked him to harvest his hybrid corn research plots and record and evaluate the data. Wallace had to go to Europe. Baker assumed all responsibility for hybrid corn research in 1933 when Wallace, like his father before him, became Secretary of Agriculture. This marked the end of Wallace's active direction of Pioneer Hi-Bred Corn Co., but others continued the work and the company grew and prospered.

A prolific writer, Wallace devoted 3 of his 17 books to corn. One of them, "Corn and Corn Growing," which first appeared in 1923, was revised as late as 1937. In 1956 two more books appeared—"Corn and the Midwestern Farmer" and "Corn and Its Early Fathers." Wallace's own appraisal of his most successful pursuits is possibly revealed in his brief entry in Who's Who, which while not leaving out any of his later positions of public service describes him simply as "editor, plant breeder."

Shortly after Henry A. Wallace died on November 18, 1965, one of the Nation's best known newspaper columnists credited him with molding the American "technical revolution on the farm."

Raymond Moley, one of the original New Deal braintrusters, said of Wallace in his book "27 Masters of Politics":

"His experiments with the breeding of corn are credited among several genuinely important contributions to genetics in the past half century. He has also been eminently successful in the improvement of breeds of hogs and chickens. We hear a good deal about the great financial success Wallace made in these lines. But no serious student of farm economics would underestimate the practical benefits to American farmers made possible by the Wallace studies."

Democracy, What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conduct a voice of democracy contest. Last year Miss Bonnie Ann Utter, of Wheatland, Wyo., won this contest for her paper entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship."

This year Jack M. Bailey, of Cheyenne, Wyo., has taken the honors in Wyoming with his "Democracy, What It Means to Me."

Jack does an excellent job of pointing out the importance of the individual—which is, in the last analysis, the strength of our democracy, Mr. Speaker, and I enter his winning essay in the RECORD at this point:

DEMOCRACY, WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Jack M. Bailey, Cheyenne, Wyo.)

"A democracy is a government of all of the people, for all of the people, a government after the principles of eternal justice, the unchanging law of God; for shortness' sake, call it the idea of freedom." These words of Theodore Parker give us a meaning of democracy which will thrill the mind, warm the heart, and inspire us to great goals.

Without this stirring meaning, democracy is something vague and difficult to visualize and for this reason it is easy to confuse with various symbols. When we think of democracy, we may think of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Statue of Liberty, or the Stars and Stripes. But these are only symbols; they are no more a democracy than a Bible is a Christian or a blueprint is a house. If these are not a democracy, then what is? To me, democracy is a living, moving force with unlimited power, power that can and must eventually engulf the entire world and carry mankind to heights far beyond our present powers of comprehension. And where does democracy get its power? The Winston Dictionary says that democracy is "government by the people," so the people must be the source of power.

But when we talk about the "people" we are still being very vague. When you hear the term "the people," what picture comes to mind? Can you close your eyes and visualize something? Frankly, I cannot. So let's separate it a step further and see if we can find something tangible, something we can see, touch, study, and try to understand.

When you analyze the people what do you see? Individuals. Living, breathing, moving entities who think and dream, love and hate, reproduce and destroy, build and demolish—who are good and who are evil. But just as surely as the atom is the building block of nature, the individual is the building block of democracy. And history shows that it is the individual rather than government who has led mankind out of the trees and caves and started him along the road to civilization, even though he still has a long journey ahead of him.

Just to keep the picture in focus, let's skim the pages of history and make a few comparisons between governments and individuals and judge their powers by their accomplishments. At first, this may seem unfair to pit the individual against the government, and it is grossly unfair, to the government. For facts prove beyond all doubt, that the individual is the giant and the government is the puppet.

Was any government responsible for the discovery of America? No. An individual with a radical new theory sold an idea to a queen, discovered a new continent, and completely revolutionized the world.

When the settlers of that new continent decided that it was time for a new form of government that would recognize the dignity and rights of the individual, was this brought about by government? Definitely not. A few individuals pointed the way, others saw their dream, joined with them in their vision, and a new form of government was born on a new continent—and they called it democracy.

Since the days when he lived in caves lighted by fire, man has alternately worshiped and feared electricity in the form of lightning. The governments of the world could offer neither hope nor explanation, but thanks to two individuals, named Ben Franklin and Thomas Edison, electricity has changed the world.

To me, democracy is a form of government which recognizes, defines, and protects the dignity and rights of the individual and guarantees him the freedom to live and work, think and dream, and attain his highest goals, so long as he does not infringe upon the rights of others. It is government of the people, to the extent that the rights of all will be protected; by the people, to insure the governed a voice in their government; and for the people, to insure the greatest freedom and oportunities for all. To me, Abraham Lincoln gave the perfect definition of democracy, when he referred to "* * * that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, may it never perish from the earth."

We Need an American Ombudsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, since 1809, the Swedish ombudsmen have played an important role in protecting Swedish citizens' rights from bureaucratic abuse or error. This Swedish innovation has been so successful that so far four other nations have established ombudsmen of their own.

On Monday, March 7, at 10 a.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, Sweden's current ombudsman, Alfred Bexelius, will testify before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.

I welcome Ombudsman Bexelius' appearance before the committee since it offers another opportunity for Americans to become acquainted with an institution which we should adopt in this country.

We cannot, of cpurse, simply graft an unaltered version of this offshoot of Swedish parliamentary democracy onto the trunk of our separation of powers system. We must adapt the institution to our constitutional and political system. In 1963 and again in 1965, I introduced legislation (H.R. 4273) which I believe proposes the most useful adaptation of the ombudsman on the Federal level. This proposal to create an American ombudsman or administrative counsel of the Congress is currently under consideration by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress

In connection with the visit to the United States of Ombudsman Bexelius and, earlier, of the New Zealand Ombudsman, Sir Guy Powles, Richard L. Strout wrote in the Christian Science Monitor of February 28 of the need for an ombudsman in impersonalized modern society.

The Milwaukee Journal of February 28 also published an excellent article by Laurence C. Eklund summarizing my proposal for an American ombudsman and the background of its Swedish prototype.

The articles are included hereafter:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 28, 1966]

WASHINGTON CONSIDERS COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—What impersonalized modern society needs is an ombudsman.

A genuine ombudsman—a live one—will be on exhibition in Washington shortly.

Two ombudsmen are at large in the United States currently, the Swedish ombudsman and the New Zealand Ombudsman. Some Members of Congress think the United States needs one.

An ombudsman is an agent of the legislature who receives and investigates citizens' grievances against bureaucracy.

He is the little man's Sir Galahad against "the system."

Dr. Alfred Bexelius, tall, lean, straight-haired and dignified, is the current Ombudsman of Sweden, where the office began in 1809. He is a former judge. He will be on view before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure shortly.

Senator Edward V. Long, Democrat of Missouri, and Representative Henry S. Reuss, Democrat of Wisconsin, have bills to create an equivalent office in the United States.

The British Parliament debated establishing an ombudsman last week.

Finland, Denmark, Norway, and New Zealand have ombudsmen.

Sir Guy Powles, barrister and diplomat, is New Zealand's first ombudsman. He is in the United States on his way to Canada which is considering establishing the office.

IDEA SPREADS

Ombudsmen are "in." Currently the following are considering setting them up: Australia, Canada, Great Britain, Republic of Ireland, Holland, and the United States. Ombudsmen bills for States were introduced last year in California, Connecticut, Illinois, New York, and Utah, as well as the New York City Council.

"The institution meets a general need in modern, industrialized nations," says University of California Political Scientist Stanley V. Anderson, "for a means of resolving citizens' unique, individual problems with a depersonalized administration."

Every big U.S. department store has a complaint office.

The ombudsman is the complaint office for government.

In Sweden he is an agent of Parliament who receives and may investigate citizens' grievances against bureaucracy. He can reprimand or even prosecute officials.

But Ombudsman Bexelius says his most important work is his annual report to Parliament on important cases. This is circulated to all officials in departments that come under his criticism.

CASEWORK LIFTED?

Why an ombudsman in Washington, where every Congressman has an element of the office in him for constituents?

Representative Reuss says this constituent-nursing (or "casework" as it's called on Capitol Hill), is so burdensome that it interferes with more important legislative duties and policymaking.

Why not establish an administrative counsel to take over a part of the casework load? Congressmen could use findings as their own.

The chairman of the proposed conference could function as a regular Bexelius-Powles ombudsman. He could make procedural recommendations or even exercise discretionary corrective intervention.

Most complaints received in New Zealand, Sir Guy told an audience recently, are unfounded.

The ombundsman also absolves Government officials of wrongful charges.

It works two ways.

Meaning of the name? "Om" means about. "Bud" means message. "Man" means persons. He's a "man with a message about something."

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Feb. 28, 1966]

Ombudsman in United States To Boost Post

Washington, D.C.—Sweden's legal watchdog will lecture at leading law schools in the United States this week as a warmup for testifying next Monday before the Senate Administrative Practice Subcommittee to detail the functions of his office.

The official is Alfred Bexelius, 62, who arrived in the United States Saturday. His post is that of ombudsman.

Representative Reuss, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who first proposed an American ombudsman, or congressional administrative counsel, in 1963, has accepted an invitation to sit with the subcommittee to question Bexelius.

ORIGINATED IN 1809

The ombudsman originated in Sweden in 1809 as an agent of Parliament to protect citizens' rights against bureaucratic abuse.

In essence, Sweden had set up a one-man complaint bureau to hear grievances from persons who felt that they were being pushed around by government and its representatives.

The Swedish Constitution charged him with the responsibility of seeing that judges and other officials observed both the letter and the spirit of the law. He was given the power to prosecute violators.

POWER BALANCE SOUGHT

In creating the office, the framers of the Swedish Constitution sought to balance the power of the Government and its civil servants with an influential legal official appointed by the Riksdag (Parliament).

Reuss has something like that in mind for Congress. His American ombudsman, aided by a high level congressional bureau of a dozen or so experts, would—

Help Congressmen deal more effectively with citizens' complaints against erroneous or unfair decisions by Federal administrators.

Allow Congressmen more time and energy for their primary role as legislators by lifting a large part of the burden of investigating citizens' grievances.

The Swedish ombudsman must be a lawyer with extensive legal background, and his pay is the same as that of a supreme court judge.

Bexelius believes the annual report he files with Parliament is one of his most effective weapons, since no public official likes to have his name included.

In addition to reading letters he receives, Bexelius follows the newspapers closely, watching for signs of injustice or improper action.

Such an abuse was discovered by the first Swedish ombudsman. He found that an unfortunate brewer had been kept under arrest for 22 years, waiting for the supreme court to decide on his appeal. The court had mislaid his file.

Reuss ran into trouble with his use of the word ombudsman before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Reuss suggested that "casework helper" might be more understandable.

LIKED HIS EXPLANATION

They especially liked his explanation of how the American ombudsman could make life easier for a Congressman.

"I hope I won't be thought of as being cynical when I say the administrative counsel, if he succeeds, gives the Congressman the opportunity to get all the credit, if he wants it.

"If there is ultimate failure, then the Congressman does not have to blame it all on himself and his own inadequacies with the executive branch.

"But he can say: 'Look, this great jurist, the administrative counsel, went to bat, too, and he was unable to produce a favorable result.'"

Tribute to the Late Albert Thomas

SPEECH
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, it was with sorrow that I learned of the passing of Albert Thomas, a distinguished and dedicated public servant. I consider myself honored to have served with him in this body and in the Committee on Appropriations.

It was my privilege to meet Albert Thomas in the cloakroom the opening day of the 87th Congress when I was being sworn in for the first time. He was friendly and kind—he gave me my first lesson in certain unwritten House rules with which we are all familiar—a lesson I have never forgotten.

Albert lived and worked for his district, State, and Nation. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for the great services he has rendered—his record of service has earned him a place among the great men who have served in this House. While he has left us, he lives on in the lives of those who were privileged to work with and to know him.

To his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

The Great "Nonsensus"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following column by Don MacLean, in which he discusses the Great Society's upward bound program.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 3, 1966]

What wondrous days there are ahead in the Great Society. Take the Government's proposed plan to give scholarships to nondeserving students. Free college is to be available for certain underprivileged, below-average students who have no hope of getting into college any other way.

In this manner the Government hopes to compensate them for (1) being poor, (2) having bad high school grades, and (3) not being athletically inclined. In addition to free tuition, meals, housing, etc., these nonscholars will be paid $50 per month for not working while in college. This will inspire them to greater study, presumably, but they will lose this money if they graduate. If they maintain a B average, they will be allowed to work, although the $50 will be cut off.

The incentives here seem vague, but, I must say, the entire project sounds perfectly in tune with our times. The poor high school student with only C (average) grades, for example, is just plain out of it. He doesn't qualify for any academic scholarships to college, yet he is not considered incompetent enough for the Government to help him.

MORTAR-BOREDS

Let us now project the happy life of a nonstudent who dares not graduate or even get grades so good that he might have to go to work. The dean of nonadmission probably will explain that at least two fields of nonstudy seem appropriate for a nondegree. The nonstudent can fail agriculture for 4 years, after which he will be qualified not to farm and can get paid for it by the Agriculture Department.

Or, he can flunk courses in government, thereby insuring himself a career as an administrator of Government agencies which give money to people who don't work. Naturally, if he plans a nonessential role in Government, I suggest that the nonstudent practice noninvolvement in campus demonstrations.

On the athletic field he will want to take up noncompetitive sports. Perhaps solitaire, jacks, or catch. It probably will not be long before the Government instructs athletic coaches to award letters to nonplayers. To deny them letters, simply for nonperformance, seems cruel.

AND NO FROM

Nonstudents might even form their own fraternity. The Greek letters nu omicron nu might do. Naturally, no brother would ever be blackballed for nonpayment of dues. A nonstudent's fraternity days, after all, should help prepare him for nonexistence in later life.

All nonstudents should turn in nonnotebooks before the day of nongraduation. Since the pages of these nonstudy aids will be blank, they can be used (or not used) again by future nonclasses. This will save the taxpayers some money and the White House can announce it in a press release. I hope this nonsense doesn't leave you nonplussed.

Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, although I did not have the opportunity to learn to know the late ALBERT THOMAS as well as so many of my colleagues who have paid tribute to this distinguished American nevertheless, I became aware of the loss suffered not only by the Congress of the United States, but by the people of our great country by the passing of this man.

As a comparative newcomer in the House of Representatives, I remember him for the courteous and thoughtful manner which he always displayed to new Members of the House, I remember when I came here in the 88th Congress how he went out of his way to accommodate new Members and, although he had vast congressional duties and years of seniority, he always found time to talk to newer Members of the House in a manner that set them at ease and made them feel at home. Notwithstanding his many years of legislative experience and seniority that made him such a towering figure in the House, he was a man of humility, and carried his position and honors with an easy grace.

In the 89th Congress, it was my privilege to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee and encounter him as a newcomer serving on this committee. Again I saw the graciousness that was the hallmark of ALBERT THOMAS as he welcomed not only myself, but other new members to the committee of which he was such a valuable member.

As others have pointed out, he will be missed not only in the meetings of the committees and on the floor of the House, where he was a master of debate, but, even more, as a man whose warm and friendly ways contributed so much to the House of Representatives.

Courage Made United States Great and Will Keep It That Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter to the editor, written by Mr. Daniel Bickford, Americanism chairman of the American Legion Post No. 20, Plattsburgh, N.Y., which appeared recently in the Plattsburgh-Press Republican newspaper.

I have long been concerned about our faltering national spirit and the casual attitude with which we look upon our freedoms. We all know the American way of life is a good way. We cherish our freedom. But we have become casual about our freedom and we have failed to make the merits of our way life apparent to the world. I believe Mr. Bickford's article contains the very essence of what has made life here in our country different from life in other countries and I am pleased to call his letter to the attention of colleagues.

The article follows:

COURAGE MADE UNITED STATES GREAT AND WILL KEEP IT THAT WAY

To the EDITOR:

In keeping with the Legion's Americanism program, I would like to take this opportunity to expound on one of the characteristics which has made our country great and should serve to keep it that way. Courage.

"Courage." Just what does the word mean? Well, we might call it a combination of bravery and ambition which makes it possible for people, despite troubles, handicaps, and obstacles to accomplish the great deeds of life.

It is the quiet courage of the multitudes of people that makes a nation great. The life we live within ourselves may have its "zero hours" and we may be fighting a battle of life unknown to others. So we must steel ourselves for the stern needs of life. We must put on the whole armor of our being. We must grow to be strong against temptation, quick to make a noble resolve, slow to anger, and patient in adversity.

We must also have the courage to treat others as we would like to have them treat us.

Life is hard at times for all of us and only courage will pull us through. You may not feel heroic; perhaps you do not remember that you ever did a "golden deed"; you have never had to fight a fire, save a life, or meet the enemy on the field of battle. You have, however, lived through moments of great courage and were not less heroic because you have forgotten it. True courage always goes with modesty and does not bother to remember.

Like Siamese twins are sacrifice and courage, neither can live without the other. It requires great courage to forget ourselves. It is the supreme courage of the soldier—the courage of that wounded man to whom the doctor said, "This is bad business, son," and who replied with a smile, "Yes, sir, but we took the hill." The kind of courage such a soldier will still need if he survives his injuries and the war, disabled, since the declaration of peace may mean that for his family and himself, the battle for life and existence will have only begun.

The strength and opportunity to accomplish great deeds does not come to everyone, but courage grows with the will to be brave. We must face life with confidence. We must believe, as did Socrates, that "To the good man no evil thing can happen," but we should see to it that we really are what we profess to be. This will help us to endure whatever we may have to face. It will save us from the folly of timidity which spoils so many lives. It will make us unafraid of those who have a little power and use it harshly.

We must seize our opportunities with eagerness and zeal. We must be willing to run the risk of taking a chance if we consider it right and necessary. We must not turn back when we come to a tough spot. We must not flinch if life is not a bed of roses.

Men have borne the heat of the day for us. We of the United States of America enjoy greater liberty than any other people on earth because in other days men fought to make this country free with the courage that has written their names in letters of gold across the pages of history.

Men are this very instant suffering untold agony and death in order that this freedom may be maintained. Shall we on the homefront fail our country now? Shall we be less worthy than they of the honor and glory which should belong to our whole people?

Let us get down to the sober realities and requirements of free citizenship. Let us all stand firm, be strong and of good courage.

DANIEL N. BICKFORD,
Chairman, Americanism Committee.

Dismissals at St. John's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, serious questions of academic freedom have been raised by the dismissal of the 31 professors at St. John's University in New York City. The dismissal of the 31 professors and the ensuing strike against the administration and board of trustees are matters of deep concern, and every effort should be made to resolve this dispute.

On February 18, 1966, the New York Times published a letter to the editor from the Reverend George B. Ford, distinguished theologian and former pastor of Corpus Christi Church. Father Ford's letter points out the serious consequences of the situation. I hope that all of my colleagues will read his letter which follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1966]

DISMISSALS AT ST. JOHN'S

To the EDITOR:

The Times editorial on February 5, "Mediation at St. John's" not only suggests a proper procedure for settlement of academic disputes, but evidences the public disquietude at the long continuance of this disturbing and shocking situation.

Prior to the adoption of labor laws operative in our society, an owner could shut out his employees, who had then no means of redress. That the dismissal of 31 professors in the year 1965 without due process—a historic and individual right—not only negates all recognized canons in college and university decisions, but at the same time denies the tenets of the faith and social principles of the church this university claims to represent.

The consequences are many and of major significance. Every denominational school—Protestant, Jewish, Catholic—in practice can restrict to the sponsors or the trustees the right to act as drastically as St. John's. The situation in all these educational institutions under religious auspices may continue relatively quiescent but always potentially explosive.

Even where the trustees are equally divided between lay and cleric—in a showdown the decision of the religious leaders would be final and dominant. Saving an attack on the principles of the faith of the denominational sponsorship by some of the teaching staff, for what justifiable reason should freedom in the classroom be curtailed?

"You shall come to know the truth and the truth will set you free." Without freedom to teach and to learn, the end result is partial mental blindness. Right around the corner in a library or paperback store there will be found the freedom to know—available without the helpful and mature insights to be imparted in the classroom.

Restrictions in learning or discussion of any subject not only mentally lessens the possibility of full understanding, but psychologically invites doubts of its validity—"injurious is the gift that takes away freedom." Interestingly enough, freedom in the classroom controls itself. For the abuse of it invites the distaste and disapproval of a teacher's colleagues, and the students develop intellectual antibodies against a teacher who rides some intellectual hobbyhorse.

WITHHOLDING APPROVAL

It would not be surprising if some States will begin to withhold educational approval from denominational schools because they are not free to comply with the State's standards for education which presupposes freedom.

The 13,000 students at St. John's—because of the unfavorable and widespread publicity—presenting their degrees in the competitive marketplace will be "the last to be hired and the first to be fired." They will be presumed to be in the category of mediocrity—an unconscionable injustice to the young women and men students.

The widely held assumption that the Catholic Church was an unreformable monolithic structure was dispelled by the spirit and freedom in the Vatican Council. For many this concept is restored by the autocracy of the trustees of St. John's—10 in all, with only 3 holding advanced academic degrees—called by some incestuous, since they were obtained from institutions of the same religious faith as St. John's.

The Reverend GEORGE B. FORD.

NEW YORK, *February 10, 1966*.

Tribute to Don Correll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, Don correll, president and director of the Old Faithful Life Insurance Co. in Cheyenne, Wyo., has recently been selected as State vice president of the American Life Convention. An outstanding Wyomingite and very dear friend, Mr. Correll has made an exemplary contribution to the field of life insurance and it is my pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following remarks of tribute to him by the vice president and general counsel of the American Life Convention, Glendon E. Johnson:

Mr. Correll has had a distinguished career in the life-insurance business. He is a widely respected spokesman for the business and his lifetime of experience in developing and building an insurance company affords him an excellent background for his responsibilities. We feel greatly honored to have him serve our association in this capacity.

This is a signal honor in the life-insurance business because the American Life Convention is the oldest and largest of the life-insurance trade associations. Its 326 member companies doing business in the United States and Canada have 98 percent of the total assets held by life-insurance companies in the United States and Canada and 95 percent of the life insurance in force in this country.

The life-insurance business occupies a significant place in the economy of the State of Wyoming. In 1964 citizens of your State purchased $182 million of ordinary life insurance bringing the total life insurance in force of all kinds in Wyoming to a total of $1,304 million. A substantial percentage of the reserves backing the life-insurance companies' commitments to policyholders in Wyoming has been invested within the State. For example, in 1963, life companies' investments in Wyoming of just one type—mortgage loans—totaled $139,869,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize this accomplishment of my friend and fellow Wyomingite, Don Correll, of Cheyenne, Wyo.

Letter to a New Leftist, From a Tired Liberal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have heard more and more of the new left, a political grouping which draws its members from such widely divergent places as the campus at New Haven and the coffeehouses of San Francisco. While there appears to be a considerable variety of political opinion within this group, its members united on one thing; there are no liberals over 30. The current issue of Harper's carries a letter from the editor to a friend in the new left. Since the average age of the House is just over 50 I am afraid we are regarded as superannuated by the new left. I commend this article to our aging colleagues, Mr. Speaker. Some will find it agreeable and some will not. Many will find it nostalgic.

The article follows:

[From Harper's magazine, March 1966]

LETTER TO A NEW LEFTIST, FROM A TIRED LIBERAL

(By John Fischer)

"Never trust anybody over 30."

(NOTE.—A slogan of the student left which apparently originated during the free speech demonstrations at Berkeley.)

DEAR SAM: When I met you in Washington during the November march on the White House, I was not surprised that you quoted that remark; but I was surprised at the gentle way you did it. To me the most unexpected (and charming) thing about your generation of revolutionists is your tact in dealing with your elders. My generation of radicals was not so kindly.

You did make it quite clear, nevertheless, that you regarded us as the enemy; that you saw no chance that anyone of my age could possibly understand your feelings or aims—or vice versa; and that any effort to bridge the gap would be a waste of time. The purpose of this note is to try to persuade you that you might be mistaken. Perhaps the gulf is not so wide as all that. And just possibly it might be worth your while to see across it, or at least to understand why it is there.

I agree that the leadership of the new left ought to remain with people under 30, for reasons that I'll get to in a moment. But even if you enlist into the cause everybody beneath that age (which you won't) you still would not have enough to make a revolution. You will need some allies from an earlier generation of rebels, and it is quite possible for you to recruit them without compromising your ideals or diluting the fervor of the movement. Although you are convinced that they are finks, who sold out to the establishment long ago, they still could be useful to you. Conceivably, too, you might learn something from their experience; for (to paraphrase that old saw of the historians) the child who is unaware of the mistakes of his parents is likely to repeat them.

Even if you rejected these possibilities, you might yet find it profitable to try to understand something about the post-30 graybeards. "Know your enemy" is a sound rule in any war, including the war between the generations. And, if you will forgive me for mentioning such a grisly fact, you will soon—ah, how soon—be over 30 yourself. Permit me, then, to offer a few clues to the odd behavior of those who live in the world of the middle-aged.

It is easy to see why they strike you as incomprehensible. They seem blind to the most obvious facts: for example, that war and racial discrimination and injustice are intolerable. Or, when they do grant the truth of these propositions, they lack your sense of outrage and urgency. For them other things have a higher priority: making a living, for one, or as you call it, the rat race. Worse yet, they seem insensitive to the ugliness of our society—to the patches of poverty, the defilement of the landscape, the squalor of our slum schools, to the constriction of life inside the organization, whether it be a corporation or a multiversity. Most of them are equally indifferent to what, in your eyes, is the sickening vulgarity of American opulence, pervading everything from television to Miami Beach, from diamond-studded bottle openers to Forest Lawn Cemetery.

You can think of only two possible explanations for this moral callousness. Most of the adults you know either are inherently crass and selfish—that is, evil—or they have been corrupted. Because of timidity or a yearning for the soft life, they have surrendered to the power structure—that mysterious cabal which (as you learned from the late C. Wright Mills) has a vested interest in war, poverty, injustice, and ugliness. Consequently you are resolved to avoid such corruption at all costs.

If I understand you correctly, you propose to achieve this laudable goal through a kind of primitive Christianity. You don't call it that, of course, since you think of yourself as entirely nonreligious, scorning all churches as part of the power structure. Yet, although you may never have read St. Paul, your precepts sound very much like his. You have, in effect, taken vows of holy poverty, believing with him that the love of money is the root of all evil. Your point of view is intensely moral and censorious. You have dedicated your life to improving the lot of the poor, the persecuted, and the outcast. Because you take literally Lord Acton's maxim that all power corrupts, you want no part of power. You distrust organizations of any sort, because you perceive (quite correctly) that they require compromises—and to you compromise is the dirtiest of words. You have, in sum, renounced the world and its temptations, just as Paul demanded. No doubt unconsciously, you have even adopted the apostolic style: the pilgrim's sandals and roughspun clothes (known in your circle as SNCC overalls), the shaggy hair and beard, the preaching in simple parables (usually set, in your case, to guitar chords).

Much of this—especially your motives and commitment—seem to me wholly admirable. While your indifference to soap and neckties seems to annoy some of your seniors, it doesn't bother me, for often I have the same impulse. After all, there is some relationship between being emancipated and unbuttoned.

But you are mistaken, I think, in both your diagnosis and your plan of action.

Your explanations for the behavior of the middle aged are quite wrong. If they have been corrupted—or, more precisely, drained of zeal—the causes are different from those you assume. The dangers you seek to avoid are largely illusory; and the real dangers are something that you so far have not recognized.

Moreover, the life-style which you are cultivating so eagerly is likely to prove disappointing. Look what it did to the early Christians. Instead of ennobling their characters, the Pauline doctrine produced a lot of sour, ineffectual old bigots, like St. Simeon Stylites. Only when Christianity compromised with its principles enough to employ worldly tools—power, money, organization—did it begin to have much effect on the surrounding society. And then, because its dogmas were nearly as intolerant and self-assured as your own, it became embroiled in centuries of warfare and persecution of the unbelievers. "Crusade" is a word you are fond of. Remember that it referred originally to a ruthless and unprovoked aggression.

If you really want to understand the behavior of the middle-aged generation, you must look first at its history. It has been through two major wars and a depression. These were experiences which you cannot even imagine—but I hope you will take my word for it that their impact was heavy and lasting. They shaped the character and outlook on the world of everybody who went under the hammer. If you prefer the word "distorted" rather than "shaped," I won't argue; in any case, they left a lot of scar tissue.

Consequently, people of my age don't feel quite as much anxiety as you do about the war in Vietnam, for example. They regard it as deplorable but hardly cataclysmic, since they have been through worse. Many of us have grave doubts about the way it is being conducted, for the reasons Gen. James Gavin mentioned in this space last month. Nevertheless, most of us see it as a necessary evil, on the theory that if we don't fight a small war there and now, we very probably will have to fight a bigger and more tragic one a little later. This conviction is based on sore experience.

If you will allow me to cite a bit of private evidence, I can offer my own embarrassing case history. When I was your age, I edited a college newspaper. I filled it with editorials denouncing war in terms much like those you use today. Any fool could see that major conflicts were brewing up in both Europe and Asia, and I was passionately convinced that the United States ought to stay out of both of them. Because I grew up as a disciple of eloquent but rather simpleminded theorists, such as Bernard Shaw, Charles Beard, and Senator Gerald Nye—who were in many ways remarkably like your own guru-figures. Mills, Paul Goodman, and Staughton Lynd—I then believed that munitions makers were primarily responsible for war, and that the abolition of the arms industry was the quickest way to perpetual peace. (A simplistic reading of the history of World War I gave some support to this view.) To me it was axiomatic that any public official who was not an isolationist must be either a corrupt tool of the military-industrial establishment, or else blind to the follies of 1914–18.

A little later I was in Germany, as a student and reporter, just after Hitler had come to power; and I began to suspect that my notions about war were not quite adequate. In the end it dawned on me that Hitler had converted virtually a whole nation to a new kind of totalitarian religion; that most Nazis sincerely thought of themselves as idealists; and that they intended, for the good of mankind, to bring the world under the hegemony of their master race—exterminating in the process such lesser races as Jews, gypsies, and Slavs.

This scheme might have been stopped and Hitler overthrown, at small cost in bloodshed, if the neighboring nations had resisted his first aggressive moves, into the Rhineland and Austria. But, by 1939, nothing could stop him except a major war. Today, it is easy to forget how close we came to losing it.

Sometime between 1933 and 1939 I came to believe that war, however horrible, might not be the worst thing that could happen; and that in any case the decision might not always rest with Washington. When I said so publicly, the Daily Worker accused me of selling out to the bloodthirsty imperialists. (That, of course, was before Hitler attacked Russia; afterwards the American Communists became more bloodyminded than anybody.)

My point is that this change of mind—for me as for millions of other then-young Americans—did not happen because we were either seduced or intimidated by the power structure. It was produced by concrete, inescapable events; and it was reinforced, something more than a decade later, by the similar events of the Korean war. Most of us believe that the same lesson applies right now to what is happening in Asia. You may disagree with us—but I hope you will grant, eventually, that our motives are just as decent as your own.

You also misread, it seems to me, the attitude of your elders toward the pockmarks on the face of our affluent society. Certainly it is infuriating, but it does not necessarily spring from moral callousness.

In most cases it springs from the depression. The hideousness of those years really can't be conveyed to anyone who didn't live through them—years when grown men prowled through garbage cans in search of scraps to feed their children, when thousands of families lived in packing case shacks while the homes from which they had been evicted stood empty. A job—any job—was the most precious thing we could imagine. Consequently, even today a secure spot inside a big organization does not look to us exactly like a spiritual death sentence. Nor are we quite as contemptuous as we should be, perhaps, about the vulgarities of fat-dripping prosperity. At its silliest, that prosperity is infinitely better than the time of hunger.

Literal hunger. I was more fortunate than many undergraduates of my time, because I managed to find some kind of night-shift work during all 4 years of college; but there were stretches when my total income was $25 a month, of which $10 went for rent of a basement room I shared with another student. That meant that every bowl of chili had to be budgeted weeks ahead, and toward the end of the month some meals had to be skipped. Because such recollections are the common property of my generation, we can't always share your derision for the paunchy suburbanite who makes a big thing out of grilling 2-inch steaks in his backyard. We know what he is making up for. So, too, we may seem a little inattentive when you talk about your troubles with college, or accuse us of lacking sympathy for the poor. Neither are we as eager as you to dismantle a social structure which we have seen change immeasurably for the better during the last 30 years, and which may still have capacities for improvement.

There are similar explanations for our hesitancy—which seems to you so unpardonable—about your worthy causes. The radicals of the thirties (when nearly all of us were radicals of some kind) invested a lot of emotion and sweat in such causes. Some of them succeeded beyond our wildest hopes; but others, even when successful, did not produce quite the results we had expected.

Consider the labor unions, for instance. To us it seemed self-evident that the quickest route to universal reform was to muster all the unorganized workers into strong unions. They would then form the backbone of a liberal political movement, something like the Labor Party in England (which then looked a lot more revolutionary than it does today). The unions would pressure Congress into a radical remodeling of the economy, so that unemployment would become impossible. They would abolish racial discrimination in jobs and schools and housing. They would see to it that we kept out of all wars. Under the leadership of the intellectuals, organized labor—with its newfound freedom, leisure, and money—would rejuvenate the arts and theater, toning up the soul and muscle of the whole American society.

With that vision beckoning us, a good many young people worked hard (and at some economic risk) to build the new unions—in my case the Newspaper Guild. We helped pass the Wagner Act, minimum-wage laws, and a long list of other legislation to help the workingman. We won nearly all the battles—but the victory didn't turn out to be quite as glorious as advertised.

Instead of becoming the shock troops of liberalism, the unions (with a very few exceptions) quickly petrified into lumps of reaction and special privilege. I don't need to tell you that some of them—notably in the construction trades—are the stubbornest opponents of integration; that they have no use for intellectuals, no interest in the arts, no cultural aspirations higher than the bowling alley; that none of their aged leaders, except Walter Reuther, has entertained a fresh political idea in 20 years. At their worst, as in the case of the Transport Workers Union of New York, they have turned pirate, using their monopoly power to torture millions of people (most of them workers) into paying ransom.

To mention one more example of what can happen to a radical idea, let me tell you about the farm program of the New Deal. In many ways it was a counterpart of the civil rights movement today: it was intended to rescue one of the most miserable and ill-treated groups in the country—including millions of oppressed Negro sharecroppers in the South. It was designed under the hand of the most "progressive" man in public life, Henry A. Wallace, later the darling of the Communist Party. For a few years I enlisted in that part of the program which was especially designed to wipe out farm tenancy, and to better the living standards (and political power) of the southern Negro. It had the fervid support of all the liberals of that day; and for a while it worked pretty well.

But at the same time another part of Wallace's program was—quite unintentionally—forcing hundreds of thousands of families off the land, Negroes and poor whites alike. Because it gave the biggest subsidies to the big farmers (as it still does) it speeded up the mechanization of agriculture, replaced the sharecropper with a cotton-picking machine, and squeezed the little farms out of existence. The end product you can see now: a river of refugees, streaming into the cities in search of unskilled jobs or relief handouts—and sometimes, as in Watts and Harlem, exploding into a bewildered and pointless fury.

Another result was that American agriculture became the most efficient in history, capable of feeding the hungry of four continents for the last 20 years. But neither outcome was anticipated by Wallace and his corps of bright-eyed reformers; and our main purpose—a better life for the rural underdog—mostly went awry. We failed, not for any of the reasons you assume, but simply because we could not foresee the long-range consequences of our actions.

This is the main reason, I think, why the middle-aged no longer plunge into radical movements with a zeal equal to yours. They are not indifferent, and they haven't sold out. They have just gone astray so often on the road to the New Jerusalem that they want to make very sure of the road map before embarking on another march. They have, in James Perkins' words, "reluctantly lost hope in the short cut and the quick fix." Still believing in progress, they have come to suspect that it can be achieved only by very hard work over a long period of time.

What I am describing, of course, is the prime target of your derision, the tired liberal; remember that he earned his weariness by years of aching labor, and many a disappointment—and that you may not always be immune to such weariness yourself.

This also is the main reason why radical movements ought to be led by you youngsters under 30. You still have the zest for combat, the valor of the unscarred. (In like fashion, boys under 20 make the best combat infantrymen.) Your elders will not follow you into campaigns which they deem hopeless or misdirected. But when they are convinced that you are right—as I am convinced, for example, that you are in your clamor for civil rights and the reform of university education—then they can give you plenty of solid support. You would do well to make some effort to enlist it; for sometimes it may prove decisive.

How can you do so without forsaking your principles?

First of all, you need to figure out a little more clearly where you want to go. So far as I can see, no radical movement since the Luddites has been so incoherent about its aims. Some of your associates, indeed, sound like old-fashioned anarchists—but without the philosophical underpinning which made Kropotkin, say, sound faintly plausible. Demonstrations are dandy; but they are not enough. Shouting "Freedom Now" doesn't help train a single Negro to hold a skilled job, and "Quit Vietnam" does not constitute a foreign policy. If you want to persuade any substantial number of voters to take you seriously, you have to tell them not only what you are against, but what you are for—specifically and in detail; not only what you dislike about the power structure, but what you propose to put in its place.[1]

In addition, you will have to overcome your distaste for organization. However repellent it may seem, in an already overorganized world, you will find that nothing else really works. If you seriously hope to overcome organized power, you can do it only by organizing a power base of your own. You will also find—alas—that it has to have some kind of hierarchy, some degree of discipline, a considerable amount of continuity and finance. "Participatory democracy" is a splendid ideal, but I think you already are discovering that it isn't very effective unless somebody takes the responsibility for drafting a program, seeing to it that decisions get made, and then making sure that they are carried out.

In the process of making these discoveries, you are going to find out some unpleasant facts about the Communists. Each generation has to learn these for itself, so I am not much disturbed that Communists are now infiltrating a number of civil rights and other new left groups; that probably is a necessary form of inoculation. It will show you, better than anything else, that Communists—whether of the orthodox brand, Maoists, Trotskyites, or Castroites—always try to destroy any organization that they cannot dominate; and that in spite of their professions, they have no use for democracy, participatory or otherwise. Before long you will learn that it is never possible to work with Communists unless you are willing to become completely subservient to their directives. And, if the new radicalism has as much vitality as I think it has, it will eventually excrete them and go its own way—but not before you have had some bruising internal struggles, of the kind that nearly wrecked the Newspaper Guild, the CIO, and dozens of other organizations.

At the same time, you will make discoveries of a more pleasant sort about what you call the establishment. You will find that, in fact, there is no such thing as a "power elite." Poor C. Wright Mills was an appealing character, but he never had a clue to the way American society actually works, or how the big decisions are really made. You may find it encouraging when you observe for yourself that the established structure is, in fact, far more porous, loose, and pluralistic than you have been taught by your gurus, and more susceptible to your influence, once you have learned the effective ways to bring it to bear. (One way is to use the apparatus of the traditional political parties; you would be surprised how easy it is to take over a precinct committee. I've done it myself, with no great effort, and so have thousands of others.)

As you begin to feel your way toward the levers that make things happen, your real danger is not that you may be corrupted by power or the lure of a comfortable suburb. It lies instead in that proverb of Disraeli's, to the effect that any man who is not a radical in his twenties lacks a heart, while any man who remains a radical after 30 lacks a head. That, in my view, is the most cynical of pronouncements, and the most damaging.

What this country needs is radicals who will stay that way—regardless of the creeping years, the inevitable blunders, defeats, and combat fatigue. For the rate of change in the world today is unimaginably faster than ever before, and we can hope to survive in reasonably good shape only if we change our human institutions fast enough to keep up. This means constant radical reexamination of everything in sight, from political systems to sex habits—radical in the old sense of going to the roots. How long can anybody hope for a decent life, for example, if we keep on doubling the earth's population every 40 years? Do our old political boundaries make any sense when a single city sprawls across three States? The list of such questions is endless—and you can be sure that the conservatives won't even ask them, much less find the answers.

You and your comrades-in-arms will keep trying, I hope, even when you are long past 30 and a younger generation of radicals is watching you with impatience and pity. For the only corruption you really need to fear is the corruption of despair.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation is beleaguered by peace demonstrations, conflicting opinions about our presence in the Vietnam situation, riots and other forms of disgruntlement within our country, I think it is particularly fitting for each of us to read the following article entitled "Democracy—What It Means to Me." This theme was presented by David Banks, of Phoenix, Ariz., in his prize-winning speech in the Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy Contest."

The article follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Dave A. Banks, Phoenix, Ariz.)

I saw them only once in the Navy hospital, in San Francisco. They call them the double-amputee cases. Men who had lost both arms and legs in the service of their country. Democracy is a way of life, a representative form of government of the people, by the people and for the people. Democracy means different things to different people. To those brave men resting in Arlington National Cemetery, it meant paying the supreme sacrifice to America and to her heritage, to John F. Kennedy, democracy meant establishing new frontiers and then unfortunately not having the privilege of seeing these new frontiers mastered.

To me an American teenager, democracy means my very life, my entire existence. Democracy includes the large metropolitan high school which I attend. It encourages me to attain the very best education possible. It invites me to become involved in democracy.

Democracy also instructs me to build my house of adult citizenship on the pillars of the four fundamental freedoms by speaking my mind clearly and intelligently in the church of my choice; by consulting the news media in order to become a better informed citizen and by meeting with my fellow man in any and every assembly that I choose.

This summer, I visited Europe for a short time, I saw the unbelievable 94 miles of hideous barbed wire, brick and mortar which divides East Berlin from West Berlin. I marveled at the confidence that seemed to flow from our European neighbors toward the gallant lady who guards the entrance to Manhattan Island. I remembered that no man is an island, therefore, the wolves of communism and tyranny must be kept forever from the doors of democracy. I realized that democracy requires us to reach out our hands to the people of other nations who are weaker and less fortunate than we are, and if necessary to lay down our lives in a small country called Vietnam.

---

[1] This, I assume, is what was in the mind of James Farmer, one of the most militant of Negro leaders, when he resigned a few months ago as national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, to head up a new, nationwide program for teaching literacy and working skills.

What does democracy mean to me and to 190 million other American citizens? It means that our responsibilities of citizenship must equal our rights as American citizens. It means that my peers and I must wage our personal wars against ignorance and juvenile delinquency. The responsibilities of adult citizenship will not be easy, but neither did our forefathers face an easy task in the conquering and subduing of a wilderness and in the building of a revolutionary form of government called a democracy. I shall visit again the veterans in the naval hospital and I'll say to them: Gentlemen, we salute you. Because of you and your unselfish service, 40 million young Americans have grown up in a land that is free.

To me democracy means my very life, my entire existence. It means both my rights and my responsibilities of citizenship. It means that I have pledged my very all toward maturing into the finest adult citizen of which I am capable. This is what democracy means to me. What does it mean to you?

He "Weds" Americans to Latin Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have been sad to learn that my good friend, Mr. James Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance for Progress, has been confined over recent days to Georgetown Hospital where he is recovering from surgery.

I know all of my colleagues who know Mr. Boren so well and admire him and the work which he does join with me in wishing him a speedy and full recovery.

The work which Mr. Boren does through the important partners of the alliance program continues to draw the attention and favorable comment of the Nation's press.

Earlier this month, in the February 6 edition of the Miami Herald, an article by Mr. Lee Winfrey, entitled "He 'Weds' Americans to Latin Development" outlines once again the important work being done by the partners programs and the programs' honorable and worthy goals.

A year or so ago, I had an opportunity to discuss the partners of the alliance program with Mr. Boren. During our discussions he stressed that the work of AID and its official program is to assist countries in the development of their own institutions. The partners program, however, works at the grass roots level, focusing on the human element while the institution-building job is being done.

I was so impressed by the program, its goals and Mr. Boren's enthusiasm for it that I undertook to establish a Tennessee Partners of the Alliance which, I am pleased to report, is operating at an accelerated pace under the very capable direction of Dr. Carl Thomas, assistant dean of the Graduate School, University of Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert Mr. Winfrey's article in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 6, 1966]

HE "WEDS" AMERICANS TO LATIN DEVELOPMENT

(By Lee Winfrey)

WASHINGTON.—Jim Boren, who took his last vacation in 1958, sat up in a hospital bed and said, "I've got to get back to work next week."

Boren is a round-faced, 40-year-old Texan who looks a little like comedian Jonathan Winters. Since 1964 he has traveled more than 150,000 miles—the equivalent of 6 times around the earth—as Director of the Partners of the Alliance.

In his travels, which keep him on the road 3 days out of every 5, Boren has hooked up 29 States of the United States with an equal number of countries and States in Latin America. Marks of his largely unpublicized work stretch from Mexico to Uruguay.

Partners of the Alliance consists of 11 people in an office of the Agency for International Development, the foreign aid arm of the U.S. Government. Boren doesn't give away money, however.

"I'm a catalyst," he says. "My job is to travel and get other people interested. This is not a giveaway program."

Specifically, the Partners, an arm of the Alliance for Progress, encourages and organizes State and statewide groups to go into partnership with a country or State in Latin America.

Boren, for example, has arranged partnerships between Alabama and Guatemala, between Delaware and Panama, between Minnesota and Uruguay.

He has married Illinois to the Brazilian industrial State of São Paulo, Utah to the mining areas of the Bolivian mountains, California to four seacoast States in Mexico.

It is mostly an on-the-road job: 80 percent of the partners' annual $200,000 budget goes for travel. Although the partners will be 2 years old next month, there has been little time for stocktaking: only a kidney ailment last week forced Boren to stop long enough to add up what he and his staff have done.

Boren figures they have stirred up $3.5 million worth of projects for Latin America in the past 2 years. Partners projects have reached into all but 5 of the 19 principal republics in Latin America.

Only Argentina, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Paraguay have been untouched by the partners program—and Boren hopes to get something rolling in the Dominican Republic and Paraguay this year.

Boren winces at any idea that this is an "adoption" program. "The term 'adoption' is patronizing," he says. "South America has plenty to offer in exchange. This isn't charity."

Thus the partners brought 12 educators from Costa Rica to Oregon to spend 3½ months improving the teaching of Spanish in 12 Oregon school districts. A $100,000 collection of Venezuelan art is in Tennessee on a 9-month tour of galleries in seven cities.

In exchange, 30 young Colombian women are studying for a semester at 6 Florida junior colleges, improving their secretarial skills and their English. Lights burn in 15 rural schools in Peru because of 15 electric generators sent from Texas.

Boren's job is to go out into the United States and help organize State partners committees. Sometimes a Congressman helps: Representative RICHARD FULTON of Nashville called the organizational meeting in Tennessee. Sometimes it is an organization, such as the Minnesota Jaycees who went into partnership with Uruguay.

Once a State committee is organized, Boren's office pays the expenses for them to go to the Latin American country or state and set up a list of projects.

"These aren't junkets," he says emphatically. "From Kentucky, we got the State treasurer, the head of the Farm Bureau and the vice president of the State chamber of commerce. To get to their area in Ecuador, they traveled 180 miles by dugout canoe.

"They eat the dust and wade in the backwaters," says Boren, who is a great believer in the grassroots approach. "You don't learn about Peru by just visiting Lima and sitting in the hotel drinking whisky sours."

When the U.S. partners come home with their project list, Boren stays put in Washington and lets them carry the ball from there. No Government aid money goes into paying for the projects the State committees decide to handle.

So far, the partners program has escaped serious criticism on Capitol Hill, where congressmen often look askance at aid projects. Perhaps because he spent 4 years on the Hill as administrative assistant to Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, Boren's congressional connections are good.

Boren got the idea for the partners while serving 2 years as deputy director of the U.S. foreign aid mission in Peru. He has been the director of the program since it began in March 1964.

He plans to slow down a little in 1966, though. This year, he has promised his wife, is time for the vacation they haven't had for 8 years.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	2500 Virginia Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 113 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit. Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming

Appendix

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 300,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the 5 scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. First prize is a $5,000 scholarship, second prize is $3,500, third prize is $2,500, fourth prize is $1,500, and the fifth prize is $1,000. The contest theme was "Democracy: What It Means to Me."

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

It is my pleasure to present to my colleagues the winning speech from my own State delivered by William Allen Pusey of Washington, D.C. Under unanimous consent I insert these thoughtful remarks in the RECORD.

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By William Allen Pusey)

During the past few years, we have witnessed an augmenting flux of demonstrations, picket lines, and protest marches to rival the massive demonstrations of the depression years of the 1930's. Though the immediate effect of these demonstrations on the general public is to publicize the specific views of the marchers, a consequential side effect is the intensive reexamination of our democratic beliefs. When we read about this endless array of people protesting various and sundry gievances, many of which are repugnant to our thinking, we have a tendency to make rash condemnations of any society which would nurture such "arrogance." But on deeper examination, one can find those very elements that are the sources of America's greatness. The very virtues which are extolled in our history books today, have merely transmigrated over a space of 200 years into the hands of today's generation. Peaceful protest is merely part of the American way.

Before the American Revolution, in the days when the colonists were primarily loyal English subjects and only scondarily American, there was imposed upon them by the king, a series of laws, the nature of which, was diametrically opposed to even their most basic ideas of human liberty. Taxes and restrictions were placed upon them to which they were adamantly opposed. But what were their methods of recourse? How did they air their grievances? By demonstrations, by marches to the local centers of government, by petitions, even to King George himself, by picketing, by burning British stamps, by boycotting British goods, and by dumping the tea into the Boston Harbor. Today we would classify these actions under the headings of "passive resistance" and "civil disobedience"; terms not always used in the highest regard to their practitioners.

But lauding the protest march is not the primary purpose of this speech. Protest is only one of the facets of democracy which endears that form of government to me. It is the symbol of free thought, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press all incorporated into one demonstrative gestude. No matter how repulsive the subject of a protest demonstration may be to me, I am always thankful that I would be given the same freedom if I were so moved.

Democracy affords this freedom for everyone on an equal basis. An indigent worker has the same right to speak out as a rich merchant. Practically anything is permitted in the realm of human rights, provided it does not infringe upon the rights of others; Fascists, Communists, all have the right to expound their philosophies, short of the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government. Though sometimes abused, democracy provides for equal protection under the law, regardless of ethnic, racial, or economic factors. Democracy places its accent on protection of the individual.

Though democracy affords all these protections of the individual, the individual has to realize certain obligations before this type of society can work for him. A citizen must be aware of his rights and be prepared to use them in the most effective manner possible; for only by effective use can our rights retain their importance and value. In totalitarian or dictatorial governments, the individual is relieved of the responsibility of thinking. But in yielding our responsibility of thnkng, we also give up our right to direct our thoughts and consequently our lives. All too many have paid this price through ignorance. I, for one, am not going to be the next.

The chief responsibility of our generation today is to learn the workings of our democracy, and to use them in a manner reverent to the blood that has been shed defending them. We can learn about democracy through education, but only one's own volition can transmute that knowledge into meaningful action. Don't let yourself be lulled into the semiconscious reasoning of "Let the other fella take care of democracy," because, to paraphrase a familiar advertisement, the rights you lose may be your own.

It was Voltaire who once wrote a friend, "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." In this declaration is that spirit which makes democracy great.

The War in Vietnam—Memorial by the Sheridan, Wyo., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, seldom a day passes without a spate of charges and countercharges pertaining to the degree of support which the American people are giving to our commitment in Vietnam. I for one am willing to believe the published indexes of support which would indicate that the great majority of our people are categorically behind the administration in this endeavor although there is much disagreement over the degree to which we should commit ourselves and the definition of victory.

I received this morning a brief and eloquent statement in the form of a memorial from Sheridan High School at Sheridan, Wyo. Teenage Republicans, students, and teachers at the high school are signatories to the statement which is "memorializing the efforts of American fighting men in South Vietnam and expressing appreciation for their sacrifices."

In a town which boasts a population of roughly 17,000, the 309 signatories to this memorial constitute a sizable and representative cross section by age, political philosophy, partisan politics, and income.

Sketched on the memorial's first page is the silhouette of an American soldier in battle dress with his rifle at the ready. I should point out that although the memorial refers to the "undesigned students" of Sheridan High School, it is signed by both students and teachers.

I ask, Mr. President, that the memorial and the names of its 309 signatories be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial and the list of names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MEMORIAL MEMORIALIZING THE EFFORTS OF AMERICAN FIGHTING MEN IN SOUTH VIETNAM, AND EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR THEIR SACRIFICES

Whereas there is currently in progress an attack upon the legally established Government of South Vietnam; and

Whereas at the request of that Government American troops are engaged in combat in that country; and

Whereas that combat has caused hardship, isolation, and death to many American fighting men; and

Whereas there are those individuals who display their disregard for our laws and our sacrifices by burning draft cards and other acts; and

Whereas, there are certain insidious movements which are engaged in a concerted effort to destroy the effect of the sacrifices of our fighting men, and deny to the citizens of that nation those rights, privileges, and liberties which are fundamental to freemen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the undersigned students of Sheridan High School, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to express our support and appreciation to our fighting men in South Vietnam; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be promptly transmitted to U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON.

Jerry Bahnsock, Norma Lynn, Mark J. Boyd, Ray Frigo, Deanna George, Dorothy Mack, Ed Reeviemer, Clayton

Brook, Wayne Finney, Sue Eckroth, Judi Hadeel, Vicki Ilsley, Janice Allen, Kathy Arney, Ron Bury.

Marshall Jay Brown, Robert Wallace, Donna Robbins, Rosalie Kelly, Lynne Freidenbloom, Viola Waslager, J. B. Price, John Garsany, Carol Barker, Bob Campbell, Lora Collier, Knute Johnson, Bud Benth.

Mrs. Irma Christy, Ken Gleason, Warren Armstrong, Mark York, Floyd Reisch, Jr., Steve Mail, Tom Arrison, James Bell, David Allen, Kathy Rice, John Fowler, Ky Slickers, Danny Sears, Pam Panetta, Delores Ellenwood, Choni Mikkelson, Bertha Trijilla.

Debra Stark, Mary Bennick, Kenneth Wylie, Bob Pooley, Jeri Rasmussen, Marlene Bitter, Jim H. Ralston, Tom Byrd, Tom Atkinson, La Jenda Smith, Judy Redies, Ronald Bourke, John Phillips, Jim Goodman, Gary Doera, Dennis Green.

Bill Fitzpatrick, Judy Fisher, Ellen Foster, Sandy Miller, Steve Finlayson, Mike Cherni, Bob Gorzalka, Linda Kosine, Mack Gutz, Wayne Hill, Jeanine Matnerd, Bob Kennedy, Sue Holtry, Brooke Holstedt, Larry Henson, Mike Patterson, Jack Sams, Jim N. Fieldson, Ron Scherry, Larry Wilson II, Mike Popovich.

Forrest Bourquin, Larry McNair, James Arrens, Jack Livingston, Mary Beth Ewan, Zena Kirtley, Sharon Davidson, Rollie Coster, Steigelman Becky, Gail Barker, Pete Martin, Paula Ross, Peggy Edwards, John Lunbeck, Jerry O'Connor, David Greenwald, Lee Gibson, Connie Robinson, Larry Lewis, Dennis Nelson.

Diane Nicholson, Rick Harker, Teri Lannan, Cheryl Brantz, Zoe Ann Collier, Linda Yager, Christine Gillis, Nancy Prince, Paul Ferries, Bette Dexter, Vicki Oatts, Pam Howeth, Vicky Harper, David Hickman, Suzette Hinz, Alan Dunn, Judy MacLean, Linda Githens.

Albert Torio, Paul Haretta, Janine Murphy, Helen Graham, Roberta Peterson, Bill Garson, Barbara Long, James Baker, Margaret Mitchell, Janice O'Rourke, Sande Metzger, Rick Kabedus, Donna Ives, Camille Urbatchka, David Wylie, Charles Palmer, Ted Killison, Randy Hout, Chuck Gazdih, Bill Warner.

Patty Ash, Pete Husman, Jim George, Pat Hedderman, Dale Buckley, Suzanne Scott, Margaret Gorzalka, Kenny Sare, Roy Schwartz, Royce Sewe, Jim Jelle, Patrick Barnhart, Jackie Benson, Mike Anderson, Penney Logan, Bob Bradley, Mike McMillan, Becky Southern, Sandy Higgins, John Crist.

Robert Severance, Pat Wilson, Dolene Fisher, Bob Catron, Linda Pedula, Riva Gillette, Ann Sanchez, Mary Carroll, Robin Kinskey, Larry Kukuchka, Martin Schwartz, Rusty Rexroat, David Mueller, Clyde Smits, David Williams, Marla Walker, Geni Barker, Cathy Barbour, Ranelle Johnson, Sharm Adler, Gordon Freese, Connie Rawling.

Sandi Belmont, Roy Jackson, Gloria Kelsey, Mark Ferries, Linda Cichonski, Andy Morris, Mary Ann Chaman, Curtis Burrows, Raimon Pearson, Charles Patton, Nancy Villhauer, Pat Marshall, Bill Patterson, Marie Linker, Shelmer Owings, Rick Scherry, Twyla King.

Charlene Hartmann, Priscilla Clawson, Leta Beansett, John Zingg, Janice Germann, Mary Lee Demple, Pam Heinbaugh, Martha Hoveland, Henry Coffin, Laura Chario, Jerry Beffert, Chris Swenson, Loretta Wilson, Dan Diefendefer, Randy Barritt, Sam Trujillo, Bruce Puett, Fred Wamhoff, Jim Jackson, Larry Hoyt.

Don Dellit, Kenny Thayer, John Palato, Bill Harnish, Steve Roe, Virginia Stroup, Walt Drake, Coreen Waddell, Karin Browning, Pat Varcall, Pam Boyd, Stan White, Tom Lannan, Jay Pilcher, Albert Torio, Susan Ringley, Bob Green, Gerald M. Lund, Charla Middleswart, John Kolos. Dick Dayle, Steve Scott, Edith Janney, Lorelei Morris, Lonaine Clark, Nancy Gurrer, Beth Scherry, Nancy Silla, Cecylia Mintock, Kathleen Kraft, Sherry Daniels, Bruce Houston, Jerry Elkins, Curt Fox, Jim Eckroth, Gary Carson, Penny Wondra, Rich Rossi, Chuck Morgan, David Bradlery, Jeff Hoffman.

Tim Wicherson, Darc Bazold, Barbara Barnhart, Chris Wiberg, Pat Herderich, Carol Hanson, Janice Kristy, Cathi Edwards, Tom Lentz, Brian Garriffa, Jennifer Davis, Dan Johnston, Dick Tate, Kim Troutt, Gary Foss, Larry Carbone, Andy Knudson, Mary Ella Bard, Gloria Warner.

John Wantulok, Judy Jones, Clinton Fay, Karen Bodine, Marsha Bachlet, Dick Mefford, Randy Storey, Loretta Rotellini, David Eisenman, Carol Norcross, Gloria Goodmay, Jim Aksamit, Roxanna Vigil, Jim Drake, Don Balleк, Margaret Giller, Bob Martini, Mike Gozalka, Eldon Shaffer.

Susan Powers, Peggy Willoughby, Nancy Ruff, Lauri Haptonstall, Vicki Waddell, Judy Penson, Kathy Harper, Bobby Barnhart, Judy Cook, Mary Sue Redle, Patty Birchby, Dave Maret, Manuel Quintana.

Nkrumah's Maneuver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. P. K. Cobbinah-Essem, a journalist from Ghana who has been in the United States since last fall under a World Press Institute program, has expressed his candid opinion on the current problems in Ghana in the Peoria Journal Star, March 4, 1966. He is now working and studying at the Journal Star until the end of April. The article referred to follows:

MANEUVER BY OUSTED NKRUMAH CLEAR TO THINKING GHANAIANS

(By P. K. Cobbinah-Essem)

Sometime during his infamous regime, Kwame Nkrumah, "his messianic dedication, leader of African redemption, originator of the African political philosophy" and a host of other gobbledegook, ousted President of Ghana, told friends, "If I had the support of a large and strong army like the U.S. Army, I would be a great man in the history of the world. I would be powerful. Look at what brains I have—and only a puny army to do my bidding."

Ironically, it is the puny army which has deprived him of his ungodly throne—deprived him of his position and power. This was the Kwame Nkrumah many people did not know and it appears, he still is the same—ambitious beyond the comprehension of man, ruthless and self-conceited.

Kwame Nkrumah has always had little regard for the intelligence of his fellow Africans and he seems still to have the same notion about Africans which characterized his notorious rule in Ghana.

Many people, for instance, do not understand why he did not marry a Ghanaian but chose to go to Egypt for a wife; why he chose to marry a woman he had never met until the day they were joined in marriage, in preference to the many Ghanaian women with whom he had associated politically and otherwise. (Incidentally, one wonders what type of woman would jump into such a union with a man she knew nothing about.)

The fact is that Nkrumah's intentions were thwarted by the publicity given in British newspapers. His intention was to marry his secretary, a British woman. The premature publicity burst his dream. His marriage to Fathia Nkrumah was purely incidental, was a comedown and a compromise between marriage to a white-skinned woman and an African. He married an African but she was white skinned. His contempt for the black skin was too much for him to associate with a woman of that color.

Be that as it may, Nkrumah is showing the contempt with which he has always regarded black man's intelligence. He has always shown by the way he treated other African leaders how little he regarded their intelligence. He is saying by his recent move that he believes the Revolutionary Council in Ghana to be made up of people so unintelligent as not to realize the significance of his reported takeover of the Guinea Government nor hope to match effectively his intelligence by taking appropriate political measures to stymie his comeback.

The man to be pitied most is Sekou Toure if what is reported may be believed. Is it not utter folly for a man with Sekou Toure's intelligence to accede to Nkrumah's maneuver and step down as President of Guinea? It is not pathetic to think that Nkrumah's desperation and Sekou Toure's selfish hopes have shut their eyes to the naivete of their strategy—that they should believe the leaders in Addis Ababa realize they mean merely to get the delegation of the Revolutionary Council of Ghana unseated from the conference table in their bid to return Nkrumah to power? Even the most simple person sees through this strategy and knows it is as unworkable as it is ludicrous.

But as I said in an earlier writeup, Nkrumah—and Sekou Toure—share the prerogative of politicians around the world. They can hardly see beyond their noses and the desperation of Nkrumah's situation has increased their naivete to untold proportions.

But let me explain the strategy and what it involves and why it will not work. It is based on the assumption that leaders of the revolution in Ghana as well as other African leaders are simpletons.

Both Nkrumah and Sekou Toure expect leaders of the revolution and the delegates to the conference in Addis Ababa to accept the Guinea delegation as representing both Guinea and Ghana. That will mean then that they all recognize Nkrumah as still the leader of Ghana.

Nkrumah can then return to Ghana and start crushing the leaders of the revolution as he threatened in Tokyo. But this is rather daft of him when the revolutionary leaders threaten to put him on trial and actually dare him to return to Ghana. It is, as a matter of fact, sneaky of someone who threatened in strong terms to "crush the leaders of the coup d'etat" which deposed him.

Nkrumah had to resort to this because, as I stated in the opening and have been emphasizing all along, he has continually underrated the intelligence of his fellow Africans and believes his strategy and his foibles will not be seen through. That is what make Nkrumah's—and Sekou Toure's—position so pathetic. It is the natural attitude of a man without a country to indulge in sneaky tricks.

The crux of the matter is that Nkrumah condemned Prof. Kofi Abrefa Busia, one of the most brilliant Africans, Komla Agbeli Gbedemah, our most able politician, and other Ghanaians to the same fate he faces now and does not like the idea in the least. He is, in effect, tasting his own medicine and feels the tang of the bitterness of it.

What does Sekou Toure hope to achieve by acceding to such a preposterous idea and step down as President? This is obvious if the situation of Africa is known.

Sekou Toure, like many other African leaders, is not secure in his own country. It is a fact which is well-guarded. His fear is to avoid the fate which befalls all ambitious people—overthrow; the fate which Nkrumah has suffered.

Besides, Sekou Toure, Modibo Keita of Mali as well as many other African leaders, are not very sure of their footing in the world politics without Nkrumah's guidance. (This is the reason for Nkrumah having little regard for their intelligence.) They follow in Nkrumah's footsteps like faithful dogs. Without Nkrumah to dictate and direct their affairs, they are like toddlers who do not understand the world about them and are therefore unable to decide things for themselves.

Sekou Toure wants Nkrumah in power—in Ghana, that is—to continue following him like the faithful dog he is. It is at once selfish and uninspired.

If Sekou Toure fails—as he is bound to—in this strategy, what does he expect to do? Nothing much as far as can be seen. While desperation may force both Nkrumah and Sekou Toure to some rash action, war with Ghana has to be ruled out. Apart from the inferior equipment and ill-training of the Guinean Army as compared to that of Ghana, an army from Guinea will have to cross the Ivory Coast which divides the two countries. This is something too farfetched to be believed since Nkrumah and Houphouet-Boigny, President of the Ivory Coast, never saw eye to eye. Besides, war is the last thing any African leader thinks about.

What may not be ruled out is harrassment by Sekou Toure, Modibo Keita and Nyerere of Tanzania of the Ghana Revolutionary Council on international platforms. What the council needs therefore, is the quick recognition due it from governments of the rest of the world—especially Western countries. This will stymie the attempts not only of Eastern countries but also of eastern-inspired and eastern-leaning countries which might want to involve themselves in the affairs of Ghana.

We are rid of a dictator and tyrant. We are rid of a regime which took us from one form of oppression to another more oppressive, more cruel and more exploiting. We are rid of a regime which was filled with liars and self-aggrandizing neosocialists.

The wish of every Ghanaian in these moments is to see a new government comprised of young, intelligent, honest and sincere people who will bring to our people the happiness and prosperity to which they are rightly entitled.

Our wish is to see a government devoted to removing the cancer of ignorance, disease and poverty which has riddled Africa for centuries and introduce the economic, political, and social possibilities which will make it possible for us to forge ahead in the world. And, by Jove, we are going to get it—in spite of the designs by other African leaders who seek to further their political ambitions at the expense of Ghana and Ghanians.

The Insight of Carl T. Rowan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, Carl T. Rowan is one of the newer nationally syndicated columnists now commenting on national and international affairs. In my judgment, he has demonstrated over the past few months that he has sound judgments and superior writing skills. His exposition of difficult problems is always lucid, calm, and thoughtful.

In my opinion, Mr. Rowan brings some special qualifications to the commentator's art because, unlike a number of his contemporaries, Carl Rowan has rendered distinguished service to the Federal Government—as an ambassador and later as director of the U.S. Information Agency.

In short, having seen government both as a journalist and as a public official, Mr. Rowan seems to be happily free from the "beast theory" of the conduct of public affairs and in my opinion writes about men and events in terms of actuality, rather than some vague or imagined conspiracy.

I find his columns refreshing and always interesting. I call attention to his column of March 4, 1966, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, and ask unanimous consent that the column by Carl T. Rowan be inserted in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE REASON HUMPHREY EXPLODED

(By Carl T. Rowan)

To understand the vigor of Vice President Hubert Humphrey's disagreement with Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Democrat, of New York, on Vietnam, you have to understand the nuances of what Humphrey was doing on his Far East trip.

Humphrey exploded when he heard of Kennedy's proposal that the United States promised the Vietcong a role in a future government of South Vietnam because he felt Kennedy had undercut the major achievement of his journey.

During the summit meeting in Honolulu, President Johnson had become concerned about the delicate political situation in Saigon. He had been impressed by arguments that the talk of negotiations had freightened some powerful forces in the south. There was some danger that the government of Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky would collapse if it were not made clear that there was no scheme afoot to abandon South Vietnam to the Reds.

So Humphrey's first job was simple—to convince leading South Vietnamese that the United States was not going to surrender the south to Hanoi—but that neither United States nor world opinion would permit Saigon to take the truculent attitude of opposing negotiations.

Humphrey left Saigon feeling that he had calmed South Vietnamese anxieties and convinced Saigon of the desirability of a peaceful settlement. Then, in New Zealand, he saw Kennedy's proposal for a coalition.

"Oh, no," he reportedly exclaimed, "this will frighten the South Vietnamese to death."

Without waiting for instructions from Washington, he denounced the idea of putting Communists in the Saigon government as like "putting a fox in a chicken coop."

Back home, the Vice President has told intimates that he wants to avoid a fight with Kennedy "but I can't remain silent in the face of talk that is so stupid. No labor organizer in his right mind would announce before negotiations what he was prepared to give up. It's like saying publicly that you don't really want a strong organization to represent the workers but you'd be satisfied with just a little company union."

Johnson also is eager to avoid an open fight with Kennedy, which is why so many people spent so many hours trying to gloss over Kennedy's initial break with the administration.

But in private, top members of the Johnson team express their irritation with Kennedy by asserting that he is "only after the headlines."

They point out that Kennedy had access to the most sensitive intelligence information and knows that the Vietcong is simply the instrument through which Hanoi set out to conquer South Vietnam.

Administration spokesmen show particular irritation when they ask, "Why didn't Kennedy propose the coalition 3 years ago when he could have shared the responsibility for it?"

As for other aspects of the Vice President's travels, I reported on January 7, after his early trip, that he had arranged for greater Asian involvement in the war—if the peace offensive failed. The Koreans have just announced that 25,000 more troops are going to Vietnam. And Philippines President Ferdinan E. Marcos, who a year ago opposed involvement of even a Filipino engineers unit in Vietnam, has disclosed that Humphrey convinced him he ought to send Filipino troops to South Vietnam.

One of the most important and unpublicized achievements of the Vice President's recent mission was to arrange to keep channels of communications open to Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow.

The war plans are being stepped up but the Vice President arranged that—through the Pakistanis to the Chinese, through the Indians to the Russians, and through some delicate channels directly to Hanoi—the olive branch is to be constantly dangled.

If a peaceful settlement of this wretched war is achieved, it very likely will be because of communications through these channels—but surely not because of any widely debated proposals and gestures on the American political scene.

Changing Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when nationwide, in fact worldwide, attention is focused upon assisting hungry nations, the outstanding editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star just yesterday, March 6, is of particular interest. The editorial by Rod Turnbull, the Star's agricultural editor, discusses world food needs and the possible effect on domestic farm plans. As he states, "Once a commitment has been made, it will be difficult to turn back."

Mr. Turnbull is widely recognized for his knowledge of agriculture and, without question, one of the Nation's top agricultural editors. I believe everyone will agree his editorial is an exceptional one.

FARM SURPLUSES FALL AS A VICTIM OF DEMAND

Recently an executive of a wheatgrower organization wrote to his members: "If someone had said to me 2 years ago 'your excess supplies of wheat would be gone by July 1, 1966,' I would have said, 'listen Bud, you have your head in the clouds.'"

This comment illustrates the national surprise over the apparent disappearance of the U.S. farm surplus problem. No doubt it has come as a surprise—if in fact we can say that the surpluses are gone.

Actually, it does seem as if all at once authorities are speaking of our farm surpluses as something in the past and are referring to stockpiles as reserves, rather than problems. Certainly this wasn't the attitude even less than a year ago, when the 1965 farm act was passed by Congress. The new law provided for still greater reductions in acreages to control production.

Now, in contrast, the Department of Agriculture is ever so slightly loosening some of the reins on production in 1966. Also there are people who propose that this country had better hurriedly return to using its idle acres before we run into serious worldwide food problems.

What happened? How could the change come so fast as between surplus piles and reserves, or even shortages?

It is a long story, difficult to explain in all its details. But in the main, the big change that has come faster than most people anticipated has been in demand, both domestic aid worldwide, and in both the dollar markets and our giveaway programs.

A second major shift has been in attitude, perhaps induced by the rapidly expanding demand. Surpluses are not measured entirely in pounds or bushels alone, we are learning. Another factor is whether the public or the market regards a certain quantity as a surplus or a reserve.

For any valid assessment of the current situation as to surpluses versus reserves, it should be kept in mind that this country has substantial stocks of grains on hand. Estimates are being made that as of July 1 this year the wheat surplus may be down to 600 million bushels. This would be the carryover of wheat on hand as the new harvest began. Incidentally, that 600-million figure is one often proposed as the amount this country always should have in reserve—it is approximately what we use annually at home for food and seed.

The United States never had a carryover of 600 million bushels until 1940. This amount was depleted during the war years and the total did not get back up to the 600-million figure again until 1953. We will also have more than a billion bushels in corn on hand next October 1. Again, the carryover of this feed grain never in all history reached a billion bushels until 1955. So we're not yet scratching the bottom of the barrel when it comes to supplies of these grains. That circumstance, indeed, is one thing that has the administration worried. It fears that demand for increasing production will break the dike again and bring about a return of surplus piles before an absolute outlet for all can be assured.

The surplus piles, which have impressed themselves so much upon the Nation, grew in the late 1950's. The decisive jump in carryover wheat stocks came after the huge 1958 crop of 1,457,435,000 bushels. Incidentally, the average per-acre yield that year was 27.5 bushels, a figure never achieved before nor since. The wheat carryover continued to grow until 1961 when it peaked at 1,411 million bushels. As mentioned, predictions are that it will be at around 600 million bushels this July 1.

The feed grain surplus likewise grew in the 1950's, reaching a top of 4,700,000 tons in 1961. It is expected to be at around 6 million tons this next October. Strangely enough, while the feed grain yields were large in the 1950's, they have been even larger in the 1960's, with alltime records set in 1965 on corn, oats, barley, and grain sorghums.

The surpluses accumulated, obviously, because production was greater than consumption. In turn, the surplus piles are growing smaller now for the simple reason that larger amounts of the grain are being consumed.

The reasons why are impressive and their development, which seems to have caught so many by surprise, is interesting.

The one word that describes the situation still is demand.

Demand has skyrocketed because of, among other things:

Prosperity in the advanced nations of the world.

Hugh needs in the less-advanced nations of the world.

The rapidly increasing world population.

On the opposite side of demand significant developments have included short wheat crops in both Australia and Argentina, traditionally important exporting nations.

Not to be overlooked is the shock that came to the world when the Soviet Union, a former exporter, had to buy wheat in huge quantities.

Balanced against all the indications of increasing demand is the realization that the only major grain surplus-producing area in the world is North America—the United States and Canada.

All these factors together have changed attitudes on just what constitutes a surplus. In other words, a given quantity of wheat or corn dosen't appear so big or market-frightening as it did some years ago.

Now as for these forces that are skyrocketing demand. It will be observed that many are interrelated.

First, world prosperity, which affects the United States and most of the other advanced nations.

In this country the utilization of feed grains, 85 percent of which go for livestock and poultry feed, has been rising markedly since the middle 1950's. Both population growth and prosperity have contributed to such expanding use. In the marketing year 1954–55, the United States required 89,700,000 tons of feed grains to feed its livestock. This year an estimate is that the corresponding utilization will be 119,100,000 tons.

But even more dramatic—and greater in percentage—has been the increase of feed grain exports. They, too, began to rise in the middle 1950's. The total in 1954–55 was 5½ million tons. Without an exception there has been an increase each year since then. And in 1966 the total should reach an amazing 25 million tons.

The major feed grain is corn. A 3-billion-bushel crop used to be considered a big one for the United States. All through the 1950's, when surpluses were building up, the corn crops were running above 3 billion and approaching 4 billion. Our first 4-billion-bushel crop was harvested in 1963.

Last year, an alltime record was set with 4,171 million bushels. The significant point is that we apparently are going to use it all this year, domestically and in exports. The carryover next October 1 will be approximately 1,200 million bushels, or just about the same as it was on the same date a year ago. A record crop, but no increase in surplus.

More poultry, more livestock in Europe and Japan spell big business for U.S. feed grain exporters. People in the countries are, as we say in the United States, eating higher on the hog. The first part of this year, for example, combined exports of grain sorghums and corn to Italy were up 70 percent over the same period in the previous year. Japan is the No. 1 importer of U.S. corn and and soybeans and its take of these two grains was up 60 percent the first quarter of this year. Spain, West Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium all are taking more and more. American salesmanship has something to do with this boost in trade, but general prosperity can't be discounted

Hardly anybody back in 1955 would have predicted totals in exports that are being experienced today. There were authorities at that time, however, who were contending that the way to get rid of surpluses was to get out and sell them.

The feed grain exports go mostly for dollars. It is a different story with wheat. But the effect on the surplus pile is the same. The United States has been sending more and more wheat abroad since 1955. Here poverty and famine in the world are dominating factors. In the current year the total may reach 900 million bushels. A major part of this will be under the Public Law 480 program, even though our dollar exports have been increasing also. Domestic consumption, plus exports, will require some 200 million more bushels of wheat than the United States raised last year.

It will be observed from the foregoing data that the utilization of grain produced in this country took an appreciable upward trend in the middle 1950's which not only has continued to this day, but appears to be accelerating. At the same time we have had a farm program which has taken some 50 to 60 million acres out of production. This decrease must have had some effect on production, even when record yields were being experienced. Farmers in the Corn Belt, it has been estimated, have almost doubled their use of fertilizer since 1960.

To whatever extent the farm program has checked total yields, it has helped, along with greater utilization, to reduce the surplus piles.

Thus we find ourselves today with surpluses in smaller quantities than was the case a few years ago. Plus the fact that because of current and pending demand, a given quantity of surplus doesn't frighten us as much as before. With this new situation in regard to surpluses, we face new decisions on how to proceed in agriculture.

One major decision must be on how much we intend to commit to the hungry nations of the world. The result will have its effect on all farm plans. Once a commitment has been made, it will be difficult to turn back.

After deciding what we intend to supply to the hungry nations then, since we have a Government-planned agriculture, it will be up to the administration to determine what the production acreage should be and what reserves should be maintained. The assumption now is that acreage controls will be relaxed to some extent, with possibly all restrictions on plantings removed by 1975.

The weather remains an unknown factor. We have experienced in recent years perhaps the best crop-growing period in recent history. Suppose there is a trend the other way?

It will take a master hand on the controls lever to determine just what acreage is needed in the various crops which have been under Government guidance but which now appear to be graduating from the trouble category.

We have always been convinced that the market—what people will pay—is the best guide to production. But a new element is added in our programs to give food to needy nations.

When the market does guide production, farmers are inclined to overproduce when prices are high and follow the opposite practice when prices fall. Currently prices are relatively good. We would suggest that farmers would be wise not to press their luck too far in boosting production too fast. But again, who actually knows what demand will be or how we will be favored by the weather? The immediate future does appear rosy for agriculture. But the millennium is not yet guaranteed.

A Miracle of Fortitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped has named Robert J. Smithdas of Brooklyn, N.Y., as Handicapped American for 1965.

Mr. Smithdas is both deaf and blind. Yet, he is gainfully employed, maintains his own household where he cooks and performs home chores, holds an advanced college degree, is a published poet, and excels in athletics. He is a living example of the ability of a handicapped person to surmount his disabilities—his is a story of ability, not disability.

I ask unanimous consent that the article on Mr. Smithdas from the February issue of Performance, monthly publication of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAF-BLIND MAN NAMED HANDICAPPED AMERICAN OF THE YEAR

Robert J. Smithdas' personal triumph over deafness and blindness, and his work to prepare others similarly disabled for lives of usefulness, has resulted in his selection as Handicapped American for 1965 by the President's Committee.

Smithdas, 40, of Brooklyn, N.Y., contracted meningitis when he was 5 years old and the disease left him both deaf and blind.

As director of the deaf-blind program of the Industrial Home for the Blind in Brooklyn, Smithdas counsels as many as 60 men and women in many areas ranging from employment to social adjustment. He also lectures extensively on problems relating to the deaf-blind in the New York area and other cities and he travels independently. His message reaches a total of 250,000 persons annually.

In addition, Smithdas is a consultant to the Anne Sullivan Macy Service for the Deaf-Blind, a regional program serving adults so handicapped in a 15-State area.

Smithdas received his high school education at the Perkins School for the Blind in Watertown, Mass. After additional rehabilitation at the Industrial Home for the Blind, where he also was employed as a shopworker from 1945 to 1950, Smithdas entered the liberal arts college of St. John's University in Brooklyn and received his bachelor's degree cum laude in English in 1950.

He was appointed a counselor in community relations at the home in 1950 and in this position he helped develop a program to educate the public on the problems, the needs, and the employability of the blind and the deaf-blind.

In 1953 Smithdas became one of a select few deaf-blind persons to receive an advanced degree when he was awarded a master's degree in education from New York University. He was named to his present post in 1962.

Smithdas reads and writes Braille rapidly and makes use of all other means of communication for the deaf-blind, including the manual alphabet. He maintains his own apartment—doing his own cooking—and manages his own affairs.

Although he had help in school, in rehabilitation sessions, and in college, it was Smithdas' determination, ingenuity, and his capacity to make the best use of that help that enabled him to bridge the gulf created by a lack of sight and hearing and thereby become independent.

In addition to his work, Smithdas has a wide range of other interests running from poetry to wrestling. Many of his poems have been published in magazines throughout the United States and a book of his collected poems is to be published early in 1966. In addition, his autobiography, "Life at My Fingertips," was published by Doubleday & Co. in 1958.

Smithdas has won numerous honors including the Poet of the Year Award for 1961 from the Poetry Society of America and the Distinguished Service Award of the New York State Junior Chamber of Commerce in 1958.

Smithdas was nominated by Peter J. Salmon, executive director of the Industrial Home for the Blind. His nomination was endorsed by the New York Governor's Committee.

The award is a mahogany and silver plaque made for the President's Committee by the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York City. It will be presented to Smithdas at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on the morning of April 28, 1966, in the Washington Hilton Hotel.

The award is presented annually to the person who has surmounted his or her handicap to become a useful citizen and who has helped encourage, inspire, or facilitate employment of other handicapped persons.

Mistake United States Made in China Is Being Repeated in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it has been said of U.S. foreign policy that its most pathetic aspect is failure to profit from mistakes of the past. Instead of learning, we proceed to repeat mistakes, just as though they had never happened.

The Mobile Press newspaper, in an editorial March 1, 1966, discussed one aspect of this phenomenon. I ask that it be reproduced here and I recommend it.

MISTAKE UNITED STATES MADE IN CHINA IS BEING REPEATED IN AFRICA

A lot of people are asking, "Why are we fighting in Vietnam?"

And they are getting a lot of differing answers.

The one answer they're not getting is a real answer.

We're sending brave, young Americans to their death in the jungles and highlands of Vietnam as a direct result of the stupidity of American officialdom during the Truman administration when this Nation cooperated in the communization of China.

Reds were sold to the people in the late forties as agrarian reformers, by officials who should (some think they did) know they were Communists.

It can be argued that the Communists would have taken over China with or without the cooperation of our State Department. But the fact remains to haunt this and future generations that the takeover was made with U.S. State Department assistance. The striped pants boys pulled the rug from under the Kuomintang of Chiang Kai-shek, denied him promised military hardware, and paved the road to Peiping for Mao Tse-tung.

In a few years people will be asking why we're sending young Americans to slaughter in the jungles and highlands of Africa.

To the Johnson administration's eternal shame, the answer will be the same as the one asked now about Vietnam. We will be sacrificing our young manpower and our substance in Africa because the U.S. State Department and the L.B.J. regime is cooperating in the communization of Africa.

Today we have joined forces with Communists masquerading as black nationalists upon whom we have conferred the "free and equal station of independent nations" in Africa to destroy Western civilization on the Dark Continent.

We are denying oil to anti-Communist Rhodesia, and flying it, at $1.07 per gallon to U.S. taxpayers, to black Zambia.

Aside from the Republic of South Africa and Portuguese Angola and Mozambique, Rhodesia is the only stable, prosperous nation in all Africa. It has committed one unpardonable sin, in the view of the bureaucrats, in failing to apply to Uncle Sam for military and/or economic assistance in the years in which our tax dollars have disappeared in the bottomless bogs of other African tribal states. South Africa, likewise, has declined to come hat in hand to Washington. Yet, there are those in U.S. leadership who insist that such nations are dangerous.

Despite—or maybe because— these free nations failed to tap America's tax largess, the citizens of South Africa and Rhodesia, both Negro and white, enjoy by far the highest standard of living in all Africa.

But under present U.S. policy they must be destroyed.

And when they are, the puny native regimes that replaced the colonial administrations in the African tribal states will be toppled on signal by the Reds, and the vast mineral and agricultural wealth of Africa will be delivered into the hands of the monster manipulators who have vowed to bury us.

Address of Daniel P. Loomis, President of the Association of American Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, Mr. Daniel P. Loomis, president of the Association of American Railroads, delivered an address before the National Defense Transportation Association, Third European Regional Conference in London. As an advocate of rail transportation, naturally Mr. Loomis made a very good presentation of the case for the railroads and developed some very interesting modern statistics in regard to rail transportation.

His address follows:

World Railroad Renaissance: Beacon of Hope for the Transport Future

(Address by Daniel P. Loomis, president, Association of American Railroads, before the National Defense Transportation Association, Third European Regional Conference, London, England, March 4, 1966)

I cannot tell you what an honor it is for an American railroadman to join this distinguished group here in Europe and, particularly, here in Britain—the ancestral home of both the Industrial Revolution and the transportation base of that agent of sweep-change—the railroads.

There is also something especially fitting that here, today, we should meet to examine the rising prospects of this first great product and servant of the machine age—a 140-year-old industry which rose to dominate land transport; then lost its status and much of its traffic under the hammer-action blows of road, air, and water competition; and now, almost miraculously, finds itself poised on the threshold of another golden age of service to mankind.

I do not believe this to be an exaggeration. Nor is this bright outlook confined to the United States. You can see the rail portents of a better transport future in Britain's planned "liner trains," in the Continent's acclaimed Trans-Europe Expresses, in Japan's high-speed Tokaido line, in the expansion of mainline networks in Communist lands and the developing nations, in the gathering emphasis in major cities everywhere on building and extending rail transit systems.

Why this worldwide reassessment of railroading? The answer lies in the inescapable transportation demands of growing populations and production.

Especially in the more industrialized and motorized nations, the whole world, with its burgeoning millions, booming output and rising individual expectations of a better life, is heading into transport problems of gargantuan proportions. This is obviously the case in and around our teeming supercities. And across the countryside, projections of growth rates of the past 35 years indicate total freight volume flowing between cities in the United States could multiply 2½ times by the year 2000, with intercity passenger travel climbing to nearly five times its present high level.

Who will handle such loads? How?

The motor vehicle, which initially gave man a heady mobility and flexibility, is now floundering under the flood of sheer numbers—despite all our roadbuilding and traffic engineering ingenuity. Alone, it cannot provide the free flow of people and goods basic to the health of our intricately organized, highly concentrated modern societies.

No; to achieve this imperative also requires the ultimate in mass transit systems and the development of railways into superfreightways for the high-speed hauling of vast volumes at low costs. The simple fact is that no other carrier can concentrate so great a flow of people and goods in such a limited space—a crucial asset to the developing megalopolis. And as the day of a balanced, total transport approach dawns, a great new era of superrailroads is born.

What must nations do to achieve the ultimate in rail services?

Whether rail systems are publicly owned, as here in Europe, or privately owned, as in the United States, the pattern of problems is surprisingly similar, the route to solutions much the same. As modern technology swept across the world and brought, first, great national rail systems, then rubber wheels, wings, and pipelines, the first era of a single carrier domination of transport was replaced by a many carrier, highly competitive environment. Rail systems had to be reevaluated and refitted into the new overall transport structure. For example, since trains on tracks are basically heavy volume carriers, railroads found themselves unable to match motor vehicles in many light-load, short-haul areas, or the airplanes for long-haul travel speed.

Railroadmen thus found it imperative to implement this kind of rationalization action:

1. Eliminate light-traffic little-used lines and unneeded duplicate routes, consolidating multiple stations, shops, yards, and other terminal facilities, and trimming railroads down to the trunk and main limbs of the transport tree.
2. Create a smoothly interconnecting road-rail transfer system to assemble and feed volume traffic to mainline routes and permit door to door delivery of shipments, making railroads as competitive on service as on price.
3. Undertake bold research programs to develop new equipment to attract customers and new means of achieving greater efficiency in operations.
4. Invest heavily to modernize plant, mechanize operations, automate services, and step up worker productivity.
5. Reduce prices to attract volume shipments, in line with the new railroads' rising economies.

The going along this reorganization line has nowhere been easy. So many barriers have been encountered in many cases, in fact, that these steps often seem more a hope than a reality. Yet nations are moving toward these goals. Understanding of the railroad's unique advantages and the great role it can play on the transportation team increases steadily on the part of the public we serve and the public officials who help direct our destiny. So, too, does realization of the consequences of failure to allow railroads to carry out these affirmative actions.

Since I cannot speak for other rail systems, I would like today to offer as an example of some fulfillment along these lines, and much hope for more, the story of the revolution of change taking place on U.S. railroads—that 214,000-mile, 600,000-man titan which last year carried 300 million passengers and originated 1.4 billion tons of freight. This revolution is made up of six major areas that run side by side like a six-track railway:

The technological revolution, modernizing facilities and operating methods to attain greater efficiency across the board.

The customer service revolution, providing new standards of equipment, delivery speed, and dependability.

The structural revolution, streamlining the overall rail network to eliminate wasteful duplications and speed up through movements.

The work rules revolution, bringing work practices into line with modern facilities and methods.

The pricing revolution, a basic overhaul of freight rates yielding rising benefits for rail customers.

A government policy revolution, without which the full fruits of all the other changes can never be realized.

Our technological changeover is being fueled by a railroad-financed capital improvement program that has involved $22 billion over the past two decades and has now reached a record rate. This has resulted in the steam locomotive being sidetracked by diesel-electrics of increasing power and utility; in revitalization of our "wagon" or freight car fleet with specially equipped, larger units allowing heavier loading at decreasing charges; in the expansion of centralized train control systems to 37,000 miles of mainline routes; in the construction of dozens of push button freight car "marshalling" or classification yards; in the strengthening of track and the mechanization of maintenance; in the application to railroading of electronic data processing, radio, radar, television, microwave, and other modern marvels.

Where are these developments leading railroads?

Well, if we look ahead only a few years, we can see it is just a matter of time before our major networks are equipped with ingenious facilities for gathering and processing car location and operating information; before data transmission attains new levels of capacity and accuracy, and all remote operating personnel are tied closely together by radio and other means of instantaneous communication; before car classification becomes mainly automated and train operations more centrally controlled; before key freight trains are run on passenger-type schedules and deliveries made within a sure range of dependability.

New passenger train achievements, meanwhile, are promised through the upcoming joint railroad-Government high-speed program along our eastern corridor from the Capital at Washington to New York City and on to Boston—where eventually will stretch a strip city 400 miles long. As visitors to America know from personal experience, the United States has always had marvelous long-distance passenger expresses. This test should demonstrate that despite all the growth in auto and air travel—and partly because of it—there remains a genuine public demand for comfortable and fast rail service on shorter trips in dense population areas. Through this first Government involvement in the United States in long-range rail research, the Nation will also perhaps chart the way toward spectacular new departures in ground transport to serve our mounting millions.

Progress in freight services is spearheaded by new emphasis on market research and on meeting rising customer service requirements. Dramatically pointing up these approaches is the piggybacking of truck trailers and containers on rail flatcars, which has multiplied six times in 10 years. This form of intermodal teamwork, combining the local flexibility of trucking with the long-haul economy of railroads, can reasonably be expected to triple in the United States in the next decade, not only injecting new efficiency into freight distribution but also taking heavy loads off our crowded road systems.

With standardized dimensions and simplified billing methods for through-movements by any combination of carriers, containers are also on the way toward becoming a major factor in international trade.

In another spectacular comeback, U.S. railroads last year moved from auto factories nearly 5 million new motor vehicles. Made possible by an expanding fleet of two- and three-level "rack" cars, this rail traffic is almost 10 times that of 1958, when railroads carried less than one-tenth of new auto shipments.

"Unit" train movements of coal, ores, grain, and other products also continue to expand, with more than one-fourth of all rail-hauled coal in the United States now shuttling in these solid trainloads without stop from mine to consumer. Indications are that shippers of large volumes will find still more ways of thus bypassing intermediate yards and promptly loading and unloading equipment to get unprecedented use of rolling stock and correspondingly low costs and rates.

In the vital merger movement, a score of United States railroads are now engaged in unification proceedings, promising an ultimate streamlining of our 76 major railroads and many other lines into a smaller number of larger systems, with sharply reduced operating costs and expedited through movements.

Europeans with their single national networks can appreciate the overriding need the United States faces to come to grips with the problems posed by our multiplicity of interwoven rail companies. It has been estimated that a full-scale merger movement could cut rail operating costs by some 10 percent, freeing a billion dollars a year for further improving our services and reducing prices. Such savings are essential if we are to boost this industry's annual capital investment from 1965's record $1.6 billion to the $2 billion-plus railroadmen feel is needed to really reshape plant and equipment to meet modern needs.

Adjustment of work practices to the new railroad dynamism has been a foremost challenge in the United States as elsewhere, and I believe that despite the occasional sound and fury on this issue, we are making headway in solving it with the least possible hardship to employees. This has been particularly true as concerns our phasing out of the position of freight locomotive fireman, which became completely surplus with the shift from steam to diesel power. A gradual approach combined with employee protection benefits of unprecedented magnitude is carrying out this change with virtually no adverse effects.

Our freight rate revolution has become the great pay-off in terms of immediate public benefits. As you all know, railroading contains a "magic cycle" which is essentially the application of mass production techniques to transportation: The more volume loaded onto railroads—the more tons per car, the more cars per train, the more trains per day—the lower the cost for hauling each unit. And the lower these unit costs, the lower can be set the freight rates paid by customers. And the lower railroads can set these prices, the more volume is attracted.

We have put this cycle to work so well that despite an increase in the U.S. Consumer Price Index of 10 percent since 1958, our average rail freight charges have been reduced each year for 7 years and are now 14 percent under the 1958 level. The scope of resulting public benefit can be measured by the fact that if last year's rail freight volume had moved at 1958 unit charges, American shippers in 1965 would have had to pay $1.4 billion more for rail transportation than was actually charged.

Another measurement of the impact of railroad modernization lies in what has happened to our share of the freight hauled between U.S. cities. This had declined each year, along with rail travel, for 18 years prior to 1961. And while passenger business continues to slide, railroaders in 1961 leveled off their freight share at 43 percent of the total and have held it there since. With the Nation's economic expansion, rail freight volume has thus been expanded by some 5 percent each year, giving a current load one-fourth greater than in 1961.

This banner achievement shows how the American railroads are moving toward a greater day despite all-pervading competition from universal auto ownership, expanding superhighways, improved waterways and the rocketing rise of aviation. And as railroads come to grips with these challenges, they are simultaneously building new efficiency and dynamism into our productive economy, helping hold the lid on inflationary price pressures, smoothing the flow of goods into international trade and strengthening the defense base under the freedoms we all hold so dear.

It is significant in this regard that U.S. railroads have been meeting all the domestic transport requirements imposed by the Vietnam conflict, and we're proud that our military leadership has been fit to commend us for this effort. I might point out for this defense-conscious audience that within the Association of American Railroads, as among our members lines, defense requirements take priority. You have all heard of the so-called "hot line" between the White House and the Kremlin. Well, our railroads maintain a ready line to the military on a 7-day-a-week, 24-hour-a-day basis so we can respond effectively and instantly to any military requirement for rail service. For the same reason, the AAR also maintains offices with the traffic manager for the Department of Defense. We have in being the nationwide capability, on behalf of the entire industry, to assemble rail equipment, to divert movements, to expedite and trace shipments and otherwise adjust rail services to the needs of the military. In keeping with a long tradition of serving the Nation's defense needs, the U.S. railroads today stand ready to go all out to meet any emergency of the future.

There are many indications that President Johnson and his transportation aids, picking up where Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower left off, are aware of such vital railroal contributions and will work to bring U.S. laws and regulatory practices into line with the vast changes being wrought in travel and distribution patterns. We thus hope to see further Washington efforts to move toward these essential policy goals:

1. Placing all carriers on a more equal basis as regards the taxes Government takes from each and the assistance it gives.

2. Allowing maximum freedom for all to adjust to change by modernizing merging, coordinating, diversifying.

3. Allowing maximum freedom for all to compete on prices and services.

Actually, these are goals railroadmen in most lands would like to see implemented. And while the Government trend seems to be running in this direction, we cannot help but wonder if it is moving fast enough to allow railroads to cope fully with pyramiding public transport needs.

We know as well as anyone that change upsets and frequently hurts. But railroads must be allowed to move with the tide, or they will surely be swept under—and their vital services lost to the public. For instance, if little-used parts of a nation's rail network need to be cut back to achieve a virile system of main routes between major centers, many branchline communities may feel loss despite the availability of motor vehicles as an alternative means of transport. Yet this rationalization is crucial if overall good is to be realized and the vicious circle of railroad declines broken. Otherwise, chronic operating losses on light-load routes wash out gains on heavy-volume routes, bringing rising deficits for taxpayers to bear where railroads are publicly owned and eventual bankruptcy where railroads are privately owned. Companion plagues include insufficient improvement funds spread too thinly over too many facilities, accelerating the deterioration of plant and services and leading to undermined employee morale, public protests, Government investigations, political crises—and on and on.

Gentleman, there are better ways to run a railroad.

Railroadmen have no intention of discarding the good of the past but we recognize that what we have done in days gone by is simply not good enough for the present—and will certainly not be good enough for the tough challenges of tomorrow.

The modern railroader is aiming at new levels of excellence in running this marvelous machine we call a railroad. Around our stations, yards, sidings, shops and out on the line where the big trains rumble by, things will never be quite the same again.

For all our nations, this forms one of the brightest beacons of hope for a better future.

FTC Reports Increased Business Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission has recently informed the House Small Business Committee concerning business mergers that are continuing at record-breaking speed and at a record-breaking level.

In a recent report, the Commission reveals that most of the 1965 mergers—more than 1,000—involve the manufacturing industry—a development which adds to the seriousness of this situation because of the high degree of concentration already existing among certain groups of manufacturers.

The FTC merger announcement follows:

MERGERS REACHED RECORD LEVELS LAST YEAR

Merger activity rose sharply last year, the Federal Trade Commission reported today. Last year both the number and assets of large manufacturing and mining firms acquired reached the highest levels on record.

Acquisitions in various industries and businesses in 1965 totaled 1,893, as compared with 1,797 in 1964. Of the 1,893 acquisitions in 1965, 1,628 were full acquisitions, in the sense of control by the acquiring company. These were acquisitions of more than half of the assets or stock of other companies, as well as subsidiaries and entire divisions of other companies. The rest, numbering 265, were partial acquisitions—minority stock interest, individual manufacturing plants, service establishments, and the like.

Most of the acquisitions in 1965, as in other years, occurred in manufacturing industries. Of the 1,628 full acquisitions, acquiring manufacturing companies accounted for 1,063, or 65 percent. Previous percentages were 66 in 1964, 68 in 1963, and 65 in 1962. These data do not include acquisitions of companies subject to regulation by other Federal agencies, such as banks, railroad, airline and steamship companies, radio and television broadcasting companies, public utility companies, and others. In addition, the Commission points out, many acquisitions, particularly small ones, are not publicized.

MERGER TRENDS IN MANUFACTURING AND MINING

The Commission maintains an annual series of firm disappearances via merger in manufacturing and mining which covers merger trends back to 1940, based on reports in two financial services. Last year, according to this series, mergers in the manufacturing-mining sector topped the 1,000 mark. In the midfifties, the number of firms acquired, according to this series, stood at about 600 per year. In the early fifties the number ranged around 200 to 300 per year.

The Commission also noted a sharply rising trend in the rate at which large manufacturing and mining concerns are being acquired. The Commission recently developed a new merger series which shows for each year beginning with 1948 both the number and the assets of the large manufacturing and mining concerns taken over by mergers. Large firms are defined as companies with assets of $10 million or more. There are a limited number of such large concerns in the economy as a whole, the Commission points out, but they play an important role in management decisions regarding output, investment, prices, technological innovations and other critical factors. Some 2,400 large manufacturing and mining companies in the United States control in the aggregate over 80 percent of all manufacturing and mining assets.

Data for the last 5 years indicate a sharply rising trend in the frequency with which large firms are acquired. In 1965, 91 large mergers were recorded. The acquired assets of these companies totaled $3.8 billion, an increase of 38 percent over 1964. Over the past 5 years, 1961–65, the number of large acquisitions has averaged 75 per year, with total acquired assets averaging over $2.7 billion annually. Since 1948, a total of 811 large manufacturing and mining concerns have been acquired. The assets of these firms totaled $27.1 billion at the time of their absorption through mergers with other firms.

SIZE OF ACQUIRING COMPANIES

Over the past 5 years, the share of manufacturing and mining mergers accounted for by companies with assets in excess of $100 million has increased steadily. The 1965 percentage is higher than that for any year since 1955, when this breakdown first became available. Moreover, acquisition activity by firms of this size has increased sharply since 1961. In 1965, for example, firms with assets of $100 million or more accounted for 27 percent of the 1,008 recorded manufacturing and mining mergers compared with only 17 percent of the 954 mergers recorded in 1961.

A substantial reduction proportionately in merger activity on the part of small firms has taken place since 1961. Firms with assets of $10 million or less accounted for 45 percent of manufacturing and mining mergers in 1961 compared with only 30 percent in 1965.

INDUSTRY OF ACQUIRING COMPANIES

In 1965, as in preceding years, most acquisitions (82 percent) were made by manufacturing companies with the remainder split between mining and other companies. Among manufacturers, companies engaged in the production of electrical machinery acquired the largest number of companies (117), followed by chemicals (89), nonelectrical machinery (87), food and kindred products (86), fabricated metal products (63), and transportation equipment (59). Firms in these 6 industry groups accounted for a total of 501 or almost 50 percent of mergers recorded during 1965.

An examination of the data since 1955 shows that some substantial changes have occurred. Between 1955 and 1959, for example, the Commission's data show that apparel manufacturers acquired 41 manufacturing firms. In 1965 alone, however, apparel manufacturers accounted for 42 acquisitions. Similar, though less dramatic changes, have occurred also in printing and publishing, petroleum, rubber products, and professional and scientific equipment industries. For 1965, only 4 of the 22 industry classes show an absolute decline in the number of mergers since 1964.

JOINT VENTURE ACTIVITY IN 1965

For the first time the Commission includes data on new joint venture activity. In 1965, 171 newly organized joint ventures were recorded. These ventures involved the participation of American companies in both domestic and foreign projects. Of those joint ventures recorded in 1965, 113—or 66 percent—involved U.S. and foreign companies and will operate in foreign countries.

Leave Unemployment Compensation Laws to the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great deal of correspondence from my district and from all parts of the country in regard to H.R. 8282. Of all these hundreds of letters and telegrams not one has been in favor of this bill.

An editorial, which appeared in the Wednesday, March 2, 1966, issue of the Greeneville Sun of Greeneville, Tenn., states very succinctly the many arguments against this measure that have been written to me, and I insert this editorial in the Record at this point:

SCOPE OF H.R: 8282 STAGGERS ONE'S IMAGINATION

It is too difficult for the average citizen to keep up with everything that is of importance going on in this country or proposed in Congress. We are constantly keeping one eye on the swelling war in Vietnam, demonstrations, investigations, inflation, tax increases, and the other eye on bewildering domestic legislation that staggers one's imagination.

Many a pending bill in Congress, whose long-range effect could be of great importance, becomes almost totally obscured simply because there is just too much for the news media to adequately cover and for the average individual citizen to analyze and understand. This is the case of a proposed measure known as H.R. 8282—a shocking grab for Federal power. If this measure passes, it will bring drastic changes in the existing Federal-State system of unemployment compensation. Control of this system would pass almost entirely to the hands of the Federal Government.

No one is arguing with the humanitarian purpose that unemployment compensation was originally intended for. But this new proposal (H.R. 8282) will put pressure on States to surrender their rights to determine who should get jobless pay, how long the payments should last and how much they should be. H.R. 8282 is so liberal that it would open the door to thousands of new outlawed claims, would allow people to cheat in getting benefits, and would discourage any punishment to those caught cheating. The bill, if passed, will hurt employees, employers, and the general public. It truly staggers one's imagination.

For one thing, it would strike down State laws whose purpose is to stop undeserving benefits to those who are discharged for misconduct, who quit a job without cause, and who refuse to accept suitable employment. (Note carefully the word "suitable.")

It would almost double the payroll taxes in the next few years, and this load would come on top of the recent substantial increase in social security levies. This would force consumer prices up.

It would outlaw experience ratings for employers—the system under which employers who maintain stable employment pay less in taxes than those who fail to do this. In addition millions of workers would be allowed to take a year's vacation by just quitting their jobs and collecting benefits. After that, just one more day of work would qualify him for another 26 weeks of benefits. See any flaws yet? Too many in our estimation.

And probably the worst of all is that H.R. 8282 takes the unemployment insurance system out of the hands of the individual States, and puts it under Federal control. And the cost of this proposal runs into the billions of dollars. One might ask the question "Why keep on working when I can collect easy pay for not working?"

If H.R. 8282 passes, this Nation will have made another giant step forward to a complete welfare state. This will be an integral part of the "cradle to the grave" security idea. It will, in our estimation and that of many of the Nation's leading businessmen, cause a drastic rise in unemployment and inflation. Can we afford such programs? We again are looking at Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen as our savior.

Institution of "Visiting" Is Long Gone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, many of us who represent rural districts and those who represent the urban districts will certainly enjoy an outstanding article by Bill Powell which appeared in the Paducah Sun-Democrat on March 4, entitled "Institution of 'Visiting' Is Long Gone."

It brings back pleasant memories of a bygone era in this Nation's history. This article is so outstanding that I thought it ought to be brought to the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

BILL POWELL'S NOTEBOOK: INSTITUTION OF "VISITING" IS LONG GONE

Memory plays tricks. What has happened always seems nicer than it really was.

Someone said the older you get the farther it was you had to walk to school. And someone else said the more the years grow on you, the deeper the snow got—say in the terrible winter of 1917.

But people have fun looking backward. There isn't too much joy in the cold realities of the present time, and cold fear can grip a man looking seriously ahead.

So when a man started talking with me about the glories of days gone by I tried to chalk him up to just another wrinkle of time in his life.

But this was hard to do.

He was talking of days when people visited each other and really enjoyed it.

Usually, visiting came as a surprise. When I wasn't more than 4 or 5 years old they came in wagons, with straight chairs behind the wagon seat for the women. The kids sat on the jolting wagon-bed floor.

They gaily came down the road, and those who were to be the hosts stood in the front yard and excitedly welcomed whoever it was that came around the dusty or muddy curve in the big road which lead crookedly and poorly to the places of commerce—starting with the country store.

Somehow, we always had something pretty good to eat when visitors, some of them cousins and other relatives, came. Maybe it had been Great Northern beans and barrel-flour biscuits all week, but the visiting day, which nearly always was Sunday, produced an unusual fare.

If a ham still hung in the smokehouse, it was cut. Fruit being saved for special occasions was opened. A chicken was run down and converted for the feast, and pies were made with dried apples or from canned blackberries.

Never, as I can remember, did anyone resent a visit; no one hid in the house or pretended to be away from home. No one made excuses if visitors happened to let it be known beforehand that they were coming.

Later, visitors came to our house in model T Fords or Stars or Chevies.

The squarely built cars were driven into the yard in a hodgepodge. The women cooked and the men sat in the yard and talked and whittled before dinner. They returned to the yard to talk and whittle while the women washed the dishes.

No one thought of leaving until dusk began, and it was past time for the night-work—the milking and feeding at home.

Then all would assemble for a last few minutes of pleasantries. The wagons, in their time, and the cars in their time, would rumble away in the gathering shadows leaving loneliness, and early night which turned a deserted yard into a place where a hoot owl ventured or a bat darted through the air as if magnetized by the ground.

Visiting wasn't one of the many victims of the depression.

People continued to associate in a warm, friendly way, although the meals no longer were feasts.

I recall a big day when a big, bony buffalo fish caught in a muddy pond was about all there was on the table. In the 1930's, a half-dozen cans of salmon and big biscuits often became the attractions during a "country visit."

If they were in season, cabbage, tomatoes, green onions, turnip greens, new potatoes, or green beans made the feasts truly big. But often they were not in season.

Often, the visitors only saw dead stalks and old, gnarled leaves along barren rows which offered nothing except promise of springtime.

But in the old days people enjoyed each other.

People haven't changed so much, but the times have. And that is the sad thing.

People still like to get together but association is precise, the mad result of pressing schedules. Feverish parties are the present-day instruments of "visiting" and they aren't much good.

People like to hide now.

"Come to see us, but call before you come" is a patented way of preparing to dodge company.

Gone, without a doubt, is some fellowship which did people some good.

No part of the old pattern will ever come back. The cold, individualistic way is a way of life already and will get worse.

In 10 or 15 years people may not even speak to each other unless speaking is a convenience or a means of executing a service.

Oh, people will nod to each other at ball games or the forced assemblies such as PTA; what little "come to see us" warmth we have now will be long gone.

The situation concerning people's relationship with each other is perplexing. Sometimes it is astounding.

I'm pretty sure it is one of the most serious problems of modern society.

We're so smart that we don't have sense to profit from a backward look.

Massachusetts Harangued by Mrs. Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was visited and harangued by an avowed atheist. Mrs. Madalyn Murray was very largely responsible for the Supreme Court's denial to millions of American youngsters of the right to pray in the public school. She has already clearly demonstrated that this was no isolated instance by moving in the Maryland courts to strike down that tax exemption which religious institutions have always enjoyed in the United States. In Boston, hoping for converts, she found her visit turned rather into a rallying point for citizens from across the Commonwealth who have banded together into Massachusetts Citizens for Public Prayer. Box 1776, Rutland, Mass.

I do not, of course, question her privilege of dissent. But I do question the propriety of escalating this privilege into a right to dictate to the great majority of the people of Massachusetts what they shall or shall not do in those schools which are sustained by their tax dollars. Democracy has never had cause to worry when one or another of its citizens disagrees with some consensus.

In fact the habit and the ability to accommodate dissent are among the principal glories of any democracy. But this is not to set up the dissenter as an arbiter tyrannizing over the bulk of the citizenry. Equal protection of the law must extend as well to the greater as to the lesser number among us. Once he has been given his right to silence or abstention, to allow the dissenter to determine public policy in such a case as this is oligarchy pure and simple.

I believe a precedent for the solution of the problem of school prayer can be found in the Supreme Court's own decision in the matter of the flag salute. Here the Court did not throw out the salute altogether. It simply said that no one could be forced against his conscience to participate in it. I concur with Dean Erwin Griswold, of the Harvard Law School who said Court action in the school prayer cases was "absolutist" and "thought denying."

The motto of the city of Boston, as Rev. Robert G. Howes of Catholic University reminded Mrs. Murray during one of her appearances in New England, is "Sicut patribus, sit Deus nobis." As He was with our fathers, let God stand with us. I am certain that for the vast majority of those I represent and their neighbors religion is indeed, as the Nation's Roman Catholic bishops once expressed it, "our chief national asset." I have heard from a number of them. They are deeply troubled at the removal of God from the public classroom. They see clearly that this removal is only the beginning of a series of attacks which, unless checked once and for all, must lead to the erosion of every other instance of public reverence. They want action now to repeal what Madalyn Murray stands for.

I urge again, as strongly as I can, that all Americans who share my belief in the validity and the urgency of public reverence make their voices heard loud and long. At least as loud and long as was the voice of Madalyn Murray in Massachusetts a few days ago.

My own position has, perhaps, been best expressed by two men. The first is professor of law at Fordham University, Charles E. Rice, who writes in his excellent book "The Supreme Court and Public Prayer":

> I believe that the Court will find itself imprisoned by its logic and that the American people will see most of the accustomed religious elements of public life eliminated singly but inexorably. * * * We are, I believe, witnessing the erection of a new public orthodoxy—of agnosticism. It is an orthodoxy destined to degenerate, unless the Court is checked, into an affirmative secularism bringing in its train, in place of our accustomed governmental hospitality to all religious, a public policy of hostility toward theistic religion.

The second is that of Dean Emeritus Henry Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary:

> The corollary in both law and logic of the Supreme Court's recent interdictions is inescapable, prohibition of the affirmative recognition and collaboration by government at all levels with all organs of religions in all relationships and circumstances. A consistent application of such a policy would involve a revolution in the Nation's habitual practice in the matter of religion. * * * Nothing less than this is at stake.

I am glad that the citizens of Massachusetts listened with forbearance to Mrs. Murray. I am even happier that so many of them have joined the fight to restore fully and proudly the right to public reverence.

Democracy: Counterpart of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a voice-of-democracy contest. This year over 300,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the VFW.

I am including with my remarks the winning speech from our State of Arkansas as delivered by Miss Diana F. Bartlett, of Little Rock, Ark., a resident of the district I have the honor of representing in the House of Representatives.

DEMOCRACY: COUNTERPART OF TOMORROW

(By Diana Bartlett)

Democracy is no more than the accepted way of life for Americans. Some citizens express it in inconspicuous intimidations such as, "Let Congress run the country; I'm keeping my nose clean." Meanwhile their neighbors rally in marches, shout themselves hoarse about a million different matters, and generally add to the existing confusion of everyone else.

Americans today are inclined to accept democratic ideals as a matter of course: Democratic government is the most valuable gift any human being could wish for, much less receive; yet, most Americans take it simply as a part of our everyday lives. Democracy either "occurs" for them, cropping up mysteriously at voting times, or has been misplaced beneath an avalanche of slogans, causes, and generalities.

This is our country today. If our generation of youth is to experience a bright democratic future, then it is our duty to prepare now for the stability of American freedom. Just how do we prime ourselves for such an impending challenge? Primarily, we must meet the duties facing us today; the most important of these duties is to seek a good education. The prolonged period of formal learning is one of the basic parts of our lives. Within this period dwells the key to our destiny. We must take full advantage of education—use it, expand it to its fullest, not only within the confines of a classroom, but also in our homes, churches, and places of recreation. As a student, my viewpoint takes in not only what I learn today, but also how I can apply this knowledge tomorrow. This is the challenge and fulfillment of youth—preparation for adulthood.

Democracy does consist, in part, of patriotic exuberance, heritage, and a treasure of history and tradition. This precious inheritance of our people goes deeper than outward emblems, of course. Democracy plants its root in the heart and mind of every American. To thrive, democracy must have a firm foothold in its citizens. It needs something basic and reliable. As students, we can provide a strong foundation for the democracy of tomorrow if we prepare ourselves today.

Our job is to vitalize democracy, to prevent it from becoming stagnant or taken for granted. Education is the main road to this goal. There are, however, other less-frequented byways which can strengthen our determination. One of these byways is to keep abreast of world affairs, to stay alert to what other people are thinking, how they are thinking, and what stimulates their thought processes. In short, we youths have a responsibility to broaden our acquaintance with life. This helps us mature, and, consequently, to secure a place for democracy. As future voters, we should also learn to respect our rights; use the vote, voice our feelings, form an opinion on national and international affairs. By practicing these rights, we throw the spotlight on the arena of democratic application. From this use will spring a fountain of interest to quench an arid, bored nation of free people.

There is a final obligation of Americans: we have to foster a true love of freedom and democracy in our hearts. We have to weave a sincere pattern of belief in the democratic way of life before we can use democracy, before we can work for it, and before we can fight for it.

Democracy is our foremost blessing—yesterday, today, tomorrow. Yesterday has passed; today is practically gone; only tomorrow remains. Tomorrow belongs to our generation; democracy belongs to Americans.

Goldberg Would Crush South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper column as printed in the Mobile Press newspaper for March 2, 1966, included some shocking allegations regarding the determination of foreign policy within our Government.

The Johnson administration should move immediately to confirm or deny the veracity of the statements made.

The entire text of the column follows:

GOLDBERG WOULD CRUSH SOUTH AFRICA

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Ambassador Goldberg is trying his hand at using the "Fulbright technique" to bring about a major change in U.S. policy in Africa.

Greatly impressed with the publicity impact the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings have had on the Vietnam issue, Goldberg is masterminding similar House hearings in an effort to develop support for imposing sanctions against South Africa.

He has persuaded Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat of Illinois, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, to conduct hearings starting this week "to determine whether South Africa's policy of separate development of the races represents a threat to international peace and security."

In a series of private talks with African delegates at the United Nations, Goldberg is taking credit for these hearings, saying they are needed to influence a change in administration policy, as President Johnson is balking at imposing drastic measures against a friendly government.

The delegates of Ethiopia and Nigeria are crediting Ambassador Goldberg as talking like a "war hawk" when it comes to South Africa.

They say Goldberg minces no words in letting it be known he favors the use of force, if necessary, to topple the Verwoerd government.

According to these U.N. delegates, Goldberg takes the position that "one white government in Africa is one too many." He is said to assert that if the House hearings can demonstrate that South Africa's policy of separate development of the races is a threat to world peace, President Johnson can be induced to drop his opposition to sanctions.

Representative O'HARA, oldest House Member, in an interview with this column, confirmed Ambassador Goldberg's forceful role in arranging the hearings.

O'HARA disclosed that Goldberg urged him to hold the hearings during a meeting at the Ambassador's hotel residence in New York. Also, that the former Supreme Court Justice suggested the "threat to international peace" approach be used.

After returning to Washington, O'HARA sent a memorandum to his group announcing, "The subcommittee will try to determine whether South Africa's policy of separate development of the races represents a threat to international peace and security."

"While the committee cannot directly influence U.S. foreign policy," O'HARA's memorandum continued, "a sense of Congress' resolution might have a strong influence on future U.S. policy and on the course of U.S. investments in that country."

Approximately 300 U.S. firms, including some of the largest in the country, have branches or subsidiaries in South Africa.

That country is one of the few that have never received or asked for U.S. aid.

Although Representative O'HARA is telling his subcommittee that witnesses from all sides will be heard, the list of those slated to testify the first week is weighted heavily for a tougher policy toward South Africa.

Assistant Secretary G. Mennen Williams, whose testimony will be his swan song in the State Department, will be the lead-off witness. A vigorous supporter of a tougher policy toward the Verwoerd regime, Williams is expected to advocate sanctions if approved by the United Nations.

Other witnesses will be Walter Nielsen, president of the African-American Affairs Institute; Vernon McKay, director of the African Study Center at Johns Hopkins University; and former Ambassador Joseph Satterthwaite.

Only Ambassador Satterthwaite is opposed to sanctions.

McKay is author of a plan calling for U.N. military intervention in South Africa should that country refuse to give up its League of Nations mandate for southwest Africa.

The explosive question of South Africa's right to control diamond-rich southwest Africa is now before the International Court of Justice at The Hague. The tribunal's decision is expected during the House hearings. Phillip Jessup, former State Department official, is U.S. representative on the World Court.

In the event The Hague Court rules against South Africa, civil rights leaders already are planning to stage a giant demonstration in New York to demand U.N. action to enforce the decision. In civil rights circles the belief is strong that the Court will rule against South Africa.

Where Are We Going To Get the Ships?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, last month, I addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on the topic "Where Are We Going To Get the Ships?" Ten days after my speech, an editorial entitled "Grave Threat to Merchant Marine" appeared in the San Francisco Examiner. It raises the same issue to which I addressed myself and assesses the proposed manner of meeting this threat, as outlined in the conflicting reports of the Interagency Maritime Task Force and the President's Maritime Advisory Committee.

The full text of the editorial follows, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

GRAVE THREAT TO MERCHANT MARINE

The American merchant marine, an indispensable element of the national defense, once again has been allowed to decline to a dangerously low level. Worse, large sections of it are threatened with oblivion.

At the end of World War II, a scant 20 years ago, the United States had the world's greatest merchant fleet. Today American bottoms are so few they transport only 9 percent of the Nation's foreign commerce.

At the end of World War II our country had the world's mightiest shipbuilding industry. Last year we fell to 12th place. Soviet Russia is building 10 times as many merchant vessels as this country.

As if this decline were not bad enough, a governmental task force has recommended among other things that:

All U.S. passenger ship services be phased out by withdrawal of subsidies.

The total merchant fleet be reduced, with a corresponding reduction in seamen's jobs from 47,000 to 26,000 over the next 20 years.

Subsidized ship construction in American yards be cut further, and American shipping lines be encouraged to contract for construction of future vessels in foreign yards.

These task force recommendations appear to be based on assumptions that the role of surface vessels in military lifts is declining, that this country can count on the emergency use of allied merchant fleets and American-owned ships flying under flags of convenience, and that subsidies in this field no longer bring an adequate return.

But these are questionable assumptions. In the Vietnam conflict 95 percent of all supplies and materiel are moving by ship. Too, Vietnam has shown that our Armed Forces cannot always count on the use of allied vessels and ships under flags of convenience with foreign crews.

And the subsidy is a sound investment so long as it provides this Nation with a merchant marine adequate to the fullest needs of our Armed Forces.

Recently the public members of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee directly challenged the task force recommendations. These public members called for a strong buildup in all categories of American vessels, and construction of all the vessels in American yards. That is good advice. We urge Congress to follow it.

A Young Marine Writes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at a time when literally thousands of words are written and read about our Nation's involvement in Vietnam, I am always impressed and moved by the words of those with the greatest commitment in that life and death struggle—our fightingmen. Such is the case in the following article written in part by a young Caro, Mich., marine and the editor and publisher of the weekly newspaper, Tuscola County Advertiser, Caro, Mich., Rudy H. Petzold.

I hope each Member will take a few minutes to read this story, which appeared in the March 3, 1966, edition of the Advertiser. Mr. Petzold and the unnamed marine have left much "food for thought."

The article follows:

A LETTER FROM VIETNAM'S JUNGLE LAND

(By Rudy H. Petzold)

A young Caro marine, in the middle of the fighting in Vietnam, had some mighty pointed things to say in a recent letter to his parents—things that we at home might well ponder as we form our opinions about the war in Vietnam and the men that are fighting it.

These are some of the things his letter said:

"Well, you've probably guessed where I am and evertyhing is as fine as can be expected—at least I'm alive. This place is the most miserable place I've ever been in. I don't know when I've been so hot and thirsty and tired. I don't know how we all keep going—but we still do.

"It seems funny saying this, but I sure am glad I am a marine. You always have buddies who will help you when you're down. No matter how tired and disgusted you get—there's always somebody to make you smile. All these kids grew up so fast I only hope our prayers are answered and we all get back home to our loved ones.

"It really hurts to see some of these young 18-year-old kids (the writer is 20) fall in front of you * * * none of them cry, though. They just say a prayer and usually we get them aboard helicopters and get them to a hospital—or grave registration—and then home.

"Mom, I swear to God if anybody ever says a word against our Vietnam policy, I think I'd kill them. All these guys over here, hot and miserable, don't ask questions. We believe in our country and our Government—and we're damn well fighting our butts off for it.

"I got your letter yesterday * * * it sure is good to hear from home * * * I sure hope I can write before I have to go up forward.

"Mom, you know what I wished I could have right now? A glass of ice cold milk or just anything cold. All we get is hot water to drink. A piece of ice would be worth a million dollars right now. Well, Mom, I'm going to have to go for now. I'll be all right. And I should be home in a few months. I love you."

The war in Vietnam has gotten some bitter cussing and discussing back here at home. Yet, out of the hell of the fighting, from the stinking, infested jungles where men have the greatest right to complain and be embittered, there comes a letter such as this.

The words in the letter are not from the pen of a general or a diplomat, whose thoughts would automatically reflect "official policy" favorably—but they are from the pen of a 20-year-old marine, caught up in his generation's war. And this is what makes the words of the letter so meaningful, so true in their ring, so worthy of thought and reflection.

Not so long ago we saw this young man on the streets of our town—cocky and sure of himself, little concerned about the great issues which face the world. Like all red-blooded young Americans he was outwardly preoccupied with fun, with his many friends and with the shenanigans that mark youth in its "growing-up years."

But in so short a time, these outward frivolities have been swept away, and the deeper inward concern about what his generation's role in history should be, have come to the surface.

He has seen the life and death struggle firshand, in a way few of us have seen it. He has viewed the horror of war and the confusion of battle. He has judged it against the causes for which it is being waged—and he has judged it a necessary thing.

For us Americans back home, Vietnam is difficult to understand. It seems so far away, so costly and so unrelated to our own sphere of living that we find it difficult to view it sympathetically.

Perhaps it is difficult to understand because we seek to understand it in the light of our other wars. The war in Vietnam is a different kind of war. The enemy America fights today is no longer a single aggressing nation—but rather a worldwide aggression. The enemy no longer sits across a "no man's land" from us in opposing trenches and foxholes, but moves among us, infiltrating our thinking and perverting our traditions.

Here at home we view the war through the noise of politics, the blurred vision of eyes watching youth march off to war, and through the seemingly unending weariness of two decades of cold war uncertainty. Perhaps, if like the young marine, we could see causes and results portrayed in the starkness of the battlefield, we too could end our uncertainty.

Perhaps Vietnam is far away—but man's right to freedom and self-determination is not. And if this is truly what we are fighting for in Vietnam, then every American could embrace it as a divine crusade.

From time immortal the dove of peace has sought a resting place—but this embattled "bird" has found little space or time to rest in a world so full of hatred and conflict.

Our grandfathers had their Flander's Field, our fathers their Iwo Jima, and our own generation its Korea. And now a new generation has come of age—and it has Vietnam.

The young men who are fighting this war—consider it important—each new drop of their blood spilled in it adds to its importance. And until we are convinced otherwise, we must listen to their testimony from before the face of the enemy.

Champion of the Common Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Philadelphia, our distinguished colleague, SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, of Puerto Rico, had the high privilege of dedicating the Ernesto Ramos Antonini Development Center.

His remarks are of great significance, as they pertain to a patriot, a true champion of the common man, and an effective contributor to the public institutions serving the people of Puerto Rico.

I believe the eloquent but humble expressions of our colleague may serve to promote understanding across the span of geography which separates our people physically, but never spiritually, and under unanimous consent I include his remarks in the RECORD:

SPEECH AT THE RIBBON-CUTTING CEREMONY TO DEDICATE THE ERNESTO RAMOS ANTONINI CENTER, PHILADELPHIA, PA., MARCH 6, 1966

(By SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico)

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to speak to you today at the ribbon-cutting ceremony to dedicate the Ernesto Ramos Antonini Development Center.

I am familiar with the fine work being accomplished by the Opportunities Industrialization Center. To this community, especially to young people, this center brings hope where there was no hope; faith where there was despair; strength where there was weakness. From the material point of view, it is making it possible for the young people of this community to acquire knowledge and to develop skills, which will make it possible for them to realize just rewards for future efforts.

The founders and organizers of this center deserve the finest congratulations and praise.

We have met here today to dedicate a particular part of this center to honor the memory of a truly great and unusual man, Ernesto Ramos Antonini. It is not my purpose to praise him as much as to learn from him.

It has been said that the mighty oak was struck and fell and that then there was a silent, empty place.

In a sense this is true of the man whose memory we honor today in this dedication. He was struck down in the vigor of his life, and he was sorely missed, because he was sorely needed by the Puerto Rican people and their institutions, which had come to rely on him.

The accomplishments which he carved in the time allotted him were so fundamental, so magnificent, so great, and so enduring that their effects are being felt in Puerto Rico as though he were still with us and guiding us.

There was a greatness about Ramos Antonini. The Almighty endowed him richly with many and varied talents, and with unusual energy. Ramos Antonini used them wisely and unselfishly for the benefit of the people he loved.

Who were these people? They were the youngsters in the high school where he taught as a young man. They were the plant and field laborers who were to gain from the strength of his helping hand. They were people in trouble who needed and got justice from the courts through his noble and skillful representations as a lawyer. They were the peoples' representatives in the legislative assembly who were inspired by his magnificent leadership as speaker of the house. They were the peasants who benefited from a social program inspired by him to provide fresh milk at the dinner table of poor people. They were the barefoot schoolboys who received shoes by legislation approved under his sponsorship. They were the artists who received his friendship, help, and inspiration. They were even the patrons of a small movie house in Rio Piedras in the days of the silent cinema where as a young man he played the piano to create the mood of the films.

The mighty oak fell, and then there was a silent, empty place.

To be sure, there was shocked silence, when this man of the people was taken so suddenly from them who loved and needed him so much. It was a sad, smothering, aching, tearful silence. And yet Ramos Antonini lives—through the principles he established in the legislative assembly; through the laws still prevailing for which he was responsible; through the labor unions that he formed; through his lasting contributions to the public school system; through his teachings to the people of Puerto Rico of all ages through his music; and not less, through his loving memory and continued inspiration of this great man.

Ramos Antonini is probably best remembered for three outstanding talents—those of a lawyer, of an orator, and of an artist. As a lawyer, his ability and accomplishments were legend. As an orator, he could sway an audience as few persons in our history. As an artist, he loved beauty and nature; he possessed an orchestral and harmonic temperament; and the gift of a sensitive soul. In thinking of him, I recall Emerson: "Most men act from motives of external compulsion; few are strongly and steadily inspired from within." Especially these words, "strongly and steadily inspired from within," are words that best describe him.

The mighty oak fell, and then there was a silent, empty place.

This is true of Ramos Antonini. But the lessons he taught endure in the hearts and minds of the working people of Puerto Rico for whom he fought so hard. Perhaps it is because this dedicated man has his origin in humble beginnings and had tasted the disappointments that come from poverty that he devoted himself to the working man and the poor. He quickly became their leader. Over and over again he repeated the call for unity in the labor ranks until the call was heard and understood and heeded. He showed the workers how to fight for their rights. He was responsible for setting minimum rates of pay for hourly or daily toil.

On one occasion, he even went into the canefields to lead a strike which was to paralyze the sugar centrals and result finally in an islandwide labor contract by collective agreement. On another occasion, he was shocked to learn how lenders were exploiting the workers by charging the most usurious interest rates so that the laborers became hopelessly mired in debt. Thus, he conceived the establishment of a workers bank through pioneering legislation. The Workers Bank has been acclaimed as one of the most advanced financial institutions in this hemisphere. The bank, established only a few years ago, already ranks fourth among all financial houses in Puerto Rico. The U.S. Government has shown its interest in using this institution of Ramos Antonini's creation as an example for all Latin American countries.

The mighty oak fell, and then there was a silent, empty place.

Yes, the voice of Don Ernesto is gone from us, but the foundations he built endure as Gibraltar. He was one of the most influential of the group of originators, creators, and builders of a new concept within the U.S. political system. He contributed brilliantly to the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico—to its structure, its organization, and its purpose.

As we gather today to pay tribute to our beloved friend, we must indeed be grateful for the legacy that he leaves us—the legacy of a life richly lived and dedicated to that which gives hope and courage.

It is a legacy which has meaning for us here today at this place and at this time. Perhaps of all his contributions, the most lasting is the lesson he taught, that poverty is no insurmountable barrier to opportunity and success; that man should have dignity in his soul, and that he must have hope for the future and take price in what he is able to accomplish in the present; that each should give something of himself to others; that in this way each accomplishment can be multiplied and multiplied again.

The institution which we meet here to dedicate is in the true image of Ernesto Ramos Antonini. For many to whom opportunity might not otherwise come, it will provide the threshold from today to all the tomorrows.

Why Fulbright as Chairman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the column by Gould Lincoln, published in the Saturday, March 5, issue of the Washington Evening Star builds up a most interesting point. Sure if Senator FULBRIGHT felt that President Truman should have resigned, he should give up his chairmanship of his Senate committee, as spokesman for the administration. Mr. Lincoln's column follows:

WHY FULBRIGHT AS CHAIRMAN?

(By Gould Lincoln)

The peace-at-any-price and appeasement bubble has burst. Congress has voted so overwhelmingly as to be almost unanimous for funds to continue the war against the Communists in Vietnam. All the Fulbright and Morse speeches attacking the Johnson administration's conduct of the war, including its policies, all the sniping of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY and other Democratic Senators have a hollow sound in view of the tremendous votes, by which the Morse resolution to withdraw the backing given by Congress last year to the President to use the Armed Forces to resist aggression in Vietnam was defeated, and by the even more devastating defeat of any attempt to halt the passage of the war funds bill.

Congress has spoken by its votes, and the world must know now that all the sniping in that body at the Johnson policies in Asia, all the demonstrations and petitions against the conduct of the war in Vietnam in this country do nct represent the real feeling of the American people.

If the sentiment of the people, of the great mass of voters, is not revealed by Congress when it votes on issues, where is it to be revealed—especially in an election year, when all the Members of the House and one-third of the Senate are to be chosen at the polls?

It isn't how a man talks in Congress, but how he votes, on which he will be judged. Evidently, the great majority of the Congress is not taking any chances on this Vietnam issue.

FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, voted first for the Morse resolution to rescind the authority given the President to prosecute the war. And then he voted to pass the bill giving the President some $4 billion to prosecute the war. Only two Senators, MORSE, of Oregon, and GRUENING, of Alaska, went all the way and were consistent. They voted for the Morse resolution and against the passage of the bill.

Nor does the fact that 78 Democrats in the House announced their opposition to any enlargement of the war in Vietnam change their votes for the bill. They voted, when the showdown came, for the passage of the bill authorizing the funds needed to conduct the war. If they had had the courage of their convictions, they would have voted against the passage of the bill. As it turned out, only four Members of the House voted against passage.

It is also of interest that KENNEDY—and his brother, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts—voted to table the Morse resolution and voted for the passage of the bill. In the coming election campaigns none of the leaders in the opposition in the Senate to the conduct of the war in Vietnam are up for reelection. But if they were, with the exception of MORSE and GRUENING, they could point, if they wish, to their votes last Tuesday. This is true of the less violent critics of the conduct of the war.

FULBRIGHT, a Rhodes scholar, has been an admirer of the British parliamentary system of government. Indeed, after the elections of 1946, when the Republicans took command of Congress, he publicly urged President Truman to appoint a Republican Secretary of State and then resign the Presidency. There was no Vice President at that time, and the law of Presidential succession would have placed the Republican Secretary of State in the White House. President Truman did not think well of the idea.

Having been soundly rejected by the Senate as its leader on foreign policy—as shown in the votes on the Vietnam war bill—is it not time for FULBRIGHT to resign the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee? Such a move could be followed by the appointment of a supporter of the President's foreign policy. It is impossible to believe that, in the light of such a vote in the British House of Commons, a foreign secretary would not be forced out. But FULBRIGHT continues to act as though he were the chief spokesman of the Senate on foreign policy—and military policy—in Vietnam. Safe in the chairmanship, he will continue to act so, no matter what.

War does not stand still, not when it is a hot war, although some of the critics of the

President are clamoring against any acceleration. The President's policy is to press so hard on the Communists that they eventually will come to the peace table—a thing that they have refused to do so far unless we abjectly withdraw all Armed Forces from Vietnam—and quit fighting. Those, like Morse and Fulbright, who want us to get out of Vietnam, are proposing all kinds of plans that would only play into the hands of the enemy—which in the final analysis is international communism. And this we must face in Vietnam and in the United States.

Support or Rose-Colored Glasses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE LOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the National Farmers Organization for its outstanding success in hard-nosed bargaining that has been improving the economic life of farmers wherever it concentrates its efforts.

This farmers' group, only 7 years old, has now become the second largest farmers' organization in Wisconsin. This is dramatic testimony to effectiveness and accomplishment.

Some basic NFO tenets can be clearly discerned in the following editorial in the current NFO reporter, which I insert in the Record:

Which Will It Be: Support or Rose-Colored Glasses?

Any enterprising young farm lad with his fortune to make might consider setting up in a small way as a manufacturer of rose-colored glasses. The market for them is great already, and is said to be increasing. There is a particular market for rose-colored glasses that can also increase the softness of the farming business landscape. But as is usually the case with such strain-reducing paraphernalia, they often blot out a vital portion of the picture they present. This is a danger that faces the farmer today. It offers a challenge which must be met head on if we are to reverse the trend of liquidation of the family farm, and grow and prosper, instead.

Everyone knows the world has grim sights to offer, and may well be offering grimmer ones tomorrow. Any moment there may be earth satellites galore, though no longer an earth. And together with frightening things to see, there are all the new facilities for seeing them more clearly. At any rate, the exposure of error and the collapse of illusion everywhere confronts us. Not everyone likes this. The liking of truth, let alone the dedicated search for it, is not extensive. Truth is a luxury item, not a mass-consumed commodity. If the truth about the world in general is never in great demand, how much less is the truth about the farm and about the NFO collective bargaining approach to low farm income in demand?

"It is far better," someone has said, "to light one little candle than to sit and curse the dark." Such constructive objectivity has quite apparently led to a heart-warming unity of purpose among farmers in Iowa. Dissenters of yesteryear have joined with NFO during recent weeks, and there is confidence among the rank and file that separate groups and factions will ultimately join in further perpetuating efforts toward accomplishment of NFO's long-range goals.

However, every farmer should keep in mind the truism that things can look rosier than they really appear to be. Each individual must examine every facet of the individual-group relationship and make sure that no one farmer, professor, newspaperman or politician is looking at the farm picture through rose-colored glasses.

Theodore Roosevelt once said: "Every man owes a part of his time and money to the business or industry in which he is engaged. No man has a moral right to withhold his support from an organization that is striving to improve conditions within his sphere."

In other words, every farmer has a moral obligation to support the organization that has a plan for solving the farm problem. This means that no thinking farmer can avoid the moral obligation of supporting the National Farmers Organization.

In 7 short years, NFO has progressed beyond the wildest expectations of seasoned observers. Nationally, NFO has become accepted as a first-class citizen—equal to every other business association in the country. Through teamwork, cooperation, NFO has made its way through severe growing pains, and has emerged as a working force in improving red meat prices. The quality of the organization's leadership has gained for NFO not only national recognition, but also the assurance that NFO pronouncements will be listened to and evaluated in all responsible circles.

Yet in the final analysis, the real strength of NFO lies in the growing realization among farmers that "Every man owes a part of his time and money to the business or industry in which he is engaged," as stated by Theodore Roosevelt—"No man has a moral right to withhold his support from an organization that is striving to improve conditions within his sphere."

Observance of Purim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish holiday, Purim, this year was observed yesterday, March 6. It is a significant commemoration, not only because it marks the anniversary of one of a long series of persecutions inflicted on the Jewish people, but also because it marks the valiant stand of the Jews in the face of religious discriminations, cultural repressions, physical tortures, and even the horrors of attempted genocide.

Purim celebrates the deliverance of the Jews of Persia from a plot to destroy them. The book of Esther relates that Haman, a close adviser of King Ahaseurus, convinced the King to designate a date on which all Jews would be killed for allegedly being unfaithful to the state. Ahaseurus' Queen was Esther, a Jewess who had concealed her religion when she married. When she learned of Haman's plot, she told Ahaseurus that she was Jewish and that she would join her people to die with them if he signed the decree. Ahaseurus instead ordered his adviser, Haman, to be killed.

On February 4, 1965, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 177 to express the sense of the Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion. It is public knowledge that Soviet Russia has prevented the Jews behind the Iron Curtain from participating in the traditions and institutions which have long been an integral part of Judaism. During the Purim observance it is fitting for us to join together in renewing our efforts to insure religious freedom for the Jews, and indeed for all peoples, who wish only to practice their faith without interference and harrassment from more powerful neighbors.

Passage of House Concurrent Resolution 177 and similar legislation would be tangible evidence of our intentions and would reaffirm to the Soviets and to all nations our belief that mankind the world over has the inherent and inalienable right to be free from tyranny and oppression.

They Love Peanut Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if I am becoming known as the "peanut politician," I am delighted because the Second District of Georgia, which I proudly represent, produces more than $50 million worth of the delicious "goobers" annually. This, incidentally, is more than any entire State in the Union, excepting Georgia, of course.

The proposal to cut back school lunchroom funds and the advent of National Peanut Week caused Mr. George P. "Mr. Pete" Donaldson, executive secretary of the Georgia Peanut Commission, to write a timely and thoughtful article, "They Love Peanut Butter." I would like to share with my colleagues this item which I noted in the Tifton, Ga., News-Examiner:

They Love Peanut Butter—School Lunch Program Cited as Taste Proof

Ask any youngster what part of the school day he likes best, and there's a good chance he'll shout "Lunchtime."

If he does, it's more in tribute to today's lunch program than in distaste for schooling. Wonderful things are being done in the Nation's school lunchrooms for our children.

Years ago, school lunch was a meager operation. Today, more than $1 billion worth of food, at wholesale values, is served to pupils during the school year.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture can be credited with a major share in providing low-cost, high-quality meals to more pupils in more schools. First, it contributes more than $200 million in surplus commodities each year. And it sets nutritional standards for meals under the national school lunch program.

Today's school lunch personnel create appetizing dishes with the accent on nutrition. For many youngsters, the lunch they get in school is the only decent meal of the day. For all pupils, the dedicated school lunch people exert an important influence at a time when the youngsters are forming lifelong eating habits.

The best example of this influence is peanut butter. More than 15 million pounds a year are supplied to schools by the USDA, more than double the amount furnished a few years ago.

Now pupils don't need any encouragement to eat peanut butter sandwiches. But creative school dietitians, knowing the high-protein content and other nutritional values of peanut butter, have developed ways to include it in the menu in many different forms.

As a result, peanut butter today is used in just about any part of the school meal—as a flavor agent in soups, basting sauces for poultry and meats, vegetable sauces, dressings on fruit salads, and in many baking products.

As the professional journal, Food Management in Schools and Colleges noted in a recent issue: "The use of peanut butter as a flavor throughout the meal, pioneered in school feeding, is now spreading to home kitchens."

National consumption of peanut butter has been increasing four times greater than the population growth and today Americans use half a billion pounds of peanut butter a year. The 15 million pounds provided the schools from surplus peanut stocks in effect is stimulating consumption at home, and thus is helping to reduce the surplus through larger commercial sales.

All in all, the school lunch program has proven itself, and ordinarily there would be no reason to curtail it.

But these are not ordinary times. Because of our obligations in Vietnam, President Johnson's budget proposals for 1966–67 include a reduction of the national school lunch program from $202 million to $183 million, as well as a major cut in the school milk program.

The need to adjust the budget in relation to defense commitments is understandable. Nevertheless, those who know the full meaning of the lunch program to pupil nutrition and farm production feverently hope a way will be found to maintain the program at its present level.

L.B.J.'s Goal: Checkmate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in Vietnam has caused every thinking American to examine and reexamine the role of the United States in southeast Asia, and indeed throughout the world.

The newspapers of our Nation have a great responsibility to their readers to present all facets of the complex situation in Vietnam to help the American public understand why our boys are fighting and dying in that far-off land. Never has responsible journalism been more important than it is today.

For this reason, I was pleased to read a recent editorial in the Detroit News, spelling out and answering some of the many nagging questions that are bothering so many Americans.

The editorial points out that the path before us is not an easy one, and it concludes:

> If we duck the obligation that lies on us all, however dire the cost, the credibility of every alliance we've made with every nation since World War II is shattered.

I am sure that the Detroit News thought-provoking editorial will be of interest to my colleagues, and I include it as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Feb. 28, 1966]

THE WORRIED AMERICAN AND VIETNAM—L.B.J.'S GOAL: CHECKMATE

The disquiet in this Nation over the Vietnam war is not confined to those critics, old Senate hands or youthful demonstrators, who oppose our active involvement, or to those whose slogan is, "Let's bomb the heart out of the Reds and get it over with."

Millions of Americans who support the President in his determination to keep our pledge and halt Communist aggression feel frustrated, have nagging doubts and raise such questions as:

How long will the conflict continue? Is it a step to a wider, or nuclear war? Can we achieve our simple goal—to help the South Vietnamese, secure and independent, plan their own future without coercion? If so, how much will it cost in lives and money, and are we going about it the right way?

The final question President Johnson himself posed in replying to the worried American at the Freedom House dinner: Is it worth it?

In World War II such questions were not asked. The aggression was directly against ourselves, the war was unlimited and our goal was announced unequivocally: unconditional surrender. The issue over Vietnam is not so clear cut.

For instance, Admiral Nimitz is reported before his death to have commented to a newsman: "I fear the war will result in a stalemate like Korea, but we must continue to keep our commitments."

The worried American is asking why all the blood, tears, and sweat that may lie ahead if Vietnam winds up as a stalemate? The answer to that is that Korea was no stalemate. The North Koreans set out to seize the South. The U.N. forces stopped them. It became checkmate, not stalemate. The Reds found out they couldn't win. They cried "enough," and today, 16 years later, South Korea is still free.

If the South Vietnam conflict winds up similarly, that again will be checkmate. Checkmate should always be the goal in limited wars. And, despite the warhawks, what is so novel or unsatisfying about such a goal? During the limited peace we've lived with in the postwar era, we've fulfilled many similar goals. We checkmated potential aggression in the Formosa Straits, West Berlin, and in the Cuban missile showdown without firing a shot. This time the aggression is real, not potential, but the result we aim at is no different.

It is true this Nation has had little experience with limited wars. The British fought them for generations. But in this nuclear-stalemated age, when an aggressor, lacking nuclear power, elects to fight the type of war he fights in Vietnam, one has to meet him head on, although bound by the confining rules that the horror of nuclear warfare clamps on us all.

If the pressures at home, political or emotional, pacifist or hawklike, inhibit Mr. Johnson from fighting the sort of limited war that is necessary in Vietnam, and if the American people haven't the fortitude, patience and will to sustain him in his resolve to keep it limited, then all of us are on the slippery slope where all conflict becomes nuclear. And if that happens, one such war will be sufficient.

Nor is escalation up to the President alone. It is the responsibility of the Reds also. Some critics hold that only the L.B.J. finger is on the escalation trigger. Yet no amount of argument about which side is guilty or promoting counterescalation gets us anywhere.

The President is not playing a solo hand. It takes two to make a war, as it takes two to make a peace. We at least know which of the two started this war and which of the two lays down conditions that block an honorable—as opposed to a face-saving—cease-fire.

How long will the war last? Like escalation, that's up to the Reds, too.

Is it worth it? The answer there is simple. We are today fighting the first war we have been called on to fight as a direct result of our postwar treaties and commitments. All those treaties have aimed at halting Communist aggression. This time, in blood, America and freedom are being actively challenged. If we duck the obligation that lies on us all, however dire the cost, the credibility of every alliance we've made with every nation since World War II is shattered.

The Reds would get the signal. So too, would our allies and the neutrals.

Those Contact Lenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents is a Washington Daily News reporter, Mrs. Clare Crawford who, on a recent assignment, was of considerable assistance in a District of Columbia Government investigation of possible inadequacies in District laws governing the fitting of contact lenses.

Mrs. Crawford's participation required considerable delicacy, ingenuity, and courage and brought some important facts to public notice. I commend to your attention an editorial concerning her activities which appeared in the News on Friday, February 18, 1966.

THOSE CONTACT LENSES

There has been growing official concern here, shared by the Washington Daily News, that the District's optometry law does not adequately guard the public in the delicate area of contact-lens fitting.

Evidence had been mounting in recent months that many lens-buyers were not getting the kind of professional service and care that these lenses seem to require.

In response to numerous complaints, the District Optometry Board, the Corporation Counsel's office and District police jointly undertook an investigation.

First, they had a look at the law—and they were dismayed. The optometry law had been enacted in 1924, when contact lenses were all but unheard of. It stated that only a licensed optometrist, or an ophthalmologist, a physician, could examine the eyes for eyeglasses. It didn't mention contact lenses. In 1946, the Corporation Counsel, noting this fact, had written an opinion that the fitting of contact lenses is "within the scope of optometry." But this opinion had never been tested in court.

Anyway, the problem didn't end there. It is common practice here for a seller of eyeglasses to grind the lenses prescribed by an optometrist or an ophthalmologist. Sellers of contact lenses seemed to be following the same pattern. But the fitting of contact lenses requires more than a prescription; that is, more than a determination of the strength the lenses should be. It involves measuring the curvature of the eye, and, as the head of the District Optometry Board put it, placing "a foreign object in the eyse."

Officials decided it was time to determine, once and for all, whether the intent, if not the letter, of the law made this practice illegal. The News assigned reporter Clare Crawford to help the city find out.

Mrs. Crawford was fitted for contact lenses at two optical companies, a process that took about a month, and on Wednesday, two opticians were arrested and charged with practicing optometry without a license. In one case, the optician arrived at his own prescription; in the other—a more subtle test of the law—the optician required a doctor's prescription, but measured the curvature of Mrs. Crawford's eyes himself.

The cases are now headed for court. Whatever the court decides, it seems clear that the law needs to be clarified. It should set forth precisely what professional training should be required of lens-fitters at all stages of the contact lens process. Possible injury to the eye is at issue; the penalties should be harsh enough to stay the hands of the unqualified.

"Underground Bishop" of Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Perth Amboy, N.J., was, on several occasions, visited by the Most Reverend Paul Hnilica, S.J., known as the underground bishop of Slovakia, who was a guest of my old friend, Rev. Michael J. Churak, pastor of the Most Holy Trinity Parish and Supreme Chaplain of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

Bishop Hnilica visited the United States recently and his visit was described in the February issue of "Good Shepherd," official organ of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America by its associate editor, Mr. John C. Sciranka, of Passaic, N.J.

The story and experiences of Bishop Hnilica are worthy of our study and admiration, so I insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with pride:

"UNDERGROUND BISHOP" OF SLOVAKIA EXPRESSES ADMIRATION FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PROGRAM OF A GREAT SOCIETY AND THE WAR ON POVERTY

(By John C. Sciranka)

Bishop Paul Hnilica, on his way to Scranton, Pa., where he was principal speaker at the annual dinner of the American Slovak Society of Lackawanna County on Sunday, February 6, was welcomed by the American Slovak leaders at the auditorium of St. John Nepomucene Parish, 66th Street and First Avenue, New York City on Saturday afternoon, January 29. The bishop was an overnight guest of Msgr. Stephen J. Krasula, P.A., pastor. He was accompanied by Rev. Dr. Felix Litva, S.J., professor of Gregorian University in Rome, where the bishop as exile from Slovakia resides. Bishop Hnilica is known as the underground bishop, who had a concentration camp in his native Slovakia, for his seminary. He was secretly ordained in a hospital in preparation for martyrdom, and became a bishop in a dark, candlelit basement.

He was born in Slovakia 45 years ago as one of eight children of poor parents and in his youth worked as a road builder; that is why he expressed great admiration for the program of Great Society of President Johnson and his war on poverty. He witnessed the poverty in many countries he visited. Pope Paul VI assigned to him the crusade of prayer for Slovakia and captive nations. He appeals for the prayers and acts of mercy for the persecuted and the persecutors.

Bishop Hnilica holds a unique record of being ordained on St. Michael feastday, September 29, in a hospital room by a bishop there. Three months later he was consecrated bishop in a basement of a private home by the light of two candles. His bishop consecrator was dressed in civilian clothes and only two other persons were present. The bishop consecrator then told him: "This is no glorious celebration; it is rather a preparation for martyrdom." This secret consecration took place on January 2, the feast of the Holy Name of Jesus. He celebrated mass secretly in Bratislava, capital of Slovakia, in private homes. Bratislava, which has a population close to 300,000 had once 180 diocesan priests besides those in monasteries. Today it has 17 diocesan priests in active pastoral ministry.

Bishop Hnilica had a dramatic escape to Austria and then to Rome. His Jesuit Superior General there sent him to Innsbruck to complete his theological studies. No one knew that he was already a bishop. He took part in the Vatican Council first as peritus and in 1964 as one of the Council Fathers. In 1965 he addressed the Vatican Council on dangers of communism. He visited India on several occasions and is pleading for the starving people of India and his native Slovakia, who hunger spiritually and materially.

Bishop Hnilica was welcomed by the representatives of American Slovak organizations and press, associated with the Slovak Catholic Federation of America and assured of their aid, also continued support of the Institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius, dedicated in Rome in 1963 during the 11th centenary of the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to what is now Slovakia, where the priests are trained for future work in that country, now under control of communism.

Bishop Hnilica was met at the Kennedy airport by Monsignor Krasula and Father Robert Tomlian. On Saturday morning he celebrated mass at St. John Nepomucene Church, assisted by Monsignor Krasula. In the afternoon he was welcomed in the parish auditorium by the parishioners and representatives of our Slovak organization. Monsignor Krasula welcomed and introduced the honored guest from Rome, who lectured for 1 hour on his experiences. Monsignor Krasula thanked the bishop, who imparted his episcopal blessing on those present.

Editor John C. Sciranka introduced the representatives of our organizations and societies and welcomed the bishop on behalf of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

A three-member delegation came from Scranton, Pa., to escort the bishop to their city, namely Rev. George Matirco, new pastor of the Holy Ghost Parish, Olyphant, Pa., County Judge John Sirotnak and Edward Greshkovich, who were introduced. The lecture was closed with a prayer by Father Matirco and the singing of the Cyrilo-Methodian hymn, and the Slovak anthem, "Hej, Slováci."

Columbus, Ind., High School Pupils Explain Views of the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following four essays, written by Columbus High School students in observance of Freedom Appreciation Day.

They afford an inspiring insight into the thinking of responsible teenaged youngsters.

Here, enmeshed in the day-to-day process of lawmaking, perhaps we grow somewhat jaded in our view of the American way. Here are four young people who are preparing themselves to take part in the American way. We would do well to read their views.

The essays have been written by Connie Brown, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Brown; Ben Stoner, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Stoner; Andrew Graham, son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Graham, Jr.; and Barbara Morford, daughter of Mrs. Freda Morford, all of Columbus:

FREEDOM APPRECIATION DAY—STUDENTS EXPLAIN VIEWS OF AMERICAN WAY: CHANCE TO GROW

(By Connie Brown)

Right now, in a small war-weakened country in southeast Asia, two kinds of men are fighting for two different ways of life. One way of life restores to mankind its God-given privilege of individualism. The other way denies man his individual self and God.

The former is our way of life—the American way, the way whose base is dignity, initiative, personal freedom, and concern for wrong. The latter is based on materialism—nothing else, just materialism. Living this kind of life, man is no longer man but rather an animal.

Living the American way of life is an art of living through which one may think bigger, reach higher, grow greater, and live more deeply than anywhere else in this world.

America's way of life is a tough, competitive sport whose rules are written so everyone can win. America's way of life challenges the willing to achieve heights they never dreamed possible. And it gets them there. The way of the Americans gives everyone the right to be himself, the right to fail and to try again.

America is the world power today. Why? Because men grateful for the chance to expand themselves in their own chosen fields used their initiative to heighten her economically, socially, and culturally and set her out front. America is the place where you write your own biography. The American way is unquestionably a unique way of life.

Almost anywhere one looks in the United States he can see effective efforts of people to take care of themselves and each other. People living under democracy are not beaten to insensitivity to the need of their brothers. The sanctity of the home, respect for the individual, respect for the rights of others are all common concerns of the American people. The American family can enjoy privacy, build security and strengthen its ties with society, all without fear of offending the Government because that Government is comprised of people with the same concern.

M. B. Schnapper says in his article, "Facts of American Life":

"The democratic system of government practiced in America has survived and grown over almost two centuries. The people like it and support it. It has served as a model for similar governments in Latin America, South Africa, Turkey, India, and Australia. The stress on the point that each individual has equal opportunity has sent many men of humble origin to great height."

The spirit of the people who live the American way is the spirit of freedom. Freedom and the American way are synonymous. If Americans like living in the free world, they have a job of using freedom, practicing it and preventing its abuse. This way of life could stop working if people stop supporting it.

The American way of life is the gift for which men by the thousands have made the supreme sacrifice, men who left a life worth living. But the trial of freedom and the wars fought for its perpetuation are never fully won. Americans fight for their beliefs when they free themselves from misunderstanding and discrimination and when they provide an environment in which others may also experience this personal growth. Freedom is a personal thing. The only fetters needing to be broken are those within the self.

Achievement of the Individual

(By Ben Stoner)

Our "American way" may first be considered as a pattern of thought. This pattern of thought, varied by a heterogeneous mixture of individual ideas, is the sum of American ideas, beliefs, and hopes. Its greatest importance and difference lies in its individualism.

English, German, Italian and other individuals have created a society which depends upon the individual for its livelihood. America has chosen specific qualities from persons of all nationalities and blended and refined these to create something it calls its own.

By promoting equal opportunity for the success or failure of every person, our Government of representative individuals is promoting advancement of a nation through achievement of an individual. Broad and strong relationships between the Government and the people are essential so an individual can gain identification with the whole and thus call this Nation his Nation.

In order to attain this position of harmony, our Government needs to aid the individual who is hindered by environmental circumstances which prevent his development to full potential.

Our pattern of thought is also a product of our chosen religious and our family ties. An American develops a sense of right and wrong and a general method of behavior through religious and family association. These connections are invaluable in forming the character needed to face a demanding society. A demanding society, as such, exists because the strength of a community lies within the strength of its individuals.

A second meaning can be associated with the term the "American way of life." All Americans are assured of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our life and growth as an individual are necessary for the function and prosperity of the whole Nation. Yet, forceful control is placed on this growth, for individual freedom ends when it inhibits another.

Our way of synonymous life and liberty promotes a unique pattern of thought with a desire to maintain this position. Our Government provides this assurance with a premium of the earnestly declared right to the pursuit of happiness. This term, however, is ambiguous for happiness can be pursued anywhere without the slightest possible chance of fulfillment.

Our American way of life is an attempt to eliminate environmental difference, thereby establishing equal opportunity. The plans of rebuilding cities, fighting poverty and poor health, establishing civil rights and providing good education, all represent American dedication—that is helping all by helping individuals.

This idea of domestic concern may also serve to elevate youngsters handicapped by a poor family background, as successfully shown in "Project Headstart." Although organized worship is prohibited by law in public institutions, such as schools, because of the violation of an individual's freedom of religion, moral instruction by society and related organizations is prevalent.

Another characteristic of our life is the American way of free enterprise. We pride ourselves that we have freedom of travel, of occupation, of recreation and, in general, freedom as an individual to establish our goals and attempt to achieve them. We can safety and often fruitfully oppose our Government's action with the assurance of a protected minority. Our individual freedom to accomplish is only as limited as our ability and desire.

Business, small or large, domestic or foreign, Government or civil, enjoys the same privileges and advantages through freedom of enterprise. Businesses decide what, where, and how many products to make with little Government stipulation. However, business privileges, as with individual's privileges, need limitations. To protect a nation of consumers and keep prosperity, there is no substitute for Government regulation which, constructively developed, prevents exploitation of individual privileges by group interests."

The American way can be summarized by a generalization of the American dream and hope for the future. Americans are showing all over the globe their conviction for the protection of the American way, and thus, for the protection of the individual freedom and privileges of others.

The United States as a nation has taken the lead in securing democracy for its citizens and is now leading in the struggle for a free world in which a freeman can live. American hopes are not blighted by a possibility of destruction. Our Government is standing with purpose and determination against the encroachment of undemocratic principles.

Vital Matter of Competition

(By Andrew Graham)

One of the most precious aspects of American life is competition. Combining this with limited government has made this country the strongest in the world, strongest politically, militarily, socially, and economically. It is this competition and free enterprise which must be preserved.

A responsible sector of the society firmly believes that, because there are poor persons in this society, there is something wrong with the system. They suggest the control of business to make employment for more and the involvement of Government in programs.

These programs would expend massive amounts of money to maintain the poor in a fashion to which the responsible, productive members of society have become accustomed and find the unemployed jobs.

Such dreams of a semi-Utopia—where no one is deprived or taken advantage of and where no one is unemployed—provide the mind with sweet diversion but they certainly are not realistic. In any economic system where one's ability and productivity are exchanged for money there are those who have no saleable abilities or services. It is the responsibility of these people to make themselves valuable, not the responsibility of society. Indeed, it is in keeping with the American tradition of initiative and individualism to help one's self.

These comments are not advocating the return of laissez faire or the return of a great have-not class. But, the luxury of socialism should not be indulged in too deeply.

A socialistic society, by the virtue of its removal of incentive to compete and its facade of giving something for nothing, encourages depenednce by the governed upon the governors.

A competitive economic and social order is best, because it recognizes the fact that a human being will not produce at his best unless he is in competition with someone else. When one is allowed to compete for one's living, the highest standard of living results for the most.

Freedom in Variety of Choice

(By Barbara Morford)

Grasslands, mountains, near arctic wastelands, deserts, and farmlands—all describe the physical America. Her geographic diversity is greater than that of nearly any other nation. Her people have come from every part of the globe, representing different races, religious and social backgrounds. Because of this variety, it follows that the interpretations of the American way of life will vary from American to American. Variety is a striking characteristic of America.

The predominance of this variety reminds me that our political system is one that permits and even depends upon it. To function, our democracy must have a number of differing opinions. An individual may express political ideas, or if he so chooses, may remain indifferent to the operation of government.

Fortunately, most Americans choose to include some political activity in their way of life. In degree, of course, this activity varies from that of the American who casually acquaints himself with the issues before an election to the one who gives up private life to seek public office.

The diversity in American social life is very great indeed, magnified by the ambiguity of the word "social." Differences such as origins and experiences of our people lead to social patterns, values, and judgments about which it is not easy to generalize. All that I find of significance here (besides the variety) is the great degree to which social life is influenced by the economic and political aspects of the United States.

Economically, Americans have been grouped according to a most important factor, income. This ranking is perhaps the best means of distinguishing among groups of Americans who, because of similar incomes, may have similar social and political inclinations.

The founders of our system of government made certain that each citizen will be free to choose his own way of life. He will be influenced by heredity and environment, but direct governmental control must be strictly limited. Certain civil rights are guaranteed and must not be infringed upon by Government. The function of the American governmental organization is to benefit the individual and enable him to make his "pursuit of happiness."

Though easily taken for granted, this is not a characteristic of the governments of a great part of the world's population. Basic political theory of communism, and of fascism, stress that the individual is important only in respect to his value to the state. He is insignificant as an individual and must live according to the plan created for him by the state.

In the United States the variety, in itself, is a clear indication of our freedom in the choice of a way of life.

Catholic Press in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, February was a Catholic Press month. On this occasion, the Children's Friend—Priatel Dietok—official organ of the Youth of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, which organization is very well known in my district and throughout the country, the following interesting article was published in the February issue, compiled by Mr. John C. Sciranka, well-known American Slovak journalist.

On this occasion, I pay tribute to the members of the fourth estate of the Catholic Press of America, which is a sentinel of our freedom and insert this interesting article on the history of the Catholic Press in the Record.

Pioneer Catholic Press in America Traced to the 18th Century: Slovak Newspapers Had Their Beginning in 1886

In this the Catholic Press month, we turn our thoughts to the pioneers of Catholic Press in America. We learn from Catholic writers that the Catholic periodicals in the United States now numbering hundreds of publications and millions of readers, had their roots in pioneer printshops of the 18th century.

Many of the early journals which blazed a trail for the 580 Catholic newspapers and magazines now published in the United States were not officially associated with the church, although edited or published by Catholic laymen.

The beginnings of the Catholic Press in America, according to an article by that name in the 1960 Catholic Press annual, have been a disputed part of history, with various publications claiming the honor of being first.

Research by Frank A. Hall, former director of NCWC news service, shows that "the first distinctly Catholic American publication undoubtedly was the U.S. Catholic Miscellany, founded by Bishop John England, of Charleston, S.C.," the article states.

First issue of the Miscellany appeared on June 5, 1822.

Earlier roots were in a number of publications, including Le Courier de Boston, a French-language newspaper issued in 1789, and the Michigan Essay or Impartial Observer of Detroit in 1809.

Le Courier was edited by a Catholic layman. The Michigan Essay was a parish organ instituted by the Reverend Gabriel Richard of St. Anne's Church in Detroit.

Before launching the paper the priest kept his parishioners informed by stationing his sacristan at the door of the church after Sunday Mass to cry out the news. His reports even included results of horse races and dates of fox hunts.

The first of a series of Irish journals appeared in 1810. The Shamrock or Hibernian Chronicle concentrated its news on Ireland and on church matters.

All the Irish journals succeeding it were produced by Catholics, although not all were concerned with specifically religious subjects.

Bishop England's United States Catholic Miscellany is credited in the Catholic Press Annual as "the first systematic effort by which Catholics of the United States could defend the principles of their religion."

The earlier Catholic publications were almost entirely concerned with struggling for civil and religious liberty of the people, according to the article.

The Miscellany was suspended in November 1822 for lack of funds, but resumed publication 2 years later. It closed shop in 1861 when the Civil War began.

In 1825 the Truth Teller began publication in New York City, becoming the spokesman for the city's Catholics, according to the article.

The paper was run by laymen with many priests contributing. Eventually it became involved in politics and lost most of its clerical support.

The second U.S. Catholic paper to have episcopal approval was the Catholic Press of Hartford, Conn. Started in 1829, it continued until 1833.

U.S. Catholic publications began to grow steadily from about the year 1830.

New magazines appeared. The first was the Metropolitan or Catholic monthly magazine, published in Baltimore. Started in 1830, it lasted only a year.

The Jesuit and Catholic Sentinel began publication in Boston in 1829. Now named the Pilot, it is considered "the oldest Catholic newspaper to survive to the present day," says the article.

The Sentinel's founding was followed by the establishment of the Catholic Telegraph in Cincinnati in 1831. It is called the Catholic Telegraph-Register today.

The Pittsburgh Catholic was launched in 1844.

While there has been disagreement over which is the oldest U.S. Catholic publication still existing, the Boston, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh papers each have a claim to distinction.

The Pittsburgh Catholic has been published the longest under the same name.

The Catholic Telegraph-Register has been published the longest with almost the same name—that is, with the addition of the word "Register."

The Pilot is the oldest U.S. Catholic newspaper published without interruption, although under a succession of names.

Many other publications started up, only to die quickly because of financial hardship. Catholic publications for young people also began to appear.

In the 19th century Catholic papers in the United States were more numerous than they are now. Today U.S. Catholic magazines outnumber Catholic newspapers by more than three to one.

Many foreign language newspapers were launched successfully during the 1800's.

With the advent of the Civil War (1861–65) progress of Catholic publications was interrupted. Practically no new papers were started. Some in existence ceased publication.

After the war approximately 120 Catholic newspapers and 40 Catholic magazines were launched between 1865 and 1883.

The first "chain" of Catholic papers started around 1870. The Northwestern Chronicle, published in St. Paul for 10 years after the Civil War, became part of one chain when purchased by the Catholic Citizen in Milwaukee.

Two magazines which continue to circulate today had their start in 1865—Ave Maria and the Catholic World.

The 1870's saw many more newspapers started, but most of them were doomed to fail. In 1875 the first U.S. Catholic daily newspaper in English was launched in New York, the Daily Telegraph. It, too, ran into debt and failed.

From 1875 on, a great number of publications appeared. Some survived and became significant. Others died, leaving only a name.

The Catholic Register of Denver, successor to several pioneer papers in Colorado, was founded in 1905. It became the nucleus to the Register chain of newspapers in 1929, now serving 35 dioceses.

America magazine, considered the first weekly Catholic publication of opinion in the United States still existing, was started in 1909 by the Society of Jesus.

Because of the steady growth of Catholic publications, the Catholic Press association was formed at Columbus, Ohio, in 1911, the same year the Catholic Bulletin began publication in St. Paul.

Our Sunday Visitor began in Huntington, Ind., in 1912, giving rise to another chain, the Our Sunday Visitor Press. It issued its first multidiocese edition in 1940 and now serves 16 Sees.

Fifty-five newspapers were established between 1900 and 1920.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference was established in 1919 by the bishops of the United States. The press department of this organization took over and enlarged the functions of the Catholic Press association's news service.

The Commonweal, an American Catholic journal of opinion edited by laymen, began in 1924.

The Catholic Digest, a monthly magazine, was started in St. Paul in 1939 by Revs. Paul Bussard and Louis Gales.

It now publishes several foreign editions and has a circulation approaching 1 million. Its editorial offices are in Roseville, Minn.

Editor John C. Sciranka who made a study of these publications and who is an old friend of Mr. Frank A. Hall, wishes to add to this vital data also the fact that the first Slovak newspaper in America. The Amerikánsko-Slovenské Noviny (American Slovak Gazette) was established in Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 21, 1886, by two Slovak teachers from Spis County, Slovakia, Ján Slovensky and Julius Wolf.

This year one of the largest Slovak Catholic newspapers the Jednot (union), a weekly, published at Middletown, Pa., is observing its 75th anniversary. The Ave Maria, monthly, published by the Slovak Benedictine Fathers of Cleveland, Ohio, is observing its 50th anniversary.

The Katolicky Sokol (Catholic Falcon), official organ of the Slovak Catholic Sokol was published first as a supplement of the Slovák v Amerike in New York City and since April 15, 1911, as the official organ of the Slovak Catholic Sokol.

The Priatel' Dietok (Children's Friend) was founded on May 1911 by the late Father Francis Skutil in cooperation with the late Father Michael Bajor.

The Slovaks in America have over 30 publications, which speaks well for them, considering the fact that in Slovakia, which has a population of over 4 million, there is only one Catholic publication, the Katolicke Noviny (Catholic News) published weekly on four pages in a tabloid format because the Red regime is in power and will not permit the freedom of the press. Let us in this free country aid the growth and progress of our publications.

Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the Happy Warrior of Texas has given to us his last smile and his final handshake. Very few Members of Congress in recent years have made a greater lasting impression upon us than did Albert Thomas when he walked among us. A tireless worker, a fearless advocate, an effective but considerate opponent, he invariably carried his congressional assignment forward to success without any apparent thought that defeat might come his way. Such a companion and coworker invariably leaves behind him a living immortality. His companions remember him long and well,

As John Donne wrote in his "No Man Is an Island":

> Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind, and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

The death of Albert Thomas has diminished this body more than a little. We miss him; we shall continue to miss him. No man, even while in great pain and with a constant reminder of the transient challenge of mortality, bore himself more courageously than our companion who has now made his final adieu.

Mrs. Aspinall and I extend to Mrs. Thomas and the family our most sincere sympathy and condolences.

National Eye Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Congressman Fred B. Rooney, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, introduced H.R. 12373 on January 27, 1966, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health. I am proud to join my colleague in sponsoring this legislation.

The National Eye Institute would conduct research on blinding eye diseases, blindness, and visual defects. I commend our colleague for having taken the initiative in this area. During the past 19 years it has been my privilege to have been a member and an officer of the National Council to Combat Blindness, Inc., a voluntary agency, which through its Fight for Sight makes awards annually, through grants-in-aid, student fellowships, postdoctoral research fellowships, and clinical service projects. Since 1946 the council has carried on extensive work in the field of basic and clinical eye research at hospitals, medical schools, and universities throughout the United States and elsewhere in the world.

To date the Fight for Sight has disbursed close to $2½ million of private funds to finance research at over 100 institutions in the United States and abroad. This effort is not enough because by 1975, unless there are some dramatic major developments in the field of eye research and treatment, there will be 16 million blind persons in the world. Today in the United States alone there are 3½ million men, women, and children with chronic noncorrectable visual defects and that number is increasing each year.

The Fight for Sight, in its support and encouragement of basic and clinical eye research, provides a unique and dynamic machinery for uniting scientific research workers, business and professional people, housewives, and others in many walks of life, so that eye resesearch can advance the health and well-being of all mankind.

Eye research anywhere can help men, women, and children everywhere. Truly the Fight for Sight is a global imperative. This spark in the dark, first ignited in 1946, has become an international beacon for ophthalmic research workers. The lost sight of one young woman has become an illuminating vision for thousands of loyal volunteers for the Fight for Sight and a reason for hope to those whose lives are threatened by impending blindness.

Miss Mildred Weisenfeld, founder and executive director of the National Council to Combat Blindness, Inc., has led the Fight for Sight since 1946. In 1949, Miss Weisenfeld, who lost her vision in her youth, because of a blinding eye disease called Retiitous Pigmentosa, for which no cure has yet been found, appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives—81st Congress—and made a significant contribution to adding "and Blindness" to the then National Institute for Neurological Diseases which is today the National Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

Mr. Speaker, you and a number of our colleagues are aware that during the past 10 years I have served as president of Fight for Sight and therefore, I do not want there to be any misunderstanding about my endorsement and sponsorship of a bill calling for the establishment of a National Eye Institute.

I have today introduced such a bill and I want to state that the National Council to Combat Blindness, Inc. and its Fight for Sight will not be eligible to receive any funds directly or indirectly by the enactment of this legislation. The work of National Eye Institute will be carried on under the direction of the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary, research in the field of blinding eye diseases and visual disorders. The National Council to Combat Blindness, Inc. in cooperation with its Fight for Sight leagues, will continue to raise funds to supplement the work done by the National Eye Institute in such areas where the Institute may not be authorized to act. The Fight for Sight will continue to finance special projects such as the Children's Eye Clinic—the first such clinic established in the eastern part of the United States at Columbia-Presbyterian Hospital in New York City and another such clinic recently established at the Wills Eye Hospital in Philadelphia, as well as to finance other service projects.

It will also continue its work in the field of public information and education and guidance to individuals requesting information regarding available sources for assistance to blind persons.

Perhaps with the establishment of the National Eye Institute, a more orderly and coordinated war against blindness may be waged and the fight for sight will be won, or at least the causes of blinding eye disease may be uncovered and cures found. Then and only then will it be feasible and practical to seek a merger of voluntary agencies in the eye research field in order that government and private voluntary agencies may coordinate their respective activities.

Prior to my introduction and cosponsorship of legislation to establish a National Eye Institute I wrote to the distinguished members of the Scientific Advisory Committee of the National Council To Combat Blindness, Inc., for their opinion on the proposed legislation. My letter of February 10, 1966, reads as follows:

> I would appreciate your comments on the proposal for a National Eye Institute as suggested by H.R. 12373 introduced by Congressman Fred B. Rooney, of Pennsylvania, which I am planning to cosponsor.
>
> With kindest personal regards.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Herbert Tenzer,
> *Member of Congress.*

The above letter was sent to the following members of the scientific advisory committee:

Charles A. Perera, M.D., chairman, associate clinical professor of ophthalmology, Columbia University, College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, N.Y.

James H. Allen, M.D., chairman, department of ophthalmology, Tulane University, School of Medicine, New Orleans, La.

Bernard Becker, M.D., head, department of ophthalmology, Washington University, School of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo.

Goodwin M. Breinin, M.D., chairman, department of ophthalmology, New York University Medical Center, New York, N.Y.

Hermann M. Burian, M.D., department of ophthalmology, State University of Iowa, College of Medicine, Iowa City, Iowa.

Arthur G. De Voe, M.D., director, the institute of ophthalmology, the Presbyterian Hospital, New York, N.Y.

Dan M. Gordon, M.D., department of ophthalmology, New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, New York, N.Y.

Michael J. Hogan, M.D., chairman, department of ophthalmology, San Francisco Medical Center, University of California, School of Medicine, San Francisco, Calif.

V. Everett Kinsey, Ph. D., assistant director of research, Kresge Eye Institute, Detroit, Mich.

Peter C. Kronfeld, M.D., head, department of ophthalmology, University of Illinois, College of Medicine, Chicago, Ill.

Irving H. Leopold, M.D., medical and research director, Wills Eye Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Edward Maumenee, M.D., director, the Wilmer Institute, Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md.

John M. McLean, M.D., chief, division of ophthalmology, Department of Surgery, New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, New York, N.Y.

Stuart Mudd, M.D., department of microbiology, University of Pennsylvania, School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pa.

Frank W. Newell, M.D., chairman, section of ophthalmology, department of surgery, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Edward W. D. Norton, M.D., chairman, department of ophthalmology, University of Miami, School of Medicine, Miami, Fla.

Theodore C. Ruch, Ph. D., chairman, department of physiology and biophysics, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

Samuel L. Saltzman, M.D., attending staff, department of ophthalmology, New York Eye and Ear Infirmary, New York, N.Y.

Harold G. Scheie, M.D., chairman, department of ophthalmology, University of Pennsylvania, School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pa.

George K. Smelser, Ph. D., director of research, department of ophthalmology, Columbia University, College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, N.Y.

Bradley R. Straatsma, M.D., chief, division of ophthalmology, department of surgery, University of California Medical Center, School of Medicine, Los Angeles, Calif.

Kenneth C. Swan, M.D., chairman, department of ophthalmology, University of Oregon Medical School, Portland, Oreg.

Phillips Thygeson, M.D., director, Francis I. Proctor Foundation for Research in Ophthalmology, San Francisco Medical Center, University of California, school of medicine, San Francisco, Calif.

I have also written to the officers and directors of the National Council to Combat Blindness—Fight for Sight—and others for their comments and I shall keep my colleagues advised of their replies from time to time.

I am today introducing a bill to establish a National Eye Institute. Mr. Speaker, I believe the distinguished group of scientists which supports this legislation should be heard and their views considered by the appropriate congressional committee and ultimately be considered by the Congress.

Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed in the past several months a stunning series of airline crashes, the two most recent having taken place in Japan. Naturally, after a calamity of this sort, there is a great thirst for details in the hope that a clear understanding of the cause and circumstances of the crash will preclude the possibility of similar accidents.

It is, then, imperative that these investigations be conducted with utmost thoroughness, clarity, and fairness, so that no fact will be left unturned. But this does not require or justify irregular or unjust procedures.

I have reason to believe that not every effort is being fairly expended in at least one of these investigations, that of the Boeing 727 crash in Salt Lake City on November 11, 1965.

Forty-three of the ninety-one persons aboard died when United Airlines flight 222 caught fire as a result of ruptured fuel lines. The Civil Aeronautics Board began conducting public hearings February 21 in Salt Lake City.

I would respectfully call to the attention of my colleagues a telegram I received from Wyoming Attorney Mayne Miller, who is representing the heirs of one of the victims of the November 11 crash.

His telegram raises several questions on the general fairness of the investigation, including the right of representatives for the next of kin of the dead and injured to participate in the inquiry, and the clearness and impartiality of the procedure.

I submit first the telegram from Mr. Miller, and second, an article from the February 20 issue of the Denver Post, which provides background information on the investigation and the airline accidents:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
February 22, 1966.

Congressman TENO RONCALIO,
Washington, D.C.:

From the opening, Monday morning, I have been attending the Salt Lake public hearing on the United 727 disaster, and I have observed the following practices which appear urgently to need correction.

No one representing the dead and injured is allowed to be a party to the inquiry or ask questions, but all probable defendants are allowed to be parties and question witnesses.

United and Boeing are furnished Government exhibits free, but families of dead passengers must pay for them at a cost of several hundred dollars. The questioning is done in a faltering, inconclusive way such that no clear answer or no answer at all to the key inquiry is elicited. For example, Captain Kehmeir testified he could not pass a physical exam shortly after the accident, but no attempt was made to show whether he was unfit at the time of the accident. Many like examples could be noted and the record will be muddy and full of unexplained inconsistencies. Compassion for the crew is allowed to blunt the effort to get at the facts.

Although this is a public hearing, no effort whatever is made by the hearing authorities to make technical terms understandable, thus much testimony is meaningless to all but experts in aeronautical language.

For the above reasons, it seems to me the hearing falls short of an adequate public inquiry to discover and reveal the facts bearing upon the cause of the disaster; the hearing has the aspect of a meeting of a mutual protective association and the public interest is not properly served. I strongly urge you to investigate this proceeding and the rules applied in all such proceedings, by a full-scale congressional investigation if need be.

MAYNE MILLER.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Feb. 20, 1966]

SALT LAKE 727 HEARING OPENS MONDAY

(By Dan Partner)

SALT LAKE CITY.—Why a Boeing 727 airliner descended at three times the normal rate to a crash landing short of the runway here November 11 may be answered in a public hearing that starts Monday.

Forth-three of the ninety-one persons aboard died when United Airlines flight 222 caught fire as a result of ruptured fuel lines. The plane struck the asphalt over-run with a gravity force estimated at 8.9 and slid on its belly after the main landing gear separated.

The hearing is the first of three involving the 727 to be conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB). Hopefully it will provide clues as to the unusual circumstances surrounding the accidents that have mystified the airline industry.

The 727, a second-generation aircraft with 3 jet engines clustered in the high "T" tail section, went into service in February 1964 and flew 17 accident-free months before the first of 3 tragic accidents placed it under suspicion.

LAKE MICHIGAN CRASH

All 30 persons died August 16 when a United flight plunged into Lake Michigan while preparing to land at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport.

Fifty-eight of sixty-two persons died November 8 when an American Airlines 727 crashed into a hill in the final approach for landing at Cincinnati.

Three days later the United flight was wrecked at Salt Lake City, and there were demands from several sources that the plane be grounded pending investigation.

This accident prompted telegrams from two Congressmen to William F. McKee, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA).

Representative SAMUEL L. DEVINE, Republican, of Ohio, suggested grounding all 727's for the duration of a fleetwide review of the aircraft's operations and structural integrity. Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, called for a public report from the FAA on the safety and durability of the 727, and inquired about progress toward development of onboard devices to prevent fire.

The FAA refused to ground the 163 planes in use by U.S. airlines, maintaining there was no relationship between the three accidents.

This stand was supported by the CAB which hastily named a special investigating group to study the performance and flight characteristics of the plane.

THREE CRASHES KILL 131

The 3 crashes, happening within 90 days killed 131 persons and accounted for more than half of the fatalities in accidents of U.S. carriers during 1965. CAB figures show that 253 persons—226 passengers and 27 crewmen—died in 7 fatal accidents during 1965.

In mid-January public attention again was focused on the jetliner when the CAB warned that the aircraft was a potential firetrap. the plane's fuel system, the CAB safety experts said, is prone to rupture during hard landings, and its cabin is furnished with materials far too combustible for safety's sake.

This criticism was provoked by the Salt Lake City crash in which the 43 victims died of suffocation.

The CAB's safety staff recommended that the landing gear be altered to assure that it wouldn't break up and inward, should the landing gear fail as it did at Salt Lake City. The gear broke fuel lines passing through the fuselage to the engines.

The Boeing Co. reportedly is making some changes in the landing gear, fuel lines, and generator leads to reduce the likelihood of post-crash fire. The landing gear is being designed to break away from the fuselage should it fail during a hard landing.

As the airlines, Boeing, and the Government agencies continued to reevaluate the 727 there appeared to be no major changes necessary in the pilot training or operating procedures. The airlines and their pilots—and a majority of the flying public—maintained confidence in the aircraft.

TOKYO CRASH

Then on February 4, the most disastrous single-plane accident in civilian aviation history occurred in Japan—a 727 jammed with 133 Japanese crashed into Tokyo Bay. There were no survivors in the accident that was in some ways similar to the August 16 tragedy in Lake Michigan.

CAB investigators flew to Tokyo to observe the probe into the All Nippon Airways crash as the FAA and CAB again received demands that the 727 be grounded.

Among the critics was Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Democrat, of Texas, whose protests early last week may have had something to do with the scheduling of an unusual meeting Thursday at FAA headquarters in Washington.

SIXTY EXPERTS CALLED

The Agency summoned 60 experts from the 17 U.S. and foreign airlines using the 727 for a discussion of problems in operating the medium-range trijet. The all-day, note-comparing session revealed nothing that would clear up the four accidents, a spokesman said.

The meeting did serve as a springboard for the FAA to again voice confidence in the 727 as an answer to Gonzalez and his colleagues. The aircraft was described as "wonderful" and "completely airworthy." An intensive investigation had failed to reveal any flaws in design, the FAA said.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

The Agency did propose a series of changes in cockpit procedures and crew training "to assure ourselves that an aircraft coming in visually at night will not suffer the consequences of the four others." These changes were described as "discussion items" and would be "refined" at another meeting with the air carriers in about 10 days.

Clifford W. Walker, Deputy Director of the FAA's Flight Standards Division, said the changes in procedures was to obtain "a reasonable rate of descent as you approach the ground."

The rate of descent, he said, related to the four accidents because—

All four crashed before reaching their landing point.

The weather in each case was reasonably good.

There were no reports of trouble from the crews.

The FAA's study showed the plane airworthy.

He concluded this rundown by posing the question: "So where would you look?"

LOOKING AT COCKPIT

Obviously, the FAA is looking in the cockpit where the flight crew carries out procedures as prescribed by the manufacturer, taught by the airlines, and supervised by Government agencies.

Walker avoided any flat statements that the four crashes were caused by pilot error, which annually accounts for about 37 percent of airline crashes. How the pilot operates in the cockpit, particularly when the 727 descends rapidly, reportedly was a major item of discussion at the meeting.

The rapid descent, called sink rate, is built into the 727 and is a "characteristic that demands attention," Walker said. The high sink rate, pilots say, is no more of a serious problem to a qualified 727 operator than to a pilot of any other commercial jet.

It is the sink rate, however, that apparently is under the closest scrutiny.

The FAA suggested Thursday that radar altimeters that "talk" to the pilots be installed in the 727's for use during landings. The altimeters would emit noises as the plane passed through 1,500 feet, 1,000 feet, and 500 feet during its descent, thus assisting in keeping tabs on the sink rate.

The FAA also suggested that carriers require pilots to call off actual altitude of the airplane as it descends.

UNDER SUSPICION

These suggestions indicate that cockpit practices were the chief factor under suspicion in the four accidents—all of which occurred during night approaches when any jet is making drastic changes in speed, power, and altitude and where there is the widest difference between landing and cruising speeds.

One of the known factors in three of the crashes was a sharp rate of descent at Cincinnati, Salt Lake City, and Tokyo. Investigators haven't determined whether the Chicago accident also involved rapid descent. This jet was on a landing approach, but its last known altitude was 6,000 feet, considerably higher than the other three.

Investigators reportedly have evidence that in each crash the pilots failed to apply power in time to keep from descending faster than they realized when they started their final approach.

CAB member John G. Adams will preside at the hearing here, beginning at 10:30 a.m. at the Hotel Utah. He will be assisted by B. R. Allen, director of the bureau of safety, and Richard R. Rodriguez, hearing officer.

Eskimo Scout Battalions of Alaska's National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, members of the Alaska National Guard are playing an unusual role in bolstering this Nation's military preparedness, especially the Alaska scouts. Last week I called the attention of the Members of the House to an article relating to the training program of these famed scouts, a unique Eskimo unit of Alaska's National Guard.

Another article pertaining to the training of these outstanding servicemen was recently authored by Mrs. Genie Chance, special correspondent of the Anchorage Daily News, and because of the special significance of the Alaska scouts in our national defense and the excellence of Mrs. Chance's report, I insert this article in the Congressional Record:

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News, Feb. 20, 1966]

Alaska National Guardsmen Are Proud of Role in Scout Battalions

(By Genie Chance)

As we climbed into the tracked troop carrier at Camp Denali, the snow was falling lightly and the temperature was in the mid-20's. Camp Denali is a training site for the Alaska Army National Guard at Fort Richardson.

We bounced and jostled over rugged, snow-covered terrain in search of the famed Eskimo scouts who had begun their annual 2-week training encampment. We marveled at the ease with which the tracked vehicle plowed through 3 feet of snow in unbroken trails. We hung on when the machine would suddenly lurch down a steep embankment.

Col. Fred Reger, State assistant adjutant general informed us the scouts in the field were expecting us so we would have no difficulty in finding them.

"But," he said, "if they had been instructed to infiltrate an area without being observed, you could walk within 2 feet of them and not see them."

Colonel Reger recalled an incident in maneuvers several years ago when that really happened. The scouts followed their orders to the letter and stayed in place behind "enemy" lines, unobserved, even by the friendly forces who moved in and captured the enemy. When the war games were over, troops were sent into the area to inform the scouts. For 2 days the search continued, but the scouts not knowing the maneuver was over, managed to escape detection. They were finally located by helicopters.

According to Colonel Reger, the Eskimos and Athabascan Indians of the two scout battalions have infinite patience and the skill and instinct of the native hunter to move quietly and to blend into the surrounding terrain. They are outstanding marksmen, too.

As we climbed from our chariot, we were greeted by a rotund, pleasant officer with flashing black eyes. Maj. Joe Pike, commanding officer of the 2d Scout Battalion, 297th Infantry, with headquarters in Bethel, is a Creek Indian from Oklahoma. He had been employed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in southeastern Alaska since the 1940's. Four years ago he moved to Bethel to take command of the battalion. He said he has no difficulty in communicating with Alaska natives—that he notices a striking similarity in the languages of the Athabascan and the Creek. We were told of an Athabascan who was sent to the Southwest last year for training, and he discovered he could converse easily with the Apaches.

Capt. Marshall Lind, schoolteacher at Good News Bay, explained that his company of men were preparing to leave on reconnaissance patrols in 10-man teams. He said the objectives of the operation were terrain navigation, map reading, compass work, cover and concealment, and practice in the use of snowshoes. When we expressed surprise that Eskimos need to learn the use of snowshoes, Captain Lind explained that many of the scouts come from areas along the coast and outlying islands where strong winds keep the snow packed hard. Thus, they have no experience with snowshoes at home.

Warm, friendly faces greeted us as we moved among the troops. Sergeant Active, of Togiak, proudly told us he has been in the scouts for 16 years. He has served on the village council for 4 years. In the winter he hunts and traps—trading the skins of seal, otter, mink, and fox to the village store for supplies. In the summer he is a salmon fisherman. He sells most of the fish to the cannery, keeping only about 1,000 to feed his dogs during the year.

Sergeant Roberts, of Good News Bay, laughed as he admitted that he and the other 20 scouts in his village look forward to their annual trip to the Anchorage area. He says that this is the only opportunity to have a reunion with many of their friends from other villages. Sergeant Roberts works at the fish cannery in his village.

Back in the troop carrier we headed for the area where the 1st Battalion was training. Maj. Bill Caldwell reported that the battalion, with headquarters in Nome, has units in 33 different villages, including St. Lawrence Island and Little Diomede.

Capt. John Schaeffer is one of the few tall Eskimos we've ever met. A native of Kotzebue, the 26-year-old officer moved to Nome last year where he serves as supply officer, 1st Scout Battalion, 297th Infantry. At the age of 19, he received his first commission in the Alaska National Guard. By the time he was 22, he became a captain. He was one of the youngest commissioned officers in the National Guard in the entire Nation. Captain Schaeffer is 1 of 12 Eskimo scouts who have graduated from airborne school and are qualified jumpmasters.

Capt. Timothy Gologeren, of Savoongah, has the longest record of service of any of the scouts. He enlisted in the Guard in 1941, just 1 month after it had been called into active duty as part of the 297th Infantry. He went through training at Fort Richardson and Valdez before being sent to the China-Burma-India theater, where he served until the end of World War II. By the time he returned home, he had been around the world. The 46-year-old Eskimo is commander of Company A of the 1st Battalion. His company has 121 men from Gambell, Diomede, Wales, Teller, Brevid, Mission, Gerring, Shishmaref, Elam, Koyok, White Mountain, and Savoongah.

In civilian life, Captain Gologeren is the airport manager and radio operator for Wien

Airlines in his village. He proudly reports that the eldest of his nine children is in school in Oregon preparing herself for a teaching career in Alaskan villages.

Lt. Clifford Weyiouana, 23-year-old Shishmaref man, joined the Eskimo scouts 4 years ago. He earned his lieutenant's bar last year. He has just returned from Officers Training School at Fort Benning, Ga.

He told us that he is happy to be back in Alaska—that he had never been so cold in all his life as during his stay in the South. When we laughed, he insisted.

"But it is true. The cold in the evening there is much worse than it is here."

We walked down the trail that the tracked vehicle had broken during our approach. We came upon a 10-man team dressed in winter overwhites and snowshoes. They listened intently as their sergeant briefed them in Eskimo. He pointed out their objective on the map, described their mission, and gave instructions for reporting to the command post.

All talking stopped, and silently the men obeyed the hand signals that meant to spread out. Only a few feet away, they blended into the snow and became invisible.

The sergeant turned around with a friendly smile on his face and introduced himself He was Sgt. Clifford Iknokinok, the noncommissioned officer in charge of the unit in Gambell on St. Lawrence Island. Iknokinok, 39 years old, is proud of his 17 years in the scouts. He and seven of his men received national recognition in 1955 when they rescued 11 crewmembers of a Navy plane that was shot down by the Russians.

He recalls that it was a bright sunny morning. The villagers watched as the plane crashed into the sea. Iknokinok ordered his men to launch skin boats, and through the rough waters they rushed to the rescue. Through their heroic action all lives were saved. Iknokinok was the guest of the Navy in Washington, D.C., where he was awarded the Navy's Gold Wing.

Unlike most National Guard units, the Eskimo scouts perform a continuing military operation along the northern and western periphery of Alaska and up the great rivers. They provide reconnaissance, surveillance and patrol capability and report daily by radio to U.S. Army, Alaska. They perform these daily tasks without pay but do it out of loyalty to their country. As Colonel Reger said: "These Eskimo scouts are the proudest people in the National Guard."

After just a few hours in the field with them, we knew the truth of the statement.

Federal-State Cooperation To Combat Unfair Trade Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Paul Rand Dixon, has written a most informative article on the effort by the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, to combat unfair trade practices. This article appeared in a recent issue of the publication, State Government, and under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION TO COMBAT UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES

(By Paul Rand Dixon)

Established in 1914 to stop trade practices which unfairly injure honest businessmen, and given responsibility in 1938 to protect consumers from false advertising and other deception, the Federal Trade Commission has recently taken action to share its experiences more fully with State and local authorities.

The Commission on October 14, 1965, established an Office of Federal-State Cooperation to develop programs of effective cooperation between the FTC and State and local officials interested in the enactment or administration of State antitrust, anti-deceptive-practice, and consumer-protection laws.

The purpose is to aid local initiative in meeting rising demands from the public for more adequate protection against unfair and deceptive practices. Effort will be made to nip such practices in the bud, by action at the State or local level, before they grow into problems of interstate or national significance. Thus will need for Federal action be minimized, and judgments about what constitutes unfair or deceptive practice will so far as possible be decentralized to the people who are most directly affected.

The Office of Federal-State Cooperation is under the FTC General Counsel, James McInnes Henderson, and is in the immediate charge of an Assistant General Counsel, Gale P. Gotschall.

At the outset, the new office is performing its functions in 3 principal ways, by supplying information to State and local officials, by referring complaints to them, and by preparing to aid with legislative proposals.

SUPPLYING INFORMATION TO STATE OFFICIALS

To make sure that State and local officials at all levels are aware of the public service available from the Federal Trade Commission, effort is being made to acquaint them with the types of unfair, restrictive or deceptive practices in interstate commerce which might warrant corrective attention under laws administered by the Commission.

This liaison with State and local officials is carried on not only from the Commission's offices at Washington, D.C., but also from field offices located in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Houston, Kansas City, Los Angeles, New Orleans, New York City, San Francisco, and Seattle. Thus State and local officials are being encouraged to report to the FTC any unfair or deceptive practices in interstate commerce affecting their areas, in order that the commission may give most effective service to the people in that section of the country.

A method is being sought for distribution to State and local officials, including County and city attorneys, librarians and school principals, of the Commission's publications which contain information about its jurisdiction and activities. Thus the officials will be in a better position to advise their constituents, both businessmen and consumers, when they might have just cause to complain to the FTC about an unfair competitive practice or one that is misleading or deceptive.

Four of the Commission's publications which are available free upon request may be worthy of mention.

A leaflet entitled "Fight Back," generally intended for consumer use, is aptly described by its subtitle: "How can you avoid being gyped? And, if you have been, what can you do about it?"

A pamphlet, "Here Is Your Federal Trade Commission," contains more detailed information, including description of the antitrust and economic reporting functions, as well as the antideceptive-practice functions, of the Commission.

"Look for That Label," a leaflet for consumer use, presents information about the special statutes administered by the Commission requiring truthful labels as to composition on wool, fur, and textile products.

Another pamphlet, "Business Advisory Service," contains information about how businessmen seeking to comply with the law can obtain advice and guidance from the Commission.

We also are particularly desirous that State officials and attorneys, and school principals and librarians, know about availability of the Commission's "News Summary," which is published about once a week and is sent to any official or organization on request. It contains a running account of FTC actions as they occur, and presents information about all Commission activities, including restraint of trade, deceptive practice, and economic reporting. For those interested only in deceptive practice and textile or fur labeling matters, the leaflet "Advertising Alert" is issued about once a month.

REFERRING COMPLAINTS TO STATE OFFICIALS

The FTC frequently encounters trade practices which appear to be unfair or deceptive but which are beyond its jurisdiction because used within a single State and not in interstate commerce. The Commission's authority, by and large, extends only to practices used across a State line, in interstate commerce.[1]

Complaints about practices used within a single State that are unfair or deceptive come to the Commission not only from consumers. Just as frequently they come from businessmen. The complainant may be a businessman who would prefer to operate on a higher level of ethics than the level to which he is being forced by local competition. Or he may be the operator of an interstate business who by reason of complying with Federal law is losing business to intrastate concerns which divert trade to themselves by use of false advertising or other misleading or unfair practice.

When the Commission has information about unfair or deceptive practices which appear to be used primarily within a single State, it will refer the information to the appropriate State, or local official for consideration as to whether action might be warranted under State or local law. Such referrals are subject to the public interest requirements applicable to other commission actions. For example, matters which appear to be primarily private controversies, in which the interests of the public are not significantly involved, will not be referred.[2]

Such referrals will be accompanied by citation to precedent court decisions or such other information as might be helpful to the State or local official in deciding whether to proceed.

The FTC's Office of Federal-State Cooperation provides legal and technical assistance to the State attorneys general and other State officials to the fullest extent practicable. For example, if a State official has need for legal, economic, accounting, or medical advice on a point within the expertise of the Commission's staff, effort will be made to supply the advice upon request.

Enforcement officials contemplating whether to institute action respecting an alleged or suspected violation of State law can be supplied with information showing whether the Commission has record of action involving the potential defendant, and whether it has had prior experience with similar alleged violations. If the nature or legal effect of the laws administered by the Commission, or Commission actions by way of trade regulation rule or stipulation or order to cease and desist, become an issue in any matter involving a State, the Commission will provide authoritative information relevant to such issues, and in appropriate cases will consider filing briefs amicus curiae, or inter-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

vening pursuant to rule 24(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

POSSIBLE NEW LEGISLATION

If a State does not have adequate legislation to deal with unfair or deceptive trade practices, the Commission's Office of Federal-State Cooperation will, upon request, aid in formulating a draft of proposed legislation. For this purpose, information about existing and proposed State laws against general false advertising and other unfair and deceptive practices is being assembled, and will be collated into a form judged most useful in advising State officials with respect to such matters.

The staff's efforts will be focused primarily on the types of conduct which would be classified as unfair methods of competition, or unfair, or deceptive, or discriminatory practices, or false advertisements if used in interstate commerce. In other words, the objective will be to stimulate State adoption and enforcement of laws prohibiting use of practices which would be unlawful if coming within the interstate jurisdiction of the FTC.

This treatment of the situation should tend toward a more or less uniform and consistent level of business regulation throughout the several States, and thus facilitate trade and commerce and consumer understanding of business practices in our highly mobile society, while a minimum level of ethics is being established to prevent unfair competition and deceptive or monopolistic practice.

To permit fullest utilization of the commission's experience it may be desirable for States to consider adoption of legislation which would remedy unfair or deceptive practice by injunction or assessment of civil penalty and not require proof of intent or knowledge as a prerequisite to a finding of violation. This assumes that fraud and other types of criminal conduct commonly requiring proof of intent or knowledge on the part of the accused before he can be convicted, and involving fine or imprisonment as the punishment, are already adequately covered by State laws and by Federal laws such as the postal fraud statute, the fraud-by-wire statute, and the Sherman Antitrust Act, which are administered by agencies other than the Federal Trade Commission.

I might say in passing that we enjoy a very congenial working relationship with these other Federal agencies, and we often consider with them whether given conduct of a reprehensible character is more appropriate for treatment under the criminal laws or under the cease-and-desist authority of the FTC.[3] The Commission also has a variety of advisory and guidance procedures designed to effect industrywide and voluntary compliance with the trade regulation laws at minimum expense both to the Government and to the business community.

One reason for considering adoption of laws complementing the Federal prohibitions against unfair methods of competition and unfair, deceptive, or discriminatory practices, as already enacted in several States, is that the administering official and the courts of the State, in applying the law, would have the benefit of 50 years of Federal decisions interpreting similar language. The 800-odd court decisions reviewing FTC orders are collected in 6 volumes and 3 paperback supplements entitled "Statutes and Court Decisions, Federal Trade Commission," available at nominal cost from the U.S. Government Printing Office. The Commission's decisions, numbering several thousand, are published in 61 volumes, and are digested and indexed in handy loose-leaf services available from commercial publishers of trade regulation material.

Another advantage of delineating the prohibited areas of conduct by use of the general terms "unfair," "discriminatory" and "deceptive" is that these terms encompass all lines of business and all types of practices which may be detrimental to competition or injurious to consumers. The types of business recently covered by the Federal Trade Commission acting under such general language include manufacture and distribution of food, drugs, clothing, shoes, home improvements, automobiles, electrical appliances, housewares, toys and recreation equipment.

Under that general authority the Commission has promulgated trade rules or guides for more than 150 different industries, as recorded in title 16 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

The types of practice covered by the Commission's actions are equally varied. They include—

Bait advertising, or the advertising of an attractive offer, not in good faith, for the purpose of obtaining leads. When the prospects respond, the salesman disparages the advertised product in order to sell more expensive models.

Use of deceptive guarantees, or claims that an article is "guaranteed" without disclosing limitations of the guarantee.

Referral selling, or the promise of commissions on sales made to friends, relatives, or neighbors. Very seldom does the amount of commissions measure up to expectations.

Misrepresentation of credit or finance charges, or failing to disclose fully the terms and conditions of sale.

Selling used or reconditioned products as new.

False claims that prospect has been specially selected as part of an advertising or introductory promotional program, or that offer will be in effect for a limited time only.

Deceptive pricing, or false claims that the product usually sells for a much higher price.

False claims as to safety, health benefits, composition, quality or performance of product.

Agreements among competitors to fix prices or restrict competition.

Conspiracy to eliminate a competitor.

Use of discriminatory pricing or allowances which favor a large concern and injure its small competitors.

Congress purposely employed general prohibitory language, rather than cataloging the practices which might then have been considered unfair or deceptive, so that the law would be flexible enough to cope with novel practices, or with variations on old practices, which sharp operators might invent to eliminate competition unfairly or to cheat the public.

The FTC's Office of Federal-State Cooperation is ready to work closely with the National Association of Attorneys General, the Council of State Governments, the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, and others in helping States to formulate or improve laws in this field.

We will participate by invitation in conferences of State and local government agencies, and in individual conferences with attorneys general and other State and local officials interested in consumer protection and trade law administration. We invite them to communicate with us, and to visit us when they are in Washington. They will find our latchstring always out.

To bring us up to date quickly on the situation in the several States, and improve our capacity to render cooperative assistance, we ask that the attorney general or other official primarily responsible within a State for administering antitrust, antideceptive practice, and consumer protection laws send us any news releases which are issued on these subjects, and any readily available information showing the present extent of activity in his State to protect consumers and honest businessmen from unfair, discriminatory, restrictive, and deceptive trade practices.

CONCLUSION

To recapitulate, the Federal Trade Commission has established its Office of Federal-State Cooperation to work closely with State and local officials interested in the enactment or administration of laws to combat false advertising and other unfair and deceptive trade practices. This cooperative effort is expected to result in improved service to the public, not only through increased effectiveness of the FTC in apprising itself of interstate practices needing attention, but also through improved methods of dealing with trade abuses of an intrastate or local character.

The objective is to provide more adequate governmental protection against selling practices which victimize either the consumer or the honest competitor.

Comments, suggestions, and inquiries concerning the Commission's program for Federal-State cooperation are invited. They may be addressed to me, to the Commission's General Counsel, James McI. Henderson, or Gale P. Gotschall, Assistant General Counsel for Federal-State Cooperation, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] The Commission's authority, under sec. 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, to prevent "unfair methods of competition" and "unfair or deceptive acts or practices," extends only to methods, acts, or practices used "in commerce," and "commerce" is defined as meaning interstate or foreign commerce or commerce in the District of Columbia. That authority comprehends all types of goods or services and all types of business, except banks, common carriers, and certain activities of packers and stockyards operators (title 15, U.S. Code, secs. 44 and 45). The Commission's authority under the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, to prevent price or other discriminations which tend to lessen competition or create a monopoly, also is limited to discriminations used "in commerce" (15 U.S.C. 13). The Commission's authority to prevent false advertising of food, drugs, medical devices, and cosmetics under the 1938 Wheeler-Lea amendments to the FTC Act is somewhat broader, extending to false advertisements disseminated via the U.S. mails or "in commerce," or disseminated by any means likely to induce purchases in commerce (15 U.S.C 52). The Commission's jurisdiction to prevent misbranding of wool, fur, and textile products and to prevent the sale of dangerously flammable wearing apparel fabrics, extends to firms producing goods for introduction into commerce or selling goods which were received in commerce (15 U.S.C. 68, 69, 70, and 1192).

[2] The Commission's General Procedures, in sec. 1.13, provide that it will act only in the public interest and not with respect to mere private controversies which do not tend adversely to affect the public. Other sections of the Procedures possibly applying to such referrals provide that the Commission may institute action upon request of government agencies or members of the public, or upon its own initiative (Sec. 1.11); that the name of a complainant will not be divulged except as required by law (1.12); and that confidential data may be disclosed by the Commission to an agency of State government upon due consideration of the Commission's rules, statutory restrictions and the public interest (1.134). Sec. 6 of the FTC Act contains some limitation on disclosure of information such as trade secrets and customer lists (15 U.S.C. 46), and sec. 10 of the same act prohibits employees from disclosing information without Commission authorization (15 U.S.C. 50).

[3] When the Commission has "reason to believe" that anyone has used an unfair or deceptive practice in commerce, and that a proceeding would be "to the interest of the public," a formal complaint is issued stating the charges and giving opportunity for hearing. If the charges are sustained, a cease-and-desist order may be issued directing the party proceeded against to stop using the practice found to be unlawful. Appeal to

U.S. circuit courts and the Supreme Court is provided. If no appeal is sought within 60 days, or the order is affirmed by the courts, it becomes final, and violation thereafter is subject to civil penalty of up to $5,000 for each violation and each day of violation (15 U.S.C. 45). The procedure for preventing discriminatory practices is similar (15 U.S.C. 21).

Chicago Poverty War: Order From Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM GIBBONS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty in Chicago has received and is still receiving a great deal of publicity, some bad and more of the favorable category.

In a February 23 article by News World Service reporters, Basil Talbot, Jr., and Thomas Day, the war on poverty is discussed as it pertains to the city of Chicago. I read it in the Charlotte, N.C., News of that date.

The article follows:

CHICAGO POVERTY WAR: ORDER FROM CHAOS

(By Basil Talbot, Jr., and Thomas Day)

CHICAGO.—Despite congressional probes and charges of political control, the huge war on poverty program in Chicago has emerged from its first year of operation well organized.

Mayor Richard J. Daley, a powerful figure in Democratic politics, has retained close control of the program, and the city's poor have been enlisted in the campaign, put on as frontline troops.

As such the poor are proving effective in helping bridge the gap between their neighbors and organized public and private services. But, events of the last year have pointed to another gap—between the poor as foot soldiers and the established welfare professionals as planners.

Federal officials, who hold the purse strings, have privately urged Chicago to reorganize its program so the poor can have a greater voice in mapping its activities.

Members of the staff of the Midwest branch of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) cited the law that requires programs to be "developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of the areas and members of the groups served."

In answer, local antipoverty workers pointed proudly to their recruitment of the troops and contended that with experience and time the poor can rise to policymaking positions. They described this as an evolutionary process that does not require any radical reorganization.

These discussions were heightened in recent months as Chicago asked OEO for more funds to expand its operation. Chicago will run out of antipoverty money in the latter part of March and the next move is up to the Federal Government.

Pressure from Congress may grow more intensive. Last week an investigation of Chicago's program was launched by six investigators sent by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee.

POWELL has expressed dissatisfaction with the Chicago program ever since hearings last April into charges of political control of the city's antipoverty effort.

Within OEO there is a variety of opinion on the issue.

Old-line staff in the OEO regional office have repeatedly made it clear they want to see more meaningful resident participation, meaning that the persons served should make decisions on who represents them.

The newly appointed head of the regional office, Theodore J. Jones, has not been as specific. He said of the city's program, "There must be some reasonable degree of self-determination in the flow of representatives from the advisory committees to the parent body."

The parent body is the city's policymaking board, the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity (CCUO).

In Washington, poverty war director, R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., has resolutely refused to be pinned down on this point. Shriver's chief assistants have talked about OEO's flexibility and one aid said, "Good faith appointments by mayors can be as effective as a vote."

Daley took firm control of the program from the start. He became chairman of CCUO, and appointed its more than 60 members.

"We moved fast," said one CCUO official. "The first grant of $57,570 arrived in December 1964. By the end of 1965, CCUO had received a total of $21,820,700 from OEO and had hired a staff of more than 1,000."

Neighborhood Youth Corps, Project Headstart, and some 35 community action programs were put into operation throughout the 12-month period.

All but a small number of the programs were designed, submitted, and approved before residents of target neighborhoods had a chance to examine them through the advisory councils.

This centralized control drew charges from such critics of the city administration as Rev. Lynward Stevenson, president of the Woodlawn Organization (TWO).

TWO, which received funds for a preschool program that has had little success with its proposal for a mass education project, contended Daley has used the program for political purposes.

"A mayor would have everything to lose by getting patronage politics in this poverty program," commented one of Mayor Daley's top aids. "It's not necessary to have precinct captains get jobs. The poor gets jobs through CCUO and Daley's chairmen. He gets the credit for what's done."

A CCUO spokesman agreed with the aid's remarks. "One reason we moved so fast in hiring people is so the politicians wouldn't know what was going on," he said.

Des Moines Sunday Register Supports President Johnson's Clean Rivers Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the Des Moines Sunday Register of February 27, 1966, states a truth when it points out that:

> Until one's own daily water supplies are affected it is difficult to grasp the full extent to which pollution dangers have been creeping across the continent over the last 50 years.

It adds what is all too apparent—that:

> Pollution is an enormous threat for people living along the watersheds of the Hudson, Potomac, and Delaware Rivers in the Eastern States. It also has become a very real threat to cities and towns in the Ohio River valley and to communities around the Great Lakes.

The Register feels that:

> President Johnson's clean rivers message to Congress outlines an enormous task confronting a steadily-increasing number of communities throughout the country. There can be no disputing the need for making a determined start toward bringing a halt to the growing pollution of our water supplies.

Because it deals with gigantic issues with which we are faced, I hereby include the Register's editorial in the RECORD:

CLEANING UP OUR RIVERS

President Johnson's clean rivers message to Congress outlines an enormous task confronting a steadily increasing number of communities throughout the country. There can be no disputing the need for making a determined start toward bringing a halt to the growing pollution of our water supplies.

The vastness of the undertaking he presented may be the biggest obstacle to getting the work started. Reducing pollution to a safe minimum in even one river such as the Mississippi or the Missouri is a staggering and costly task, requiring cooperation of the Federal Government, States, and local communities.

Some rough estimates of the cost of the President's program place it at $20 to $30 billion over a period of 10 to 20 years. No accurate estimates will be possible until more detailed studies of needs and methods have been made. Tentatively, the Federal Government would pay 30 percent of the cost. Local governments would be expected to pay the remainder and would recover the investment from water users and possibly some sewage disposal charges.

The enormity of the undertaking dramatically focuses attention on the carelessness and neglect that over the years have permitted the threat to our water resources to build up toward a national crisis.

Not every community in Iowa is faced with a water problem today. Far fewer have a recognized pollution problem than do not. Some are contributing to the problems of other communities by adding their bit of untreated sewage and industrial wastes. Often their contribution is so small that it does not seem worth bothering about at present.

Until one's own daily water supplies are affected it is difficult to grasp the full extent to which pollution dangers have been creeping across the continent over the last 50 years. Pollution is an enormous threat for people living along the watersheds of the Hudson, Potomac, and Delaware Rivers in the Eastern States. It also has become a very real threat to cities and towns in the Ohio River Valley and to communities around the Great Lakes.

Missouri River cities below Omaha have been discovering that the need for drastic action is not confined entirely to the thickly-populated and industrial areas of New England and the Central Atlantic coastal States.

Piled on top of all the other Great Society programs that have been proposed by President Johnson and the huge obligations this country has taken on throughout much of the world, the clean rivers proposal may seem to be that one more burden on which we would like to close our eyes and turn our backs.

Sober, realistic weighing of the facts, however, does not permit it. A determined start must be made. Because of past delays it has to be on a much larger scale than might have been reasonably adequate 10 or 20 years ago.

General Services Administration Reports on Stockpile Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1966, Commissioner John G. Harlan, Jr., who heads the Defense Materials Services of the General Services Administration, testified before the House Subcommittee on Mines and Mining on the status and progress of the Government's stockpiling programs.

The report which Mr. Harlan made was both informative and constructive, outlining the policies which govern stockpile management and defining the responsibilities of the various Government departments and agencies with responsibilities in the field. For these and other reasons, but principally because I believe the general subject is in need of the widest possible study and understanding, I am placing Commissioner Harlan's statement in the Record:

Statement of John G. Harlan, Jr., Commissioner, Defense Materials Service, General Services Administration, Before the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, March 3, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, on behalf of the Administrator of General Services, who has asked me to represent him at the hearing today, I wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity of appearing before your subcommittee for the purpose of reviewing with you the current status and progress of the Government's stockpiling programs since our last report to you.

In accordance with policies and program directives from the Office of Emergency Planning, the Defense Materials Service of the General Services Administration is responsible for managing and maintaining the national stockpile of strategic and critical materials, the supplemental stockpile, and the Defense Production Act inventory. GSA also is responsible for managing the inventory of strategic and critical materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Coproration through its barter program, which materials are periodically transferred to the supplemental stockpile.

As of the end of December 1965, a total of approximately 52 million short tons of materials was in inventories in GSA custody. These inventories include the 77 materials with current stockpile objectives and 20 other materials for which there are no stockpile objectives. Materials in the inventories are stored at 154 locations in 38 States. The acquisition cost of the inventories approximates $8 billion and the estimated current market value is approximately $7.8 billion. Of this amount, materials valued at approximately $3.7 billion, at current market value, are excess to current stockpile objectives. Materials in these inventories or on order are sufficient to meet the stockpile objective for all but 11 materials. Only one of these materials, jewel bearings, is programed by OEP for current procurement by GSA. Quantities needed to meet the stockpile objectives for the other 10 materials are to be obtained through the Commodity Credit Corporation barter program.

GSA furnishes CCC with technical advice, inspection, handling, and other accessorial services and stores and maintains the materials acquired under the barter program.

Stockpile inventories maintained at 154 locations are stored at 26 GSA depots, 46 military depots, 40 industrial plantsites, 12 commercial warehouses, 15 Government-owned sites, and 15 leased commercial sites. These materials occupy approximately 93 million square feet, of which 19.7 million square feet are closed storage space.

We store our inventories at the least cost consistent with OEP storage criteria and we constantly strive to reduce occupancy of commercial space.

I turn now, Mr. Chairman, to the progress of our efforts to dispose of the excess inventories of strategic and critical materials, the bulk of which results from technological changes and from the continuing review of defense mobilization requirements.

For the past 2 years the Government has planned for the disposal of these excesses on a commodity-by-commodity basis. Orderly programs for the disposal of excess materials are planned so as to have minimum impact on normal supply sources. Disposal plans have been formulated in close coordination with concerned Federal agencies and industry. Excess materials are released into the market in a manner carefully calculated to conform to the ability of the markets to absorb them without adverse economic impact. Our disposal efforts to date have been successful in this regard. With the rapid expansion in the gross national product, particularly that which has taken place in the last 2 years, we have been able to accelerate sales, at rates consistent with the needs of the domestic economy which normal sources of supply have been unable to fulfill.

Zinc, molybdenum, vanadium, columbium, and tungsten are examples of the excess commodities which we have disposed of to relieve severely strained normal supply sources. Our disposal of excess strategic and critical materials has, in many instances, been the factor which enabled continued full-scale domestic industrial operations instead of curtailment.

In fiscal year 1964, the volume of excess materials sales totaled $167 million. Disposal volume of $432.5 million was reached during fiscal year 1965. In the current fiscal year, total disposal volume reached $550 million through mid-February 1966. This disposal of materials worth more than one-half of a billion dollars within the past 7 months was accomplished without any perceptible adverse impact on the normal channels of trade.

Established Government policy to use excess strategic and critical materials to avoid cash outlays for new procurement has resulted not only in the avoidance of substantial Federal expenditures, but also has reduced the Federal drain on materials currently in short commercial supply. The volume of Government use of excess strategic and critical materials has increased to $142.9 million for the first 6 months of this fiscal year. This includes approximately $78 million of copper transferred to the Bureau of the Mint under Public Law 89–251.

General policies and guidelines for the disposal of stockpile excesses were established as a result of recommendations of the Executive Stockpile Committee report approved by the President in 1963. In accordance with the recommendations in this report an Interdepartmental Disposal Committee was established by OEP in 1963 to develop long-range programs for the disposal of excess stockpile materials. This committee, chaired by OEP, consists of representatives from the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, the General Services Administration, Small Business Administration, and the Agency for International Development. The Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Treasury Department participate as observers.

The work of the committee is supplemented by a subcommittee, chaired by GSA, whose responsibility it is to recommend the scope of the disposal program and guidelines as to the quantity and rate of sales, and to review other pertinent factors which must be considered to insure that the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, and the possible effects on interested foreign governments, are thoroughly taken into consideration in the development of each disposal plan. During the development stage of the plan, consultations are held with affected segments of industry and other interests to assure ample opportunity for exchange of views and to obtain the benefit of their advice.

In addition, ad hoc working groups comprised of agency specialists are appointed on a commodity-by-commodity basis. These groups develop the necessary technical, economic, and statistical data required by the subcommittee in arriving at long-range disposal recommendations.

These huge quantities of Government-owned strategic and critical materials excess to Government needs not only represent a substantial economic burden to the taxpayer, but they also constitute an ever-present uncertainty to producers and consumers who otherwise would be concerned only with the usual competitive forces of supply and demand.

The present strong economic situation impacted by increasingly heavy defense requirements is placing an abnormal strain on normal supply sources for many of the raw materials which we hold in excess. These supply-demand circumstances afford an unprecedented opportunity for the Government to divest itself of these large quantities of unneeded materials and remove, in a manner nondisruptive to the market, the retarding influence of these excesses on customary economic competitive incentive of supply sources to meet rising demands through expansion of their productive capacity.

We are intensifying our efforts to assure that excess stockpile materials are channeled into the market in a manner which will enable them to be absorbed without disrupting normal marketing processes and, at the same time, permit the usual competitive forces of private enterprise to plan for needed capacity to meet consumption demands without consideration of the future plans of the Government in disposing of these substantial quantities of excess strategic and critical materials.

This concludes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. I will be glad to try to answer any questions you or the other subcommittee members may have.

Stop the Theft of Dogs and Cats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to regulate the traffic in dogs and cats that are sold for scientific research purposes.

Recent articles in Life magazine and other publications have detailed the shocking operating procedures of some dealers in such animals—theft, brutality, deception. Surely we can preserve the health and lives of animals legally intended for research. Surely we must protect the thousands of household pets stolen each year and the families who love them.

My bill provides for the licensing of animal dealers and the inspection of their facilities and records, directs the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate standards governing the handling and transportation of dogs and cats, and requires that research facilities obtain animals only from licensed dealers.

Such legislation should go far in eliminating conditions which are an affront to both personal and business ethics and a disservice to the quality of scientific research in this country. I hope that immediate action will be taken by the committee and the Congress.

Specter of Illness Major Fear in Poverty Pocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the third in a series of articles written by the associate editor of the Daytona Beach, Fla., News-Journal, Mrs. Mabel Norris Chesley, dealing with children under the aid to dependent children program.

The article follows:

[From the Daytona Beach (Fla.) News-Journal, Feb. 22, 1966]

Specter of Illness Major Fear in Poverty Pocket

(Note.—What is it like to live on the dole that goes under the name of aid for dependent children? That's State and Federal money paid to women who have fatherless children and its status is bound to be an issue in the next legislature. This series deals with a specific case which while possibly not typical of ADC cases, nonetheless tells a story of struggle, of pride and of ambition.)

(By Mabel Norris Chesley)

Mary H., the "poverty pocket" mother of five, had to give up $15 of her slim income this month to hospitalize her 2-year-old son because there was suspicion that he might have leukemia.

The fear, fortunately, was unfounded. But the boy was in an Orlando children's hospital for several days, which meant long trips to that city for Mary, and extra babysitter expenses for the other children. And, of course, extra expenses for operating her 7-year-old car.

Those extra trips also hastened the need to buy new tires for the car.

A sympathetic girl friend allowed Mary to charge to her phone the long distance calls she had to make while the boy was hospitalized, and she has that debt to repay.

Mary's aid for dependent children case is more fortunate, though, than many others in this area. Because she refuses to divorce her wandering husband, she retains post exchange privileges as a dependent of a serviceman. So, monthly, she makes trips to Orlando to buy her groceries at the commissary, which saves her quite a bit.

She puts out about $75 on each trip, loading her bags with canned goods.

But she aches to buy fresh fruit for her children.

"Can you imagine," said Mary, "my kids haven't had a banana in more than a year—and that's pretty sad. But I figure canned peaches have just about the same food value, and they go a lot farther than five bananas."

In between commissary buying, Mary buys only bread, which amounts to $2 a week.

But there is the expense of a babysitter—$15 a week. She can't reduce this cost by putting the children in a nursery because a doctor says her youngest, who is afflicted with a respiratory ailment, wouldn't fare well there.

"Besides," said Mary, "I may be poor, but I still feel my children have the right to be in their own home."

In an emergency, Mary could get a $5 food order from a welfare agency, but she's too proud to do it. She explained that it would mean she would have to spend every penny of the order, receiving no cash back. And she feels this is demeaning.

The school her children attend requires that all children eat in the lunchroom. That would have been another $4.50 a week for Mary. But the principal was understanding of her situation and agreed that she need pay only $1.50 a week for the three who attend.

But a lunchroom worker takes pains to let the children know that she knows two of them are charity—and this makes Mary seethe.

Tough though her spirit is and buoyed as she is by her sense of humor, tears were in Mary's voice when she discussed one aspect of her poverty.

"The only time I feel like crying is when I look at my 12-year old," she said. "She's a real pretty girl, but her teeth are crooked. She needs braces badly to correct them. Well, that kind of work isn't included in welfare dental care. But can I crawl into some dentist's office and say: 'I will pay you some day, if you'll just fix my daughter's teeth?' I haven't got up that much nerve yet."

Mary herself needs dental attention. But something makes her draw back from accepting the welfare provision for the work.

Talking again of Florida's welfare laws, Mary concluded her story thus:

"How much better off the State would be if it had some way of helping people get off relief.

"But under Florida law as it is now, I'm not supposed to do that. I'm supposed just to sit back and accept $85 a month for as long as I remain decent and don't run around with questionable characters or stay drunk all the time. That is not the kind of example I want to be for my children—I love them far too much to abide by the implication of the Florida law."

There's another implication in the Florida law too. The legislature, in 1951, decided all women on ADC were immoral—that they deliberately were having babies in order to get an increase in their State allowance. That's why an $81 limit—raised to $85 last month—was slapped on, no matter how many children a woman has to support.

There also was that old bugaboo of racial prejudice which was spotlighted by a welfare department report a few years ago: "There's been particular criticism * * * because of large numbers of Negroes in the recipient group. Of course, one reason for this is that the average income of Negroes is proportionately lower than the average income of white persons and the need for assistance occurs more frequently in low-income groups with few, or marginal resources."

Well, Mary is white and her income is quite marginal too. She is being penalized along with a minority group for a legislative attitude.

The Great Society Cuts Land-Grant College and University Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter from Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Minnesota, and other correspondence of President Wilson all relating to the hardships that will be suffered by the University of Minnesota if funds under the Land-Grant College Act are not restored in the fiscal 1967 budget.

The 1967 Federal budget proposes a cut of more than $20 million in instructional and research funds for the 68 land-grant colleges and universities. This leaves only $50,000 per State for instructional use and in some States it would be divided between two institutions. The agricultural research funds would be cut 20 percent, even though the administration says we must help meet the world food crisis by exporting our agricultural technology.

There are no funds to replace this money. It is too late for the colleges to appeal to their State legislatures because most legislatures are not meeting this year. All of the land-grant colleges will have trouble replacing the money.

May I again remind my colleagues that for a century, educators, Congressmen, and the public at large have hailed the Land-Grant Act as the keystone of Federal participation in higher education.

University of Minnesota,
Office of the President,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 21, 1966.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: I am writing to alert you to the hardships that will be suffered by the University of Minnesota if certain omissions in President Johnson's 1967 budget are not restored. A crippling blow to instructional programs of the university would accompany the proposed decline of Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds available to the university. Proposed is a decline from $281,144 available currently to $50,000 in the coming fiscal year. This, in the face of growing enrollment pressures, is catastrophic.

The Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds, also known as land-grant funds, are used exclusively for the support of teaching positions. Eleven units in our college of agriculture, forestry, home economics, institute of technology, and college of liberal arts use such funds. In home economics, for example, more than 15 percent of our teaching budget comes from these sources. Many of these dollars are employed for tenure positions. Thus, even if such a reduction is desirable in the long run, a position that we strongly dispute, a reduction of this magnitude on such short notice places land-grant educational institutions in an almost impossible fiscal situation.

We are further distressed by declines in Federal assistance for research at State institutions (Hatch funds). A decline of 18 percent in this assistance, totaling $190,000 for the Minnesota Experiment Station, is outlined in the new budget. The effect on tenured personnel and their research could create chaotic situations. We feel duty-bound to impress upon you the adverse effect the proposed reductions would have on research work that is critical to the State and the Nation. A reduction in agricultural research funds at this time, when world attention is being increasingly directed to a world food crisis, seems particularly incongruous to us.

My conversations aimed at discovering motives behind this change in policy from formula support of research to grant support of research have troubled me. The implications seem to have been that the grant research in space science or under the National Science Foundation has been more successful than agricultural research. I am a great admirer of what has been done by these Federal agencies and what has been done by the National Institute of Health. But as an historian I think the record is clear. American achievements in agriculture are our most impressive achievements and perhaps our strongest weapon against propaganda of Communist countries.

Our agricultural progress has been based upon agriculture research that has been supported through the Hatch Act formula. I find it hard to understand why Federal policy would want to abandon a clearly successful policy which has given us unquestioned leadership for other policies where our leadership is still in dispute.

Proposed changes in the administering of cooperative extension funds worries us as well. Suggested changes call for a shift in $10 million in support from institutional allocation to allocation by the Federal Government. We feel this suggested shift does an injustice to men administering our agricultural extension programs. We are particularly proud of the ability of our Minnesota Extension Service to gage correctly the needs of the people of the State and devise programs to serve these needs. We do not favor the change. We want you to know, however, that our position is based upon the nature of funding and not upon the direction of proposed program adjustments. As you know, the University of Minnesota has been a leader in the development of community and resource development programs.

Attached are documents dealing in more detail with the concerns we have. May I remind you of the difficulties faced by your university if these funds are interrupted and urge you to restore them when the bill comes before you. This matter should be of grave concern not only to the administration of the university but to all Minnesotans.

Sincerely yours,

O. MEREDITH WILSON,
President.

FEBRUARY 18, 1966.

DR. HAROLD HOWE,
Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HOWE: It is my purpose to express to you grave concern over proposed cuts in Federal appropriations for instructional programs in the land-grant institutions as revealed in President Johnson's 1967 budget. Cuts proposed would deal a crippling blow to the instructional programs of the University of Minnesota.

This institution currently receives slightly in excess of $281,000 annually in Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds. These funds comprise a significant and an essential part of the institution's instructional resources and many of the funds support tenured positions. The newly proposed budget suggests a reduction of these funds to $50,000 thereby slashing more than $231,000 of critical funding for instruction.

It seems incongruous that this proposed reduction of Federal support should come at a time when the Federal Government seems to be seeking acceptable ways to help meet demands for expansion of instruction on university campuses. Our own institution, for example, has experienced a doubling of enrollment in the past 11 years.

Undergraduate enrollment has increased sharply from over 20,000 in 1954 to more than 42,000 in 1965. Our concern becomes even more pronounced when we recognize that the total number of college-age youth in the State of Minnesota has risen from nearly 167,000 in 1954 to over 232,000 in 1965. During the same period persons attending colleges in Minnesota have risen from over 38,000 to over 90,000 with projections calling for further increases in the years ahead.

In light of projections of continued increases in Minnesotans desiring college training, and in light of the significant proportions of these people served by the University of Minnesota, we are alarmed by the suggestion that Federal instruction funds be curtailed. Clearly such a curtailment would markedly impair the ability of this land-grant institution to serve the educational needs of the State and the Nation.

May I urge that every step possible be taken to bring about a reinstatement of the instructional funds in the 1967 budget. Indeed, increases rather than curtailments are in order for the health of instructional programs in the land-grant institutions of the country.

Sincerely yours,

O. MEREDITH WILSON,
President.

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION REGARDING PROPOSED FEDERAL BUDGETARY CUTS IN FUNDS FOR LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

The executive committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges views with surprise and shock the proposals in the 1967 budget for a reduction of more than $20 million in instructional and research funds going to the 68 land-grant institutions, and for a shift of $10 million in support of cooperative extension programs with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, from institutional allocation by formula to Federal allocation.

The executive committee feels that the implications of these actions are of great concern to the 98 members of the association, and to higher education generally.

Relationships between the Federal Government and the land-grant institutions, in which for more than a century desirable national objectives have been accomplished with a maximum of institutional independence and decentralized decisionmaking, have long been hailed as a model of Federal-State relationships in education. An across-the-board modification of these institutionally related programs, at a time when Federal support of higher education is being increased in federally selected categories, may be viewed as raising fundamental philosophic issues. We were of the opinion that these were not fully understood or considered under the unusual conditions which surrounded preparation of the 1967 budget.

The proposed reduction in instructional and research funds of more than $20 million represents more than 2,000 faculty members and if put in terms of endowment represent a capital of $400 million. The Federal instructional funds cut is particularly disturbing in terms of the programs of the 16 land-grant institutions predominantly attended by Negro students. A more detailed discussion of each item appears below.

TEACHING FUNDS

The budget proposes a reduction of nearly $12 million, or 80 percent, in Federal appropriations for the "further endowment" of the instructional programs of the land-grant institutions. These annual appropriations, administered by the U.S. Office of Education, are for instruction or instructional materials in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, agriculture, and related subjects. They were initiated by unanimous act of Congress in 1890 in legislation introduced by Senator J. S. Morrill, of Vermont, for the purpose of placing these institutions on a firm instructional foundation "for as long as this Nation shall live." As recently as 1960, Congress reviewed this program and, by unanimous action in both Houses, increased its support from $5 to $14.5 million annually, based on inflation and population growth since the last review. The proposed reduction is the equivalent of 1,200 faculty members and at least 18,000 students, at a time when enrollments are at an all-time high and increasing rapidly, and students being denied admission for lack of adequate staff. The budget message states that these funds are no longer needed because of other Federal aids for higher education.

This statement represents a gross lack of information on current Federal funds relating to higher education. The Federal Government has substantial programs to help students get into college. It helps build buildings, construct educational television facilities, and purchase equipment. It finances a wide variety of research programs. But, aside from the modest amount is now proposes to eliminate, it nowhere helps finance the central function of instruction of the undergraduates about which there is so much national concern today.

We note particularly the impact of the proposed cut on the 16 land-grant institutions predominantly attended by Negro students, which involves a reduction in instructional support of more than $1 million, representing more than 100 staff members at current rates and, through them, some 1,500 students. This is the equivalent to a 15- to 20-percent reduction in next fall's freshman class at these institutions, unless the funds are replaced from other sources—emergency appropriations from State legislatures, many of which are not in session and some of which meet only biennially, or increase in student fees and tuition. In several institutions, the Federal support proposed to be withdrawn represents the total amount of Federal funds going to the institutions. In one case, it represents one-fourth of the entire instructional budget.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

The proposed reduction of $8.5 million in research funds for the agricultural experiment stations of the land-grant institutions, coupled with a substantial reduction in U.S. Department of Agriculture research funds, is shocking at a time when our concerns are turning from agricultural surpluses to possible shortages, and Food for Peace is being emphasized as never before. The actual reduction in federally supported research amounts to substantially more than 20 percent, since research costs increase at the rate of 5 to 6 percent a year. This is the spigot theory of research: Under this theory one simply turns on the spigot when research results are needed, and results flow forth. Then one turns off the spigot until more results are needed. Unfortunately science has not reached the point at which faculty members and their families may be stockpiled pending the development of a food crisis in which their talents are urgently needed. Nor can research assistants forced to turn to other careers be quickly retrained or redirected.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK

The proposal for a shift of $10 million in suupport of the cooperative extension program of the land-grant institutions and the U.S. Department of Agriculture from institutional allocation to Federal allocation is described as for the purpose of assuring increased concentration of effort on rural community development and work with low-income families. The objective is praiseworthy, the method unnecessary and undesirable. The land-grant institutions have pioneered the work of rural community development and shifted resources to this area and to work with low-income families, in full cooperation and consultation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. They have also repeatedly urged additional Federal assistance for this work, which has not been forthcoming. The implications of change from cooperative consultation to Federal direction are disturbing, to say the least.

CONCLUSION

We would emphasize that the need for action is immediate and critical. Faculty arrangements for the coming academic year must normally be made within the next 2 or 3 months. Some State legislatures are on a biennial funding basis and do not meet this year. In the substantial majority of others appropriations actions have already been concluded or will be within a brief period, leaving no available source of funds for support of the faculty positions involved in the proposed Federal budget cut.

The following members of the executive committee of the association participated in the meeting at which the above statement was unanimously agreed on: President David D. Henry, University of Illinois, chairman; President Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., University of Virginia, president of the association; President James H. Jensen, Oregon State University, president-elect; President Lewis C. Dowdy, Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina; President Mason Gross, Rutgers University; President Fred H. Harrington, University of Wisconsin; President Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Indiana University; Chancellor W. Clarke Wescoe, University of Kansas; Vice Presidents Robert Kerley, University of Kentucky, Boyd Page, Iowa State University; Herman Spivey, University of Kentucky; Deans Paul Sheats, University of California; and C. C. Murray, University of Georgia. Also President Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., University of Connecticut, chairman, legislative committee.

RESIDENT TEACHING FUNDS FOR LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

The following is a table by states and institutions for distribution of resident teaching funds. If the proposed budgetary cut stands there would remain of these funds only $50,000 per State, and where more than one institution is involved, this $50,000 would be allocated in the same ratio as the total now going to the State is allocated.

Land-grant institution	*Funds for instruction and facilities (Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds)*
All land-grant institutions	$14, 500, 000
Alabama:	
Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College	95, 170
Auburn University	182, 477
Alaska: University of Alaska	205, 376
Arizona: University of Arizona	230, 951
Arkansas:	
Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College	66, 125
University of Arkansas	176, 333
California: University of California	573, 580
Colorado: Colorado State University	241, 689
Connecticut: University of Connecticut	260, 260
Delaware:	
Delaware State College	42, 122
University of Delaware	168, 486
Florida:	
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	103, 357
University of Florida	214, 386
Georgia:	
Fort Valley State College	53, 507
University of Georgia	210, 216
Hawaii: University of Hawaii	215, 040
Idaho: University of Idaho	215, 858
Illinois: University of Illinois	439, 618
Indiana: Purdue University	310, 822
Iowa: Iowa State University of Science and Technology	265, 544
Kansas: Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	251, 783
Kentucky:	
Kentucky State College	39, 471
University of Kentucky	232, 743
Louisiana:	
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	188, 920
Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	88, 496
Maine: University of Maine	223, 038
Maryland:	
Maryland State College, Division of the University of Maryland	32, 844
University of Maryland	240, 856
Massachusetts:	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	16, 667
University of Massachusetts	306, 709
Michigan: Michigan State University	385, 949
Minnesota: University of Minnesota	281, 144
Mississippi:	
Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College	127, 519
Mississippi State University	124, 253
Missouri:	
Lincoln University	$18, 917
University of Missouri	283, 760
Montana: Montana State College	216, 038
Nebraska: University of Nebraska	233, 546
Nevada: University of Nevada	206, 781
New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire	214, 426
New Jersey: Rutgers, The State University	344, 201
New Mexico: New Mexico State University	222, 606
New York: Cornell University	598, 897
North Carolina:	
Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina	101, 737
State College of Agriculture and Engineering, University of North Carolina	206, 567
North Dakota: North Dakota State University	215, 032
Ohio: Ohio State University	430, 710
Oklahoma:	
Langston University	25, 534
Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	229, 807
Oregon: Oregon State University	242, 040
Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University	469, 049
Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico	255, 846
Rhode Island: University of Rhode Island	220, 429
South Carolina:	
Clemson Agricultural College	128, 316
South Carolina State College	128, 316
South Dakota: South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	216, 175
Tennessee:	
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University	51, 509
University of Tennessee	233, 187
Texas:	
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College [3]	106, 924
Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University [3]	320, 774
Utah: Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	221, 109
Vermont: University of Vermont and State Agricultural College	209, 267
Virginia:	
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	196, 193
Virginia State College	98, 097
Washington: Washington State University	267, 818
West Virginia: West Virginia University	244, 220
Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin	293. 929
Wyoming: University of Wyoming	207, 845

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION FUNDS

The following table shows the proposed reductions under Hatch (agricultural experiment station) formula funds, by States, which would be effected if the 1967 Federal budget proposals are approved. It does not show the total effect of the $8.5 million cut proposed, as $2,380,000 in regional research funds allocated on the basis of regional projects, are also involved.

Effect of reduction on Hatch formula funds

Alabama	$154, 803
Alaska	39, 276
Arizona	54, 246
Arkansas	125, 614
California	170, 852
Colorado	71, 560
Connecticut	59, 084
Delaware	42, 568
Florida	101, 213
Georgia	166, 981
Hawaii	40, 973
Idaho	67, 937
Illinois	196, 255
Indiana	178, 709
Iowa	187, 918
Kansas	$117, 065
Kentucky	185, 706
Louisiana	117, 313
Maine	59, 662
Maryland	84, 252
Massachusetts	72, 620
Michigan	185, 031
Minnesota	176, 166
Mississippi	171, 854
Missouri	174, 967
Montana	63, 165
Nebraska	107, 063
Nevada	38, 280
New Hampshire	46, 324
New Jersey	68, 952
New Mexico	55, 340
New York	181, 601
North Carolina	268, 872
North Dakota	81, 446
Ohio	217, 165
Oklahoma	108, 035
Oregon	81, 508
Pennsylvania	217, 112
Puerto Rico	207, 080
Rhode Island	38, 602
South Carolina	$143, 824
South Dakota	81, 790
Tennessee	192, 444
Texas	236, 724
Utah	48, 998
Vermont	50, 502
Virginia	165, 377
Washington	95, 108
West Virginia	98, 001
Wisconsin	176, 452
Wyoming	45, 710
Subtotal	6, 120, 000

(NOTE.—This table does not take into account regional research fund.)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 18, 1966.

The Honorable ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FREEMAN: We have always prized the cooperative arrangements shared with the U.S. Department of Agriculture under the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act and related legislation. Such arrangements have enabled the extension service to develop competent staff and effective educational programs. We earnestly hope that the progress of many years will not be jeopardized by proposed budget changes. We fear that important, well established extension services will be sacrificed in order to achieve the new emphasis you suggest.

I hasten to indicate that we sympathize with work in resource development and with programs designed to help the underprivileged. While it may be true that in some places more forceful measures are required to direct resources to these areas, the Minnesota extension service has made significant progress in adjusting our programs to the two program areas mentioned. You may be interested in knowing, for example, that during the period 1962–65 the percentage of staff time devoted to community and resource development increased from less than 20 percent in 1962 to almost 28 percent in 1965 in spite of a sizeable reduction in total staff days available. This includes time devoted to work with resource planning and development groups, State and local government in community planning and development projects, soil and water conservation, wildlife development, recreation and touristry.

While we do not record participation of low income or disadvantaged families in extension programs, some studies have been made of this. A recent national study indicated that in the North Central States about 34 percent of total extension time is invested in work with families whose annual income is below $3,000. We feel it important to note that these changes have come at the State level as a result of State programing in response to State needs.

Agriculture constitutes an important resource base in the economy of our State. It provides employment and income opportunities for farmers, processors, distributors, and farm supply firms as part of the total agribusiness complex. Contrary to some opinion, a decline in numbers of farms and of farm operators has not resulted in a comparable decline in needs and demands for educational service. On the contrary, requests have been made for expanded educational work with the increasingly complex agribusiness sector of the economy.

To meet these demands we have undertaken new and intensified educational programs. To do this job effectively we need to draw upon resources throughout the university as well as those found in the traditional departments in the institute of agriculture. These needs require a broadly based staff and more sophisticated programs. We have already attempted to adjust resources and structure to meet these increasing demands. Unfortunately adequate support has not been made available for these needs. Reduction of support for this work can only jeopardize the significant improvements already achieved.

We have experienced significant increases in total demands placed on our staff by other agencies—Federal, State, and local—and by various private agencies engaged in agricultural or nonagricultural endeavors. At the same time there has been relatively little increase in the resources made available to us.

If the budget proposals are supported by the Congress, we do hope that consideration will be given to those of us who share your views on the importance of work in the resource development and poverty areas and, at considerable sacrifice to other needs, have already made significant shifts in resources use and program emphasis. We hope, too, that you are aware of the existence of additional unmet needs that deserve program help.

If the budget proposals are supported by Congress, we hope that those institutions that have recognized the need for expanded work in the resource development and poverty areas and have devoted additional resources thereto will not be penalized for their foresight.

Sincerely yours,

O. Meredith Wilson,
President.

P.S.—I am sending a copy of this letter to Dean Sherwood O. Berg, with the request that he provide you specific information regarding the impact on University of Minnesota programs.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1966.

Dr. O. Meredith Wilson,
President, University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear President Wilson: I want to write you about changes as we are proposing in the 1967 budget for the Cooperative Extension Service.

We wish to continue the cooperative programs with the land-grant universities that have been so productive in the past. We wish to maintain the same high degree of freedom for local program determination to serve the needs of the people in each State, consistent with national missions and goals. The educational role of the Extension Service is important in helping people develop fully their capacity to solve their problems, to avail of their particular opportunities and fully to achieve their individual potentials. It is likewise important in the development of the understanding and motivation essential to the local initiative that is crucial to effective operation of many Federal, State, and local programs.

Extension's work with farm families continues to be important to our family farms and to the income of farm families. Extension's work with youth and homemakers serve important needs today as they have in the past. And, Extension has served well the interests of American consumers and the business sector of the food industry. These long-established services shall continue without major change.

But, now, in addition we seek to increase the effectiveness of Extension programs to help people develop their own communities and the services those communities provide, wisely to use, develop and conserve our natural resources, to speed the economic growth of rural areas, and to provide greater service to low-income people who have special needs for these educational programs.

We propose a 1967 appropriation for the Extension Service at the same level as in 1966. Within this appropriation we propose to continue adjustment of our programs. We propose reduction of $10 million in funds allocated to the States according to formula, and an increase of $10 million to be allocated to the States on the basis of project proposals. This shift will be consistent with our continued efforts to increase emphasis on high priority work and to reduce work of lower priority. We propose to use $2.9 million of the $10 million shifted to fortify our work with lower income people, $6.7 million to expand our resource development programs, and $400,000 to compensate for the reduction in matching funds.

These actions have been taken to support two major purposes of the Department. First, it remains our aim always to adjust our work as efficiently as possible. Second, we are trying to use available funds whereever possible to provide special consideration to those Americans whose needs are greatest.

Today many rural communities lag in economic development and in the services provided to members of the community. Yet there are now a number of Government programs available to these communities through which the opportunities for people there can be improved. So, there is a growing need for programs of Extension education to encourage people to take initiative in the development of these rural areas. Also, there is still a wide gap between the low income and the more affluent segments of our society. There is a growing need for Extension education to help the disadvantaged more fully to participate in the high level of prosperity now general in this Nation. We believe that the State extension directors must and will participate fully as primary agents to determine the areas of lower urgency and reduced relative emphasis as these more urgent and growing needs are met.

Thus, these redirections of programs are being made in order to serve high priority purposes. The administration is determined that we shall have a strong Extension program serving well the high priority needs of our farmers, our other rural people and the consumers of America.

Sincerely yours,

Orville L. Freeman.

University of Minnesota,
Office of the President,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 18, 1966.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Freeman: My Minnesota colleagues and I are distressed by your letter of January 26, 1966, which describes the proposed 1967 USDA budget and reflects sharply reduced allocations for research.

Our principal concern runs to proposed reductions in Hatch funds. A suggested $8.5 million reduction in this fund would represent a reduction for the State of Minnesota of approximately $190,000—the first reduction since the passage of the Hatch Act in 1887. This represents a decrease of about 18 percent in the slightly more than $1 million in Hatch funds currently available to Minnesota. Such a reduction would seriously threaten the work of our agricultural experiment station.

Our concern is heightened because much of the success of the Hatch program can be attributed to the continuity of funding. This procedure has enabled us to support continuing research with high-quality staff in tenured positions. As I am sure you appreciate, short-term reductions of funds such as these have serious fiscal implications for institutions such as ours and particularly at this time when budgets are strained to meet increasing student demands. Furthermore, reduction in agricultural research support at this time seems to us to be inconsistent with the growing international concern regarding future world food supplies.

We are also concerned by a proposed shift in appropriations, which seems to describe a decrease in formula funds and an increase in grant funds. My conversations aimed at discovering motives behind this change in policy from formula support of research to grant support of research have troubled me. The implications seem to have been that the grant research in space science or under the National Science Foundation has been more successful than agricultural research. I am a great admirer of what has been done by these Federal agencies and what has been done by the National Institutes of Health. But as a historian I think the record is clear: American achievements in agriculture are our most impressive achievements and perhaps our strongest weapon against propaganda of Communist countries. Our agricultural progress has been based upon agricultural research that has been supported through the Hatch Act formula. I find it hard to understand why Federal policy would want to abandon a clearly successful policy which has given us unquestioned leadership for other policies where our leadership is still in dispute.

The formula program has made agricultural research in the States most successful. This is because it provided a continuity of research support and therefore made it possible to keep highly qualified personnel. Genetic research such as you describe in your letter would have found less success if carried on with grant funds rather than formula funds because of the long-term nature of the research. It is an example of research maintained successfully by a station only because of the confidence in the ability to fund long-term research. This confidence was based largely upon our history of formula funding. The continuing aspect of this program is a principal source of its strength. We feel that any attempt to trade formula funds for grant funds would be a violation of the original philosophy contained in the Hatch appropriation and would jeopardize the continuity which has made the Hatch program so effective.

Turning to specifics defined in your letter, we are prompted to remind you of the long history of the Minnesota Experiment Station in water research, toxicoses, and our current heavy involvement in studies involving various mycotoxins as they affect livestock and humans. This important work has been carried on with the assistance of Hatch funds and, as you indicate, deserves continued attention and support. In addition, Minnesota has had a long history of State support for plant protein research. We fear that a reduction in experiment station funds might shift priorities and threaten this vital and ongoing research.

We are cognizant of increasing national interest in the area of resource development. Forestry is obviously an important portion of this field of study. We feel it important that McIntire-Stennis funds be increased to allow additional work in this area.

While we recognize that at a Federal level priorities can be addressed to agricultural research, we would hope that it be recognized that the same process operates at a State level. We would hope, too, that it would be apparent that the tradition of research in the State, the strengths of research staff, and the needs and desires of the people of a specific State are strong directives in formulating these priorities. We like to feel that our 15- to 20-percent adjustment in program each year, arrived at in consultation with USDA, represents a diligent and responsible effort to address ourselves to tasks of current importance.

We hope that our concern for the proposed cuts in USDA research expenditures has been made clear. Further, we hope that possible shifts in the method of deployment of these funds will be reconsidered. We strongly urge that the serious concerns of this institution and our sister institutions throughout the country will prompt a restoration of a budget that makes possible the research in State universities and colleges that is so obviously important to the health of the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

O. Meredith Wilson,
President.

P.S.—I am sending a copy of this letter to Dean Sherwood O. Berg, with the request that he provide you specific information regarding the impact on University of Minnesota programs.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1966.
President O. Meredith Wilson,
University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear President Wilson: This letter is to inform you about this Department's 1967 budget proposals. These include funds for support of research in the State agriculture experiment stations, cooperative State forestry schools, and funds for project grants administered by the Cooperative State Research Service.

We are asking for increased project grant funds to support research on problems of highest priority in States where such support can be gotten most effectively. Specific areas for new research emphasis will include more efficient use of water, ways of eliminating food poisoning and toxin-producing organisms from our food supply and other issues of pressing importance.

Increased support is proposed for research on plant proteins, including soybeans, to help expand markets and to contribute to world protein food needs. Some new funds are requested to accelerate research on the role of cooperatives in farm marketing systems.

Funds are included to continue project grant support for research to find ways of reducing the costs of producing and marketing cotton.

This new research will all contribute to achieving the missions and goals that this Nation has set out.

Of especial importance to one of these goals, about $1 million are requested for the first time to support research in the 16 former Negro land-grant colleges. They now have little research support from any source. They provide training for a rapidly increasing number of students, presently about 40,000. Provision of research support for their faculties is essential to their further growth in excellence. The research to be supported will be responsive to the needs of the rural communities from which their students come.

Support for forestry research under the McIntire-Stennis Act complements that of the Forest Service. This new research program is off to a very good start. It will provide a much-needed increase in the supply of trained research people for all our forest-related activities. It will speed the research results needed in the several States. Funds asked for this area of research are continued at the 1966 level, $2.5 million.

We are determined to continue support to the research in the State agricultural experiment stations. We will continue to work with them to make that research even more productive, to further improve its quality, and to assure its concentration on research of highest priority.

The research at the State agricultural experiment stations which is supported by funds appropriated under the Hatch Act and by State appropriated funds continues to make outstanding contributions to the solution of agriculture's problems. For example, a recent discovery has been made at the Indiana Agricultural Experiment Station at Purdue. Genetic research there has developed corn breeding lines and hybrids which are high in protein. This discovery may be epochial not only for the feeding of pigs and poultry, but for people for whom corn is an important food, too.

Adjustments proposed in the 1967 estimates will permit continuation of research on such urgent problems as pesticides for which the Congress provided special funds in 1965 and on other problems of high priority.

We have always emphasized the necessity for elimination of research of low priority. About 20 percent of all projects terminate each year. Many of these are replaced by projects in new areas. This year's budget proposals for funds under the Hatch Act reflect this continuing policy by a proposed reduction of $8.5 million. This reduction amounts to only about 4 percent of funds from all sources available to the State agricultural experiment stations.

While it will necessitate elimination of low-priority research, remaining funds and the new grant research funds can accelerate needed concentration on high-priority problems.

The long-range study of research needs now underway will more clearly identify areas of greatest urgency for future budgetary consideration.

The administration is determined to support research needed for economic growth and for human welfare. We will find within our current funds as much of that needed for research as we can. Pruning out low-priority research will make the new growth more fruitful.

Sincerely yours,

Orville L. Freeman.

The School Lunch and Special Milk Programs Are Vital to the Continuing Good Health and Proper Education of American Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
of
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, like a good many colleagues here I am very deeply concerned about and very deeply and earnestly question the economic urgency and wisdom of the Administration's request for apparent major reductions in the appropriations for federally impacted areas and the school lunch and special milk programs that have, over these past several years, been so healthfully enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of American children.

The President himself has said that, "a poor diet is a root cause of disease." I am sure that every American agrees with him in that statement.

The school milk program is of vital importance for our school youngsters because, according to all of the authorities, milk contains nutrients essential for good health. They further tell us that milk is a basic factor in building proper diet habits. And even further, we all know that a well-nourished child learns better than an undernourished child.

The school officials themselves testify to us that the proposal to distribute the milk and limit the program on the basis of need is both impractical and unworkable. Under this proposal it would seem that school administrators would be asked to separate the students whose parents have a low level of income from those who are assumed to be able to afford to buy the milk. This certainly appears to be inducing school officials to do something our schools are not set up to do and it is also quite likely to create an artificial barrier between and among the students.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion our school-lunch and milk program is basically and primarily a health program, not a welfare program. The savings projected in the proposed appropriation reductions are so small in comparison with some of our overly generous expenditures for projects and programs in other countries and other people all over the world that they appear unjustifiable on any normal, economic or practical standards.

Whatever the need, and I think there is real need, to sensibly restrict Government expenditures, I would hope we can find more nonessential areas in which to do it rather than take a chance on cutting down and into our wisest investment in the future of America, the encouragement of a healthy, well-nourished, wholesome, American youth, in the best educational environment we can devise.

Our Greek Lesson Applies to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Seymour Freidin has pointed out in the following article from the February 26, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune that the situation we face in Vietnam today is directly analogous to that we faced in postwar Greece when the Truman doctrine saved that nation from certain Communist takeover.

Mr. Freidin's article is very much to the point and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

OUR GREEK LESSONS APPLY TO VIETNAM

(By Seymour Freidin)

SAIGON.—This is a war the Vietnamese must fight and win, with help, but none of the choleric critics and self-appointed peacemakers abroad really consider them.

After 20 years of bloodletting and terror there is a pronounced battle fatigue. But the people of South Vietnam show no sign that they are ready to yield. Indeed, if they didn't have the will to persist, all Vietnam would by now have been in Communist hands.

This fact has been ignored by the critics as they search for methods of bypassing the South Vietnamese.

The determination to assure social reform, the vast military operation—which confounds the Communists—and the projects for pacifying South Vietnam are really just beginning. Their successful completion requires time, stamina, and comprehension.

U.S. forces speak with assurance and admiration of the Vietnamese and the future of their country. The Americans here are quite a new breed from those we knew in World War II. They are, in the main, knowledgeable and compassionate. Moreover, they know why they are here.

A realization, therefore, has grown rapidly that the nearest parallel to South Vietnam in contemporary history is that of postwar Greece. There, Communist guerrillas included combat forces and highly organized, tightly discipline political activists.

Desperately poor, the country depended on its tough-willed but have-not rural population to power the economy. By the time the Truman doctrine was promulgated nearly 20 years ago, the Greek Government was most unpopular and inept.

Having been short circuited immediately after the war by the direct role of Winston Churchill, Communist cadres cached weapons and munitions. They had a huge frontier sanctuary across the Albanian, Yugoslav, and Bulgar borders. Soon they were falling upon mountain villages, exacting bloody reprisals and exorting taxes and ransom. Government forces were riddled with intrigue and bad leadership. The nation had avaricious politicians to match.

When we came to Greece, after Britain bowed out due to exhausted resources, Communist guerrillas were at the gates of Athens. Our first move was to try and pour tangible aid into the country. Profiteering commenced and corruption spread.

Sound familiar? There were the critics of the "Truman intervention" who said Greece was too far gone and that we didn't belong there anyway. Gradually, the whole program was upgraded, emphasizing security and social reform.

With the rejuvenation came a governmental and military shakeup. Marshal Papagos became the take-charge man for Greece. We sent in skilled officers, who worked down to the company level with a refitted Greek Army that went out to seek and destroy the guerrillas and their nationwide network.

In mid-civil war, Tito, having broken with Stalin, closed his borders to the Greek guerrillas, sealing their doom. But before that, assistance teams went out to the remotest, most wretched hamlets and worked at reform, which the Communists always tried to prevent.

The lamenters and the cynics declared that the Greek-American plan couldn't possibly work; that the Communists were riding the wave of revolution. Moreover, they worried, the Soviet Union could not stand by idly and see our presence so near.

What happened in Greece is history. Lots of the same treatment—curing social injustice and, above all, providing security—is on the way to Vietnam now.

The Government has a chance under Nguyen Cao Ky. He is young and impatient but intelligent. Ky knows that the real battlefront is reform and development. To win takes time. The Vietnamese know it. So should we. Greece is our shining example.

"Job Center To Be Reality"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, businessmen the country over are taking an increasingly active role in the War on Poverty. As an example of this fact, I cite an article appearing in the Omaha, Nebr., World-Herald of February 20, dealing with the efforts of one Omaha businessman, J. O. Grantham, director of long-range manpower planning for the Northern Natural Gas Co., to help secure a men's Job Corps center at the Lincoln, Nebr., Air Force Base.

I commend this article to my colleagues:

JOB CENTER TO BE REALITY—OMAHAN SAYS LINCOLN WILL GET APPROVAL

The Omahan spearheading a drive to create a men's Job Corps center at the Lincoln Air Force Base said Saturday he is confident the center will be approved.

J. O. Grantham, director of long-range man power planning for the Northern Natural Gas Co., said he hopes the remaining hurdles can be cleared Tuesday when two Federal Job Corps officials from Washington spend the day in Omaha and Lincoln.

Mr. Grantham said he feels the Federal Government no longer questions the capability of Northern and the University of Nebraska to start and successful operate the center.

But Federal officials aren't satisfied with the proposed educational program, he said, specifically in these areas:

How the basic education of the corpsmen will fit into their vocational training.

How their 24-hour living schedule will fit into the vocational training.

How Northern and NU will train the staff to work with corpsmen, most of whom are school dropouts.

How Northern and NU plan to improve the program as it goes along.

If the Federal Government wasn't interested in creating the center, it wouldn't send Drs. Ray Keating and Chester Hall here Tuesday for further talks after days of discussions in Washington last week, Mr. Grantham said.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is proceeding slowly in creating new centers, he said. It has had time to evaluate weaknesses in its first centers and is eliminating them before opening new ones, he said.

Mr. Grantham said the proposed center, which would open next summer, has more potential significance to Nebraska than just its economic impact on Lincoln.

The number of top staff personnel it would attract and trained corpsmen it would produce could be a significant factor in attracting new industry to the State, he said.

Jets Broaden Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Marion Sadler, president of American Airlines, addressed the Rotary Club of Rochester, N.Y., on March 1. In reporting this important talk, both the Rochester Times-Union and the Democrat and Chronicle emphasized the importance of direct air service in expanding domestic markets and developing foreign markets. Particular emphasis was focused on the expanding markets in the Far East.

The airline president told members of the Rotary Club that American, along with most other air carriers was receiving a great many new jet aircraft, making it possible for American to improve service to Chicago, New York, and other cities.

Mr. Speaker, because of its interest to my colleagues, especially those serving communities having similar industrial and commercial roles to those of Rochester, I am pleased to have Mr. Sadler's excellent speech published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ROCHESTER AND THE SUPERSONIC AGE

(By Marion Sadler, president, American Airlines, Inc., before the Rotary Club, Rochester, N.Y., Mar. 1, 1966)

I thank you for inviting me to be with you today. It is good to be in Rochester, and it is good to be at Rotary.

For 5 years, I was an active member of Rotary in Buffalo, and my father was an early president of the Rotary Club in Clarksville, Tenn., soon after World War I. I sort of grew up with Rotary, and I regard it as a privilege to be able to break bread and talk with you Rochester Rotarians today.

I am, as you know, engaged in the air transportation business, and I hope you will forgive me if I take advantage of this opportunity to talk for a few minutes about my own business. But perhaps I am taking a very narrow view if I regard air transportation as my business, and not yours. In recent years, air transportation has grown to the extent that its development and efficiency are extremely important to most communities in the United States. Air transportation has become a vital force in the economy of our country. The quality of air transportation available to a community has become an important factor in that community's ability to attract and retain industry, in that community's ability to develop commerce.

This is paricularly true of Rochester, and the important industrial area which is centered on Rochester. You are large users of air for the movement of both people and goods. And this forward-looking community has been quick to see the benefits of air travel and of airfreight. You have made good and frequent use of these services.

You here in Rochester had the foresight to plan and develop an efficient jet-age airport facility. It is a good facility, and the investment you have made in it should be returned to you many times in the future.

Also, we at American Airlines have had a long and happy association with your great community. We began to serve Rochester when air transportation was in its infancy. As you grew, we grew with you. As you prospered, we prospered with you. We have become a part of this community, and we are proud of that fact. We want to serve you well now, and serve you well in the future—and it is that future about which I want to talk briefly today.

In the year 1966, which is just beginning, we plan to improve substantially the air service which we offer at Rochester. During this year, American Airlines will take delivery on 54 new jet airplanes. Fifty of these airplanes will be designed to carry both passengers and cargo. The other four will be large jet freighters. Taken together, these 54 airplanes represent a capital outlay of more than $200 million.

In the weeks and months immediately ahead of us, Rochester will benefit from this rather substantial investment in aircraft.

Until now, many passengers traveling between Rochester and New York City have had to rely upon one-stop service through Syracuse. In 1966, we will remedy that. The New York-Rochester service will have its own pattern of nonstop flights, no longer relying upon schedules stopping at intermediate points.

Equally important, until now most of the passengers between Rochester and New York City have been forced to use propeller service. Within the next few months, American Airlines' service upon this route will become an all-jet service.

Our service to Chicago will also substantially improve. At present, only one of our nonstop flights to the Windy City is flown with jet airplanes. Before this week is over, we will add a second jet on this route. And by summer all of our nonstop service between Rochester and Chicago will be flown with jet aircraft.

We will also be improving our service from here to the West Coast. Our connections to California will be improved as we upgrade our schedules between Rochester and such gateway points as Chicago. Even more significant is the fact that we are planning to introduce, for the first time, an express through jet service between Rochester and California.

These improvements in air service are substantial. They will aid Rochester, and hopefully they will be profitable for American Airlines. We both will make progress in 1966.

But this is only a beginning. Our world is changing; air transportation is changing. Rochester and its economy are changing. By 1970 or 1971, airplanes will be available which can carry upward of 400 passengers, and 200,000 pounds of cargo. By the mid-1970's, supersonic transports will be available, capable of flying between 2 and 3 times the speed of sound.

These new airplanes—especially the incredibly fast supersonic transports—will bring about a revolution in air transportation, and in the economy of the entire world. And these airplanes are not merely dreams in the minds of far-out engineers. In England and France, work is already underway on the Concorde, which is expected to fly at 1,500 miles per hour. This airplane should be in commercial service by 1972—only 6 years from now. In our own country, plans are rapidly proceeding for the construction of a supersonic airplane which will travel at approximately 2,000 miles per hour. This airplane will probably be in service by 1974 or 1975—less than 10 years from now.

The impact of these new machines on you, your economy, and the airlines themsevles can hardly be overstated. These new aircraft will make our world a very small place. It will be possible to leave Rochester at 8 o'clock in the morning and arrive in Los Angeles at 7 o'clock that same morning.

If one should leave Rochester at 6 o'clock in the morning to fly west to San Francisco, the sun, of course, would be rising behind him in the east. But this supersonic airplane would outrun the sun. As the journey proceeded, the sun would set not in the west, but viewed from the airplane, the sun would set behind the traveler—in the east.

Yes, we are coming into a new age—the supersonic age, and this new day will bring with it vast changes in the way we live and in the way we do business. Some communities will grow and prosper in this new age. Some communities will be bypassed. They will wither and die.

You might wonder what is being done to make sure that Rochester won't become a ghost town—a ghost town of the supersonic age. Perhaps many of you have thought about this.

We have, at American. We have been thinking about our own situation, naturally, and we have been thinking about yours, and a lot of other cities in this country, too. Because we are all facing this supersonic age together.

Today we are living in an economy which is worldwide. The jet plane is already moving men and merchandise over continents and oceans at speeds which are making a neighborhood out of a world.

Look at your own community. Rochester leads the country in per capita dollar volume of manufactured exports. That is something to be proud of. But will this city continue to lead—now that we are entering the supersonic age? Now that things are changing so rapidly?

We are already in an age where markets and competition are global; where people and products are no longer confined to 70-mile-an-hour groundspeed, but are now moving at 600-mile-per-hour airspeeds—and tomorrow will be traveling at 2,000-mile-per-hour supersonic speeds, ignoring every geographical and physical boundary man has ever known on earth.

The steam engine led to what we called the industrial revolution. The jet engine has ushered in a new revolution—a revolution that combines the speed of the computer and the speed of the jet to produce a new equation of time and space.

Here are some examples of how it works:

A million-dollar computer developed in New England is shipped by airfreight to Europe—to go into operation and begin paying for itself a day or so later, instead of weeks later had it been shipped by ocean vessel. Interest on the money to pay for a million-dollar computer runs $1,000 per week and begins when the computer leaves the factory.

A mail-order house supplies its 8,000 outlets, including one in Honolulu, by airfreight, moving 120,000 pounds of everything from women's dresses to tractor parts every week.

A drug company in Indiana eliminates its warehouses entirely by shipping airfreight—and preventing the obsolescence and spoilage of its products that used to occur through slower methods of shipment.

An automobile company in Detroit finds that it can eliminate zone and regional warehouses by shipping fenders, engine parts, and accessories to California, South America, and Africa overnight.

A shipment of a whole herd of cattle flies over the Atlantic to relieve a critical shortage of meat in Italy.

A motorcycle manufacturer ships machines completely assembled and factory adjusted. Although the air rates are higher, the manufacturer spends $7.45 less per motorcycle by eliminating reassembly and adjustment at destination.

Household appliances are flown from our Midwest to Lima, Peru, and Bogotá, Colombia, saving warehouse costs in South America, reducing inventory in the United States, and speeding delivery to Latin American customers.

The biggest producer of business cards in the United States has gone 100 percent to airfreight distribution from one central source in New England, expanding what was once a regional market into a national market.

The airplane has put Australia so close to Japan that the two nations are considering a common market agreement. What city in Australia has designs on Rochester's markets in the Far East?

Right now we at American Airlines have seven jet freighters in operation and five more on order. They carry 45 tons of freight, but on the drawing boards are plans for airfreighters that will carry 100 tons. Think what that will mean in terms of export freight capacity to reach foreign markets at speeds in excess of 600 miles per hour.

Frankly, gentlemen, these developments are changing the way you live, the way you think, and the way you do business. The change is already great, and it will be even greater tomorrow.

The economics of the present jets and the coming supersonic jets are going to challenge us—precisely as military logistics were challenged by the atomic bomb. We are on the threshold of a technical revolution that is changing the entire commerce of the world, not just the air transport industry. And if we neglect to take advantage of this revolution, American industry and commerce will drop behind more enterprising, far-sighted world competitors.

What does all of this mean to Rochester? It means a lot. Seventy percent of the manufacturing employees in this city work in plants that produce some products for export.

What does this mean to American Airlines? Right now, nearly 20 percent of our airfreight is either going to, or arriving from, overseas destinations, even though our airline is landlocked on the North American Continent.

So we're both—Rochester and American Airlines—in the business of serving world markets. We want to increase this business. In fact, we are going to have to increase it, if we want to keep growing—if we want to survive.

Let us take a look at the future by learning a lesson from the past.

Rochester has been fortunate. It has a lake; it has a canal; and it has a strong railroad running through it. And right now, it has some strong airlines using the airport. Also, it has the great New York Thruway.

What would have happened to Rochester if the New York Central main line had not been put through back in the 1840's? Just look around. New York State is full of pleasant little towns that the New York Central does not serve. Some of them, I should say, are still pleasant little towns. Others have just sort of withered and dried up over the years. They never got into the mainstream of commerce.

Rochester, as I said, has been fortunate. It has been on the mainstream. But what's going to happen now—now that the airplane is taking over the mainstream of commerce? I'll tell you what can happen. Rochester can still be passed by. It can be passed by just as surely as those towns which did not get the railroad were passed by in an earlier age.

In fact, at this very moment, Rochester, to a certain extent, is being passed by. Foreign airlines are overflying Rochester. They are carrying people and products from Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Houston, for example, directly to markets in Europe and the Orient. Who are they? Well, there is BOAC, Alitalia, Air France, Quantas, KLM, Swissair, Japan Air Lines, and others. Do you have competitors in the cities served by these airlines? If so, every time you hear the faint whine of a jet overhead, you might pause to wonder how much of your market may be slipping away.

Take the Far East market, for example. Your Rochester firms have plants and offices there. Many Rochester firms export to the Far East. And, for the United States as a whole, the Far East market amounts to about $4 billion annually—a higher dollar value of exports than our sales to the Common Market of Europe. Japan, in fact, has the fastest growing economy in the world.

We at American Airlines want to grow in this changing world. We also want to make certain that Rochester, and the other cities we serve, share in the global prosperity which is now developing. To that end, we have applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for routes from Rochester to Hawaii and Tokyo.

Let me give you a few specific examples of how direct, one-carrier air service to the Orient is important to you. Take the Gleason Works—for example. Half of Gleason's business is for export. And Gleason's biggest export customer is Japan.

Take another example—Xerox, which is famous for having a 40- to 50-percent annual growth rate, one of the highest in the country. Xerox sells to and buys from Japan, and its Japanese business is growing at a very rapid rate. I was interested in learn the other day that the Xerox people ordered $600,000 worth of materials from Japan. They arrived at Kennedy Airport in New York City for transshipment to Rochester, but they were delayed for 6 days at Kennedy Airport because of a misunderstanding in customs.

The Japanese market is our fastest growing market. Yet only 2 U.S. airlines are now serving it, while 17 airlines are serving the Atlantic routes to Europe. Between 1962 and 1964, our airborne exports to Japan increased more than seven times as fast as did our air exports to the rest of the world.

As for passenger traffic, some of your travel agents in Rochester have told us that travelers are looking for new horizons—that Rochester people are turning their eyes to the West and to the Orient. This typifies passenger travel for the entire country. The number of air passengers going to Japan in the last 10 years has increased at twice the rate of passengers going to other areas.

President Johnson has said: "It is important that we proceed quickly to determine whether our transpacific route pattern should be altered so as to place our carriers in a satisfactory competitive position in the Pacific with foreign-flag carriers operating into the east coast."

I agree with President Johnson, and I think you will, too.

At American Airlines we have decided that we want to be a part of the global network of air transportation which is now so rapidly developing. We have decided that the jet airplane of today—and the supersonic airplane of tomorrow—should not be tied down to national boundaries. We intend to serve not merely national markets; we intend to serve the great new global markets which are now developing.

This is the thinking which lies behind our application to extend our routes from the United States to Hawaii and the Orient. We believe that by receiving the right to fly these routes, we can be of greater service to you here in Rochester. We believe that you have a great stake in international commerce, and if we are to serve you well, we must be able to provide for your needs in international as well as in domestic commerce.

Frankly, we ask your support for our efforts to expand into the Pacific and to the Orient. We believe that our long and creditable record of service to Rochester and the Nation merits this support. We have a great deal of know-how in the air transportation business, and we have not been slow to introduce innovations. American was the first airline to carry 100 million passengers, the first airline to introduce a credit card for air travel, the first airline to introduce airfreight service to the United States, and the first airline to computerize its reservation service.

We think that this record of past accomplishments establishes our qualifications to provide this new and badly needed transportation link between the United States and rapidly growing markets of the Pacific. You need this service; you must have this service if you are to grow and prosper in the future. We are ready, willing, and able to provide it. We ask your support in our efforts to secure the right to place Rochester on tomorrow's global air map.

In closing, I want to thank the business community of Rochester for the fine support which you have given us in the past. We are extremely proud of the fact that we have been corporate citizens of Rochester for many years. We first began to serve your community many years ago when we were a small, struggling airline. As you have grown, we have grown with you. As you have prospered, we have prospered with you.

We look to the future, as you do, with confidence. We, like you, are keenly aware that the future holds many radical changes, many difficult problems, but also many exciting opportunities. We want to work with you to adjust to change, solve our common problems, and take advantage of common opportunities. In short, we pledge to you that we will continue to be good, aggressive, forward-looking corporate citizens of your community.

In the weeks and months just ahead of us, we will radically improve Rochester's air service to such points as New York, Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. In the years ahead of us, we will work with you to see that Rochester's industries receive a larger and growing portion of the vast new markets which are now developing in the Pacific and in the Orient.

Mr. Speaker, in my introduction to Mr. Sadler's speech, I made reference to the newspaper coverage it was accorded in my home community. Because these stories reflect the considerable interest which exists among my constituents, I am pleased to have them printed with my comments in the Record:

From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, Mar. 1, 1967]

Airlines President Warns City

(By John Street)

Rochester could become a ghost town of the supersonic age if it's not alert to the technical revolution in world commerce, according to Marion Sadler, president of American Airlines.

Rochester, with a lake, a canal, and a railroad and the Thruway, "has been on the main stream" so far, Sadler said in a talk prepared for Rochester Rotary Club at luncheon today at the chamber of commerce.

"But what's going to happen now—now that the airplane is taking over the main stream of commerce?

"I'll tell you what can happen. Rochester can still be passed by. It can be passed by just as surely as those towns which did not get the railroad were passed by in an earlier age.

"In fact, at this very moment, Rochester, to a certain extent, is being passed by. Foreign airlines are overflying Rochester. They are carrying people and products from Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Houston, for example, directly to markets in Europe and the Orient.

"Do you have competitors in the cities served by these airlines? If so, every time you hear the faint whine of a jet overhead, you might pause to wonder how much of your market may be slipping away."

Sadler tied this warning to a pitch for local support for American's application to the Civil Aeronautics Board to extend cargo and passenger service to Hawaii and the Orient. American is now limited to service in the North American continent.

Several competing airlines are also seeking to extend their service to the Far East.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Mar. 2, 1966]

To Far East: Air Exports Value Cited

The Far East market boasts a higher dollar value of exports than U.S. sales to the Common Market of Europe, Marion Sadler, president of American Airlines, told the Rochester Rotary Club yesterday at the chamber.

He said:

"Our airborne exports to Japan increased more than seven times as fast as did our air exports to the rest of the world from 1962 to 1964," he said.

And he added: "The number of air passengers going to Japan in the last 10 years has increased at twice the rates of passengers going to other areas."

Sadler cited these figures in calling for the city's backing of American's efforts to expand into the Pacific and the Orient.

Even while he was speaking a competitor, United Airlines, requested authority to extend its Pacific routes beyond Hawaii to the Orient and to Australia and New Zealand.

Sadler warned that Rochester could become a "ghost town" in the coming supersonic, global transportation if it got bypassed by the airlines.

He said an air transportation link with the rapidly growing markets of the Pacific is badly needed if the city is to survive in a changing world. He said that with its lage, canal, and strong railroad the city has been fortunate.

"But what's going to happen now that the airplane is taking over the mainstream of commerce."

He said that new airplanes will travel faster than the sun so in airplanes of the future you will see the sun setting in the east—behind you.

Sadler after his talk said there was no trouble in hiring pilots. "That's a myth," he said, "that there is a great shortage of pilots."

He said American Airlines was making a profit on airfreight now and had a huge advertising program pushing it. He said that he expected airfreight to grow 35 percent in the next year.

Inequities of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern in the country about the efficiency and adequacy of our present system of obtaining necessary military manpower. We have seen too many examples of inequities and inefficiencies; we have seen too many instances of poor planning and lack of priorities in our draft calls.

Last week I was proud to join with a number of my Republican colleagues in pointing out some of the present shortcomings and in calling for a thorough congressional investigation of the Selective Service System. I am pleased that the House Armed Services Committee will give its attention to this subject within the near future.

On Sunday, Martin F. Nolan, of the Boston Globe Washington bureau, summarized the recent comments on the draft and discussed a number of proposals that have been made for its improvement.

Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the Congressional Record following my remarks:

New Factor in Vietnam Debate: Inequities of the Draft

(By Martin F. Nolan)

Washington.—Shortly after Gen. Matthew B. Ridgeway took command of U.S. troops in Korea in 1951, he said: "In my brief period of command duty here I have heard from several sources, chiefly from the members of combat units, the questions 'Why are we here?' 'What are we fighting for?' "

"The answer to the first question," Ridgeway said, "is conclusive because the loyalty we give, and expect, precludes any slightest questioning.

"The second question is of much greater significance," he added. "The real issues are whether or not the power of Western civilization, as God has permitted it to flower in our own beloved lands, shall defy and defeat communism."

In Vietnam and over here, the same questions are being asked today.

It seems unlikely that Gen. William C. Westmoreland, however much he would agree with Ridgeway's first answer, would adopt the apocalyptic view of the second.

A changing American attitude toward the infallibility of American foreign policy, new appraisals of the supposedly monolithic menace of conspiratorial communism—many factors have changed the Nation's attitude toward its goals of war.

None, however, has been as profound or as symptomatic as the changing American attitude toward the military draft.

Debate on the draft provides a curious counterpoint to debate on the war in Vietnam. Sometimes the discussions coincide, sometimes not. In either case, the draft remains a key political issue, at least in living rooms where teenage sons reside.

Last week, 30 Republican Congressmen—some liberal members of the Wednesday Club, some not so liberal—urged an investigation of the Nation's 25-year-old system of procuring military manpower. In doing so, they enraged neither hawks nor doves.

One of the least-noticed comments of Senator Robert F. Kennedy in his celebrated February 19 statement on Vietnam was his reference to inequities in the draft.

"The war perpetuates discrimination," Kennedy said, "for the poor and the less fortunate serve in Vietnam out of all proportion to their numbers in the United States as a whole."

Negroes, who comprise about 10 percent of the Nation's population, provide 14 percent of the Army's total manpower, according to Pentagon statistics. But Negroes make up but 3.5 percent of the Army's officers.

Self-evident flaws and subtle ones, glaring injustices and petty mistakes—Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey dismisses them all with characteristic bluntness: "Absolute equity has never been attained." The father of the draft, its custodian and most vigorous defender, thus hurls an implicit challenge at his critics: Do something better.

One of them has. John U. Monro, dean of Harvard College, suggests a national lottery to choose draftees. Dean Monro sees luck as a more suitable standard for his students than the present Selective Service plan of making the bottom half of freshman students available for the draft.

The lottery has all the statistical logic of and automobile accident. But its prestigous sponsorship alone will bring discussion of the draft into clearer focus, as well as provide a clear-eyer view of the war in Vietnam.

A lottery does not ask the question: Which is more important, education or war? A lottery is indiscriminate, but so is the war. The Selective Service System, in Br'er Rabbit fashion, has been hitting away at that tar baby mass of fluctuating needs, standards and deferments until it has become hopelessly entangled. The analogy of American involvement in Vietnam to the moral of this Uncle Remus tale is clear.

General Hershey, who has not gone out of his way to please professors, may find his academic adversaries more formidable now than every before. During the Korean war domestic hysteria made professors suspect; no billboards proclaimed then that "College Is America's Best Friend." Now, they do and it is.

The drafting of college students may have an ultimate benefit of curing this problem of civilian morale and fitting conscription—as well as its cause—into the philosophy of modern America. Serious thought on the legal and moral aspects of the draft can do nothing but good.

The resources of Academe, never really used on behalf of selective service before, may help the draft law live up to its claim that "in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally."

Legal Help Is Poverty Item

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we continue to read and hear a great deal about legal help for the Nation's poor. I noticed an interesting story in the Escanaba Daily Press, Escanaba, Mich., of January 31 describing some action taken by the Community Action Committee of the Michigan State Bar Association to help provide such services. I commend it to my colleagues:

Legal Help Is Poverty Item

When the community action committee of the Star bar met in Lansing recently to consider a pilot project for providing legal services to the rural indigent, six of the seven members of the committee were urban lawyers and Walter T. Dartland of Houghton was the sole attorney from a rural area.

According to Dartland, the program would cover education on legal services to the rural indigent and provision for legal consultation and representation.

To date, especially in the Houghton-Barage-Keweenaw area, the means of providing legal services to the rural poor has not been developed past the level of largely gratuitous services by private attorneys acting voluntarily through the Copper Country Bar Association. This results, Dartland said, in a sporadic contact between the poor and the lawyer which results in an insufficient use by the rural poor of the services of an attorney.

An initial hypothesis of the project is that such services can be provided best by privately practicing attorneys within the community. It is based upon such factors as the knowledge of such attorneys of the rural community, the position they hold in the community, their geographic availability to the rural resident and their ability to resolve problems of the rural poor within the rural community.

It is expected that the Michigan Bar Association would propose that one attorney be assigned to the Upper Peninsula through UPCAP. His responsibility would be to coordinate, educate, and develop the program through the six functioning community action agencies. Each CAA would in turn request one legal social worker who would work in conjunction with the area representatives. Referrals would be made by the legal social worker to local attorneys who would be reimbursed for their services using the State bar minimum schedule and billing through UPCAP.

Research and evaluation of means of providing timely representation in misdemeanor cases will be conducted and various methods attempted to provide representation. Also included in this study will be a bail project for the purpose of obtaining release on personal bond for indigent defendants.

Six Hundred and Thirty-three Signed Up for Feed Grain Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, there has been a clamor in the eastern press recently about a lack of enthusiasm in the Midwest for the 1966 feed grain program. This misinterpretation of the situation in my area needs to be corrected so that it will not damage the excellent program passed by Congress last year.

The tardiness of farmers to sign up for this year's program has nothing to do with a lack of support. A recent story in the Carroll Daily Times Herald by Donald H. Severin, manager of the Carroll County ASCS office, indicates that the number of farmers signing up for the 1966 program compares quite favorably with the number signed up at this time in 1965.

This is representative of several similar news articles that have appeared throughout the 19 counties in the Seventh Iowa District. It indicates a strong support by the farmers in our area of this program.

I feel it is important to get this information before my colleagues so they will not be misled by uninformed news media.

The article follows:

SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THREE SIGNED UP FOR FEED GRAIN PLAN

(By Donald H. Severin)

A total of 633 farmers have signed up for the 1966 feed grain program. This compares favorably with last year so far. The signup by township in past years got about half the signers and 2 or 3 weeks before the deadline another 600 or 700 sign up. The signup period this year ends on April 1.

Many farmers have mentioned they like the feed grain program this year because it is more flexible. It is designed so farmers can plant whole fields of corn or divert whole fields. Last year farmers had to plant all of the permitted corn acres or take a reduction in payment. This year farmers can substitute soybeans for corn on all of the permitted corn acres. For example a farmer with a 100-acre corn base could divert 20 acres and grow 80 acres of soybeans with no reduction in feed grain payments.

This year farmers can divert from 20 to 50 percent of the corn base. Since the payment for diverting more than 20 percent is high many farmers have diverted more than 20 percent. For example, a farmer with a 100-acre corn base might have a 25-acre field to divert. This extra 5 acres above the first 20 percent would earn about $60 per acre. Farmers wanting more details can talk to a township committeeman or call at the ASCS office.

Farmers have signed up for a number of ACP practices they plan to start this spring including tile, terraces, ponds, and windbreaks. With the open winter, a number of farmers have already spread lime. For lime the payment is 50 percent of the cost or no more than $6 per acre. The field limed must be seeded down for two consecutive years.

Several farmers have signed up for windbreak practice around farm buildings. Probably due to the rather mild weather and little snow farmers haven't felt the need for a good windbreak around the farm. This practice has a good payment rate. The trees and shrubs must be ordered from a commercial nursery.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the voice of democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies' auxiliary is one of the finest programs offered the youth of this Nation.

I am especially proud that the winning speech from Kansas this year was delivered by one of my constitutuents, Mr. Bill Ray Hutchison, of Chanute, Kans.

Reading his oration reinforces my faith in the teenage generation of America. We often read the headlines about the young anti-Vietnam demonstrators whose militant individualism leads to a general rejection of traditional morality. However, I am convinced these are a small minority who blacken the name of the dedicated, hardworking, clear-thinking majority.

I suggest that anyone who has doubts as to the direction our younger generation is headed should read this young man's speech. Listen to what he says about democracy and what it means to him; see how he feels to be an American.

It may not make the headlines, but you can be sure it is a much truer reflection of the pulse of young America than that you read in the morning paper.

The speech follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Bill Ray Hutchison, Chanute, Kans.)

A 17-year-old American girl brings honor to her country by her victories in Olympic swimming competition. An 18-year-old chemistry student gives the patent rights of his new process to the Government. An outstanding high school leader inspires the Nation by voicing his views of democracy. Freedom means a lot to these young people, and they dedicate their superior talents to make that freedom better because of their sacrifices. I feel that same desire to make America stronger, and I have a job to do in this democracy.

I don't have a vote, so my part is to encourage others to vote, both by words and by action. I am willing to give rides or babysit to allow others to vote. This is not being entirely selfless. After all, people are squandering my freedom, too, when they "take the liberty," as it were, to stay home on election day. I cannot live in my own one-man democracy, so I must encourage others to help preserve the freedom we live in.

So even as a high school student, I have a place to fill in democracy to keep it alive and working. I am studying to gain an appreciation for my heritage, to learn of the Government's institutions and methods, to gain an understanding of my duties and privileges as a citizen, and to become a productive member of our free society. In short, I am learning about the freedom I have. After all, I really don't have total freedom until I know all the things I am free to do. A football player who is not sure about all the rules severely limits his actions to avoid breaking a role. And he can't contribute much to the game, just as I can't contribute much to our democracy if I don't know all of its rules.

Book-learning, however, is not enough by itself. The nature of democracy calls for action. I belong to the school service club, which builds character and serves the community and Nation by its projects. I represent a class of students on the student council, our own democratic system. In this position of trust, I work to change procedures or policies when they are not in line with democratic principles or when the change would benefit the group, for we protect our democracy by using it fully. If we practice only following the directions of teachers and administrators, we cannot expect to step out into the world ready to live in a democratic community.

If our generation is to keep America strong and free, we must be willing to participate in our Government. Of course, everyone can't be in public office, but we all play a part in Government. That's what makes this a democracy. Each of our representatives in the governing body needs an indication of his area's thinking. Letters from electors do not give an accurate concensus, because most Americans of this era seldom write their leaders unless they have definite feelings against an issue. Lord Bryce, in his "American Commonwealth," said Americans were concerned when opposing a piece of legislation, but were, as he put it, "timid in advocacy as well as infantile in suggestion."

What we need in more consciousness of our freedom in our everyday lives. Democracy isn't limited to politics. Real freedom manifests itself, in for example, staying within even the unreasonable speed limit, dropping papers n a trash can instead of on the street, and choosing to put savings in Government bonds instead of a bank account. Then democracy begins to mean more. We begin to thank God for our America and pray for guidance for its leaders. We might join the organization, people-to-people, to make another friend for ourselves and our country through the mail. When the flag goes by in a parade, we will salute it and show everyone we are proud of our country. There are many ways of practicing our freedom if we will become aware of them.

Our America can become the country whose leaders know what the electors want, a country whose flag passes with the saluations of its proud and free people, a country whose citizens are vigorous in advocacy as well as aggressive in suggestion. Our generation will become the freest people in the world if we take another look at the freedom we have.

Long, Hard Road in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, in a February 28 editorial the Baltimore Sun points out that President Johnson can help to keep the war in Vietnam in perspective by reiterating what he said during a recent press conference that "now we will have a long and hard road," in Vietnam.

The Sun editorial quotes the President to the effect that the war in Vietnam is not going to be easy or short; it is going to be difficult and it is going to require sacrifices.

The Sun points out:

> A necessary part of this summing up is Mr. Johnson's emphasis on the point that the United States' objectives are limited—to defeat the act of aggression against South Vietnam, to search for an honorable and just peace and to try to establish a stable, democratic government.

In the conviction that others will find the Sun's lucid editorial a clarification of the issues facing us, I am offering it to the RECORD, where the article may be read in its entirety:

LONG, HARD ROAD

President Johnson can also help to keep the war in Vietnam in perspective, and he can expect firm and steady support from the American people, by reiterating what he said during his Saturday press conference: "Now we will have a long and hard road."

As the President said further, it is not going to be easy or short; it is going to be difficult and it is going to require sacrifices. A necessary part of this summing up is Mr. Johnson's emphasis on the point that the U.S. objectives are limited—to defeat the act of aggression against South Vietnam, to search for an honorable and just peace, and to try to establish a stable, democratic government. This, as he said, will take time.

If we look back for a moment, we can see that one of the worst errors in our policy in Vietnam has been the all too frequent outburst of easy optimism that has been shattered by subsequent developments. State Department reporters can remember a briefing, some 12 years ago, in which it was predicted that with increasing help from the United States the French soon would be able to put down the Vietminh. Not long thereafter the series of setbacks began which led to the defeat at Dienbienphu and the French withdrawal.

In the years since, each measure of increasing involvement by the United States has usually been accompanied by forecasts of early success. It is small wonder that our words have been questioned. Now, at last, our policy is beginning to show signs of forward movement. The Senate debate has pointed up the inadequacy of quick or inexpensive solutions. Emphasis on our willingness to follow a long, hard road is an essential step toward a settlement—so essential that it bears repeating many times.

The Traditional American; Probate Judge Carl E. Wahlstrom of Worcester, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 27, last, with an appropriate ceremony in the Beth Israel Synagogue Hall at Worcester, Mass., Worcester County Probate Court Judge Carl E. Wahlstrom, became the fourth recipient of the Beth Israel Brotherhood's Good Neighbor Award for his "betterment of understanding among men of all faiths."

Several hundred men and women from the city's major faiths gathered in the congregation's social hall to honor Judge Wahlstrom who was chosen for this particular distinction by a committee made up of the past recipients, A. Alfred Marcello, day city editor of the Worcester Telegram, 1963; Very Rev. Armand H. Desautels, A.A., 1964, then president of Assumption College and now provincial superior of the Assumptionist Fathers in North America; and Rev. Kenneth E. Bath, minister of Greendale People's Community Church, 1965.

A unique silver bowl signifying the Good Neighbor Award was presented to Judge Wahlstrom by Melvin Merten of the brotherhood.

Multitudinous past distinctions have been bestowed upon Judge Wahlstrom in recognition of his most unselfish and effective civic leadership and only last November he was specially honored at a great public testimonial upon the completion of 25 years as probate judge in our area.

He is a graduate of Worcester, Mass., Commerce High School; Clark University in Worcester; and Boston University Law School. Also, he is an acknowledged expert on Lincoln lore, a director of colleges, businesses and associations, and an honorary 33d degree Scottish Rite Mason.

Mr. Speaker, it was my special pleasure and privilege to sum up the tributes to Judge Wahlstrom that were given by various city officials, educational directors, prominent judges, and spiritual leaders on this occasion.

I emphasized that in the torturous pursuit of solutions for the tremendous problems plaguing ourselves and the world today it is imperative, if we are to be successful, for all of us to perseveringly follow the inspiring example of the life and conduct of Judge Carl E. Wahlstrom so truly representative of the traditional American virtues upon which this country was founded and only upon which it can endure and will prevail.

The text of my summation follows:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE AT BETH ISRAEL ANNUAL GOOD NEIGHBOR AWARD TO JUDGE CARL WAHLSTROM, BETH ISRAEL SYNAGOGUE, FEBRUARY 27, 1966

Rabbi Kazis, other members of the clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of Beth Israel Congregation, it is a particular pleasure for me to take part in this well-deserved public tribute to my dear friend and our good neighbor, Judge Carl E. Wahlstrom.

On the basis of distinguished judicial stewardship alone, Judge Wahlstrom preeminently merits the special honor you are conferring upon him this morning.

In his court, the probate court, legal issues and disputes embrace the most intimate actions and vital interests of human beings at their best and at their worst. Their settlement demands the most searching analysis and the most equitable judgment.

To successfully preside over and decide upon these most stirring judicial challenges very truly requires possession of the persistence of Diogenes, the patience of Job, and the wisdom of Solomon; yes, requiring the exercise of the fullest understanding, the deepest compassion, the utmost tolerance, and the kindliest firmness.

Judge Wahlstrom possesses these rare qualities and that is why he is an exceptional judge.

Judge Wahlstrom applies these attributes in all his actions and that is why he is an extraordinary person.

Together with his acclaimed leadership in multitudinous community objectives, at great sacrifice, it is the practice of these combined virtues in all his daily associations that makes Judge Wahlstrom our good neighbor.

Perhaps not too many know that he was a student leader and outstanding athlete at Clark University in his college days and served his country as an infantry lieutenant in World War I.

Judge Wahlstrom's career reveals a prime example of the full, wholesome, balanced life.

Besides all this, he is an outstanding scholar and is recognized as one of the Nation's authorities on the life and works of our revered 16th President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln.

It is significantly indicative of the character and disposition of our honored guest that he would be so vitally interested in the life of one of the greatest men of our history whose stalwart qualities and attributes are so well mirrored in his own personal and professional career.

Judge Wahlstrom's distinction in connection with this great American patriot prompts the reflection that perhaps we might suitably and profitably dwell, this morning, on a comparison of the problems that confronted President Lincoln and the country with the crucial challenges facing us in this nuclear age.

Of course, our problems today are technically different and our challenges are now expanded beyond and above the horizon.

But there is a similar height of urgency in our affairs today. We are at a similar crossroad of our destiny, a destiny involving the world's future.

The various problems bedeviling us today comprise a lengthy and fulsome list. Their broad recitation would include such soul-searching questions as:

How shall we exercise our traditional right to differ while we carry out our patriotic obligation of unity in purpose?

How can we effectuate the guarantees of civil rights while we fulfill our duty of civil obedience?

How shall we apply the restraint of recommended guidelines without suffocating the fruitful energy of personal effort and private enterprise?

How shall we extend our spending while we contain inflation?

How shall we share in the privations of our servicemen fighting overseas while we enjoy the extravagances of domestic plenty?

And finally—How can we negotiate an end of agonizing war without yielding to dishonorable peace terms?

These are a few of what we might term the umbrella challenges.

It would take a hundred mornings and a hundred nights to itemize all the problems that would come under them. And although I receive in my daily mail about 50 earnest and thoughtful suggestions for their settlement, I don't think anyone yet possesses the full answer to each different problem.

It is my opinion the proper answers and full solutions will have to come out of a nationally unified character and atmosphere of moral responsibility, patriotic sacrifice, and dedicated unselfishness that was urged by the voice, and personified in the life and death of Abraham Lincoln.

In this country today we have the great wealth and the highest standard of living of any people in the history of the earth and there is even more in sight on the nuclear energy horizon ahead.

If Lincoln were alive we fear that he would have to question the existence of that moral character and atmosphere in our country today. We fear Lincoln would join with many authorities today who express the deepest doubts that proper solutions to our problems will not be found until substantial turnabout changes are made in a great many current attitudes and practices that seem to be corrupting the core of our modern society.

But, as we look about us today, I think you might agree there are far too many regettable signs of widespread immorality in conduct, indifference to recognized ethical standards, defiance of legitimate authority, disrespect for hallowed traditions, disregard of our historical ideals, and even some thoughtless ridicule of the heroic sacrifices of our servicemen abroad.

These unhappy signs of dangerous weaknesses in our prosperous society emphasize the wisdom of the warning advice contained in the question President Lincoln asked of the people during a speech in Illinois back in 1858.

This was his question—"What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling sea coasts, our Army, and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors."

It would appear that this question by President Lincoln is even more pertinent to our affairs today than it was back in 1858.

Isn't it the strengths of this traditional belief and American spirit that we must help to place back into the hearts and minds of all Americans and into the basic structure of our national character if we are to find surviving solutions to the problems of ourselves and the world?

A few days ago, as I thought of this meeting this morning, I recalled a story of the father and of the little boy who wanted to be doing something.

The father was stretched out in his easy chair after a day's work to read his newspaper before dinner. He was interrupted by the normal complaint of children about having nothing to do—so he assigned a minor household chore to the youngster.

In no time the boy was back for another assignment. This was repeated several times and finally his father, in desperation, picked up a map of the United States from a table beside his chair, tore it into many dozens of pieces, and said: "Here, son, take this and put the country back together again."

The boy happily went to work on the homemade jigsaw puzzle. His father again settled back with the newspaper—but before he had read as far as the sports page the child tugged at his arm and proudly pointed to a perfectly put together United States of America.

Pleased and amazed by the lad's knowledge of geography and his speed in applying it, the father said: "That's really wonderful. But how did you do it?"

"I remembered," the boy explained, "that on the back side of that map was a picture of a man. And I figured that if I just put man together right, the country would come out in pretty good shape."

Don't you think it is about time for you and for me and for each American to start putting ourselves to right and the country back in good shape?

Isn't it high time for us to get to work to restore proper reverence of our churches, decency in public conduct, ethical standards in business, recognized discipline in educational institutions, obedience to our laws, acceptance of parental authority in the home and a mature, moral example for the proper encouragement of our youth?

And while we proceed with the development of a Great Society let us wisely insure the construction of a good society.

This, I think, was what President Lincoln was urging when, speaking in Milwaukee, on September 30, 1859, he said: "Let us hope that by the best cultivation of the physical world beneath and around us, and the best intellectual and moral world within us, we shall secure an individual, social, and political prosperity, and hapiness whose course shall be onward and upward and which, while the earth endures, shall not pass away."

Above all, then, let us remember the true mission of all mankind is not for nations to war with each other unto death but to live with each other in a brotherhood of good will and under a peace of honor forever lasting.

That, I believe, is the true significance and the true meaning of our meeting and ceremony here this morning in this hall, adjacent to your temple of prayer.

That is the true worth of Carl Wahlstrom's contribution of virtues and talents as a good man and a good neighbor.

That, I think, is the true value of your exercise here this morning, in the encouragement of fellow citizens to emulate the example of a good neighbor, for the betterment of their community, for the progress of their country, and for the peace of the world.

If then, we and our fellow Americans will unite in our faiths and consolidate our moral spirits in patriotic sacrifice to preserve our liberty and repel tyranny I am supremely confident we will not just survive—we will prevail.

Statement on Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today I testified on the subject of "Electoral College Reform" before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

On two occasions, first on February 1, 1965, and again an January 20, 1966, President Johnson urged the Congress to approve a constitutional amendment abolishing the electoral college.

The draft of a proposed electoral reform amendment, which the President sent to the Congress last year, has been introduced in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 58 and in the House of Representatives as House Joint Resolution 278.

The Senate subcommittee began hearings a week ago but, as it happens, I was the first witness to testify in support of the basic approach to electrol college reform as incorporated in the President's proposal.

In most respects, I think this proposal is a sound and realistic one. However, as I pointed out in my prepared statement to the Senate subcommittee, I feel that there is room for improvement.

Since electoral college reform should be a matter of great concern, not only to the Congress but to all Americans, I am including the text of my prepared statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON ELECTORAL COLLEGE, BY BERT BANDSTRA, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM IOWA; SUBMITTED MARCH 7, 1966, TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I am here today to express my conviction that a constitutional amendment is urgently needed to abolish the electoral college and to further modernize our presidential and vice-presidential election process. I am also appearing to place myself on record in support of the basic approach to electoral reform as incorporated in Senate Joint Resolution 58 and, at the same time, to suggest some possible improvements to this proposal.

The electoral college, in my view, is a serious threat to orderly and democratic government. This opinion is based in part on personal experience. Nearly 2 years ago, I served as a presidential elector for my home State of Iowa and, in that capacity, I had the more or less anonymous distinction of being one of the 538 citizens who in 1964 actually cast ballots for the President and Vice President of the United States. Having participated myself in the workings of the electoral college, I can say with some authority that the institution is not only useless but dangerous. I have also given some close study to the way in which the electoral college system has operated in the past, and this has further convinced me that our Constitution today contains serious defects which could at some future date turn a presidential election into a national calamity.

Consequently, I am hopeful that this session of the Congress will approve and send to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment to remove the long-existing flaws in our presidential and vice-presidential election process. My feeling is that such an amendment should be confined to making limited reforms, as is the case with Senate Joint Resolution 58, and that efforts to fundamentally alter the basic operation of our electoral system should, for the time being at least, be put to one side. An amendment aimed at limited reform would, I think, be most beneficial if it were drafted so as to (1) abolish the electoral college and automatically award a State's total electoral vote to the presidential and vice-presidential candidates who carry the State and (2) reduce to the very minimum the chances of a presidential election being thrown into the House of Representatives, as now provided by the Constitution, or into a joint session of the Congress, as proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 58.

The electoral college and the contingent election, as the provision for choosing the President in the House is often called, are the two major defects in the Constitution as it relates to the selection of the Chief Executive. Both these flaws can be removed by an amendment which would in no way endanger our present two-party system, and which would simply give the constitutional seal of approval to our presidential election process as it is expected to operate today. And I firmly believe a limited reform amendment of this sort is critically needed in order to place our constitutional provisions for the presidential election on a secure and democratic footing. Accordingly, last year I introduced such a proposed amendment, House Joint Resolution 327, in the House of Representatives. Since then, in order to make two technical but necessary revisions, I have reintroduced it in the form of House Joint Resolution 819.

This proposal, in agreement with Senate Joint Resolution 58 would make no sweeping changes in our presidential election system. By contrast other approaches to the electoral college problem would make fundamental, and perhaps even revolutionary, changes in our existing election process. These alternative proposals, of which there are basically three, are all aimed at abolishing the general ticket system, under which a State awards all its electoral votes to the presidential and vice-presidential candidates who carry the State.

There is, to begin with, the proposal for the direct popular election of the President, thereby eliminating the electoral college, electoral votes, and States lines as voting factors. This plan has the merit of insuring that the candidate with the most popular votes will automatically become President. It is, in fact, the only proposal that would do so. However, the blunt truth is that this proposal, whatever its virtues, has almost no chance of adoption. Electoral votes, as the Constitution has always provided, are awarded to States on the basis of their representation in both the House and the Senate. Thus, no matter how small a State's population, it is assured of at least three electoral votes. And it is hardly likely that the smaller States would ratify an amendment abolishing a voting system weighted in their favor.

Secondly, there is the district system proposal. Under this, the electoral college would be retained, but with the express requirement that electors credited to a State on the basis of its representation in the House be elected from single-member districts. Another two electors, like U.S. Senators, would be chosen in a statewide vote. One drawback to this proposal is that it would open the door to possible gerrymandering of electoral districts. It would also divide the Nation into 481 separate presidential voting units, as compared with the 51 in which campaigns are now conducted. Moreover, there is no assurance that the district system would prevent the election of Presidents who did not receive the most popular votes.

For example, a study by Congressional Quarterly, based on returns from congressional districts, showed that Kennedy would have lost the 1960 election to Nixon if the district system had been in effect. Furthermore, this proposal would not abolish the general ticket universally. For in Alaska, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming, all States with only one Congressman, the candidate who carried the State would receive all three electoral votes.

Finally, there is the proportional plan. Under this proposal, the electoral college would be abolished and a State's electoral votes would automatically be awarded to candidates on a formula proportional to the popular vote. The primary objection to this plan, it seems to me, is that it could very well weaken our two-party system. Unit voting by States serves to discourage zealous political activity among minority factions, since they have little chance of obtaining enough popular support in any State to bring them electoral votes. However, if the proportional voting plan were in effect, this moderating influence on our two-party structure would be removed.

Third-party movements, by obtaining a small number of electoral votes in several States, could become a major factor in the final outcome of a presidential election. Thus, in my view, the proportional plan carries with it the risk of political instability. And, as with the district system, it would not necessarily prevent the election of a "minority" President.

The Congressional Quarterly study of the 1960 returns, to which I referred earlier, also showed that Nixon would have won over Kennedy had the proportional plan been used. In addition, earlier studies have shown that the proportional plan would have resulted in the election of "minority" Presidents in 1880 and 1896.

Efforts to abolish the general ticket system have been made repeatedly in the past, but always without success. In a way, this is rather ironical. For there is nothing whatever in the Constitution requiring a State to cast its electoral votes by the general ticket system. And yet every State has used it since 1892, when Michigan abandoned it briefly, and for partisan reasons, in favor of the district system. Today, our presidential elections are conducted on the assumption that the general ticket system will prevail across the entire Nation, and that each State will cast its electoral votes in one unit. To abolish the general ticket system by constitutional amendment, especially as proposed by the district or proportional plans, would result in basic alterations to our presidential election process. No one can foresee the results of these changes, and it seems to me that the wisest course is to refrain from these changes until we can be fairly certain of their results.

Nevertheless, as I said earlier, there are serious defects in our constitutional provisions for the presidential election which, in the national interest, should be corrected. This can be accomplished by means of a limited reform amendment. In my view, such an amendment should be drafted so as to remove the following flaws in our Constitution:

First, presidential electors are legally free, under the Constitution, to vote for anyone they might desire. Thus, there is always the possibility that an elector will substitute his own particular wishes for the popular will of the people. This has happened more than once in our history. Electors have broken pledges to their party in 1820, 1824, 1948, 1956, and, most recently, in 1960.

The 1960 example is the most frightening. That year a Republican elector from Oklahoma, one Henry Irwin, abandoned Richard Nixon and cast his ballot instead for a man who was not a presidential candidate in any of the States. Worse yet, he actively sought to induce other Republican electors to do likewise. In 1961, testifying before this subcommittee, Mr. Irwin described his participation in a coalition movement. The avowed aim of this movement, he admitted, was to obtain enough votes in the electoral college to prevent either Kennedy or Nixon from obtaining the Presidency, and to send to the White House a man with no popular mandate from the people.

Fortunately, this movement failed. But this incident clearly shows that the electoral college is not, as Hamilton affirmed it would be, a barrier against cabal, intrigue, and corruption. Today, it is exactly the opposite. Moreover, the electoral college, as the 1960 incident points out, can be used as a device by political extremists seeking to thwart the democratic process.

Second, State legislatures retain an absolute power over the appointment of electors. The Constitution, under article II, section 1, provides that each State shall appoint electors in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct. In the early days of the Republic, electors were frequently chosen by State legislatures. The Supreme Court, in an 1892 decision, held that legislatures still retain this power, explaining that the Court "can perceive no reason for holding that the power confided to the States by the Constitution has ceased to exist because the operation of the system has not fully realized the hopes of those by whom it was created" (*McPherson* v. *Blacker*, 146 U.S. 1, 35). In other words, in no State do the people have a constitutional right to vote for presidential electors, and any State has the power to resume legislative appointment of electors. Furthermore, this State power of appointment allows legislative enactment of laws permitting the use of unpledged or independent electors. In 1960, a total of 14 unpledged electors were chosen from 2 States, and all 14 voted for the candidate of Mr. Irwin's coalition movement. The chief danger of this practice is that enough unpledged electors might be chosen in a close election so that they would hold the balance of power over the outcome, either by picking one of the major party candidates or by voting for a third person and throwing the election into the House.

Third, a presidential candidate must obtain an absolute majority of electoral votes to prevent an election in the House of Representatives. The House has been called upon to decide a presidential election twice in our history, once in 1800 and again in 1824. On the first occasion, Aaron Burr was very nearly elected President over Thomas Jefferson. And in 1824, when 18 of the 24 States had their electors chosen by the people, Andrew Jackson obtained a plurality of the popular votes cast, but lost the election in the House to John Quincy Adams.

In both cases, there were allegations of intrigue and vote-trading in the House. There is general agreement today that selection of a President by the House is highly undesirable, particularly under the present constitutional provisions for the contingent election. The procedure is hardly democratic, since each State delegation, regardless of size, has only one vote in deciding the outcome. Nevertheless, so long as the election of the President requires an absolute majority of electoral votes, there is always the danger that the House will be called upon to decide the contest.

This danger is especially acute when strong third-party movements arise, or when a presidential election is decided by a close popular vote. In 1948, for example, if Truman had lost less than six-tenths of 1 percent of his vote in two States, the election would have gone to the House. And in 1960, a total shift of only about 20,000 popular votes in two States would have left Kennedy with less than an absolute majority of electoral votes.

If adopted, Senate Joint Resolution 58 would correct all but one of these defects. It provides for abolishing the electoral college and automatically awarding a State's electoral votes to the winning candidate. This, in one stroke, would remove the dangers stemming from the office of elector and the State's absolute power over appointment of electors. It also provides that, if a presidential candidate fails to obtain an absolute majority of electoral votes, the election will be decided from among the three leading candidates by a joint session of the Senate and the House, with each Member casting one vote. This would make the contingent election more democratic, but it would not in any way lessen the danger of its occurrence.

Since my feeling is that the danger of the contingent election should be reduced to the very minimum, I would like to suggest to the subcommittee that it consider the provisions covering it as contained in House Joint Resolution 819. Under my proposal, the candidates with the greatest number of electoral votes, whether a majority or a plurality, would automatically be declared President and Vice President after a routine count by the Congress. If the electoral vote ended in a tie, which is a remote possibility, the Senate and House of Representatives, sitting in joint session and with each Member casting one vote, would immediately choose the President and Vice President from among the candidates with the greatest and equal number of electoral votes.

As I see it, the provision for election by plurality has these arguments in its favor:

First, it would give the greatest possible assurance, within the framework of a limited reform amendment, that the electoral vote count will reflect the result of the popular vote. In a close election, it is always possible that the presidential candidate with the most popular votes, and who as such would be the choice of the people, might nevertheless fall short of an absolute majority of electoral votes. If that happened, the people would not have elected the President. And, even under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 58, it cannot be said with certainty that the Congress would be guided by the results of the popular vote. There would always be the danger of "cabal, intrigue, and corruption," especially if the leading candidate's party held a narrow majority in the Congress.

Second, it would discourage divisive efforts by third parties. A third party, even with fairly heavy popular backing, would not be strong enough to elect a President. But it might actively work to frustrate the November election, throw the decision into the hands of the Congress and, in this way, exert an influence disproportionate to its strength. The contingent election, as provided by Senate Joint Resolution 58, would be decided among the three leading candidates, which would further encourage third-party efforts toward an inconclusive general election. Election by either a plurality or majority of electoral votes, rather than by an absolute majority only, would render such tactics futile and, in the process, strengthen our two-party system.

Third, it would prevent the risk of an intolerable situation as regards the conduct of our foreign affairs. If a close election denied the leading candidate an absolute majority of electoral votes, the United States, lacking a President-elect, would drift from November to January uncertain as to the next occupant of the White House. And so would the rest of the world. It is not hard to imagine the difficulties which could plague us, particularly if a sudden international crisis arose before the Congress could elect the next President.

Fourth, it would insure the orderly exchange of executive power from one administration to the next. A President-elect, especially if he is from a party returned to power, faces an enormous task after the November election. He must pick a Cabinet, appoint other high officials, consult, plan, and prepare. He must do all this in the relatively short period from early November until the January inauguration. A President chosen by the Congress would be denied this time, and instead would be faced with the impossible job of organizing a new administration within a few weeks. The certain result would be delay and disorder in the executive branch, possibly for months.

Finally, from the standpoint of practical politics, election by either a plurality or majority of electoral votes would not change our presidential election process. We find nothing harmful in sending the successful presidential candidate to the White House with a plurality of popular votes. In fact, some of our greatest Presidents reached office with less than 50 percent of the popular vote. Abraham Lincoln was a "plurality President" in the 1860 election. So was Woodrow Wilson in 1912, and again in 1916. So was Harry Truman in 1948. And so was John Kennedy in 1960. If we honor the plurality principle as to the popular vote, which is considered the presidential mandate, there is no logical reason why we should not do likewise as to the electoral votes.

In addition to the plurality provision, I also would like to suggest to the subcommittee that it consider revisions to Senate Joint Resolution 58 relating to the following subjects:

1. District of Columbia presidential vote: Under the 23d amendment, adopted in 1961, the District of Columbia obtained the right to participate in the presidential election. However, Senate Joint Resolution 58 has no provision regarding voting in the District of Columbia and its status in the presidential election would be left in doubt if the proposed amendment were adopted in its present form. This problem can be resolved, as I have done in House Joint Resolution 819, by simply reworking the language of the 23d amendment so as to conform to an election system in which the electoral college plays no part.

2. State residency requirements for presidential elections: Within the last several years, there has been a growing trend toward State legislation allowing newly arrived citizens a shorter term of residence to qualify for voting in presidential elections. At least 19 States now have laws of this sort. The theory behind them is sound, since the presidential election is of national scope, and a citizen should not lose his right to participate simply because he has moved from one State to another. Senate Joint Resolution 58, however, provides that voting in presidential elections be limited to persons qualified to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. If approved in this form, the proposed amendment would strike down the more liberal residency laws now existing. To preserve these laws, it would be necessary only to add a provision allowing State legislatures to prescribe lesser qualification with regard to residency in presidential elections.

3. Places and manner of holding presidential elections: Senate Joint Resolution 58 gives the Congress authority to determine the time of presidential elections, but it says nothing as regards jurisdiction over the places and manner of holding the elections. Thus, it is silent on a subject involving, among other things, the determination of contested elections. In my view, it would be best to add a provision giving the Congress and the States concurrent jurisdiction over the places and manner of holding presidential elections.

A precedent for such a provision can be found in article I, section 4, of the Constitution, which gives the Congress and the States concurrent jurisdiction over the conduct of elections to the House and Senate. It may be that the Congress would leave to the States statutory authority over the conduct of presidential elections. However, there might also be a need for uniform laws on some matters in this area, especially the determination of election disputes. In that case, the Congress would need to draw its authority from the Constitution, and it would be well to make provision for that eventuality in any amendment abolishing the electoral college.

By way of clarification, I would like to add that I see no technical problems with regard to the 24th amendment, which bans the poll tax in Federal elections. On February 2, 1966, I placed in the Congressional Record an analysis of Senate Joint Resolution 58 prepared by the committee on Federal legislation of the association of the bar of the city of New York. The analysis, among other things, suggested that Senate Joint Resolution 58 be revised so as to avoid any arguments that the 24th amendment would no longer apply to presidential elections, should Senate Joint Resolution 58 become part of the Constitution. At my request, the American Law Division of the Library of Congress has prepared a memorandum on this question. The memorandum, I think, clearly shows that the 24th amendment, both as to its language and intent, was drafted so that the ban on poll taxes would continue to apply to the presidential election in case the electoral college were abolished. I am submitting both the analysis and the memorandum to the subcommittee, which may wish to include them in the record of the hearings.

In conclusion, I wish to express again my conviction that action is needed now to abolish the electoral college. These hearings, as the subcommittee knows, represent the latest in a long series of efforts to reform an electoral system which has never functioned as the framers of the Constitution intended. Unfortunately, largely because of disagreement as to the method of reform, these efforts have been futile. Even so, there is general agreement that something should be done to modernize the way in which we elect our President. Edward S. Corwin, a leading authority on the Constitution, has said:

"On no problem did the Convention of 1787 expend more time and effort than that of devising a suitable method of choosing a President. With no other feature of the Constitution did they express greater satisfaction than on the method finally devised. It is, Hamilton said in The Federalist, 'the only part of the Constitution not condemned by its opponents.' Actually, no feature of the Constitution has raised more difficulties in the past, or remains at this moment a graver menace to our domestic peace."

If this menace is to be removed, the first step toward success is approval by the Congress of a limited reform amendment such as Senate Joint Resolution 58. This sort of amendment, I think, is a sound compromise between what may seem ideally desirable and what is realistically possible. As such, there is no reason why it should not be ratified by the States. It would preserve our presidential election system as it is expected to operate under normal circumstances, but at the same time remove the subtle dangers in the Constitution which some day could lead to disorder, delay, and even disaster. Even if the risks seem small, we should no longer trust to luck in filling the highest office in the land. Therefore, I hope that this subcommittee will act favorably on Senate Joint Resolution 58, perhaps making some of the revisions suggested earlier, and that the Congress as a whole will do likewise before this session ends.

The Missing H-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in a thoughtful editorial on Friday, March 4, the Boston Globe raised some of the serious questions that have arisen in all our minds as a result of the loss of a hydrogen bomb in Spain. The implications of this incident may be more far-ranging than we presently believe, not merely from the standpoint of the health and morale of the people of Palomares, Spain, but also from the standpoint of the success or failure of the 18-nation disarmament talks currently underway in Geneva. The Globe asks the question, "Is it not time to call a halt to routine flights with nuclear weapons?" I think it is a question to which the administration must give a great deal of careful thought.

The Boston Globe editorial follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 4, 1966]

THE MISSING H-BOMB

The news is now official. One of our H-bombs is missing. Like basketball players looking for a lost contact lens, as columnist James Wechsler has so aptly put it, our Air Force and Navy have been searching for it on and off the shore of Palomares, Spain.

Last January 17 a Strategic Air Command B-52 carrying four such bombs collided with a tanker plane while refueling, and the weapons were apparently jettisoned before it crashed. One bomb was recovered presumably intact; two were found split apart by the detonation of the conventional explosives packed around them, but there was no nuclear blast.

And the fourth is missing, apparently somewhere in the Mediterranean approximately where the Spanish southern coast turns north toward France. James Bond characters abound, and it seems like a scene out of "Thunderball," except that Ian Fleming is dead and this is real life.

But in finally making the news official, the Departments of State and Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission have tried to be reassuring. All the bombs, they say, were unarmed, and while some radioactive material was scattered on the countryside, "no evidence of a health hazard exists." Vegetables, meat, fish and milk may be consumed safely.

Doubtless Washington is right, but Communist propaganda has been having a field day with the case. To combat their alarms, U.S. Ambassador to Spain Angier Biddle Duke, who knows his protocol, and the Spanish minister of information and tourism, will go swimming in the Mediterranean next Tuesday. Meanwhile some 2,000 tons of soil is being ferried back to this country for burial in a nuclear-waste graveyard.

Presumably the missing H-bomb, which cannot now cause a nuclear explosion anyway, will eventually be found. But the problems it has posed may be harder to solve.

For it is only the latest in a series of similar accidents.

Ralph E. Lapp, a top atomic scientist, wrote in "Kill and Overkill," published in 1962, that nuclear weapons were involved in about a dozen accidents in the United States and overseas. In one, a B-52 bomber had to jettison a 24-megaton bomb over North Carolina. It fell in a field without exploding.

"The Defense Department has adopted complex devices and strict rules," wrote Lapp, "to prevent the accidental arming or firing of nuclear weapons. In this case, the * * * warhead was equipped with six interlocking safety mechanisms, all of which would have to be triggered in sequence to explode the bomb.

"When Air Force experts rushed to the North Carolina farm to examine the weapon after the accident, they found that five of the six interlocks had been set off by the fall. Only a single switch prevented the 24-megaton bomb from detonating and spreading fire and destruction over a wide area."

For many years it has been part of this Nation's defense setup to have bombers carrying nuclear weapons flying many hours, ready for nuclear war in case of attack. This may have been necessary in times of crisis, though it was already scary in 1961 to know that the world's stockpile of nuclear weapons contained the equivalent of 30 tons of TNT for every person on the planet.

But today, when tension has been greatly lessened in Europe and when intercontinental missiles have better capability of delivery than airplanes, is it not time to call a halt to routine flights with nuclear weapons?

An Exceptional Man Has Been Lost to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 4, 1966, I sorrowfully attended the funeral of Elliot See at Arlington National Cemetery. As a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics I was intimately acquainted with Mr. See's accomplishments, and of what it took to make an astronaut. As the Representative of the Third Congressional District of New York, I came to know of his accomplishments at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., of which Elliot See was a graduate, class of 1949.

Elliot See had mastered many disciplines, all in the service of the Republic; all to the credit of that Republic; all for the future of mankind. We cannot afford to lose men like Elliot See. No nation produces enough of them. These were the thoughts that ran through my mind as I performed my melancholy duty on that remembered day last week. It is my hope that those who follow in his footsteps will be worthy of the example he set.

Appended here is an appreciation of this young man given by the commander of the Merchant Marine Academy, Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock. Admiral McLintock has superbly prepared so many of our brightest young men for their merchant marine careers, and his judgment is as esteemed as his observation is keen.

The material follows:

An Appreciation

U.S. Department of Commerce,
Maritime Administration, U.S.
Merchant Marine Academy,
Kings Point, N.Y., March 1, 1966.

[Circular No. 66-5]

From: Superintendent.
To: Cadet-midshipmen of all classes.
Subject: Elliot M. See, Kings Point, 1949.

Not since the shocking news of President Kennedy's death has the regiment been so saddened as by the accident that took the life of our shipmate and astronaut Elliot See, class of 1949. We had all looked forward to Gemini 9 when he was to be the command pilot. We were very proud of his accomplishments and gave him our highest honor, the honor of being our reviewing officer on May 22, 1965. He was a credit to his Academy and to his country.

Elliott was a quiet cadet, studious and capable. He was 3d Company commander, carrying out his responsibilities with care and competence but always without bombast. His slow cheerful smile, and his readiness to perform his duties, at once characterized him as a kind and earnest man who was well knit and well oriented to life. He was a churchgoer and a believer and he was kind enough to tell me—though he did not talk much—that throughout his graduate years he remembered my talks to the regiment and took many of my words to heart.

When I asked him what made him go into the space program he said it was because air navigation seemed to him to be an extension of surface navigation, and he said he thought President Kennedy summed this up when he said, "Space is our new ocean and we intend to sail upon it."

We had high hopes of his Gemini 9 flight and only on January 16 last I had had a letter from him accepting my offer of a Kings Point pennant to take with him on this flight. One of his classmates, Edgar Russell, asked his father to make this special beautiful little flag, and I propose to send it to Elliot's wife in Houston, with the request that it be placed in his pocket, where he intended to carry it.

So he will carry our flag higher than the moon.

God alone, our Creator, knows why in the course of his work and at this great moment of his career he should be lost to us. But be very sure that his spirit soars beyond the stars he studied. Command pilot, classmate, shipmate, we salute you. Ave atque vale.

I have sent on your behalf a message to his wife and children, our flag will fly at half mast until after his funeral and I ask you to remember him always, as I will, our son of Kings Point who soared and dared to make our exploration of space possible.

Gordon McLintock,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Maritime Service, Superintendent.

Ronald Schebil Wins VFW Speech Contest in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to call to the attention of our colleagues the winning speech in the Michigan voice-of-democracy contest, sponsored each year by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary. I am doubly pleased to announce that the Michigan winner is a young man who lives in the 12th Congressional District which I am privileged to represent.

His name is Ronald John Schebil, and he lives in St. Clair Shores, Mich. His speech should dispel the thoughts of many that our younger generation fails to recognize the values of living in a democracy.

Here is a passage, Mr. Speaker, from my young constituent's speech:

> Communists, racists, and all purveyors of hate are selling a line that distorts the truth and leaves us with no hope for the future in this world or the next.
>
> But my generation will not buy that line. Individually and through organizations like the Peace Corps and VISTA, we will fight against all forms of injustice.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald John Schebil understands what our democracy is all about. I submit that he is more typical of today's younger generation than many people may think. Our country will be in good hands when his generation assumes the reins of leadership.

I have unanimous consent that Mr. Schebil's speech, "What Democracy Means to Me," be printed as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

What Democracy Means to Me

(By Ronald John Schebil)

I am a part of the new generation of Americans—a generation available for defense, a generation which is now paying the price for freedom in Vietnam. I am a part of that generation in whom the privilege and responsibility of full citizenship will soon be vested.

My generation is at the apex of scientific development. We are heirs of all that the world has accomplished, of all that man has done to improve, or perhaps to destroy, the world in which he lives. In spite of dramatic portrayals of injustice, war, and destruction, we believe that our inheritance is golden, for we live in a free society.

Today we face the greatest challenge that youth has ever known. Great political machines are in head-on collision; a mad race for arms supremacy is running wild; the world is becoming a marketplace for the minds and the souls of men.

Yet we are called upon to preserve freedom. Communists, racists, and all purveyors of hate are selling a line that distorts the truth and leaves us with no hope for the future in this world or the next.

But my generation will not buy that line. Individually and through organizations like the Peace Corps and VISTA we will fight against all forms of injustice.

A recent article appearing in the American Mercury, written by Channing Pollock reads:

"In 1912 the finest and safest vessel that had ever been built, the unsinkable *Titanic*, struck an iceberg and sank—the staggering fact is not that the ship went down, but that she met disaster after radio warnings of danger ahead, with her engines at full speed, her band playing, passengers dancing, and apparently nobody caring a damn that there was ice ahead."

Continuing Mr. Pollock says: "And the staggering fact about contemporary America—warnings are everywhere, passengers are dancing, and nobody gives a damn."

Is this true? As for me, as for my generation, we are not blind to what is happening; we are not deaf to the fallacies of the evil doctrines of today. We will not stand to see our freedom snatched from us.

We will combat slavery with a just appraisal of the worth of man. We will combat hatred with a genuine consideration for the brotherhood among men, and we will fight in every way against those evils which strive for the conquest of the souls of men.

Democracy means our life, our liberty, and our happiness. With God's help we will fight as did our Founding Fathers to preserve these ideals with the weapons of sacrifice, sacred dedication, and grim determination.

What Democracy Means to Brian E. Bice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that this year's winning voice-of-democracy speech in the State of Illinois was delivered by Brian E. Bice, of peoria. I am looking forward to presenting a copy of today's Record to Brian at the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars congressional dinner. The VFW is to be complimented for encouraging over 300,000 students to participate in a mental exercise to strengthen the backbone of our country. Brian's speech is marked by integrity and wisdom. Also, one cannot help but get the feeling that he has the courage to translate his words into action which will carry him through any opposition. I take this opportunity to congratulate Brian on his speech and commend his words to my colleagues and to all the young men and women of this Nation.

Under unanimous consent, I include the speech at this point:

What Democracy Means to Me

(By Brian E. Bice, Peoria, Ill.)

In this confused day and age, when riots and demonstrations are as commonplace as putting the cat out; in this day and age when burning a draft card or carrying a placard denouncing U.S. policies is considered a sign of youth; in this day and age when youth is labeled "frustrated," it seems important to me, a part of the younger generation of today, to stop a moment, and reflect on the question, What does democracy mean to me?

Democracy means a dream; not the type of dream that one ordinarily associates with a member of the beat generation, but more of a vision; the type of vision that characterized our forefathers. "One nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all," is a direct result of their vision. Yes, this is my heritage, the heritage that I dream of and would fight to support.

But what else is democracy to me? Democracy means obligation. It can't be all dreams. It must be practical, and workable in today's society, as well as it was in the time when our forefathers first conceived it.

Democracy has responsibilities as well as privileges. Voting is not only a privilege, it is a responsibility. When one goes to the polls to vote, he is exercising a right that is denied to so many people in today's world. He is choosing his own leaders.

Democracy is obligation to me. Although I am not of age to accept the privileges of democracy, such as voting, I am still willing to accept the obligations of good citizenship.

Sadly enough, democracy has still another meaning. Democracy means suffering. Democracy requires sacrifice. Not the kind of sacrifice that calls for the senseless waste of suicide in order to attract attention to one's grievances, but the kind of sacrifices that people make every day. Democracy, to me, means sacrificing time for jury duty. It means the sacrifice in effort. For instance, our representatives in National, State, and even local government sacrifice the effort that could be spent for personal achievement in a position that offers more monetary rewards. But, most of all, suffering means the supreme sacrifice of giving one's life for his country. Today this is more than mere, empty words. Although we are technically at peace, more and more young American men are proving the fact that democracy is synonymous with suffering. But perhaps those who suffer most for democracy are those left behind these brave men—to place a gold star in the window.

Yes, democracy does mean suffering; but because I am young, I cannot help believing that democracy means something far more beautiful than suffering: faith. The kind of faith that pushed the pioneers across mountains, the kind of faith that freed slaves, the kind of faith that carried soldiers through trenches in France, the kind of faith that liberated Berlin, the kind of faith that lives on today and gives democracy meaning for the future.

Yes, democracy has meaning for me. Democracy means a dream. Democracy means obligation. Democracy means suffering. And most of all democracy means faith.

We Are There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I insert at this point an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of March 6, entitled "We Are There."

May I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

We Are There

With the steady increase in the number of American troops in Vietnam—the figure is already 215,000 and will soon rise by another 20,000—there can no longer be much doubt that the United States is becoming committed to precisely what its civilian and military leaders have almost unanimously wanted to avoid: a massive land war on the continent of Asia.

Whether or not the figure will escalate to 400,000—or even to 600,000, as has been widely predicted—the fact is that already, as of today, "we are there"; and "we are there" on a scale and to a degree not even contemplated a relatively short time ago. The problem now is not to recriminate, but to see how and in what way the President can be aided in his profoundly serious search for peace—the peace that, as he said last week, "is within our grasp if we will both reach for it together."

While a strictly military victory in the normal sense of the word could, of course, be won by the United States over the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, the cost in escalation, in human life, and in moral, physical, economic, and political damage could invalidate such a victory even before it was won. Quite apart from the risk entailed in war with China, the picture of Americans obliterating an Asian country and people—even with the highest, most selfless of motives—is not a picture that would in the long run redound to the benefit of the United States, nor to its long-range safety or interest.

It must be emphasized that the United States cannot and should not under present circumstances pull out of Vietnam. The United States, as the President has made clear, is not going to withdraw precipitously—or withdraw at all—without a satisfactory settlement. What this newspaper believes, and always has believed, is that constant military buildup is not the way to achieve such a settlement. Nor is it the way to accomplish the avowed purpose of the United States to transfer the conflict from battlefield to bargaining table.

If the non-Communist South Vietnamese are to have a fighting chance after the war, they must carry the main military burden now. The immediate American objective should be to strengthen our allies but not to replace or supplant them, as escalation much beyond present levels threatens to do. A buildup to 40,000 American troops would over-Americanize what is essentially a Vietnamese political conflict, while bombing of the North Vietnamese cities of Hanoi and Haiphong—which thus far President Johnson has wisely refused to sanction—would also change the whole character of the war. This newspaper has, in fact, opposed and continues to oppose the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam on the grounds that, in terms of the purposes for which the United States is fighting, it does far more political and moral harm than military good.

In fact, this kind of choice is the essence of virtually all decisions affecting Vietnam; a balancing of risks, a determination of which of two unattractive courses is the less attractive, a selection not between what is clearly desirable and clearly undesirable, but between what is more or less undesirable.

While continued military pressure is surely essential if Hanoi and the Vietcong are ever to be persuaded to negotiate, there is an important difference between the approach suggested above and a steady escalation of the American military effort, which—despite protestations to the contrary—is what seems to be occurring.

The picture is not clear. There is no doubt that President Johnson has restrained the more belligerent of his advisers, and he deserves full credit for doing so; but it is also evident that he has not succeeded in making as plain as possible the limited nature of the American involvement.

The surest way to do this would be by a far more persuasive and consistent diplomatic and political offensive than has even yet been undertaken. We have not the slightest doubt that the Presiden would infinitely prefer peace to war. Yet, neither the world—nor, even more strongly, the enemy—has been persuaded that the United States purpose in Vietnam is purely defensive; that Washington really means negotiations to be "unconditional"; that it would enter a resurrected Geneva Conference without prior conditions; that the United States really does not intend to keep on building up its forces in Vietnam to the maximum degree possible into an indefinite future.

While the attitude of Hanoi has thus far been totally negative and uncompromising, the fact remains that without compromise there can be no negotiation; and the United States should not be the party to this conflict that leaves any stone unturned in an honorable effort to achieve such negotiations.

For example, direct talks with the Vietcong are essential; and that fact should be frankly recognized despite the understandable aversion of the South Vietnamese Government to giving the immediate enemy even that much recognition. And it needs to be made even clearer that—as the White House has in fact suggested—the Communists would not necessarily be excluded from participation in whatever interim government may be set up to precede the elections; nor if the vote so warrants, from whatever government may be established after the elections.

In recent weeks the United States seems to have moved quite far toward accepting such a possibility; but the American position has been obscured by cross-currents emanating from various White House spokesmen, not to mention the South Vietnamese Government. It is obviously not to America's interest to weaken the South Vietnam Government; at the same time, however, steady pressure must be applied on General Ky and his colleagues to open up a dialog with civilian political groups and to envisage the ultimate establishment of contact with the Vietcong, looking toward an interim coalition government into which the Vietcong could be incorporated along with the many other elements that make up the variegated political life of South Vietnam.

It goes without saying that the projected program of social reform emphasized at the recent Honolulu meeting is essential to any long-term solution in South Vietnam. If vigorously pursued, it would strengthen support for the Saigon Government and, in fact, aid it in negotiations with the Communists and in the inevitable postwar political conflict. But the trouble is that statements of South Vietnamese leaders give the impression that they have not much faith, or are not particularly interested, in pushing this vital program. Such attitudes need drastic revision.

This newspaper believes that these modifications in present policy could conceivably lead to the beginning of a beginning of an end to the war. They may not work; but it is our belief that they offer a far greater hope of achieving an honorable peace and a far smaller risk of an "open-ended" war than faces the embattled and bewildered American people today. The ultimate American objective must be to leave South Vietnam honorably and to leave it in condition freely to choose its own government and determine its own policy.

Eager Corpsmen Gain Respect in Chadron Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty is still barely out of the infant stage when it comes to Federal programs, but already it is gaining a good-sized pile of success stories.

Out in Nebraska, near Chadron, a men's Job Corps camp has been established—not without opposition, it must be added. Anything new and unfamiliar with residents of communities selected for such centers is bound to come in for its share and perhaps more of suspicion and even denunciation. I would like to insert in the Record a news story from the Omaha, Nebr., Evening Herald of February 22 telling of the success story already being written by the young men at the Pine Ridge Job Corps Conservation Camp near Chadron.

Eager Corpsmen Gain Respect in Chadron Job

(By Tom Allan)

Chadron, Nebr.—Heated opposition a year ago delayed immediate approval by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the establishment of the Pine Ridge Job Corps Conservation Camp south of town.

Opponents lashed at the high cost to taxpayers, character of the youth to be stationed at the camp and the possibility of the area being saddled with other people's problems.

When the OEO ordered another feasibility survey the opposition was buried in an avalanche of support from the Chadron Ministerial Association, Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs, American Legion, Chadron State College, all backed by editorial support of the Chadron Record.

The camp is now a reality with 82 boys, ages 16 to 21, from 30 States enrolled. Camp capacity of 112 is expected to be reached by early spring.

What's the feeling now? So far it has been one of mutual respect and cooperation.

"The acceptance of the camp and the boys has been very good," Don Huls, editor of the Chadron Record said. "I have heard nothing anti. Everybody seems real happy. If there is still opposition it is being kept quiet."

LEADERSHIP

Editor Huls credits the excellent relations between the community and the camp 11 miles south of town to a camp coordinating committee of townspeople and the personality and leadership of Walter J. Fillmore, director of the camp for the U.S. Forestry Service.

"Chadron has been wonderful and the cooperation has been out of this world," Superintendent Fillmore said. "Our relations with the college have been particularly fine."

The college has invited the corpsmen to use the swimming pool twice a week. Corpsmen are ardent rooters for the Eagles at athletic contests and are invited to other special events.

They go to the various town churches on Sunday. Many are invited into homes for Sunday dinners. They get a cut price at the local movie and are anxious to show their appreciation.

Fine; but how much is the camp costing the taxpayers?

Mr. Fillmore candidly concedes the cost is high but is quick to point out that at camps like the one here and the Bureau of Reclamation sponsored camp at McCook, taxpayers are getting more of an immediate return for their money than from urban center projects.

He estimates it will cost $4,000 a year per corpsman. This compares to an estimated annual per corpsman cost of $7,000 at the girls' urban Job Corps Center at Omaha's Regis Hotel.

"We, however, estimate the corpsmen here will contribute some $2,000 to work projects benefiting the public," he said.

The camp cost $350,000 to construct. Mobile-home type of construction can be moved elsewhere should the camp be terminated.

BUDGET

The superintendent said the camp is currently operating on an annual budget of $418,000 which includes $228,000 in salaries for the 32 allocated staff members. The camp now has a 25-member staff including cooks, counselors, teachers, and supervisors. He anticipates a slightly lower budget next year through reuse of initial supplies and equipment purchased this year.

Corpsmen are paid $30 a month.

In addition, each corpsman receives a $75 clothing allowance after completing 30 days in camp.

The Chadron area benefits from much of the disbursed funds. It was initially estimated the economic inpact from salaries and money spent on services would be between $12,000 and $15,000 here.

Meat is obtained from a Gordon contractor. Area doctors, dentists, and optometrists are paid for their services. Corpsmen spend the bulk of their salaries in town and practically all of their clothing allowance.

Our National Stockpile: A Valued Insurance Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for every Member of this Congress to take a new and careful look at our national stockpile and the policies which affect it.

During the past week, members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs heard testimony from spokesmen of most Government agencies concerned with stockpile management and policy. We also heard testimony from responsible private citizens who have carefully examined the stockpile picture and policies affecting that picture.

One of the most expert and thoughtful witnesses appearing at the hearing was the chairman of the Special Stockpile Study Committee of the American Mining Congress, Mr. Simon D. Strauss.

The testimony of Mr. Strauss, while admittedly concentrating on mining industry considerations, nonetheless contains an abundance of commonsense and good judgmet bearing on stockpile policy.

Our stockpile, in the final analysis, is in the words of Mr. Strauss, "a splendid insurance policy."

Before that insurance policy is either scrapped or shredded by some proposals now receiving consideration in Washington, every American should be informed as fully as possible on our stockpiles' importance to the country—the reasons for its establishment in the first place and the factors which bear on its vital importance today.

The statement of Mr. Strauss is made a part of the Record in the belief it will be helpful to all Members of this Congress, and to the public at large:

Stockpile Policy

(Statement by Simon D. Strauss, on behalf of the American Mining Congress before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, House of Representatives, March 4, 1966)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Simon D. Strauss. I am a vice president of the American Smelting & Refining Co. I am also chairman of the Special Stockpile Study Committee of the American Mining Congress. I appear today on behalf of the American Mining Congress with regard to the consideration which this committee is giving to the influence of stockpile activities on the domestic mining industry of the United States.

Stockpiles have been in the news since January 31, 1962, when President Kennedy at a televised press conference expressed the view that stockpiles were unduly large and that "unconscionable" profits may have been made by those who sold to the Government. Within a few days Senator Symington of Missouri was named to head an investigation by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Shortly after hearings began, detailed statements were published for the first time revealing the quantities and values of individual commodities held in the stockpiles, the stockpile objectives themselves, and the surpluses as calculated by the administration.

Since the stockpiles consist largely, although not entirely, of metals and minerals, the American Mining Congress felt that it had an obligation to state the views of the mining industry with regard to stockpile matters. For this purpose a pamphlet was issued in February 1963 entitled "The Stockpile Story." It received wide distribution at that time.

The American Mining Congress reached nine basic conclusions with respect to stockpile matters which it considered merited careful attention. These nine conclusions were as follows:

1. Stockpiles consist largely of mineral resources that cannot be replenished or replaced.

2. Two-thirds of the investment is in nine major metals that will not become technologically obsolescent; and this country is an importer of all nine.

3. No one can be certain as to the proper size of the objective for the individual commodities. Objectives today are lower than they were a few years ago. When the purposes of the stockpiles are reconsidered, objectives may well be substantially increased.

4. When stockpiled commodities are needed in an emergency, the cost of acquiring them will not be measured solely in dollars. The cost will also have to take into account diversion of labor, power, transportation equipment, and scarce machinery—all badly needed for other emergency activities.

5. The cost of storing the stockpiles is negligible.

6. Stockpile sales will adversely affect employment, commodity prices, relations with other producing countries, and development of new resources. This is the reason that the present disposal provisions were incorporated in the 1946 act. Congress should retain control of any such sales.

7. To avoid detrimental effects of even limited sales, industry must be given an opportunity to present its views under procedures clearly defined by the Congress.

8. Stockpiles not only provide protection in the event of war, the knowledge of their existence may also be an important deterrent to the outbreak of war.

9. Stockpiles represent insurance against adverse political trends abroad short of war, providing alternate sources of supply in the event the flow of materials is cut off from countries that have defected to the Soviet bloc or that have reduced production due to internal upheavals.

More than 3 years have elapsed since the American Mining Congress made its views known. In that interim period substantial sales of the stockpile commodities have been made. Stockpile objectives have been reviewed and substantial changes have been made.

Nothing that has happened, however, has changed the conclusions stated in our brochure of 1963. We still earnestly believe that it is in the national interest that large stockpiles be retained for use in emergencies.

The most recent stockpile report to the Congress by the Office of Emergency Planning is for the period ending June 30, 1965. A new report will doubtless be forthcoming within the next month or two. However, the June 30, 1965, report showed stockpiles held at an acquisition cost of $8,181,121,600. Of these stockpiles $4,772,650,800 was classed as in excess of stockpile objectives. This surplus is actually larger than the amount classified as surplus on December 31, 1961. At that time the surplus was stated to be $3,390,866,000.

Why is it that the country had a larger stockpile surplus on June 30, 1965, than it had at the end of 1961—in spite of the substantial disposals of stockpile materials that had occurred during the interim period? For example, in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, disposals of surplus materials had a sales value of $423,500,000. In the previous year disposals had a sales value of $167,100,000. The answer is clear.

The size of the surplus has increased because the aggregate value of stockpile objectives has been reduced. In the reevaluation of stockpile objectives undertaken during 1963 and early 1964, objectives were reduced for 34 commodities, increased for 39 commodities and left unchanged for only 6.

You will recall the earlier comment that "no one can be certain as to the proper size of the objective for individual commodities." Here is really the central dilemma with respect to stockpile policies.

Although there undoubtedly have been widespread and earnest discussions of stockpile objectives on the part of administrative agencies, we are not aware that the Congress or the general public has been invited to take part in these discussions. We recognize, of course, that in discussing military requirements for specific materials, there may be problems that require secrecy. However, the broader policy aspect involved seems to us a fit subject for public debate.

Since the classification of more than half the present total stockpile holdings as surplus clearly constitutes a major problem for the domestic mining industry, we welcome this opportunity to put forth our own views on this matter.

We repeat that no one, including the military, can state that any one stockpile objective figure is exactly the correct amount. The history of the stockpile is illuminating in that the objectives have been changed with great frequency. For example, during 20 years since the enactment of the Stockpile Act of 1946, the objectives for three major metals which are mined in the United States—copper, lead, and zinc—have been changed eight times. The copper objective has varied from a high of 3,100,000 short tons to its present low of 775,000 tons; zinc has varied from a high of 1,500,000 tons to the present objective of zero; and lead has varied from a high of 1,150,000 tons to a present objective of zero.

Because the ideas held by military authorities as to U.S. involvement in war change rapidly, it seems inevitable that each time stockpile objectives are reviewed major alterations will be made, if the present system of establishing objectives continues in effect. The present system involves estimates of military and civilian requirements in wartime; estimates of the duration of a war; estimates of assured supplies; and the setting of objectives based on these three major variables.

All these figures involve basic assumptions that are matters of opinion. In the case of commodities that are produced to a major extent in the United States, such as copper, lead and zinc, the result of the calculations is likely to be a broad and sweeping change in the stockpile objective each time it is studied.

The American Mining Congress believes that this method of arriving at objectives yields results that are too erratic in terms of the national interest. As an example of the dangers inherent in the present system of calculating objectives, recent experience in lead and zinc is illuminating and particularly relevant since these are two major domestic mining industries which are vitally affected by stockpile decisions.

On June 17, 1963, the Office of Emergency Planning revised the conventional-war stockpile objectives for lead and zinc. The new objectives were set at zero—in other words the Government planners decided that there would be no need for a stockpile of either metal in a future conventional war.

The previous stockpile objectives had been 286,000 tons of lead and 178,000 tons of zinc and had been established on June 30, 1958. They replaced objectives for the two metals set at 1,250,000 tons of zinc and 1,150,000 tons of lead on November 8, 1956.

To put it another way: within 7 years the planning experts of the Federal Government had so revised their ideas regarding these two metals that instead of feeling a need for stockpiles of more than one million tons of each metal, they had concluded that no stockpiles at all were required. For the record, the Government had on hand as of March 31, 1964, total stockpiles of 1,378,453 tons of lead and 1,580,740 tons of zinc.

The decision to eliminate all lead and zinc stockpile objectives was made in June 1963, but the basis for this decision was not revealed to the public until June 1964. At that time, testifying before subcommittee No. 2 of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. William N. Lawrence of the Office of Emergency Planning explained that requirements for military purposes for both metals appeared to be somewhat smaller in 1963 than the estimates made in 1958. At the same time estimates in 1963 indicated that supplies would be somewhat larger than had been calculated in 1958.

Mr. Lawrence added that the OEP estimates of available supplies included only lead and zinc from those foreign sources that could supply this country by land transportation. For zinc he mentioned Canada, Mexico and Honduras. For lead he mentioned Canada, Mexico, Honduras and Guatemala.

Under normal circumstances the United States imports substantial quantities of lead and zinc by water—mainly from Australia, Peru, the Union of South Africa, Yugoslavia and Western Europe. In 1963 importation from these waterborne sources (including metal content of ores and concentrates as well as refined metal) amounted to 246,059 tons of lead and 148,338 tons of zinc, two-thirds of all lead imports and almost one-third of all zinc imports.

Although OEP does not count on imports from waterborne sources under war conditions, the government planners have concluded that adequate supplies of lead and zinc from other sources will be available to meet wartime needs, including the necessary production of civilian goods.

The mining industry cannot accept these conclusions, even recognizing, as it does, that certain information affecting OEP's calculations is necessarily of a classified nature. The assumptions made by OEP are based on conditions similar to those that actually prevailed in World War II and Korea. In both these conventional wars there was serious disruption of markets for lead and zinc. Prices were forced to levels far above normal and greatly in excess of the average at which the Government holds lead and zinc in the stockpiles. Would this not happen again?

The objective of stockpiles is to protect the United States against unforeseen contingencies. We suggest the following considerations with respect to supply and demand:

OEP assumes that domestic mine production of both lead and zinc would increase substantially over the minimum rate of domestic mine production in recent years. Specifically the figures used were the 425,000 tons of zinc produced in 1959 and 237,000 tons of lead produced in 1962. Because of depressed economic conditions domestic lead and zinc mine production was at a low level between 1958 and 1963.

It has since increased, output in 1965 having been 620,000 tons of zinc and 293,000 tons of lead. Further gains are expected. However, experience in previous wars has been that availability of labor constitutes a major problem for the domestic mining industry. During World War II shortage of manpower caused a substantial drop in mine output despite Government production incentives offered to marginal mining operations. Zinc mine production in the United States dropped from 768,000 tons in 1942 to 614,000 tons in 1945. Lead mine production dropped from 496,000 tons in 1942 to 390,000 tons in 1945. About 40 percent of present domestic mine production of lead is obtained from a single district in the United States (southeast Missouri); sabotage could seriously interfere with production from this source. Zinc mine production is less highly concentrated but nevertheless the number of major mining areas is limited and sabotage or accidents could create bottlenecks.

It is true that land transportation is available for importation of lead and zinc from both Canada and Mexico. However, it is not necessarily true, as OEP implies, that tonnages received from Mexico would increase in wartime over the amounts currently being obtained from that country. Lead and zinc mining in that country has not expanded in recent years and a number of major ore deposits are approaching depletion. Unless new mining investments are made Mexican production of both metals could decline.

Furthermore, growing industrialization of Mexico has greatly increased consumption of both metals in that country and tended to reduce the amounts available for export. It should also be borne in mind that Mexico is aggressively seeking to develop markets in other Latin American countries under the LAFTA customs union plan. Unless Mexico is drawn into any future conflict as an active ally of the United States, it is questionable whether the country's commercial policy would be altered to divert exports away from Latin American markets in order to supply the U.S. markets. If the North Atlantic lanes remain open—as would probably be the case in the event of a war in Asia—Mexico would also expect to continue to serve its traditional European markets. We believe that stockpile planners cannot assume that imports from our neighbors will automatically increase in the event of involvement in war.

In the case of Canada, expansion of lead and zinc production in that country is of such magnitude that increased quantities should be available to the United States in wartime unless Canada has continued access to its equally important market in the United Kingdom. During World War II and also during Korea Canadian exports of lead and zinc had to be divided between the British and ourselves. The United States did not have an automatic first call on Canadian production.

The two Central American countries of Guatemala and Honduras are also listed as available for imports by land transportation. This is curious since so far as is known imports from both countries are brought into the United States by water and are subject to the hazards of water transportation. The tonnages involved are small. Land transportation is possible but would be slow and expensive. It would be cheaper to continue to hold a stockpile equivalent to the amounts involved.

Thus OEP estimates of available supplies in the event of conventional warfare are open to serious question both as to sources and quantities. Events may work out as analyzed by OEP but these are assumptions, not certainties. The purpose of stockpiles is to guard against unforeseen contingencies.

In analyzing probable wartime requirements for lead and zinc OEP expects actual military needs for both metals to be somewhat less than previously planned due to technological changes. Lead has been replaced to a major extent in cable covering; aviation gasoline, which requires tetraethyl lead, has been superseded by jet fuels; and ammunition requirements for both lead and zinc are materially lower than they were. In any case, private industry cannot have access to the information which is readily available to the Government agencies regarding military requirements for these two metals. Without disputing the military assessment, a civilian can properly point out that obviously ideas do change.

Even if in recent years the military requirements for lead and zinc appear to have been reduced, new developments in the future could reverse the trend. New uses, either unimportant at present or entirely unknown, could develop that will require substantial tonnages of both metals for military applications.

A good example of the kind of change that can occur is afforded by the experience of the automobile industry in recent years in the use of galvanized (zinc coated) steel. Prior to 1954 little or no galvanized steel was used by the automobile industry. In 1955, 22 pounds was used per passenger car. By 1964 this amount had grown to 170 pounds per passenger car. In terms of an industry which produces 8 to 9 million units a year, this means an enormous expansion in zinc requirements. If the automobile industry has seen fit to adopt a new material on a large scale within this brief span of time, it is, of course, equally conceivable that similar changes will be made in military requirements.

Zinc and lead rate fourth and fifth in terms of total tons of consumption among all metals. Obviously there is strong likelihood at some future date of new military demands being developed for either or both metals.

On the civilian side, industry is better able to question the figures and assumptions of the OEP. The growth in the country's population over the levels prevailing during World War II and Korea makes it probable that civilian needs for both metals will be materially greater in a future emergency than they were at the time of either of these two recent wars. As the availability of supplies is unlikely to be any greater than it was during these two most recent military undertakings, and as severe shortages and rationing were experienced on both occasions, to expect a more favorable balance between supply and demand that existed then seems illogical.

Perhaps the simplest way to state the mining industry's reaction to zero stockpile obectives for lead and zinc is this: the absence of any stockpile of either metal can be justified only if the administration is convinced that under no set of conceivable circumstances in wartime can a shortage of either metal be foreseen.

Each time the Government planners have gone through the exercise of setting stockpile goals they have reached different conclusions as a result of balancing assumed demand with assumed supply. This history of frequent changes provides ample justification for the expectation that whenever in the future the problem is again studied, the results will again be different. The reason for this is that elaborate mathematical calculations have been superimposed on highly uncertain assumptions.

The variations in the stockpile goals has been less marked for those commodities which are almost entirely imported than for those commodities in which there is a substantial domestic production. Thus, although stockpile goals for tin, manganese, and chromium have varied from time to time, at all times a large target has been maintained. The reason for this is clear. With no domestic production of consequence, the calculations are not affected by assumptions as to domestic supply. It is only the variations in the expanded scale of wartime consumption, plus the changing assessment as to the probable duration of a conventional war, which affect the final result.

Would it not be more logical to adopt a broader and more realistic philosophy in regard to stockpiles?

Certain basic industrial materials are essential both to the defense of the country and to the maintenance of its economic well-being. The ebb and flow of supply and demand will always result in varying calculations as to shortages or surpluses for each commodity.

There is no possibility of setting an absolutely correct stockpile objective. However, whereas surpluses of materials are merely financially embarrassing, shortages of materials can be disastrous in times of emergency. If there is to be an error in the calculation, the error should be on the side of safety.

The foregoing discussion has been based on conventional war stockpile objectives. It has been made clear that the Government is also studying stockpile needs in the event of a nuclear war. However, the protracted delay in setting objectives for stockpile needs in the event of nuclear war is in itself a clear indication that those studying the problems have had difficulties in coping with the numerous factors that must be taken into account. The variables involved are so many that one questions whether any nuclear stockpile objectives can be calculated except on the broadest considerations. The type of involved calculations that have been used to arrive at conventional war stockpile needs would not appear feasible in assessing nuclear war demands.

The American Mining Congress concludes that the national security would be better served if with respect to each commodity the Government maintained stockpiles equivalent at least to this counthy's essential requirements under wartime conditions for a stated minimum period, regardless of the extent of estimated domestic or safe supply of the commodity. Obviously if this country is almost entirely dependent on imports of a commodity, such as tin, a longer time span is essential—but every critical and strategic material should be covered with at least a minimum reserve. The length of the minimum period is something on which opinions will differ. My personal view is that an amount equivalent to 6-month total estimated wartime consumption—both for military and civilian purposes—might be appropriate.

A stockpile policy based on such considerations is in the long run likely to prove more effective than is one based on carefully calculated mathematical projections of highly hypothetical assumptions.

Assuming that the stockpile objectives are recalculated in this manner, which the American Mining Congress feels would be more realistic, there nevertheless remains the question of the effect on the domestic mining industry of disposals of materials calculated to be surplus under the new rules.

Because metals and minerals are highly affected by the economic cycle, demand conditions and prices pervailing for these commodities will vary greatly from year to year.

If large scale liquidation of stockpile surpluses had begun promptly when attention was first focused on the problem 4 years ago, the course of markets would have been quite different from what has in fact occurred.

The law states and congressional representatives have frequently reaffirmed the desire that disposal of stockpiled materials should be handled in such a way as to minimize market disturbance. Nevertheless, no matter how skillfully the General Services Administration, the Government agency charged with disposal, may conduct its affairs, every pound sold by the Government is 1 pound less than can be sold by industry. Every pound sold has some effect on the market.

For many years the U.S. Treasury had discretionary authority to sell so-called "free silver" from its stocks to domestic users. The Treasury chose to sell silver from its stocks at the minimum price permitted under the Silver Act of 1946. These Treasury sales imposed a price ceiling on the silver market at slightly over 90 cents an ounce until November 1961, when all sales were abruptly suspended by the Government because the free stock was virtually exhausted.

Following suspension of Government sales of silver, the price promptly began a rise that continued until it reached the level of $1.29 an ounce. At that point redemption of silver certificates imposed a new price ceiling. This price will continue in effect so long as the Treasury continues redemption of silver certificates and holds stocks for that purpose.

This illustration from the recent price history of a commodity that, until last year, was not included in the list of stockpiled materials, affords a clear illustration of the power that the Government can exercise over a market by selling from the stocks which it holds.

In every commodity in which the Government holds a substantial surplus—and this would include such materials as lead, zinc, aluminum, tin, and nickel—the General Services Administration is in a position to impose a price ceiling. To its credit one must testify that it has endeavored not to abuse this power and in most instances has accepted the prevailing market price at the time the material was offered for sale.

Nevertheless if one looks back to August 1962, when there was great pressure for prompt liquidation of surplus stockpiled materials, one can see what might have happened had the administration then possessed the power to begin prompt disposal of such materials as copper, lead, and zinc.

The price of lead is today $130 a ton higher than it was in August 1962. The Government has sold almost 100,000 tons of lead but still has—based on today's zero stockpile objective—over 1,250,000 tons of lead for sale. This quantity is equivalent to a full year's consumption in the United States. If sales had begun promptly in the summer of 1962, the subsequent price recovery in lead would not have occurred and domestic mine production could not have made the modest improvement that has since been reported.

Furthermore, under such conditions, investments currently being made to greatly expand the mining of lead in southeast Missouri might not have been undertaken because of an unsatisfactory price situation.

In the same 4-year period the Government has sold 309,000 tons of zinc, all since the price advanced by $60 a ton over the level prevailing in August, 1962. The Government has disposed of 534,000 tons of copper; the price today is $100 a ton higher than it was in August 1962.

The American Mining Congress believes these facts clearly demonstrate the desirability of making haste slowly in disposal of stockpile commodities.

Because economic conditions do change so widely from year to year, there is great merit in a frequent review of the position of each material. The administration would apparently like the greatest possible measure of discretionary authority with respect to future disposals. To the American Mining Congress it seems, on the contrary, that the need for congressional approval has thus far actually worked materially to the Government's advantage. Programs have been scrutinized more carefully as a consequence. The Government's revenue has increased because time was taken to consider the position.

Gentlemen, the stockpile is a great national asset. It represents a reserve of minerals and meals that exceeds manyfold the value of the largest single known ore deposit anywhere in the world. To dissipate this reserve at an accelerated rate simply to improve the immediate balance sheet position of the Government may prove to be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The country is currently involved in a grave political and military situation overseas. A major bullwark for the defense position of this country is the stockpile. Regardless of what may happen to domestic production or to overseas supplies, our continued ability to make military weapons and to maintain our essential industrial activity is underwritten by the stockpile reserve, a splendid insurance policy.

David Rockefeller Speaks on the Population Problem and Economic Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the ancient curse of privation and hunger has become the crisis of our time. Exploding populations threaten starvation in many places of the world. One of the Nation's leading bankers has spoken out on this crisis. Mr. David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, addressed the Economic Club of Detroit on February 14 on "The Population Problem and Economic Progress." His insight into the interlocking problems of populations and the world food gap is such that it is my thought that Members of Congress should have the opportunity to share his broad information and probings for solutions. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I am inserting excerpts from Mr. Rockefeller's speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE POPULATION PROBLEM AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

(Excerpt from an address by David Rockefeller, president, Chase Manhattan Bank, before Economic Club of Detroit, February 14, 1966)

I refer to the desperate chase of the world's resources, particularly agricultural production, to catch up with the accelerating growth of the global population.

The increasing imbalance between people and food vastly complicates the continuing task of spurring economic progress in the lesser developed nations, and brings to that task a new note of urgency. It means that population trends must be taken fully into account in national planning. It means that greatly increased agricultural production must be given new emphasis in the allocation of national resources. It means that the industrialized countries must reassign the priorities by which they render assistance to undeveloped lands.

In other words, the problem of population and the productiveness of agriculture must be given a new and far greater emphasis in all thinking and actions relating to the economic advance of the developing world, or that advance simply cannot take place.

The dangers ahead are spelled out in stark statistics. At the present rate of increase, the world's population of more than 3 billion will double in the next three and a half decades. The doubling time is a mere 25 years in Latin America.

The developing nations do not offer their people a satisfactory sustenance today. If they are to do so by the end of this century, doubling food production will not suffice. They must achieve a fourfold increase in food supply. World farm production has been rising annually by less than 2 percent, while the population is growing by 3 percent or more in many of the neediest countries.

In Latin America, the Far East, and Africa, per capita food production has actually declined over the past few years. Unless this trend is reversed, widespread famine will be a grim condition of life—or, rather, of death—in large areas of the world, and many past efforts to stimulate economic development will prove to have been relatively meaningless. We have only to consider the recent famine in India to appreciate what could be in store on a much broader scale.

The problem may be largely biological and agricultural; but the solution is, in great measure, economic. That is why I feel this issue is both timely and relevant even for us in the business and financial community of the United States.

It intimately involves you and me simply because we belong to the family of man, and the plight of our fellow men anywhere in the world should engage our compassionate regard. With untold millions facing imminent starvation, we cannot be content blandly to enjoy our own sustenance, without at the same time sacrificing our spiritual values. So on humanitarian grounds alone, this subject commands our attention and our action.

Another reason for our concern is that our interests as citizens of a democratic society, which seeks to endure and to triumph in a sharply divided world, are threatened by continued disparity. Unless we close the gap between population and food supply and the gap between wealthy and poor nations, allegiances will be shifted by despair, ideologies will seem dry as dust, and pockets of security will be engulfed by a sea of want. We risk unleashing upon this globe a frustration, a bitterness, an anguished fury more explosive than the growth of population itself.

Finally, the economic well-being of business here in the United States is increasingly dependent on material progress in other countries. Until they escape the crushing burden of a population growing faster than food supply, many of these nations will be unable to cross the threshold of sustained development, or to create a climate of stability and order which is necessary to attract private capital. This can be a vicious circle, for direct private investment overseas is as vitally important to us in the United States as it is to the developing nations. Already direct U.S. private investment overseas amounts to over $44 billion, having risen 28 percent in the last 3 years. These investments are now producing an income of some $5 billion a year. Sound development and continuing investment abroad are also necessary to secure sources of supply for materials required by our domestic productive plant.

* * * * *

Obviously we cannot prosper in economic isolation. Yet, the whole intricate weave of international commerce and finance can become unraveled if rampant population growth prevents modern economic development from taking place in many parts of the world. In order to speed economic progress and improve standards of living in the developing nations, as well as to secure our own freedom and prosperity in a highly interdependent world, it seems to me that we must take four essential steps.

First, we must recognize that even our most strenuous and enlightened efforts at economic expansion will be insufficient, unless they include an unremitting search for programs of family planning which are realistic, effective, and generally acceptable. It is not for us in the United States to try dictating the approach that others should take to this difficult question. Nevertheless, I do believe it is proper for us to give special recognition to those whose programs signify a commitment to progress.

A second necessary step requires the emerging nations to follow a pattern of economic development firmly rooted in the enhancement of their agricultural base. Too many of them have been captivated by the fetish of industrialization, seeking status in steel mills and prestige in airlines, but neglecting the development of their agriculture. They forget that the bedrock of progress lies in the soil, and they cannot afford to depend much longer on massive imports of agricultural products. Instead, they must formulate realistic programs for the advancement of their own agricultural sufficiency.

The problem is technical, as well as economic. Programs for improvement must reflect a receptivity to new agricultural practices and a recognition of the need for giving high priority to their implementation. With the reserve of uncultivated land steadily diminishing, it becomes all the more important to upgrade the yield.

Clearly, the developing nations must also put heightened emphasis on modern farm machinery, on promising techniques relating to preparation of the soil, on the growing of crops and on the processing of food. And just as obviously, all these things call for an intensified educational effort.

It should be a matter of urgent concern to inaugurate a massive and varied array of training programs for the rural populations. Providing maximum educational opportunity for the young, and channeling that opportunity in accordance with the real needs of their society, is critically important.

Sound development requires priorities in the use of material, as well as human resources. The nations which stand today on the threshold of modernization must take measures which stimulate capital investment, both public and private, in those activities which enhance their agricultural base or build logically upon it. This means paying attention to economic fundamentals, and not squandering severely limited treasure on meaningless monuments to national prestige. The cement which is needed for roads, should not be poured into a showcase sports stadium. The capital which is needed to clear virgin land should not go into erecting a luxury apartment house. The foreign exchange which could be spent for farm implements should not be used to purchase fleets of Government limousines. Rather, careful management of public investments must be coupled with incentives which guide private investment into the most productive uses.

Without neglecting a balanced and healthy industrial growth, capital must first be concentrated on the improvement of agriculture. Combined with better education, it creates a solid foundation for sound economic development. After stabilizing the population, that is the second essential step.

A third step is to achieve maximum effectiveness from outside programs of assistance to the developing nations. This must be a joint responsibility of the industrialized and the developing nations.

Enhancing food production involves much more than clearing land, scattering seeds, spreading fertilizer and spraying pesticides. The actual problem of feeding masses of people also calls for building roads and laying tracks, for setting up networks of transportation and distribution, for dredging rivers and improving harbors, for erecting storage facilities and constructing dams—those many things that are grouped under the name of infrastructure. There is also need for a host of small industries. We cannot just introduce modern technology on the farms, leaving all other aspects of the social and economic fabric in a primitive state, and hope to succeed.

Clearly the whole process of development in the emérging nations requires a considerable measure of outside assistance, if it is to move with adequate speed. Our foreign aid program is intended to help meet this need, and we are serving our own best interests in providing such assistance. While some aspects of the U.S. program have been disappointing, others have proved extraordinarily successful, and in general the program has greatly improved in recent years—thanks in no small measure to the skill and ability of David Bell, the present AID administrator. The capital we have dispensed through such multinational agencies as the World Bank has also reaped notable benefits. Under the brilliant leadership of Eugene Black, and more recently of George Woods, the World Bank has gained a wealth of knowledge and experience in dealing with development problems. It has an exemplary record of applying realistic economic reasoning, and a certain immunity to the distracting influences of international politics. It is particularly well equipped to provide aid in the building of that infrastructure which is an indispensable ingredient of economic advance. Moreover, it often makes its participation contingent on the benefiting nations taking basic steps to maximize their contribution to their own development.

In my judgment, the United States could well consider channeling a larger share of its aid for infrastructure and other large-scale development projects through multinational institutions. Our contribution to the new Asian Development Bank is a highly promising example. I am hopeful that a similar program will be created for Africa. On a broader scale, I think we should offer to increase our subscription to the International Development Association of the World Bank. Contrary to fears in some quarters that aid administered through international agencies has an adverse effect on U.S. balance of payments, there is good evidence to indicate that a heightened emphasis on the multinational approach will not have a more adverse effect on our balance-of-payments problems than do our bilateral programs, in which more than 80 percent of aid funds are tied to U.S. exports.

However, I would make any increase in our contribution to international agencies conditioned on its being matched by contributions from the other industrialized nations. In view of the disproportionate military burden the United States has assumed in defense of the free world, our industrialized allies can and should increase their share of economic help to the developing nations. The magnitude of the problem is far beyond the capabilities of just our own country, and this should be acknowledged by our friends who have an equal stake in its solution. I believe they are more apt to agree to an increased contribution if it is channeled through international agencies.

Meanwhile, the United States should also go right ahead with certain of its bilateral aid efforts. One field which seems to me highly appropriate for bilateral aid is technical assistance in areas such as agriculture, health, and education. The enormous demands placed on us by global population growth and the failure to provide an adequate food supply make it absolutely essential that our aid be directed to areas of maximum need and where it can be most effectively utilized.

For this reason, I very much favor extending meaningful help to programs aimed at bringing population and food supply into balance through practical family planning. There are also compelling reasons for continuing to give technical assistance to many countries, so as to speed the process of agricultural modernization.

Equally worthy of our support are educational programs overseas. They are essential to the success of plans to improve agricultural productivity and are of comparable importance for industrial growth.

It is also encouraging that the President has given renewed emphasis to the fight against disease on a wide front, supplementing the excellent health programs conducted by the United Nations World Health Organization and other institutions, both public and private.

We should make widely available technical, educational, and health assistance to the many needy countries where it can have a reasonably quick and significant impact.

On the other hand, I am strongly persuaded that our surplus food aid and our program of capital grants—to the extent we continue them on a bilateral basis—should be concentrated on fewer recipients. Dispersing our investment efforts among dozens of nations usually results in making our contribution to each of them too small to constitute a real difference, at the same time depriving those relatively few which could competently utilize more aid.

By concentrating our aid on those countries which are best able and most prepared to mobilize themselves effectively in the war against want, we shall speed the day when they will no longer require our assistance. For instance, Taiwan reached that milestone last year, and our massive aid program there has come to an end. As others achieve relative self-sufficiency in the future, we can then turn our attention to nations which will newly arrive at the stage where they can make proper use of our aid.

These, then, are some of the changed directions whereby our assistance can more closely match real needs and actual opportunities.

A am pleased to note that President Johnson is calling for the abandonment of Public Law 480 as a program for disposing of agricultural surpluses at home. Instead, it is to become a positive part of our foreign assistance program. Except for certain emergencies, American food aid and other major forms of economic assistance relating to agriculture should be given only where there is a clear and comprehensive plan for agricultural self-help or for compensatory development of nonagricultural exports, which can pay for the import of needed food. American assistance should additionally require that recipient nations have economic programs that realistically reflect their present and future populations. The plain truth is that, no matter how good our intentions or how great our beneficence, we cannot really help those who will not help themselves. It serves no useful purpose to forget the difference between the have-nots and the will-nots.

Of course, we cannot ask others to adhere to long-term plans if we are unwilling to make long-term commitments ourselves. I can understand congressional preference for year-to-year appropriations in the past, but they are not well suited to our present program. Aside from handicapping long-term planning, this practice imposes on our generally very competent aid administrators the constant task of defending, explaining, and lobbying in the legislative halls.

Making our governmental assistance to the developing nations more effective and more realistic, and having those nations undertake programs of population control and agricultural productivity, are three ways in which to mount an attack on the massive problem of feeding the peoples of the world and advancing their material well-being. But the job can never be achieved by governments alone.

A fourth requirement is to encourage fully the risks, the competition, the performance, and the fruits of private enterprise.

This is necessary in order to mobilize the immense amounts of capital required for economic development. For instance, in countries where industrialization has started, experience shows that—in addition to population control, education, good management, and healthy competition—a responsible and efficient investment of 20 percent of their gross national product is needed to raise their growth rate to 3 percent per capita, which would result in a doubling every 23 years. This means that a nation of 200 million people, with per capita incomes averaging only $150 a year, would need annual investments of no less than $6 billion in order to move toward self-sustaining growth. Capital of this magnitude can be mobilized only if the Government does its utmost to pursue policies designed to encourage savings and to gain the confidence of investors.

Experience shows that where these conditions prevail, economic development does take place. But it will not take place unless the developing nations adopt policies of positive receptivity to the investment of both domestic and foreign capital. And I regret to say that a number of countries have so far been doing the opposite. They have frustrated free enterprise with a tangle ol restrictions, prohibitions, and conditions that render effective investment virtually impossible. This is one reason why our own Government's assistance should be conditioned upon a change in these attitudes and policies abroad.

In addition, I believe our Government should give incentives here at home to investments in the developing nations—incentives whereby U.S. business will be encouraged to help areas such as Latin America raise their per capita use of fertilizer, which is now less than one-tenth that in our own land; to help the developing nations acquire more than the mere 8 percent of the world's tractors with which they now struggle to accomplish a monumental job.

Specifically, I urge that Congress adopt the proposal * * * which would give a 30-percent tax credit in the first year on investments in developing countries, and I most certainly believe such credits should apply to investments which relate to agricultural, as well as industrial improvement. * * * It is also my conviction that, by broadening still further and simplifying the risk guarantees that our Government provides for qualified overseas investments, more businesses would avail themselves of venturesome opportunities.

The challenge confronting us throughout the world today requires the imaginative and harmonious mobilizing of all the resources at our command. We face a common crisis. It is composed of interlocking problems, for which there are only interdependent solutions. This fact acts as a compulsion for cooperation.

In acknowledging this, let us think of those who shall be born to pain, if we do not hold forth promise. Let us resolve to conquer the ancient curse of privation. Let us accept, too, that it is not enough just to produce the means of life. We must also provide for a manner of living.

Children need more than merely to be fed. They need decent homes and healthy surroundings. They need schools in which to learn and parks in which to play. They need the sound prospects of employment and the opportunity to enjoy and enhance their cultural endowment. Our task is no less than the shaping of entire societies which are congenial to the aspirations of man.

As we approach this critical passage in the long course of civilization, may we all determine that our deeds shall prove equal to our dreams.

Calling Mr. Keen, Tracer of Lost Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column from the February 28 issue of Broadcasting magazine:

CALLING MR. KEEN, TRACER OF LOST PERSONS

Who is Edward Paul Mattar III?

What is the U.S. Association of Television Viewers?

These questions were being asked all over Washington and in State capitals last week and no one seemed to have the answers.

On Wednesday, February 23, form letters bearing Mr. Mattar's signature and listing him as national executive director of USATV began turning up. The only return address was the National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

The letter said USATV was a nonprofit association aimed at improving TV programing and inviting the recipients "to become a member of our National Advisory Board, and to nominate 10 constituents for membership on the board." The invitations were made for the "board of trustees"—no names given.

Before the week was out broadcasters were wondering if Mr. Mattar might not be an undercover lobbyist for community antenna TV interests.

The National Community Television Association said he wasn't one of its men and questioned if this idea might not be part of broadcaster lobby. This premise was denied by the National Association of Broadcasters and the Association of Maximum Service Telecasters.

WEDNESDAY'S MAIL

The letters came to light when some of the Congressmen opened their mail Wednesday morning. They had not heard of Mr. Mattar or his organization and began asking questions.

The National Press building said Mr. Mattar was receiving his mail at the offices of Chittenden Press Service, a firm that distributes releases to news offices. However, Chittenden officials said they were acting only as a drop point for the USATV mail.

Contacted Friday, February 25, at Eastern College, Baltimore, where he is acting dean of students and an instructor, Mr. Mattar said he already had 12 affirmative responses from his mailing. He said the letters had been sent to all Representatives and Senators, some Governors, and others.

Mr. Matter, 26, said USATV is his "brainchild" and its purpose is to open more TV time to public service programing. However, he is aware such programs can't be welfare cases, that the stations and networks have to be paid for airtime and production.

To this end he wants to create a broad base of support to show programers and advertisers that viewers actively support public service programing. In this way he hopes more time may be opened to similarly sponsored programs. Although the number of viewers of such shows might be smaller, he said, "their net worth might be substantially more."

He said he doesn't believe any good purpose can be served by "flag waving and negative approaches." He called the approach of the National Association for Better Radio and Television in counting the number of muggings in a program as "irrelevant."

Mr. Mattar intends to locate in the National Press building as soon as USATV has enough funds for office space and a staff. The cost of the mailings are coming out of his pocket, he said, and financing from USATV members or supporters will all be voluntary. He hopes "to operate in such a manner to justify foundation support."

Other members of the USATV board were identified as Frank T. Relabate, a Baltimore lawyer, and Suzanne Royter, a Washington public relations executive.

Mr. Mattar had been active in New York State politics and worked for the Republican presidential nomination for Gov. Nelson Rockefeller (New York) in 1964.

Atlantic Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Reston which appeared in the New York Times on Friday, March 4, 1966. The subject of the column is the need for political reconstruction and experimentation in the Atlantic Alliance, a need which is imperative under the threat of withdrawal by France's President de Gaulle.

I think it is particularly interesting that Mr. Reston cites the work of the House Republican task force on NATO Unity led by Congressman PAUL FINDLEY in introducing a resolution to establish an Atlantic union delegation for the purpose of studying a much closer association of the Atlantic nations.

The future of the alliance is a matter of pressing concern. I hope my colleagues will read this article and lend their active support to the Atlantic union deleagtion resolution.

THE FORGOTTEN REVOLUTION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—The Federal Government of the United States was formed 177 years ago this week, and though nationalism is the most powerful political force in the world today, the ideal of political federation is still very much alive.

Even in the agony of war in southeast Asia and rebellion in Africa, some leaders are still talking about regional federal associations and the forgotten American Revolution as the ultimate solution to their problems.

The more the British yearn for isolation, the more their urgent economic problems force them to reconsider joining Europe, and even here in Washington the old idea of Atlantic federation comes up whenever the Atlantic Alliance seems to be falling apart.

ACTION IN CONGRESS

This week a group of young Congressmen in the House of Representatives, led by Representative Paul Findley, Republican, of Illinois, introduced a resolution to establish an Atlantic union delegation. Alarmed by President de Gaulle's threat to take France out of NATO in 1969 and by the failure of the allies to devise common policies for common problems in the Atlantic, Asia, and elsewhere, the Congressmen have called for a study of a much closer association of the Atlantic nations.

Paradoxically, the movement gets its main thrust from within the Republican Party, once the center of American isolation, and it has the written support of former Vice President Richard Nixon, Governors Romney, of Michigan, Scranton, of Pennsylvania, Hatfield, of Oregon, and Rockefeller, of New York, and former Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona.

What the resolution proposes is that President Johnson and the Congress appoint an 18-man delegation of both parties to explore with representatives of other Atlantic nations "the possibility of agreement on a declaration that the eventual goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a federal union."

THE CONTROVERSY

"We believe it helpful," the Congressmen said, "indeed highly important, to define clearly the goals we seek. * * * The future of the alliance is a matter of pressing concern. In several respects it is presently suffering the 'infractions and interruptions' which George Washington said are typical of all alliances.

"Just as Washington saw the need for a 'government for the whole,' so we see the need eventually to have one for the whole of the Atlantic community."

This is, of course, much further than most officials or legislators here are prepared to go, but the world is changing fast and the present system of loose alliances is not only failing to keep pace with the integrating tides of contemporary history but is disintegrating faster than is generally realized.

No doubt it will have to disintegrate even more before it gets serious attention here, but meanwhile a quiet study of the possibilities of a different kind of association could do no harm.

VICTORY FROM DEFEAT

Most of the major constructive achievements of the last generation in the Atlantic came out of chaos and collapse. The United Nations was formed when the world was still at war. The Marshall plan became a reality only in the face of economic disaster in Europe. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization could not be created until the Red Army threatened to paralyze the political will of Western Europe, and Jean Monnet was not able to make progress toward the unification of that Continent until the threat of nationalism and separation frightened the Europeans into unified economic experiments.

Fortunately, there are a few far-sighted men in the alliance who see the need for political reconstruction and experimentation, among them Prime Minister Lester Pearson, of Canada, and former Secretary of State Christian Herter, and former Secretary of the Treasury Robert Anderson in this country.

JOHNSON'S DECISION

Much will depend, however, on President Johnson's reaction to the proposed study. He has always been an enthusiastic supporter of the Federal principle for other nations, but never very keen about it as a means to Atlantic union.

Still, he is deeply worried about the decline of the alliance and eager for new projects that will emphasize the larger objectives of his foreign policy, rather than the narrow frustrations of Vietnam.

On this basis he may at least support a study of the prospects, but without his support it will probably not even be put to the vote.

The Role of the Civil Police Force in Free World Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, recently, the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, George B. McClellan, gave an address at the graduation exercises of the International Police Academy here in Washington. He was introduced by William S. Gaud, Deputy Administrator for the Agency for International Development, which introduction outlines the importance of the remarks of Commissioner McClellan and qualifies him as a man who has distinguished himself nationally and internationally in the field of law enforcement.

The International Police Academy, under the able leadership of Byron Engle, Director of the Office of Public Safety, performs a very vital mission, not only in American but also in free world security.

It is my feeling that Commissioner McClellan, in his remarks, touches on the vital role that is played by the police officer in the pattern of free world defense and, for that reason, I wanted to bring his address to the attention of other Members of the House. I felt that other Members of the House would be interested in seeing the biographical sketch of Commissioner McClellan which I am inserting following the remarks. As this sketch points out, he has over 33 years of outstanding public service that qualified him to head the world-renowned Canadian Mounted Police.

Remarks of William S. Gaud, Deputy Administrator, for the Agency for International Development

(At the graduation ceremonies Feb. 18, 1966, International Police Academy, Office of Safety, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. McClellan, honored guests, members of the graduating classes, ladies, and gentlemen, it is always with great satisfaction and pride that I appear in this institution, and I always think of the first time I was here. The first graduation ceremonies that we held in this building were nearly 2 years ago. The main speaker on that occasion was then Attorney General Robert Kennedy, now Senator Kennedy from New York. When we start talking about men who were really responsible for this Academy and the programs we are engaged in, and which you have been participating in, two men are at the top of the list; one is President Kennedy himself, the other is his brother, Attorney General Kennedy, now Senator Kennedy.

President Kennedy was fond of saying that we live in an untidy world. He would go on to say that it is untidy in that many parts of it are full of disease, many people were ignorant, illiterate, have no education and no opportunity—many people do not have enough food—in many parts of the world there is unrest; no law, no order, or very little of it—in many places, none of the institutions which are necessary for orderly existence and for effective government. And in addition to these conditions, which have existed for many years, there is the struggle between men who believe in freedom and men who do not.

He would lean back in his rocking chair and say that it all makes for an untidy world, but it is the only world we have and we ought to do something about it. This, I think, is the big difference between the world today and the world of 25 or 50 years ago, or a hundred years ago. It used to be that people took these conditions for granted. The would say, "So what? Of course people are poor, do not have enough to eat, have no education, and their children have no opportunity. That is the way the world is." For hundreds of years, we shrugged our shoulders and said that is the way the world is.

But in the 1950's and the 1960's there has been a change. We in the free world, throughout the free world, are united to clean up some of this untidiness. We have a common effort, a common cause, and a common belief in the dignity of man.

You and we have worked here together for the last 12 weeks. We have learned from you; you have learned from us, and this association will continue for the rest of our lives. We are proud of this organization because it is on an international basis, and this morning we are particularly proud, because participating in these ceremonies is a representative of one of our closest neighbors, Canada.

Commissioner McClellan happened to be here on that same morning 2 years ago when the Attorney General made the address of which I spoke. We all know about the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I don't suppose there is a police force in the world that has a better reputation or that more deserves the reputation it has. It is an extraordinary, distinguished organization, and one has only to look at the history of Canada to realize the truth of this—the extent of this truth. Its present commissioner, Commissioner McClellan, has had a very distinguished career in a very distinguished service. He is known throughout the world. He has been decorated by many countries in the world. His services are immense to the cause of peace, to the cause of law, to the cause of order. It gives me great pleasure to present to you Commissioner George B. McClellan of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Address by Commissioner G. B. McClellan, Royal Canadian Mounted Police

(At the graduation exercises, International Police Academy, Washington, D.C., Feb. 18, 1966)

Mr. Engle, Mr. McCann, distinguished visitors, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, I sat in this room when Mr. Robert Kennedy, then Attorney General of the United States, addressed the first graduating class of senior officers on February 28, 1964, and I am deeply conscious of the respect that has been paid to my country and myself in the invitation to follow him and the other very distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me in speaking to the graduating class.

What qualifications I may have to place a few thoughts before you today are founded on the fact that I am a working policeman, and I have been so for almost 34 years.

I am, I believe, one of the few remaining members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who carried out patrols and investigations from the back of a saddle horse.

I have been fortunate to see and participate in the development of the force to a fully modern law enforcement organization, using the tools of modern science in our four crime laboratories across Canada—and having daily radio contact with Interpol in Paris, of which I have the honor to be a vice president.

I have serve in almost all ranks of the force and have been stationed from one end of my country to the other.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police has, I believe, the most extensive area of jurisdiction of any single police force in the world.

This jurisdiction in one form or another extends 3,256 miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and 2,992 miles from the North Pole to the northern border of the United States.

In the Arctic our police posts are as much as 500 miles apart, and among the Indian and Eskimo people our duties are almost 70 percent in the field of welfare and assistance rather than law enforcement.

We are the federal police for all of Canada in such matters as counterfeiting, narcotics, and smuggling. We have the responsibility for internal national security and counterespionage.

We are the criminal police in 8 of our 10 Provinces outside of major towns and cities, and we police 122 towns and villages.

We have 69 ships and patrol boats on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, as well as the Great Lakes. We have 18 aircraft strategically placed across Canada. It may interest those of you from warmer climates to know that we also have 241 sleigh dogs for patrols in the northern regions.

Our Canadian Police College has, since 1938, qualified students from many parts of the world, such as Pakistan, the Philippines, several South American countries, and the United States.

Our uniformed strength is over 7,000 and our total establishment over 9,000.

It is from this reservoir of complex and varied responsibilities, carried out over vast areas and varying climates, that I draw the views and thoughs I submit to you today.

It is my opinion that there has been no time in history when the stabilizing influences of the world, including law enforcement bodies, have been so tested as they are today. Instead of the dream of one world and world government, we have today, in increasing numbers, groups of people—new nations, cutting away the ties of former associations, and striking out alone in an effort to be masters of their own destinies.

Such transitions are not always easily made. When the status quo is changed, it is not done without resentment. Ancient loyalties are affronted and opposition results. Emotions run high and bitterness takes many forms. We have seen a variety of results of such situations all over the world. One common denominator is almost always present—little people get hurt.

Eventually there is a cry goes up for peace and stability—and those two lovely words in the ears of any policeman—and in due course it is the policeman who is called upon to restore peace and stability on the streets of the village, the city, and the Nation.

He may appear first as a soldier of the United Nations in what is most aptly called a peacekeeping mission. That is police language—police language as it should be—and if the soldier peace officer is successful in his mission, he will be replaced in due course by the civil police—but that is not the end.

We here today know from our collective experience that the civil police do and will face a daily challenge to their authority, their integrity, their loyalty, their courage, and their efficiency.

In one country the challenge may come from criminals; in another from subversion or terror, or both; and yet in another, from corruption in high places. Combinations of any of these may and do occur.

It has been said many times that the police are the first line of defense in a country. I believe this, and I believe that this first line of defense is being challenged, tested and probed for its weak spots; not only by criminal elements from within our respective countries, but by forces from outside the country.

It is no accident that the textbooks of subversion give a high priority to eliminating or absorbing the police force. Such a result may be achieved, they teach, not only by force but by disaffection, corruption and the creation of public antipathy to law and order.

If you accept my views so far, then I am sure you will agree that those of us charged with the efficiency and effectiveness of the police forces we command, must give an equal or greater priority to the creation of conditions in the police—an atmosphere—an esprit de corps—which will be highly resistant to the insidious or frontal attacks we face.

What are these qualities we need and how do we develop them and retain them.

You gentlemen have just completed here in Washington a first-class course in modern police techniques and administration. It will no doubt be your duty when you return home to use your new knowledge and skills as tools to build a better police force. But first you must be certain of the soundness of the foundation upon which you build, if your structure is to stand against the storms that will beat against it.

If I were called upon to build from the ground up a new police force—give me as my foundation stone—integrity. Webster's Dictionary defines "integrity" as "The state or quality of being complete, undivided or unbroken." It is further defined as "moral soundness, honesty, uprightness." It is all there in that one word "integrity"—everything you need for a foundation upon which to build.

By itself, integrity will not give you trained men, first-class equipment, police experience or efficiency—but without it all else will fail you in the inevitable crises to come.

Can we develop integrity as a group quality? Yes, I believe we can to a high degree.

Provided your recruit selection program is sound, you must then, in my view, establish a tradition and you must instill in your men a pride in that tradition.

We teach every recruit the history of our force—we tell them the story of its heroes, who so often stood alone in the early years—and of men who quietly and incorruptibly took the law into the far places of my country—often in the face of brutal weather, violence and stupidity because of a sense of duty to be done in the tradition of those who had gone before.

Integrity walks hand in hand with loyalty, and loyalty is a two-way street. While all of us strive to develop the loyalty of subordinate ranks to their superiors—do we always make it quite apparent to all our men that officers must exhibit an even greater loyalty to their subordinates? In loyalty as in all other endeavors the good officer will always lead—not push.

After integrity and loyalty, give me discipline. No word is more misunderstood. A very wise officer in my own force once said to me that police regulations were meant to be a guide to wise men and a law for fools.

Much the same may be said for discipline. There is the discipline of the Roman legion; unquestioning obedience to the point of absurdity. There is a discipline for soldiers who will, for the most part, face their adversary together as a group, a platoon, a company, a battalion.

Police discipline differs from these. The policeman so often faces his problem alone and without immediate help at his side. His discipline must be self-discipline, drawn up from within him when he needs it most, and this discipline is the sum total of all the qualities of integrity, loyalty, courage, sense of duty, and self-respect which you have or should have instilled in your men.

I know of no other way to teach this type of self-discipline except by example. It is, for instance, letting it be seen by all that you yourself, as a superior officer, live by the regulations you expect your men to observe. It is making it clear that you accept full responsibility for the decisions you make. It is in standing up and defending your men when they are wrongfully criticized—and once in a while it is defending then when perhaps the criticism was justified.

Know something of your men, their homes, their personal problems, their hopes, and ambitions. Walk among them and talk to them about these things. Judge their failings with humanity and understanding—and never forget a word of praise for their successes.

From these and many other intangibles will grow discipline that, like a good tree with deep roots, will remain upright against the winds of adversity and provide protection for the people of our countries whom we serve.

I am very conscious that many of you go home from here to face serious problems of law enforcement in your own countries—problems that will require more wisdom than most of us possess. I feel sure that you are leaving this Academy far better prepared to face your responsibilities than when you came to Washington.

May I recommend a sense of humor, and remember once in a while that only in a police state is police work easy.

May I, in closing, leave with you a few words written by Max Ehrman. I have read them many times recently, for here in a paragraph is a complete philosophy and a way of life for a policeman. Ehrman said this:

"Go placidly amid the noise and the haste and remember what peace there may be in silence.

"As far as possible without surrender, be on good terms with all persons.

"Speak your truth quietly and clearly, and listen to others, even to the dull and ignorant; they too have their story. With all its sham, drudgery and broken dreams, it is still a beautiful world."

Best of luck to you all.

Vaya con Dios.

COMMISSIONER GEO. B. MCCLELLAN—BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Commissioner McClellan was born at Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan in 1908. He was educated at the Royal Military College, at Kingston, Ontario, and is also a graduate of the Canadian Police College, and the Canadian National Defense College.

He joined the Royal Canadian Mounted Police at Vancouver, British Columbia, in 1932, and on completion of his training course at Regina, Saskatchewan, was subsequently stationed in various areas in the Provinces of Alberta and Nova Scotia. During these years he was involved directly in general criminal police investigations.

He was promoted to the commissioned rank of subinspector in 1939 and, on the outbreak of war was placed in charge of security and intelligence operations of the force in the Province of British Columbia. In 1941 he was posted to similar duties in Toronto, Ontario, having responsibility for security and intelligence in western Ontario.

He was promoted to inspector in 1941 and in 1943 became officer in charge of criminal investigations in western Ontario. He was posted as officer commanding Saskatoon subdivision, at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, in 1946 and in 1947 was transferred to headquarters of the force in Ottawa as director of security and intelligence for the entire force.

He was promoted to superintendent in 1948. In 1953 he was transferred to Toronto, Ontario, as officer commanding the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for western Ontario, and was promoted to the rank of assistant commissioner in 1954.

Assistant Commissioner McClellan was transferred to Edmonton, Alberta, in 1956, as officer commanding the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for that Province. These duties involved the direction and supervision of all Federal and Provincial police work in the Province outside of the largest cities and municipalities.

In 1959 Assistant Commissioner McClellan was promoted to the rank of deputy commissioner and transferred to Headquarters in Ottawa, where he was responsible to the commissioner for all administration of the force until April 1960, when he became deputy commissioner (operations), responsible to the Commissioner for all phases of policing, security, and investigational work of the force, as the senior deputy commissioner and second in command.

On November 1, 1963, Deputy Commissioner McClellan was appointed commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Commissioner McClellan has 33 years' service, most of which has been divided between the fields of criminal investigation and national security. He was married in 1941 and has three daughters.

Following World War II he was decorated by the Norwegian Government with the King Haakon VII Cross of Liberation, in recognition of his association and work with the Norwegian armed services based in Canada for training during the war.

Hubert Humphrey: An Articulate Spokesman for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most eloquent and persuasive members of the administration is Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. The Vice President's recent trip to Asia has reinforced his ability to speak out on Vietnam.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column from the February 25, 1966, edition of the New York Journal American which expresses the sentiments of all of us who have seen the Vice President in action:

H.H.H. ADDS SHOULDER TO VIET BURDEN

(By Warren Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—Vice President HUMPHREY is home from Asia a bigger man, qualified now to take on the critics of President Johnson's Vietnam policy and eager to do the job.

The President now has an articulate, persuasive spokesman to throw into the fray alongside Secretary of State Rusk, who for all his softspoken demeanor is fast developing into the hardest hard liner of all the President's top advisers.

Nobody ever has doubted HUMPHREY'S powers as an orator, debater, or just plain talker. He has iron tonsils and steelplated lungs, as Nikita Khrushchev once found out in a celebrated talkathon in the Kremlin during a HUMPHREY visit there a few years back.

But until his 15-day, 9-nation tour of Asia and the Pacific a recordbreaking 43,000-mile jaunt as the President's personal emissary, HUMPHREY never had the credentials to speak out on Vietnam with authority. Now he has been there. He has seen it. And he has talked to the leaders of the nations which tried to make do under the ominous shadow of Peiping's Damocletian sword.

Nobody in America—not even the demonstration leading professors in the halls of academe—can practice oneupmanship on this pharmacist from Waverly, Minn., who is just one heartbeat away from the Presidency.

In the course of the trip, HUMPHREY made a profound impression on the leaders he talked to in South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Pakistan, India, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and South Korea. In some places—notably Australia and New Zealand—his sincerity and conviction actually brought tears to the eyes of his high-level listeners.

But perhaps more importantly, he made a big impression also on a couple of key Americans along for the trip; Roaming Ambassador Averell Harriman and Presidential Aid Jack Valenti. In a sense, Harriman was Secretary Rusk's watchbird and Valenti was the President's.

In quiet moments, Harriman will be telling Rusk about HUMPHREY'S performance—both in comprehending what the Far Eastern struggle against communism is all about and in articulating American policy to the nations out there. Likewise, Valenti will be giving a personal report to the President.

It can be reported that each of these astute observers will be giving HUMPHREY high marks. As a result, it is likely that HUMPHREY more and more will be asked to take on the job of spokesman to the Congress and to the American people on the excruciatingly difficult problem of Vietnam.

It is conceivable that HUMPHREY, to maintain his credentials, may be called upon to repeat his tour of the nations immediately threatened by Red China, perhaps after the expected second Honolulu conference this summer.

In the meantime, the President has a new champion of his Vietnam policies. With HUMPHREY also eligible now to confront the critics, he is in a position to take some of the burden off of Secretary Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and the President himself.

Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, Miss Barbara Huffman, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Huffman, Route 2, Peru, Ind., recently won the Peru, Ind., Jaycees essay contest. Miss Huffman is an eighth-grade student at North Miami School. She was appropriately honored at a recognition banquet for her essay entitled: "What My American Patriotism Means to Me." Miss Huffman's essay is so meaningful that I wanted to share it with my colleagues and fellow Americans:

WHAT MY AMERICAN PATRIOTISM MEANS TO ME

(By Miss Barbara Huffman)

To me, my patriotism is much more than just saying the Pledge of Allegiance or singing "The Star-Spangled Banner." It is deeply embedded love and respect for our country and the ideals upon which it was built. America is like a strong arm of liberty for the weaker countries of the world to lean upon. Though less than 200 years old, the United States has overcome adversity and can proudly take its place among the great powers of the world. When I think of our struggles and triumphs, my heart swells with pride and tears come to my eyes.

America is by no means a perfect country, but we have learned by past mistakes how this country can become a better place to live.

It is rather difficult to try to express my feelings toward patriotism, but I believe that if you have a deep-seated faith in God and your country, it should carry you through any trouble you should meet.

When I hear the national anthem or other patriotic songs, my eyes cloud over, I get a lump in my throat, and I experience a feeling of melancholy. Thoughts of Washington at Valley Forge, Gettysburg in the Civil War, and the brave infantry of World Wars I and II pass through my mind, and I marvel at the bravery and courage of the men who were the foundation stones of our country and its principles.

Patriotism is also knowing that, no matter how bleak things look for our country, freedom will still reign supreme.

True patriotism is not going out and burning your draft card or yourself to prove loyalty to your country. Instead it is pride and belief in the fact that America is doing what is really best for the people.

America is a beautiful country and a wonderful place in which to live. This feeling of pride and love for America and the principles upon which it was founded is really my patriotism.

Therefore, my patriotism is really being able to hold my head high and say proudly, "I'm glad I'm an American."

Congressman James A. Byrne, a Great Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to learn of the tremendously impressive reception and dinner recently given in his hometown of Philadelphia, Pa., in honor and tribute to my esteemed and distinguished friend, Congressman JAMES A. BYRNE, of Pennsylvania.

Congressman BYRNE is a colleague of mine on the House Armed Services Committee, whose outstanding service in the committee, and in the House, has been a true inspiration to all of us.

JIM BYRNE is a public servant of rare distinction and real stature, endowed with great ability, deepest concern for his constituency and the country, and a spirit of dedication to his work that marks him as one of the most valuable, effective members of the Armed Services Committee and the House.

He is a keen student of the problems of national defense and an acknowledged authority in this vital field, and his opinions, counsel, and cooperation are sought by all of us working in this area, and in other areas of our congressional activities.

It is always a great benefit for us, Mr. Speaker, to be in a position to receive the advice, views, and assistance of the very distinguished, knowledgeable, and articulate gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JAMES A. BYRNE.

I am proud indeed to call Congressman JAMES A. BYRNE my dear and valued friend. I hold him in highest regard, respect, admiration, and affection.

I cherish his friendship, applaud his leadership and hail and salute him as one of the finest, public servants that I know.

I am honored and pleased on the occasion of the reception to extend my heartiest congratulations to my esteemed friend. Congressman BYRNE, and his devoted family and to wish them continued good health, increasing success in all their endeavors, and happiness and peace for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include therein a very timely, informative article from the Philadelphia Bulletin on the occasion of the Congressman JAMES A. BYRNE dinner:

ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED ATTEND TESTIMONIAL FOR REPRESENTATIVE BYRNE

More than 1,500 persons crowded into the main ballroom of the Sheraton Hotel last night for a testimonial dinner for U.S. Representative JAMES A. BYRNE.

Nine other Congressmen, including one Republican, attended the affair, which was hosted by John B. Kelly, Jr. BYRNE is a Democrat.

Most Members of this congressional delegation strongly urged the audience to "return JIMMY BYRNE to Congress." BYRNE, who is rounding out his 14th year in Congress, is reported to face Democratic city organization opposition to his nomination in the May 17 primary.

However, Representative WILLIAM T. CAHILL, Republican, of New Jersey, said he was "perplexed and amazed at people saying that JIMMY BYRNE is not going to get reelected.

"Who would question his right to carry the banner for the Democratic Party?" CAHILL asked.

Guest speaker at the dinner was Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, Democrat, of Hawaii, who reiterated the remark made by President Johnson in a telegram to BYRNE that it would be "in the best interest of the United States" to return BYRNE to Congress.

BYRNE is a member of the Armed Services Committee.

At the dinner, 10 organizations made presentations to BYRNE.

Commemorative Services for Rev. James J. Reeb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Sunday, March 6, the All Souls Unitarian Church at 16th and Harvard Streets in Washington conducted services commemorating the first anniversary of the martyrdom of James Reeb. An especially moving tribute to this Wyoming minister and victim of the racial hatred at Selma a year ago was delivered by Dr. Duncan Howlett, D.D., L.L.D., minister of the All Souls Church.

Two hymns of the service were particularly appropriate; the first, the John Greenleaf Whittier tribute to the self-sacrifice of one man for the saving of the life of another; the second the matchless "America the Beautiful," with its hope that God may mend its every flaw, and confirm its self-control, its liberty in law.

In memory of the first anniversary of this occasion, I am happy to use the text of the two hymns as a part of my remarks. They follow:

Wherever through the ages rise
The altars of self sacrifice,
Where love its arms hath opened wide,
Or man for man has calmly died,

We see the same white wings outspread,
That hovered o'er the Master's head;
And in all lands beneath the sun
The heart affirmeth, Love is one.

Up from undated time they come,
The martyr-souls of heathendom,
And to his cross and passion bring
Their fellowship of suffering.

And the one marvel of their death
To the one order witnesseth,
Each, in his measure, but a part
Of thine unmeasured loving heart.

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL

O beautiful for spacious skies,
  For amber waves of grain,
For purple mountain majesties
  Above the fruited plain.
America. America.
  God shed his grace on thee,
And crown they good with brotherhood
  From sea to shining sea.

O beautiful for pilgrim feet,
  Whose stern, impassioned stress,
A thoroughfare for freedom beat
  Across the wilderness.
America. America.
  God mend thine every flaw,
Confirm they soul in self-control,
  Thy liberty in law.

O beautiful for heroes prov'd
  In liberating strife,
Who more than self their country lov'd
  And mercy more than life.
America. America.
  May God they gold refine,
Till all success be nobleness,
  And every gain divine.

O beautiful for patriot dream
  That sees beyond the years
Thine alabaster cities gleam
  Undimmed by human tears.
America. America.
  God shed his grace on thee,
And crown they good with brotherhood
  From sea to shining sea.

Imperialists for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include the following thought provoking sermon delivered by the Reverend Robert P. Gates, of the First Presbyterian Church of Peoria, Ill., on February 6, 1966:

A FAT CHANCE

(Scripture, Isaiah 1: 1–20)

One of the brutal realities that jars one when he reads the Bible is how devastatingly up to date is its message. And one shudders to see that in the face of facts that have always led to the downfall of peoples and nations—facts that are spelled out in minute detail—one shudders to see that our age is either blind to them or thinks it can duck the consequences of its actions.

It was Bismarck who made the scornful comment to men who pride themselves of being practical men—men who think that they can manipulate and adjust matters in a practical way—try this and try that, and finally come out with a practical answer—Bismarck said, "Fools say they learn by experience. I prefer to learn by other people's experience." Of course, he didn't follow his own advice, but his point is true.

How often do we hear people claim that they have some knowledge of the world, or life, because they are 60 or 70 years old? Sixty or seventy years of knowledge means nothing. If a person is not at least 3,000 years old in his mind he has a fat chance of enduring in our day.

The great problems that bear upon our Nation these days are the result of youthful minds that are calling the plays. Some of the most influential minds among us are less than 200 years old. Indeed, many minds do not reach any further back than the 1930's. They are deeply influenced by those days, or more especially, the myths of those days. Balanced judgment calls for minds that are at least 3,000 years old. It takes that long to learn from the experience of others.

It was nearly 3,000 years ago that a fellow looked back about 3,000 years before his own time, and came before his people and made a state of the Union address. What he had to say is not too easy or soothing on the ears, but he makes his point. And his point was to be proved true by subsequent events. Listen to these words of Isaiah (as translated by J. B. Phillips):

"This is what Isaiah saw to be true about Judah and Jerusalem during the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah.

"Let the heavens hear and let the earth listen. For the Lord has spoken: I have nourished children and brought them up, but they have rebelled against me; the ox knows its owner, and the ass its master's manager, but Israel does not care, my people give me no thought.

"You are a nation rotten to the core. A people bowed down with guilt, a generation of evil doers, sons who cheat and lie. They have forsaken the Lord, they have despised the Holy One of Israel, and made themselves utter strangers to him.

"Why must you invite further punishment? Why continue in your rebellion? Your whole head is sick, and your whole heart diseased. From the soles of your feet to the top of your head no single part is sound. Nothing but bruises and sores and still bleeding wounds, which are neither squeezed out nor bandaged, nor softened with oil.

"Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom. Listen to the instruction of our God you people of Gomorrah. What use to me are your innumerable sacrifices? I am sick of the burnt rams offered to me and of the grease of fattened beasts. I get no pleasure from the blood of bulls, nor of lambs nor of he-goats. Who requires such things from you when you come into my presence? I will not have you trampling my courts, let us have no more of these gifts. The smoke of your sacrifices is detestable to me, I cannot bear your calls to prayer at Sabbath or new moon, with my soul I hate your fasts and festivals. They have become a burden to me and I am weary of carrying it. When you spread out your hands in prayer I will turn my face away from you. Yes even though you make many prayers, I shall not listen. Your hands are dripping with blood. Cleanse yourselves; make yourselves pure! Take the evil of your doings out of my sight. Cease to do wrong, learn to do good, seek justice, restrain violence, defend the right of the orphan, champion the cause of the widow.

"Come, now, and let us settle the matter, says the Lord, though your sins are like scarlet they shall be as white as snow? Though they are red like crimson they shall become like wool? If you are willing and obedient, you shall live on the fat of the land. But if you refuse, and rebel, then husks will be your food."—Isaiah 1: 1–6, 10–20.

What has Isaiah said here? Well, his message is divided into three parts. First, he makes an accurate observation concerning the state of his nation and the people in it. And second, he points ahead to where this state of things is leading his people. His 3,000-year-old mind indicates that unless changes are made his nation will be punished and likely destroyed. (History shows that they did not change their ways and, indeed, his nation was punished and destroyed.) And third, at that moment in history he offered his people a hope, and a guarantee for victory, if they changed the direction of their lives while the opportunity was still alive. He said that if they continue in their ways and do things as they are doing (trusting to a religious ritual in the hopes they could bribe God) they have a fat chance of surviving. But he promised them that "If you are willing and obedient (to the eternal moral laws of God) you shall live in the fat of the land. You'll have a chance at all the fat and the nourishment that life can give." As he spoke in God's name, he both threatened a fat chance, and offered a fat chance.

Who can hear his words without sensing Isaiah is speaking to our day, February 1966. This message is so terribly relevant it is almost frightening. Isaiah points a bony finger at he 20th-century American, and charges us with blindness, insensitivity, and downright stupidity. "I have nourished children, I have brought them up, but they have rebelled against me. An ox knows its owner and the ass its master's manger, but Israel does not care, my people give me no thought."

Can you not see God as a father in sorrow and anguish over a son or daughter who does not care, who gives him no thought, who rebels and runs away from home and makes a stranger of himself? Stupid and insensitive children do this, even though a father has nourished and cared for and loved his child during the child's infant years. Isaiah says, why even a dumb animal knows its master. A stupid ox is smarter than a wayward child. And America, like Israel, is a wayward child. He said, "You are a nation rotten to the core, a people bowed down with guilt, a generation of evil doers, sons who cheat and lie. They have foresaken the Lord, they have despised the Holy One of Israel, and made themselves utter stranger to Him."

Talk about a nation that is "rotten to the core;" What is your moral judgment on a people woh think they can fight a nice, clean, tidy, indeed prosperous war, on the basis of drafting the total capital of the young and at the same time agreeing to give benefits to the old? The only capital most of our young people have is their lives. They have no money, only their lives. And our Nation drafts those lives—takes a total claim on them. But at the same time does not draft the dollars of the old. Who here would want our Government to draft and enlist all of our capital and all of our income to fight a war for freedom for the bushmen of Vietnam? Draft our money and our capital? Not on your life. We, who are safe and sound back home, want more dollars and more capital, higher wages, better working conditions, and lower taxes. Why this very day we even have a strike in one of our major Peoria industries for these goals. Don't call the strikers immoral. We all shoot at the same target. We want more of everything. Don't ask for sacrifices from me—no—but place a legal claim on everything that youth has—his very life.

What sort of morality do you call that? Why should we in Peoria ever want that war in Vietnam to stop if we can continue with high profits, high wages, increased prosperity, lower taxes, and greater "hand backs" by Government? What will happen to our will to win the war that must be won now that we are committed, if we continue as a generation of evil doers, sons who cheat and lie and double deal? By drafting our youth and not our dollars, we not only double deal, but we are stupid.

One of the horrible lessons of modern history that falls upon one, is the knowledge that nations that married their armed forces to a system of universal conscription have always proved weakest in war. One needs only to look at the last two great World Wars for proof. It was the least free States that collapsed under the strains of war. And they collapsed in the order of their degrees of unfreedom.

I wish I had the time for a short history lesson at this point, but I don't. But the reasons are obvious. Modern war demands specialized technical equipment and ability. Success increasingly depends upon individual initiative, which in turn springs from a sense of personal responsibility. Our Vietnam war makes inordinate demands upon individual initiative and responsibility. One does not have to be a psychologist to know that personal responsibility is atrophied by compulsion. Moreover, every unwilling man who is compelled to serve his nation against his will is a germ carrier. He spreads infection to an extent altogether disproportionate to the value of the service he is forced to contribute.

Efficiency in any endeavor springs from enthusiasm, because enthusiasm alone develops a dynamic impulse. And if we have no enthusiasm on the home front to get that war over as soon and as effectively as possible (either from a sense of mission to provide freedom, or from the burr of personal discomfort by having our income and our capital reduced) how long do you suppose you could keep an efficient and enthusiastic fighting force at the front? How long do you suppose God the father of us all, will allow us to exist and prosper on this sort of double standard of morality and refusal to learn from the experience of others?

Or don't you think God has any interest in the matter? Many voices today would say, "God, what has God got to do with it?" Indeed, bringing God into the argument elicits a laugh in many quarters.

For years we have let schoolteachers and college professors ridicule God, or downgrade him, or tell our youngsters that we need not take God into account. We let a psychologist or a sociologist or a modern moralist or journalist, write that we no longer need to be bound by God's laws—that the Ten Commandments are passé and not absolute, indeed, repealed and need not be followed. Theologians say we now have a contextual ethic, a relative ethic. God makes no absolute claims. Indeed, some even say God is dead. And with His death—His moral laws. And we listen, some politely, and some impolitely. But we don't make a big issue of it. Why? Because we have become to believe that God is really only a figment of faith and not fact.

But let this same group or others, denounce the United States, ridicule the flag, burn draft cards, criticize our Government, and we get riled up, we shout treason, we look on with disgust.

You and I know that it is more dangerous these days to speak out against our country or our President (the FBI interrogated a fellow working for the TVA because he made some judgmental remarks about President Johnson) than God. Indeed, our Supreme Court has ruled that we cannot even allow our youngsters to communicate with God corporately, as they corporately go about learning the other facts of their world, and life about them.

We act as though God were an idea, a philosophy, an opinion, a subjective attitude, that one can hold or, not at his own option. We cease to state categorically that God is—that God is sovereign—that God is master—that God is the father of each of us, and the father of our country. God is not a thought that some of us have and others do not.

Our 18th century forefathers, who designed, and blueprinted, and welded a diversified group of people on this continent into what we now call the United States of America, had a profound conviction that God, a real, true, living God, was the author and the protector and the sovereign of life. Our Constitution, our laws, were all based upon the premise that God is a fact, alive in our life. Now, if for sake of argument, it is allowed that God is a subjective feeling, that one can take or leave, and not an objective fact that makes demands and places responsibilities upon us all—if that is assumed to be correct—where is the logic or the rational for a belief that a structure built upon the proposition that God is a fact, could possibly work if He is not a fact but only a subjective idea?

Take away the truth of God as fact and you no longer have a United States of America. You can call it by the same name but it is not possible to be what it was designed to be, or perform the service that it was designed to perform. For if God is "just a feeling" then our Nation was founded on an error with no real substance at its foundations and the whole edifice will crumble. When will we learn that green cucumbers and green bananas are not the same, even though they make look alike. If there is no God, then there is no United States, for our Nation and every one of its institutions presupposes God as the basis of life.

Young Thomas Jefferson had a 3,000-year-old mind when he said, "Can the liberties of a nation be sure when we remove their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God, that they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that his justice cannot sleep forever."

"An ox knows its owner, an ass its master's manger but America does not care. My people give me no thought, they have forsaken the Lord. They have despised the Holy One of America, and made themselves strangers to Him—and by laws no less."

Talk about making ourselves strangers to the Holy One—we take a good law that says that we cannot interfere with an atheist benefiting from the other facts of his life among us, simply because he does not believe in God—and we make it read that an atheist, blind to the fact of God, can interfere with the God-knowing and keep the God-knowing from communicating with the One Living Fact that creates, gives substance, meaning, and direction to all else in life. And then we have the boldness in our blindness to call that American freedom under law. How stupid, blind, and insensitive have we become?

I leave it to you, if Isaiah hasn't come pretty close to home when he says that we are a nation rotten to the core. And those are his words, not mine. And so Isaiah asks us, "Why must you invite further punishment? Why continue your rebellion? Your whole head is sick and your whole heart diseased. From the sole of your feet to the top of your head no single part is sound."

Why invite further punishment? Here is a possible road back. Why not, now that we are somebody in world affairs in the 20th century, rather than a bunch of nobodies of the 18th century, why not (some of you who are leaders in your respective political parties) why not get together on a 20th century declaration of freedom and the rights of all men, wherever men live on this planet (without all the if, but, whereas, of the fake declaration of the U.N. which ties man's freedom, not to God, but to the mercy of the state)? Such a declaration could help stop the rank untruthfulness that has infested our foreign affairs, and has trapped each of our Presidents in a dilemma of maintaining and building on the promises and the policies and the premises and agreements laid down by his predecessors, rather than giving him the freedom of action he ought to have in world affairs. Such a declaration would allow our President to be loyal to God rather than the policies of former Presidents. I believe our President would enjoy this option.

For instance, our Government has said for years now, that we are fighting in Vietnam in order to secure a free election by the populace. It has been stated that if South Vietnam would go communistic in a free election, that would be their business. We only want to make certain they have this freedom of choice. Now that position on the face of it is immoral. For we are either lying to the world or we are lying to our own men in uniform. Are we really sending our young men to die in Vietnam so the Vietnamese can go ahead and vote itself into the slavery of communism? Is that worth the life of any man? Now if that is not our position with our soldiers then our position before the world is false. We are bald-faced liars either to our own men or to the world. If we are imperialists for freedom, let's say it and say it frankly, and tell the world why. Why? We cannot be otherwise for the just God of the universe has ordained it for all men, and we can only fight for it and defend it—we cannot repeal or compromise it.

But we cannot declare for freedom for men the world over unless we include men and women who have the good fortune to live here in America. One need not be an astute observer of our American scene to know that we are devoted to upholding the rights of a group rather than the rights of an individual. The argument for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, springs from this premise. Repeal is asked for in order to secure the rights of a corporation and the rights of a union to do what seems beneficial to them, and if what is beneficial to them gets in the way of individual rights, that's too bad. Individual rights are secondary to group rights, and corporations and unions like it that way and make all sorts of practical arguments for it. But God-given individual rights cannot be repealed. And if they are, God will make some changes.

Is the Negro in America given individual freedom? Was a New Yorker free to use public transportation in New York a few weeks ago? Is the businessman free to let the laws of supply and demand set his prices? Is the individual laboring man free to join or not join a union, or bargain for his own wages or not? Is a classroom 100 percent full of God-knowing teachers and pupils permitted to address themselves corporately to God? Surely we all know the answers.

You see, the reason why our present political parties cannot make a declaration for freedom of the individual man under God, is because neither party is really earnestly ready to live, and act, by that principle here at home. They will both plead that they have "a fat chance" of winning an election if they stood for individual freedom under God rather than group advantage under government paternalism.

Is "our whole head so sick and our hearts so diseased—no single part sound"— and are we "so bowed down by guilt" that we cannot turn to the Lord, and put our faith and future in His power? Are we enslaved by our ignorance and by rebellion against God?

Can the United States give up its double standards in international politics? We support England in its effort to destroy Rhodesia by economic power. Why? Because we say that the Government of Rhodesia is a minority group and not representing all the people of Rhodesia. Well, is that is the reason, then why not destroy Russia by economic power, for the ruling Communist is a minority group? The Communist Party never has included a majority of the people. Or destroy Cuba, or Poland, or Red China, or East Germany because these nations are ruled by a minority? Well, we plead, we are not ready for that step. But rather, stating that our position not to destroy these nations is based upon expediency of power politics—what do we do?—we give to the world a "moral reason" for our actions. Who do we think we are fooling anyway? Surely, not the world and certainly not God.

Isaiah really levels at those who have forsaken God and God's ways. He calls us Sodom and Gomorrah, the symbol of the lowest sort of morality. And what do we do? We try to do what Israel of old tried to do—try to cover up our immorality by an outward show of our love for God. Oh, we go to church, we try to look like Christians. We open our Congress with prayers. We add God to the last paragraph of a political speech. We put on great shows of religious faith. Israel had its rituals, and we have our rituals, but we don't live and act as though God were really a fact in our daily affairs—a God who wants loyalty and obedience and not bribes and hypocracy.

And thus Isaiah pleads with us, "Cleanse yourselves; make yourselves clean." If we say that we believe in freedom under God then let's act like we do. If we acted in obedience to God, rather than our own wills for power or advantage, then when we were faced with a hard practical question in matters of public concern, we would be willing to ask ourselves, "Will this action protect individual freedom that God has granted man, or is it some scheme to reduce another man's freedom, or control him by force in order to give some advantage to another person or another group?" How we answer will determine whether or not we know God as he is—or whether we pay lipservice to him.

What do we think of anyone who really is dedicated to freedom under God? Will we say, "He has a fat chance in today's world?" Most experts say that in our complex corporate society today, freedom under God will not work. Most of us believe this is so. Why? Is it because we have deliberately strayed so far from God, the very word freedom spells anarchy to our generation? Truly God-fearing people know that freedom is life lived within the demands and the laws of God. God did not create man for violence and lawlessness. God does not sanction anarchy.

Isaiah says that we are to "restrain violence." In America today we need a rebirth of our willingness to say, straight out, that mass movements and mass pressures, and mob parades, and criminal actions must stop and stop now. Let us get over this sentimentality toward violent men who use violent actions to get things done. Let us stop being sentimental over criminal action. America needs tougher courts and tougher juries to "protect the rights of the orphans and champion the cause of widows." Yes, "restrain violence," for God's love, God's grace, and God's laws demand it.

Now if we do not respond—if we think we can continue to go along in the way our Nation has been going, and the way we continually urge our leaders to take it, and continue to approve of double standards of morality and righteousness to prevail at every level of society—are we so stupid and sick to believe that simply because we profess to worship God—simply because 60 percent of our populace would say that they practice some form of religion—or simply because we know God is a forgiving and loving God—or simply because our Nation was founded on the belief of God—do we suppose that though "our sins are scarlet, that they will be as white as snow? That though they are red like crimson, they will become like wool?" Surely we haven't become so stupid and so insensitive and so young minded, as to believe that our Nation will survive. Those of us who have 3,000-year-old minds better start using them.

Isaiah calls to us over 3,000 years and gives us the hope and the assurance that if we still know enough about God and the fact of the fatherhood of God, and then if we are willing, and if we are obedient, then we shall live on the "fat of the land." He promises that we shall have a fat chance, a great chance, to remain a great and growing a prosperous and fat nation that our forefathers dreamed of. Indeed, a fat chance to rise to heights undreamed of by any man.

But, he threatens, if we refuse and continue to rebel, then "husks will be our food." Anyone with a mind a few thousand years old surely knows Isaiah speaks the truth of God's word to us. Oh, let us not be fooled. Christ, the word of God made flesh, is not our Saviour unless we come to him in obedience and in faith—to believe in Him would be to walk in obedience with Him.

Yes, today 1966, we have a "fat chance" in a positive sense, or a "fat chance" in a negative sense. The challenge is before us. "Let the heavens hear and let the earth listen for the Lord has spoken." Amen.

The Professor's Illogical Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by John Chamberlain appeared in the March 4, 1966, edition of the New York Journal American and provides a more than adequate response to Lynd's erroneous arguments about southeast Asia.

I commend Mr. Chamberlain's article to the attention of our colleagues:

THE PROFESSOR'S ILLOGIC LOGIC

(By John Chamberlain)

Staughton Lynd, the Hanoi-voyaging Yale professor who tries to be his own cutrate state department, has expressed bewilderment that others are bewildered when he describes himself as a "Marxist-pacifist-existentialist." And, for the benefit of his students, he has tried in recent talks to break down the terms in reference to himself.

He is a Marxist, he says, because the Marxian analysis of history arrives at some "cogent and helpful" conclusions. He is a pacifist because he, a Quaker, holds to Albert Schweitzer's concept of "reverence for life." He is an existentialist because he believes one solves problems by action and not by thought.

This is just about as strange an intellectual bouillabaisse as any academic chef could cook up. The actual conclusion of the Marxist analysis of history, a conclusion which Lynd neglects, is that capitalist and Communist states are locked inexorably in a war that is destined to be fought to a finish.

So if you say you are a Marxist and a pacifist, you are a walking contradition whether you know it or not. As for being an existentialist, who isn't? We all exist, we all have problems to solve, and the solution normally entails action. Lyndon Johnson, whose foreign policy Staughton Lynd abhors, is our greatest existentialist President since Theodore Roosevelt, if action is to be made the test of problem solving.

What beats me in the Staughton Lynd case is that men who are so allergic to logic can rise in the university world.

Even though I hate what Professor Lynd stands for in action, I find myself as one with him in honoring the names of Albert Schweitzer and Henry David Thoreau. It was my own "reverence for life" that turned me against the Communists in the middle thirties when Walter Duranty, the toughguy Moscow correspondent of the New York Times, cynically told the late Simeon Strunsky and myself in the Times Annex elevator one day that Stalin had liquidated a few million kulaks in a manmade famine in Russia.

In refusing to pay the proportion of his income taxes represented by military budgeting, Staughton Lynd invoked the shade of Thoreau, who went to jail rather than support the unjust landgrabbing Mexican War. But I, a Thoreau devotee from away back, find the war in Vietnam to be a just war because the landgrabbing, this time, is being attempted by the other side.

What I'd like to see is a little operational clarity in our thinking. Bringing in august names proves nothing, for their words can be adapted to almost any side. The relevant question today is what would happen if we put our signatures to a bad peace in Vietnam.

How many Vietnamese peasants would lose their heads for not having supported the Vietcong? How many Catholics would be murdered or exiled? What would be the pressures on Thailand, and how many of the Thai people would eventually die in a battle for their own freedom? If you have any Schweitzerian "reverence for life" and Thoreauvian concern for justice, you have to ask yourself such questions.

And, if you believe in a "materialist conception of history," what will be the material effect on certain peripheral nations in the East—Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand, Laos, India, and Pakistan—if Red China breaks out of its circle? Lynd, as a Marxist materialist, may not care, but I, as a James Madison materialist, most emphatically do.

Poverty War Hitting Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Ruth Montgomery is a distinguished columnist for the Hearst newspapers. We are greatly indebted to her for an excellent article on the war against poverty, which recently appeared in the Hearst newspapers across the country.

The thrust of this article is that great progress is being made and much good accomplished in the war against poverty, and that this dynamic young program is forging ahead to open the doors of opportunity to millions of our fellow citizens.

I commend the reading of Miss Montgomery's article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the New York Journal-American, Feb. 6, 1966]

POVERTY WAR HITTING TARGET

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—Sargent Shriver is expanding the war on poverty as energetically as General Westmoreland is stepping up the bombing in Vietnam, and he frequently uses the same terminology.

"The question is, Are we hitting the target with our missiles?" he says, "and we are. Tests show that during the past 12 months we've helped 1,500,000 poor people with jobs, education, or job training."

Discussing the farflung program to which he is now devoting full time, the poverty boss said in an interview: "We have everything set up here like the Pentagon has with the Polaris. We assign so much of our budget to each project, and let them zero in on the target."

The target is the poor, and one of the newest projects is called medicare alert, which began with a $2 million budget last month but has already been stepped up to $6 million. Shriver explains it this way:

"We hire thousands of poor old people to go from door to door alerting other poor old people to fill out the blanks and register for medicare. It's really catching fire."

Probably the least criticized poverty project is Headstart, in which three-quarters of a million youngsters have participated since last July. Waxing enthusiastic about its progress, Shriver said: "I don't know of another Federal project that has blossomed so rapidly. A year ago this month it was just an idea. We began it with a half-million pre-school-age children last summer, but now it's a year-round program, and the President has now authorized us to request a $310 million budget for it."

Last summer's Headstart program, conducted at 11,000 centers, was an outstanding success. It cost the taxpayers $85 million, but volunteers donated the equivalent of $100 million in free time to help prepare children from underprivileged homes to keep up with other youngsters in regular school classes.

First-graders as well as 4- and 5-year-old tots are now enrolled in the year-round Headstart program, 109,000 strong. Kindergarten classes are held for the preschool moppets, and volunteers take those firstgraders who need attention to doctors and dentists.

Shriver thinks the most important aspect of the program, however, is the chance that it gives social workers to improve home conditions. "It's a good way of getting our foot in the door," he explains frankly. "Mothers who see that we're trying to help their children are beginning to attend PTA meetings for the first time. They let trained workers come in to demonstrate proper baby care, and explain the importance of balanced meals. We're trying to provide physical, medical, and psychological aid as well as intellectual development."

No program is closer to Shriver's heart, however, than VISTA. This is the homefront Peace Corps which has 2,000 volunteers working in city slums, in Appalachia, on Indian reservations, and in institutions for the mentally retarded.

Without the glamor of overseas assignments, many of the VSITA volunteers are nonetheless enlisting for a second year, at a pay of only $50 a month.

Plenty of Fish in the Sea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill introduced today by Mr. KEITH of Massachusetts, in which I join, to establish a contiguous fishery zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States, I am submitting the article by Martin Kane, "Plenty of Fish in the Sea?", contained in the January 31, 1966, issue of Sports Illustrated:

PLENTY OF FISH IN THE SEA?

(By Martin Kane)

Don't believe it. An ancient technique of commercial fishing has proved so efficient that sportsmen fear it will destroy big game fishing in a few years. Called long-lining, and used on an enormous scale by the Japanese, the practice already has begun to deplete the world stock of tuna, marlin, and swordfish.

The world population of big game fishes—most notably swordfish, the marlins, sailfish, and the various tunas—is threatened with early decimation. A technique of commercial fishing that is centuries old but has been applied on a large scale only recently is ravaging the oceans. It is called long-lining, and it is the subject of dismayed denunciation in every big game fishing port on the coastal perimeter of the United States, throughout the Caribbean, along the coast of Mexico, in Scandinavia, Australia, and New Zealand. It has sparked skirmishes between sport and commercial fishermen. It has alarmed marine scientists, most of whom concede its devastating effects as a matter of commonsense but urgently need funds to establish scientifically the precise extent of the harm it has done to fish populations already and what its continued untrammeled use portends. Objective of the research: international controls. To many a saltwater angler the prospect that such controls can be instituted in time is dim.

Robert S. Nyburg, a Baltimore sport fisherman and advertising man who specializes in billfish, fears that "there may be no more (salt water) sport fishing in this country" by 1970. (If you think striped bass are a sport fish, Nyburg does not know you. He thinks in terms of bigger game.) "There is a real and present danger," Nyburg says, "that, unless some fast action is taken, there will be no more marlin, sailfish, giant tuna, or broadbill fishing on either coast of the United States in a very few years."

At least equally alarmed is Ed Louys, executive secretary and director of the Caribbean Gamefishing Association.

"Soon there will be no fishing in the Caribbean," he said recently in Miami. "Commercial fishermen themselves told me this in Venezuela, in Trinidad, in Jamaica—that, unless restrictions are placed on this fishing, they will be destroyed. Since the longlining thing came out we have been answering questions from hundreds of people asking what we should do, what can we do, to prevent overfishing."

Gerald Talbert, head of the Tiburon (Calif.) Marine Laboratory of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, believes that since the Japanese are by far the most extensive users of long-lining, "our only hope is to appeal to the basic good nature and the sense of fair play among the Japanese people." "If properly approached," he says, "I believe they would understand and withdraw from the sport fishing area. So far as

I know, no official protest has ever been entered."

Though there are others who hold that the only effective recourse would be a threat of economic sanctions in areas other than fishing, Talbert's view is by no means naive. The Japanese have been singularly cooperative in game fish tagging programs aimed at understanding and eventual conservation of the fish involved and are more aware than any other national fishery of the excessive efficiency of long-lining. But they do need enormous quantities of fish to supply the protein requirements of their national diet, as do many island peoples. To pose the importance of recreational fishing against this need may be difficult, but there is more to it than that. While long-line fishing has been profitable for them, their catches have begun to thin out under long-lining pressure and they might well be amenable to international controls if these were to be proposed with sound scientific backing.

Unfortunately, sound scientific backing does not exist. If sufficient research grants were available immediately, it might take 5 years or more to put together a persuasive argument of solid scientific validity. In 5 years, many sport fishermen believe, the whole matter may be tragically academic.

Long-lining is as simple as it is ancient. Tie a line to the handle of a glass jug, add a hook and bait to the line and toss the jug over the side. As the jug drifts free, the bait will attract a fish. When a fish is hooked it pulls against the resistance of the jug and seemingly tries to drag it under. The jug always wins. The fish is inevitably exhausted. The fisherman recovers the jug and hauls in the fish.

Multiply that single hook by thousands and the glass jug by hundreds of glass-ball floats, all connected by surface lines that, strung together, may extend 10 miles or more, and you have long-lining, the deadliest method of ocean fishing ever devised.

The long-line's basic unit, called a basket because the line is coiled into baskets on deck, is a main line about 300 yards long, buoyed to the surface by float lines. Branch lines, to which baited hooks are attached, extend down into the water at variable depths. About 10 hooks are used for every 300 yards or so of main line. Baskets are connected one to another until a length of 10 miles or more may be reached. Adrift in a current, such a line has the effect of a wide broom sweeping the sea.

Tuna constitutes 85 percent of the Japanese catch in Pacific waters, the remaining 15 percent being billfish. The boats put out individually and in fleets, some accompanied by a mother ship, aboard which the catch is processed and canned. There is one major fishing firm which operates two mother ships and 112 catcher boats, each of them long lining. At 10 miles to a line, though actually some lines are shorter, these 112 boats would represent 1,120 miles of fishing line in simultaneous operation.

Long-lining can deplete the sea itself. It has done just that in the Indian Ocean, which is the world's third largest and second deepest sea. Long-lining so drained it of yellowfin tuna—the catch dropped from 12 fish per 100 hooks set to about 5 per 100—that the Japanese all but quit fishing for them there. They switched to marlin and sailfish and in 1956 began to concentrate on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in ever-widening scope. Now the Japanese seem to be fishing themselves out of the Atlantic. With declining catches there, half the Japanese Atlantic fleet has been ordered back to Japan. The bankruptcy inherent in long-lining is being seen in the Pacific, too. According to the Sport Fishing Institute in Washington, "Marlin harvests by Japanese long-liners fishing off the Pacific coast of Central America" were poor in 1965—only three or four fish per boat, compared with catches of hundreds per boat in 1964. Average weight per fish was about two-thirds of what it used to be, a fact confirmed by sport fishermen, who note that along the Pacific coast marlin once averaged 110 pounds and now are down to 60 or 70 pounds. Mexican resort owners, largely dependent on sport fishermen, are in a state of panic.

The Sport Fishing Institute, which is largely supported by tackle manufacturers and provides research grants for scientific institutions, observed in its November bulletin that "bluefin tuna stocks in the Atlantic Ocean also may soon be in trouble." Not just long-lining but purse seining threatens the Atlantic tun population, to such an extent that O. V. Wells, Deputy Director-General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, said last summer that "the rational utilization of tuna resources in the Atlantic Ocean requires urgent international attention." During 1962, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found, United States fishermen landed a mere 40,000 pounds of tuna at Middle Atlantic ports. Two years later the United States figure had jumped to 6 million pounds, and the fishery had become so attractive that purse seiners were moving in from as far away as the Pacific coast.

The Japanese are by no means the only long-liners. The Norwegians are in the Atlantic, off the United States coast, concentrating on sharks but getting a share of swordfish and other gamesters, too. Swedish sportsmen are decrying the fact that long-lining has begun to affect their salmon catch. Canada has some 250 vessels in the summer and 25 in the winter long-lining the Atlantic for swordfish, once taken mostly by harpoon as they lolled on the surface. The United States fishery has a score or so of long-lining vessels in the Atlantic, and these have been averaging 300 swordfish a trip during the peak fall season. Red China is long-lining, but no one knows to what extent, and the same is true of the U.S.S.R., which has just announced a new 5-year plan aimed at increasing its catch more than 50 percent. Cubans are long-lining for marlin. And the Spanish are at it, too.

But all these, separately and together, are minuscule in comparison with the Japanese operation. Its growth from 1956 to 1963 was astronomical. In 1956, when 164,000 hooks were set by the Japanese, they caught 7 metric tons of striped marlin (100 fish) and 50 metric tons of blue marlin (400 fish). By 1963 they had more than 50 million hooks out and took 8,236 metric tons of striped marlin (126,700 fish) and 9,413 metric tons of blue marlin (75,300 fish). Not to mention countless other billfish and tuna.

Today Japan has 625,935 persons engaged directly in the fishing industry, a decline from the 790,000 so occupied in 1963. The decline was due largely to the fact that expansion of Japanese industry and higher wages on land pulled many a fisherman away from the sea.

Japanese boats, ranging in size from 300 to 800 tons, fish through the South Seas and deposit their catches in southeast Asia, then move on through the Indian Ocean to unload their next haul in Mediterranean ports. From the Mediterranean their course takes them into the South Atlantic, down through the Caribbean—some to the east coast of South America, others through the Panama Canal and out into the Pacific again, where they deposit their catches in Samoa before sailing back to Japan. This marketing system somewhat compromises the theory that the Japanese are seeking protein only for home consumption. Thirty percent of the fish taken by their wandering fleets, in fact, is sold to foreign countries.

Behind the explosive expansion of the long-line fishery is the development, in 1955, of the tuna hotdog, which has become widely popular in Japan. This sausage made possible the exploitation of the bigeye tuna, which had been held in low regard until then, the yellowfin and bluefin being preferred. Then the marlins began to be used for sausage and the billfish kill became a valuable adjunct to the tuna fishery. The Japanese also like marlin raw as sashimi, an appetizer. (North Americans seldom eat marlin, though it is esteemed in Latin America.)

Last year the Japanese fleet did not do too well, especially with tuna, but it is impossible to say whether the decline was due to overfishing, as sport fishermen insist, or changes in water temperature, available food and salinity, as some marine scientists suspect.

There is no reason to suppose that it was not both. There is every good reason to believe that overfishing, by purse seiners as wall as long-liners, is the leading villain. The 1964 annual report of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission recalled that in 1962 Dr. Milner B. Schaefer, then its director of investigations, was able to assert that "the maximum average equilibrium catch" of yellowfin tuna would be in the vicinity of 183 million pounds. In other words, overfishing would begin at this point. The catch in 1959 was 145.4 million pounds, jumped sharply to 234.2 and 239.8 in 1960 and 1961 respectfully, fell off for a couple of years, then rose again to 197.8 in 1964.

On the other hand, some few commercial fishermen, perhaps responding to long years of warfare with sport-fishing interests, profess to see no threat to the tuna-fishing industry from long-lining. One of these is August Felando, general manager of the American Tuna Boat Association in San Diego. Falando points out that the Japanese are primarily interested in bigeye tuna, which are deep swimmers and unimportant to either the U.S. commercial fishery or sport fishery. The yellowfin has become a secondary prize (20 percent of the total catch in the eastern Pacific), and bluefin tuna are only occasionally taken by the Japanese in the Pacific.

But Felando does conceded that his association's boats see increasing numbers of Japanese long-liners fishing off the Mexican coast and that these are working primarily for swordfish and marlin.

Bruce Barnes and Bill Pole, partners in a San Diego charter-fishing operation, believe that the decline in the marlin catch out of San Diego during the 1965 season could well be attributed to the more extensive use of the long-line technique off the Mexican and South American coasts. In 1963 the confirmed count on marlin at San Diego docks was 1,500. In 1965 it has dropped to 400.

There is something approaching terror on the Atlantic side of the Mexican-Central American land strip.

"This year—1965—is the worst Jamaica has had," says Ed Louys. "In the blue marlin tournament only five fish were caught and the biggest weighed 162 pounds. But a Japanese vessel which needed medical attention for one of its crew put into Montego Bay in late September. It was loaded with blue marlin."

Sportsmen like Louys are not impressed by the fact that the Japanese and other long-liners are harvesting protein. The profits derived from sport fishing, they feel, are a source of life, too, for those engaged in boatbuilding, tacklemaking, resort maintenance and allied serving of sport fishermen. In the United States alone, salt water sport fishermen spent $626,191,000 in 1960, according to the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Talbert notes that in 1960 1.7 billion pounds edible fish were caught commercially, but marine sport fishing brought in almost as much—1.4 billion pounds. So, say the sportsmen, their kind of fishing is a rich source of protein, too, and does not deplete the available stock.

But the high seas are free, whether they be considered to begin 3 miles, 12 miles or

200 miles out from shore. Besides, it is not just coastal overfishing that threatens the sportsmen. The pelagic fish he most esteems are far-ranging wanderers, and it matters not a whit whether they are destroyed 5 miles out or 500.

Since no practical means of controlling the long-liners has yet been devised, or even proposed, a few frustrated sport fishermen have been taking matters into their own hands. Long-line sets have been destroyed in the Atlantic. Off Acapulco, sport fishermen, persistently wreaking havoc on longlines off their coast, forced one Japanese vessel to abandon the area as too expensive. U.S. sport-fishing boats sailing off the shores of Baja California play a game called "ocean skeet." They shatter the long-liners' glass buoys with shotguns.

The damage inflicted by such means is, of course, a mere nuisance and will have little or no effect on the enormous enterprise that long-lining has become. But when a Japanese long-liner ran aground last September on the southernmost tip of Baja California gleeful Mexican fishermen indulged in soul-satisfying fantasies to account for the wreck and take credit for it.

The 350-ton vessel crashed onto a reef at about 2 a.m. The 18 men aboard all got ashore safely. Some commercial and sport fishermen went aboard and found the boat equipped with the very latest in navigational and fish-finding equipment, from radar to sonar. Stacked in her freezer locker below decks were an estimated 140 tons of tuna, 40 tons of marlin and an unknown quantity of shark meat, in addition to dolphin, wahoo and sailfish.

How to account for the wreck? The Mexicans wink and tell any of a number of stories:

1. Mexican fishermen turned off the light in the lighthouse. (Ah, but with all that electronic gear a modern vessel does not bother with lighthouses.)

2. They turned off the light and set up another light atop a high cliff to lead the Japanese astray. (But the radar would have indicated the huge land mass—cliffs several hundred feet high on the beach—behind the Judas light.)

3. Long-line sets are equipped with transistorized homing buoys that send out a signal to guide the fishing boat to where the sets have drifted. The Mexicans took one such buoy and put it on the beach. (This one is more ingenious than plausible. The Japanese navigational gear again would have foiled the plot.)

What hope is there, since even the wishful cleverness of Mexican wreckers is no match for the vast Japanese fleet. One theory, not very attractive, is that overfishing will solve itself.

"In some ways long-lining may be considered self-limiting," says Frank J. Mather III, associate scientist at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and himself a sport fisherman. "When the catch declines enough it becomes unprofitable. I think there is cause for concern but don't know what can be done. Agreement among all the nations involved would be very difficult."

"We know the extest of long-lining," Mather says, "but we have no idea of the size of fish populations." Such knowledge would be essential to the establishment of meaningful international controls, but it simply is not there to be laid on the bargaining table.

There is unanimity among marine scientists that research is a sine qua non of international controls.

"We are getting more and more letters from Congressmen inquiring about long-lining," says Albert H. Swartz, assistant chief of the Division of Fishery Research of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. "Some people are advocating an extensive research program. Others are talking about an international convention—but there are no facts to bring to it. A research program would take about 5 years before we could go to the Japanese regarding conservation measures."

Swartz made a point that sport fishermen and their associations might consider.

"Until now," he said, "international conventions have always been on food fish. The sport fishery has never been represented. Now sport fishing should be represented. The International Game Fishing Association should have a voice."

It should indeed. And so should all sport fishermen, organized or unorganized, who know the names and addresses of their Congressmen, who, in turn, might well be persuaded to initiate preliminary negotiations with the Japanese while a crash research program is underway. The extent of this crisis cannot wait for precise scientific determination. The commonsense evidence is plentiful now. At this juncture the need for controls is clear. In the long run, controls need not deprive the Japanese of their protein supply. They could, in fact, preserve it.

Edward W. Allen recently was chairman of an international meeting which sought, unsuccessfully, to institute new controls on fishing in the North Pacific. Though he spoke in another context, in a statement to the conference he may have suggested the theme for a preliminary meeting of world sport fishing associations and the leading fishing nations. He put it this way:

"Ocean fisheries should not be deemed to exist merely for the benefit of [commercial] fishermen and cannery operators, but should be considered to be a great trust for the benefit of humanity."

Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, a day does not pass but that I receive mail from people in my district who are concerned about the war in Vietnam. By far, most of it expresses firm support for President Johnson and the policies the administration are following in southeast Asia.

A few days ago my mail included a letter from a close personal friend not in my district but in Thailand, where the Government is already faced with the all too familiar tactics of Communist aggression in its northern Provinces.

His letter, a portion of which I have unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record, is illuminating. It is the result of careful observation and evaluation by a man who is living and working in southeast Asia. Along with his letter, he sent a copy of a letter written to the editor of the Bangkok Post by a group of American scholars who are specialists in Asian affairs. It too is an illuminating commentary and I insert it, too, in the Record at this point.

The letters follow:

Dear Don: It was very good hearing from you. My faith in the American political process is always made stronger by the knowledge that such people as yourself are representing the American public.

I like to think that in a private capacity, I am making a contribution to a better life for a small segment of Asia in a socially stable but progressive context. The work is rewarding—if exhausting—I travel a great deal, particularly to Laos. I am still the "last of the New Deal Democrats" domestically, Don, but I am perturbed that the liberal Democrat is becoming identified with the Lippman-Morganthau-Fulbright position. I feel it is essential to pursue the objective of peaceful negotiations to the best of our ability. I also feel that the ultimate battle for Vietnam will be won by achieving a social revolution that entails such things as land reform, local democracy, community development programing, etc.

At the same time, however, it seems to me absolutely essential to stand fast in military terms while pursuing the other objectives noted above. We must not allow the Communists to feel that their "wars of liberation" subversion and infiltration doctrines will prevail and represent the wave of the future. The Communist goals are outlined plainly and their objectives and methods are stated boldly. They believe their hegemony will hold sway over all Asia and by ideological imperative of their doctrine wars of aggression and infiltration are justified. We cannot abandon Asia to such a doctrine either in our interests or in the interests of the free Asian nations.

The domino theory has an element of truth. The pressures on Laos and consequently on Thailand will be overpowering if the Vietcong and Hanoi and Peiping gain control over South Vietnam through their aggression. There is no doubt the subversion in northeast Thailand is directed by and supported by personnel trained in Communist-controlled areas outside of Thailand. This is clear and certain and if our resolve is weakened and our position compromised in Vietnam, such subversion and infiltration will be increased and the resolve of the Thais and others to combat such subversion will be weakened.

I am enclosing a letter for the editor written to the Bangkok Post by eminent and respected scholars in the field of Asian studies. You may have already seen this letter. I know most of the signatories personally. They have all traveled widely in Asia and have an intimate knowledge of Asia, of Communist objectives, of the Vietnam situation. Their views are sound and well reasoned. I agree with their conclusions. If this statement has not already appeared in the Congressional Record—it should.

Please forgive me for rambling on. We who are working in the field are involved and committed to seeing a better world created in Asia. I hope it will be achieved. But it will not be easy.

[From the Bangkok Post, Jan. 29, 1966]

U.S. Group Supports Vietnam War

To the Editor:

We, the undersigned, write as scholars and specialists most of whom have devoted much of their adult lives to study and work in south and east Asian affairs. Included in our number are most of this Nation's small nucleus of specialists on Vietnam. Many of us have lived in Vietnam itself.

We feel compelled to write in response to what we consider the distortions of fact and the emotional allegations of a small but viciferous group of fellow university teachers regarding the war in Vietnam. We must first observe that those who have signed advertisements and petitions represent a very small proportion of all university professors. Further the petition signers include disproportionally fewer schools in the fields of government, international relations, and Asian studies. To our knowledge, no acknowledged expert on Vietnam itself has signed the advertisements appearing in the New York Times protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam. A mere handful of scholars with Far East credentials identified themselves with these protests.

Quite apart from the merits of American policy—past or present—we believe the manner in which the petition and many "teach-ins" have been presented is a discredit to those who would call themselves scholars. The Vietnamese war and its related political context are enormously complex. Even the most qualified experts disagree on important facts or the meaning of those facts. It is no surprise that they also disagree on alternative courses of action.

It serves no useful purpose, therefore, to engage in name-calling, distortion, emotionalism and gross oversimplification. Many of our fellow scholars, no doubt eminently qualified in their own fields, are in our view guilty of unacademic behaviour in their protests of Vietnam policy.

For the record, therefore, we feel compelled to make the following assertions of fact:

1. The Vietcong initiated the present war in South Vietnam. They did so in gradual stages, beginning with assassination, terror, and bellicose propaganda. This was followed by sabotage, subversion, and small-scale guerrilla attacks; in later stages, large-scale frontal assaults were employed. Only in the last stage did the U.S. Government feel compelled to increase its military involvement substantially.

2. The Vietcong is a Communist-led and Communist-controlled political movement. Its aim is to establish, by any available means, a Communist rule in South Vietnam.

3. It is false to compare the war now being fought in Vietnam with that which was fought by the French between 1946 and 1954. That was a colonial war, fought by Vietnamese of every variety of political complexions to achieve national independence. The Government of Vietnam since 1954 has been a truly Vietnamese national regime, and it is fighting now to maintain its independence. That it is not without faults goes without saying. This, however, is not the issue. Surely, it is of some significance that not one prominent nationalist of all the thousands of such men in South Vietnam has defected to the Communist since 1954.

4. The People's Revolutionary Party, which leads the Vietcong, is a segment of the Lao Dong (Communist) Party of North Vietnam. The Vietcong itself was organized by the North Vietnamese, armed by the North Vietnamese, and trained by the North Vietnamese. This is not to deny the fact that many of its cadres were originally born in South Vietnam, and later trained or indoctrinated in the north. Nor is it to deny that thousands of South Vietnamese were persuaded or forced to join the Vietcong in the south.

5. The Vietcong have employed methods of terror, torture, and outright murder that, on a smaller scale, rival the atrocities of the Axis Powers in World War II. Thousands of innocent people (including women and children) have been deliberately slaughtered by the Vietcong as "examples" for the other South Vietnamese. Beheading and mutilation are not uncommon. For American academics to bemoan the "brutality" of the South Vietnamese response, without the slightest comment on the initiators of the brutality, is the epitome of bias.

6. The Communist regime in North Vietnam is among the harshest and most brutal in Asia. All opposition has been exterminated. The society is organized into cells of mutual surveillance.

No free elections of any kind have been permitted. The living standards of the people are low even by Asian standards.

7. In contrast, the people of South Vietnam, until the stepped-up Vietcong attack, were enjoying a far better living standard. Hunger was virtually eliminated. Industries were expanding. Schools, clinics, and social welfare services were proliferating rapidly. Between 1954 and 1961, there were four elections, conducted with varying degrees of freedom.

8. The Geneva accords were broken first and repeatedly by the Communists, as documented by the records of the International Controls Commission.

9. The President has offered to hold unconditional peace talks with Hanoi and has been rejected repeatedly by Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow. The burden of proof is now on the Communists.

10. Communist conquest of South Vietnam would, in our view, lead inevitably to a deterioration of resolve throughout south and southeast Asia. While the non-Communist states in the region are not likely to fall in actual geographical sequence (that is, the "domino" theory), we believe these nations would eventually succumb politically and/or militarily to Chinese expansionism following an American withdrawal from Vietnam. We further believe that Chinese hegemony over southeast Asia would be disastrous to American national interest and will severely compromise the capacity of Japan, the Philippines, India, and Pakistan to survive as independent nations.

If there is any lesson that should have been learned by us since 1919, it is that collective security is the only effective means to deal with totalitarianism on the march. Our negotiations and agreements must not be "Munichs." Rather, they must be backed by clear evidence of our determination to maintain the arrangements agreed to as the conditions for peace. Men who prize liberty are unwilling to settle for peace at any price. Nor does negotiation from weakness and without conditions serve to placate imperial ambitions. The surest guarantee of peace in Asia is what it has always been everywhere: recognition by all that our commitments to our allies will be honored. And we shall use the peace thus secured as Americans used it in postwar Europe, and as President Johnson has pledged to use it for Asia. The basis for a lasting settlement in Asia will be built as we create the conditions for freedom through social and economic programs no less than through military means.

The signers (organizational affiliations listed for identification purposes only):

Dr. Wesley R. Fishel, Michigan State University; Prof. P. J. Honey, University of London; William P. Maddox, New York City; Prof. Ralph L. Turner, Michigan State University.

Dr. Charles Wolf, Jr., the Rand Corp.; Dr. George E. Taylor, University of Washington; Prof. William B. Dunn, University of the State of New York.

Prof. John D. Montgomery, Harvard University; Dr. Frank N. Trager, New York University; Rev. Francis J. Corley, S.J., St. Louis University; Dr. Chester L. Hunt, Western Michigan University; Dr. Lucian Pye, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. David A. Wilson, University of California.

Dr. Amrom H. Katz, the Rand Corp.; Dr. John T. Dorsey, Vanderbilt University; Dr. I. Milton Sacks, Brandeis University; Dr. Charles A. Joiner, Temple University; William Henderson, Socony Mobil Oil Co.; Dr. Guy H. Fox, Michigan State University; Dr. Ralph H. Smuckler, Michigan State University; George K. Tanham, the Rand Corp.; Dr. Karl J. Selzer, Yale University.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Westinghouse Science Talent Search Honors Five Top Award Winners at Silver Anniversary Institute Awards Banquet—Linda Sue Powers, West Virginia High School Student, Among Five Scholarship Winners

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last night, the Institute Awards banquet was held here honoring the 40 young high school students who are this year's winners in the science talent search. This project is conducted annually by the Science Talent Institute sponsored by Westinghouse Electric Corp. One of these young scientists, Miss Linda Sue Powers, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Luther T. Powers, of Beckley, W. Va., is the first student from West Virginia to win a place among the 40 finalists in the 25 years the talent search has been conducted.

Linda Sue won further recognition of her ability by being awarded a $3,000 scholarship, as one of the five most outstanding young award winners. In her research problem, she demonstrated and amended a tentative theory as to why certain organic chemical compounds change color when exposed to light, heat and pressure.

In speaking of how she initially became interested in science, Miss Powers stated:

> I used to look up at the stars and wonder about them—what they are composed of, and what is out there in space.

This attractive and brilliant young woman has a wide variety of interests, both scientific and nonscientific. She has designed and built carbon dioxide rockets, studied the breeding habits of seahorses and the effects of the environment on these tiny fishes, and has built apparatus to experiment with polarized light. Her hobbies include skiing, canoeing, and reading, and, as could be expected from one whose scientific career began with questions about the stars, she is familiar with Walt Whitman's poem "When I Heard the Learned Astronomer"—that famous piece describing the poet's emotions as he listened to the astronomer, left the lecture hall, and thoughtfully "looked up in perfect silence at the stars."

Linda Sue is a senior at Woodrow Wilson High School in Beckley. She has also taken special courses at Marshall University and Beckley College.

This year, Mr. President, marks the silver anniversary of the science talent search. On this 25th anniversary, these outstanding students heard addresses by Dr. Glenn Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission: Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president of Science Service and vice president for research and exploration, National Geographic Society; and Mr. Howard S. Kaltenborn, vice president of personnel and public affairs of Westinghouse Electric Corp., and chairman, Westinghouse Educational Foundation. The students also heard from two of the first winners of the science talent search, Lt. Col. Paul E. Teschan and Dr. Marina Prajmovsky Meyers. These distinguished speakers gave the students and several hundred guests informative and stimulating glimpses of the past and the future of science.

Most of the addresses were given from notes, and are not available in complete form. Mr. Kaltenborn's remarks are, however, printed; and I ask unanimous consent that they appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks by Howard S. Kaltenborn were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HOWARD S. KALTENBORN, VICE PRESIDENT, WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP., 25TH ANNUAL SCIENCE TALENT SEARCH, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 7, 1966

Dr. Davis, Dr. Meyers, Dr. Teschan, Science Talent Search winners, ladies and gentlemen, this is the second time I have been privileged to have a part in this awards dinner. But for Dr. Davis it is the 25th. Congratulations are due you, Dr. Davis, and your staff at Science Service, for demonstrating over this quarter century that science talent can indeed be identified and encouraged, and that doing so is a contribution to the welfare of this Nation.

May I suggest to this audience a rising vote of thanks to Dr. Davis and to Science Service.

To you 40 winners who make up this silver anniversary class of the science talent search, my congratulations upon having that unique combination of native ability, aptitude in science, and high standards of personal achievement which brought you here. In a quarter of a century there have been but 1,000 of you science talent search winners—just 1,000 from the 35 million high school seniors graduated in these 25 years.

Important anniversaries tempt us to pause and evaluate our accomplishments. We at Science Service and Westinghouse have yielded to this temptation. We made a survey of the 960 science talent search winners who have preceded the 40 we honor here tonight. And I should like to share with you, very briefly, what we learned.

The 960 winners started out as 450,000 qualifying examinations distributed to public, private, and parochial schools in all 50 States and the District of Columbia. From these 450,000, less than 74,000 could complete all the requirements of the search. And of these, only 960 were chosen as winners.

These 960 winners have earned $450,000 in Westinghouse scholarhsips and awards. They, and the honors groups from which they were chosen each year, have received more than $5 million in additional financial aid as a result of their performance in this competition.

This investment has paid rich dividends in the cause of science and technology.

Replies from more than 82 percent of the winners revealed that, without exception, they are attending or have attended institutions of higher learning. Of those more than 8 years beyond high school, 62 percent earned a doctorate and 7½ percent more are doctoral candidates. Their doctorates came from 67 universities in the United States and abroad.

Almost 1 winner in 2 earned fellowships for graduate study; about one-fourth were named to Phi Beta Kappa and to Sigma Xi.

The winners found their life's work in almost every field of science and engineering. They are professors, physicians, researchers, chemists, astronomers, biologists and engineers in universities, Government laboratories and industry.

And, in case you may wonder about it, these 738 men and 222 women were found to be wonderfully normal husbands and wives.

Of those beyond graduate school, 95 percent are married; they average 1.65 children; their divorce rate is a fraction of the national average.

I cite these figures to you 40 winners here tonight to forewarn you that you now join a distinguished group of alumni, who have accomplished much and of whom much is always expected.

Your predecessors have had a part in largely remaking the world of science and technology that existed at the time they sat where you sit tonight.

They have played a part in discovering the structure of the atom and bringing useful power from its nucleus—in extending the known limits of the universe to almost inconceivable distances—in learning the form and function of living molecules, with its hope of understanding the secret of life itself—in beginning that inevitable chain of events which will place man as much at home in space and beneath the sea as he now feels on our planet's surface.

We hope you do as well. For this we know: you will have no dearth of problems to work upon, because the acquisition of scientific knowledge always creates more questions than it solves. And we know, too, that the problems of science and technology which you face grow ever more complex, and their social and political implications more complicated still.

But such problems, we know, will not deter you any more than they did Dr. Meyers, Dr. Teschan, and their fellow winners who have gone before.

The English scientist, James Smithson, whose name is perpetuated in the Smithsonian Institution which Dr. Carmichael served so well, once said: "It is in his knowledge that man has found his greatness and his happiness."

So may it be for you.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Westinghouse has a large plant at Fairmont, W. Va., employing over 2,100 workers. The Melpar facility, at Beckley, a subsidiary of Westinghouse, also provides employment in our State.

I was thrilled to be present at the awards banquet and to personally congratulate Miss Powers. All West Virginians are justly proud of her academic excellence and scientific achievement.

Mr. President, I commend Westinghouse for its creative and constructive leadership in the field of stimulating young people to take an interest in science. When this program began, 25 years ago, it was not popular to become a scientist, as it now is today. This courageous and prophetic initiation of a science talent search is a splendid example of industrial leadership and corporate responsibility at its best.

A Timely Safety Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News agrees with President Johnson that it is certainly time to do something about the slaughter of American lives by automobile accidents.

In his broad Federal program on highway safety, "the President got down to brass tacks," the paper states. It also said:

> He wants Federal standards in driver education and licensing. Better traffic control techniques. Cars designed and engineered to be safer. Better tires. Safer highways.

Because many may want to study the contents of this lucid article I am offering it for publication in the Record.

A Timely Safety Proposal

President Johnson's message to Congress on transportation yesterday was really two separate and extensive proposals which only happened to fall together.

One was a long-range plan for bringing together in one new Cabinet department all Government agencies dealing with transportation—by highway, air, rail, and water. The President has some justification for his request; as he says, our transportation system is the web of our Union and it had grown without coordination.

Today, the Federal Government spends about $6 billion a year on transport matters and 100,000 Federal employees work at it, scattered in numerous agencies. Probably greater efficiency would follow a consolidation of this effort into one department, but there will be good arguments on both sides of its creation and the question is not likely to be quickly resolved.

But as to the second part of Johnson's message, there should be little argument as to the need and urgency. That is for a broad Federal program on highway safety.

No other necessity of modern life, said the President, has brought more convenience to the American people—or more tragedy—than the auto. More Americans have died in auto accidents than have been killed in all our wars.

The President got down to brass tacks. He wants Federal standards in driver education and licensing. Better traffic control techniques. Cars designed and engineered to be safer. Better tires. Safer highways.

To a nation heartsick over a traffic death toll averaging 1,000 lives a week, the President's strong words are welcome. He proposes improvement in drivers, vehicles, and roads, and there no doubt are shortcomings in all these areas. This would be a new responsibility for the Federal Government, but scarcely anyone could say it is an unnecessary one.

The Civil Rights Protection Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. CASE. Madam President, with the cosponsorship of 18 Senators, Senator Douglas and I introduced the Civil Rights Protection Act, designed to eliminate prejudice in our system of justice. It is a pleasure to note the favorable reception that our bill has been given in editorials appearing in the New York Times and in the Newark Star-Ledger. In both of these articles, elimination of unjust practices, particularly in southern courts, is strongly supported.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Feb. 12, 1966]

Civil Rights

This generation has been witness to the enactment and implementation of historic legislation in the field of civil rights. In 1957, 1960, and again in 1964, Congress wrestled with the problem of discrimination in a land dedicated to liberty and justice for all.

Each succeeding act of the Federal lawmakers marked an important and impressive advance in the cause of human dignity. Each act was a victory for the basic rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and a defeat for those who would apply these rights differently by reason of a man's color, religion, or national origin.

The crusade on behalf of fair and equal treatment continues. The latest development is a bipartisan bill to end discrimination in jury selection and remove cases to Federal courts where discrimination in State courts is evident.

The measure, officialy titled the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966, was placed into the legislative hopper by Senator Clifford P. Case, New Jersey Republican, and Paul H. Douglas, Illinois Democrat.

Among the 18 bipartisan cosponsors are Democrat Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey, and Robert F. Kennedy, of New York, and Republicans Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, and Jacob K. Javits, of New York.

In addition to jury selection improvement and the transfer of courts, the bill would extend the authority of the U.S. Attorney General to seek injunctions to prevent deprivations of constitutional rights. This includes the right of protest by demonstrations, as set forth in the first amendment to the Constitution.

Still another provision would grant compensation by the Federal Government to civil rights workers injured while exercising their constitutional rights. States and counties would be made liable to the Federal Government where police and local officials are responsible for the injuries suffered.

This is a strong bill, but in speaking for it on the Senate floor, Senator Case emphasized that it will not touch a single community where law enforcement officials are administering justice fairly and equitably.

Case said the proposed legislation "seeks to end a system not of justice but of injustice which has denied Negro citizens and civil rights workers the equal protection of laws and which has for years permitted acts of violence and murder to go unpunished."

The bill takes direct aim at those areas where local officials have defaulted in their constitutional obligation to provide equal justice for all.

"By their biased and partial administration of justice, by their misuse of the legal process to harass and intimidate civil rights workers, by their failure to protect those engaged in civil rights activity from violence and by permitting such violence to go unpunished, these officials have made a mockery of justice," the New Jersey Senator charged.

Most Americans are acutely aware of the need for corrective legislation. The miscarriage of justice in some areas of the South remains a source of shame for all fair-minded people.

Whether this specific bill, or a similar one promised by the Johnson administration in the near future is the one that will be acted upon is unimportant.

What does matter is that a new law be passed and that it be strong enough to do the job for which it is intended. The leak in the dam against discrimination must be plugged.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 12, 1966]

Still the Reconstruction

More than a century after Lincoln's death, the Negro's share in American life is a mingled portion of rich accomplishment and tragic inequality, of faith redeemed and hope snuffed out, of brilliant opportunity and dark fear.

A bipartisan group of 20 Senators led by Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, and Clifford Case, of New Jersey, has introduced this week a bill that seeks to dismantle yet another part of the rotting, unjust structure of segregation that still humiliates and contains many Negroes. The bill would reform southern justice, enabling the Federal courts and prosecutors to take jurisdiction in State cases where a fair trial is not possible.

Such intervention could occur, for example, if Negroes were systematically excluded from juries. It would become a Federal crime to kill, injure, or intimidate Negroes trying to exercise their constitutional rights. The bill would insure that juries were selected from a representative cross-section of the population. Incentives to desegregate southern police forces are provided, and victims of racial violence would be eligible for financial compensation.

President Johnson has already indicated his intention of recommending similar measures, but Senator Douglas and his colleagues have in the past pointed the way for Congress on Federal voting registrars and other innovations. Certainly, it is clear that legislation in this field is necessary. Numerous Negroes and white civil rights workers have lost their lives in recent years, but Southern State juries have repeatedly refused to convict in such cases. The miasma of fear must be lifted from the lives of southern Negroes and those who battle to assure them genuine equality.

In the North the need is less for new laws than for a sense of urgency about removing the roots of tension. Six months after the riots in Watts, 18 months after the upheavals in Harlem and Rochester, nothing very much has changed in the racial ghettoes. The bad housing and inferior schools are still there; the additional blue collar jobs for the unskilled are still missing; the aimless, angry teenager is still drifting.

The American Negro has to help himself, but the larger society also has to do more than it has yet done to help him overcome decades of past discrimination and deprivation. A century after Lincoln, the Negro still has a claim on the American conscience.

Adult Illiteracy Attacked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a very excellent article which appeared recently in the Washington Post. It is entitled "Adult Illiteracy Attacked," and it reveals the tremendously important role which the adult basic education program is playing in the war against poverty.

Mr. Jesse W. Lewis, Jr., wrote this article for the Post on February 9, and focused his highly informative discussion chiefly upon the adult basic education programs in Breathitt and Jefferson Counties, Ky., where the need is great and the rewards are many. In fact, Mr. Lewis points out, what is needed is a much more extensive attack on adult illiteracy than the one presently being conducted. No fewer than 19,463,000 Americans over 18 years of age have less than an eighth-grade education, and 3,055,000 persons 15 years old or older are actually illiterate. Yet the current effort under the Economic Opportunity Act seeks to involve only 75,000 participants in this fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I place Mr. Lewis' article at this point in the Record, and state in doing so my conviction that the campaign against adult illiteracy must be extended and expanded:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1966]

The Better War: Adult Illiteracy Attacked

(By Jesse W. Lewis, Jr.)

An evening class at Butler High School in Jefferson County, Ky., was reading from a word-and-picture text.

The picture showed a restaurant scene. In the foreground was a woman wearing a tiny white cap, a dress and an abbreviated apron. Under the picture was the word waitress.

"Read that word, Charles," said the teacher.

"Waiter," said Charles Childress after looking at the word for about 30 seconds.

"No, almost," the teacher said.

"Waste."

"You almost had it right the first time. Try again."

"Waitress."

"That's right," the teacher said with a broad approving smile. The student looked pleased, too.

Childress is 27 years old, and is one of 191,000 adult students enrolled in antipoverty basic education classes across the Nation.

"For a long time we presumed we had a well-educated population," Roy B. Minnis, Acting Chief of Adult Basic Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has said. "But the truth is—we don't."

There are 19,463,000 people over 18 who have less than an eighth-grade education, according to 1964 census figures on national educational attainment.

And 3,055,000 persons, or 2.4 percent of the U.S. population, 15 years old or older, are illiterate.

EDUCATION AIMS

These persons are the target of the adult basic education title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which aims to prevent functional illiterates and undereducated persons from losing their jobs and (2) to prepare others without jobs for the kind of training courses they will need if they are to find work.

Operations vary by location. Charles Childress, the night student at Butler High, is learning how to read as a way of assuring his $100 a week job at a furniture factory, where he must be able to fill out daily reports.

Minnie L. Hopkins, a domestic servant in Cleveland, who earns $10 a day plus carfare, is enrolled in a night class at East Tech High School.

Some of her employers began leaving written instructions for her, she explained, and "You just can't guess at what them notes say. If I didn't learn how to read just a little, I coulda lost some jobs."

In Breathitt County, Ky., in the heart of poverty stricken Appalachia, the program is somewhat different and is aimed at giving job training to people who are now virtually unemployable. Thus, some 460-male heads of families go to literacy classes 1 day a week and chop weeds the other 4, at $1.25 an hour for 40 hours a week.

Before Raymond Isaac Caudill started school last September, he said he could read a little. "But not good, I couldn't. I never went to more than the second grade."

Caudill is 33, married, and has four children. He is also unemployed. He says: "I think if I can learn to read good I think I can learn how to mechanic."

Though the adult basic education program is a small part of the war on poverty (it has consumed only $35 million in Federal funds) it is designed to keep Mrs. Hopkins and Childress from being shunted into the ranks of the jobless and to give basic reading skill to prepare Caudill for job training.

Other antipoverty projects—like Headstart, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Job Corps—will not reach them.

The program itself is administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and local school systems. The Federal Government matches local funds with a 9-to-1 contribution formula.

Although adult education seeks to bestow one of civilization's greatest resources on those who have been denied it, this is not to say that the war on poverty's program to this end is beyond criticism.

From one side is the criticism that it is such a minuscule effort relative to the need. If the objective is worth while, why limit it to fewer than 200,000 of the 3 million—or 19 million—who need it?

In fact, in the early stages of framing the war on poverty program, one proposal with no little support behind it was to make it a literacy program in its entirety. And it was obviously the belief that the present program is operating on too small a scale that led to the creation here a few weeks ago of the Center for Community Action, Inc. Its program is to give at least 1 million people sixth-grade reading skills.

At the present pace of the war on poverty effort, "It'll take 30 or 40 years to make the population functionally literate," Kentucky adult education director C. F. Esham points out.

But Esham also notes the existence, nationwide, of a diametrically opposite criticism: that the adults have already had their chance at an education, and money for schooling should be spent exclusively for the young, for they stand the best chance of putting it to constructive use.

It may be cruel to the older people, these critics concede, but life is tough, and the best way to make it better is to spend poverty money on the youngsters before whom the future stretches.

Still another complaint contends that even with present funds more adults could be taught if only there were more energetic efforts to bring them into classes.

Under the law, no funds are provided for recruiting students. Uneducated persons, particularly functional illiterates, can scarcely be expected to respond to brochures or notices that they can't read in the first place.

RECRUITERS URGED

Llyod Redman, Jr., who heads a particularly successful program in suburban Louisville's Jefferson County, argues the need for full-time recruiters going to the boondocks on "talking campaigns."

Redman has done just that, with significant success in a Negro community that had been notably indifferent to previous offers of adult schooling.

Unfortunately, Redman is not typical. Too many heads of adult education programs, mired in the lethargy of the past, have shown little imagination in grasping the opportunity offered by the war on poverty to stimulate enrollment.

In general, though, and within its rather restricted confines, the war on poverty's adult education efforts get good marks. Its teachers, who should know best, tend to be the most enthusiastic.

Judy S. Gabbard, 24, a teacher in Breathitt County, was going through some magazines last month to make reading real for her pupils, and working up some mathematics problems from newspaper advertisements. The traditional Dick and Jane books, she scarcely needed to say, were something less than grabbers for her particular pupils.

"For instance," she explained, "we don't teach arithmetic by using abstract 2 plus 2, or 3 times 6. But we figure out a building problem using floor area and how much lumber and brick is needed. The skills needed are the same, but you relate them to something real."

But the game is worth the candle. In the words of Mildred T. Bundy, a teacher in a Cleveland school:

"There's such a difference teaching adults. It's a satisfaction you don't experience with children. The adult is already motivated. And the rewards are immediate and visible when you see them fill out an application for a telephone or a vacation request without help."

There is a helpful fallout too. With mother and father taking literacy courses, encouragement flows to their older children to stay in school, many of the teachers have noted.

And there is the matter of image, too, not without its poignancy.

A father in Jefferson County, Ky., was explaining recently why he had enrolled for a basic reading course: "You don't know how it feels for your child to come to you for help with the homework—and you can't help him."

Agricultural Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been published and put in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about the agricultural losses in California due to the fact that the Secretary of Labor would not certify bracero labor for harvesting the crops. Recently a study was inaugurated by the University of California, which study was performed at the request of the State board of agriculture, and their report sharply contradicts statements that farmers suffered little or no losses throughout the 1965 harvest season. The Council of California Growers report the findings of the study group as follows:

> Growers of high labor use crops suffered a total loss of $139.9 million in net income in 1965, with $90 million of this due directly to increased production and harvesting costs, the 175-page study revealed.
>
> The report was prepared by Dr. Trimble R. Hedges, agricultural economists, University of California at Davis, and Dr. Eric Thor, extension economist, Berkeley.
>
> Specifically, the report confirmed that harvest labor shortages "caused harvest losses in asparagus, strawberries, brussels sprouts, and early tomatoes," and added that "local labor shortages for the 1965 deciduous and citrus fruit harvests caused harvest to lag behind the usual harvest pattern, resulting in some individual grower losses."
>
> Losses to related industries were not evaluated in the report, except for an estimated $4 million loss to the processors of strawberries and asparagus.
>
> Lionel Steinberg, a member of the State board, estimated the total economic loss to California at $200 million.

Andy Borg, Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, Andy Borg, national commander of the Veterans' of Foreign Wars of the United States of America hails from my district. He is a soldier, lawyer, civic leader, husban and father, a statesman, and an all-around great citizen.

Commander Andy Borg made an important statement this morning before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. I commend his statement. I agree with all he says.

I urge all Members of the Congress to read and study his timely speech which ought to be read by all Americans.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ANDY BORG, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Andy Borg, 54, Superior, Wis., was elected commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on August 20, 1965, at the VFW's 66th Annual Convention held in Chicago, Ill. He was elected to the office of senior vice commander in chief August 28, 1964, at the 65th annual convention held in Cleveland, Ohio, and during the 64th annual convention held in 1963 in Seattle, Wash., was elected to junior vice commander in chief.

Born and raised in Superior, Borg is now actively engaged in the general practice of law with the firm of Borg, McGill & Moodie. He is a former district attorney, having been elected while still serving overseas during World War II. Borg is a graduate of Wisconsin State University, Superior, and the University of Minnesota, where he received his law degree.

During World War II he served as legal officer and judge advocate with the 7th Fleet in the Southwest Pacific. He also served as a member of the Foreign Claims Commission while he was in service.

The Commander in Chief has served the Veterans of Foreign Wars on a post, district, department and national level for many years. He was a district commander 2 years; judge advocate, department of Wisconsin, 3 years; and in 1954–55 served as department commander. He was selected as a member of the All-American team of department commanders for the year. On a national level he served as vice chairman of the national security committee, on the national council of administration in 1956–58, and served three terms as a member of the important national budget and finance committee. He was elected to serve as judge advocate general during the year 1962–63. He has also been very active at the national conventions, having served on the national bylaws committee, as chairman of the general resolutions committee and as chairman of the committee on finance and internal organization, among others. He is a former member of the management board of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Employees' Retirement Plan.

Mr. Borg is married and has three children, a daughter, Kamie, and two sons, Andy and Willie.

Besides his VFW interests, Borg is also very active in civic and other organizational work. He has served as vice president of the Wisconsin District Attorneys Association and vice chairman of the State of Wisconsin Great Lakes Port Committee. He is a past president of the junior chamber of commerce and of the association of commerce, and is a present member of the police and fire commission of the city of Superior. Other committees he has served either as chairman or director are the community chest, juvenile guidance committee, State labor conciliation panel and Superior northern league baseball team. He is also a member of the American Legion, Eagles, Elks, F. & A.M., Shrine, United Commercial Travelers, chamber of commerce, local and State bar associations, the American Bar Association, and the Royal Order of Jesters.

STATEMENT OF ANDY BORG

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first, may I express my deep appreciation for the high honor and great privilege of appearing before this distinguished committee of the Congress of the United States.

Accompanying me this morning are several hundred fellow national department officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States who comprise the leadership of our organization. They are from every State in the Union. Many are on their way up to greater areas of responsibility. Others have served at the top level and continue to give freely of their time, advice, and counsel to our organization. We have been here several days attending our annual Washington conference. This opportunity to present our program to this committee helps make the conference a highly successful one.

You have probably noticed that I am accompanied also by a large number of young people. These are the Voice of Democracy winners from the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, and Japan. The Voice of Democracy program, which is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary, is a broadcast scriptwriting contest for all high school students. The subject this year is: "Democracy: What It Means to Me." We believe this program is an outstanding example of one of our great purposes which is to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom by bringing to the serious attention of our youth the great principles upon which this Nation was founded, has flourished, and has helped make us the leader and principal defender of the free world.

At our annual congressional dinner tonight, the national Voice of Democracy winners will be announced and a total of $13,500 in scholarships will be distributed, including a $5,000 scholarship for the winner. I am hopeful that all of you will join with us this evening and have the opportunity of meeting these outstanding young Americans who will be our leaders of tomorrow.

As many of you know, the Veterans of Foreign Wars is the oldest active major veterans' organization in the United States. It has been in continuous existence since 1899 when a handful of veterans of the Spanish-American War who had just returned from overseas duty decided to form a veterans' organization. These men chose to limit their membership to those who had served overseas and in engagements for which a campaign badge or medal was authorized. That is still the criterion for membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and that is also why we are known as a fightingman's organization.

From the slim ranks of that handful of Spanish-American War veterans our organization has grown to its present 1.3 million members. I am pleased to report to you that we have had 10 consecutive years of membership growth and are presently 75,000 members ahead of the same period 1 year ago. Our members are distributed throughout the United States and in foreign lands and make up some 10,000 posts. These posts are located all the way from Bangkok and Thailand in the Far East to France and Germany in Western Europe. Working side by side with our membership are the 400,000 members of our ladies auxiliary.

The primary purpose of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is to "honor the dead by helping the living." We are proud of the fact that we are a service organization—first, last, and always.

A program which helps carry out this purpose is our national home for widows and orphans which is located at Eaton Rapids, Mich. This home was founded in 1926 and is a model in the care of young people.

Our National Rehabilitation Service is another outstanding example of our service to others. Veterans of Foreign Wars service officers are working quietly and effectively in all Veterans' Administration regional offices, hospitals and other facilities, rendering service to all who call upon them for assistance—this, without regard to whether they are members of our organization or entitled to membership.

Another service which ranks high in the activities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is our community activities program. We are proud that last year our 10,000 posts and ladies' auxiliary sponsored more than 500,000 community activities projects.

In recent months much of our effort in this area has been to lend our fullest support to President Johnson and the men fighting in the jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. In November of 1965, we conducted a program known as Operation Boost which had as its primary function the staging of public meetings in support of our Government's efforts in Vietnam. Presently one of our major community activities projects is known as "Operation Assist." This is a program designed to help the families of the men presently serving our Nation.

It is the opinion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the single greatest problem facing our Nation and the free world is our confrontation with communism in many areas of the world. The focal point of that confrontation at the moment is South Vietnam. I say to you that South Vietnam is just one struggle in the overall Communist conspiracy which has promised many times to bury us. This is why we must win in Vietnam. We cannot—we must not, break our word to those who have had the courage to stand up to Communist aggression.

It is because the Veterans of Foreign Wars recognizes this Nation's obligation to defend freedom that we have no time for the draft card burners, appeasers and others who would divide our country during times of great peril.

Since this committee is primarily concerned with the welfare of veterans and their families, or, if deceased, their surviving widows, orphans and dependent parents, and because time is limited, I am confining the remainder of my remarks to veteran programs. It would, however, be deeply appreciated if at the conclusion of my statement a digest of all the resolutions, including the national security program, be made a part of the hearing record.

Now I want to discuss a matter that greatly disturbs the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is the tendency on the part of some people to look down on this Nation's war veterans. They would cut away the veteran's benefits and cast him adrift. They ask: What is so special about a war veteran?

Well, let me say this—the veteran is something special. He became something special the moment he slipped into his uniform. The fact that he was selected made him something special and put him in a class by himself. He was and is committed to fight to the death for the ideals of freedom around the world.

And then I would remind you that only the best physically, mentally and morally are called to war; hence, only the best are a special breed—the elite. The tragedy of war is that only the best are fit to be killed and disabled.

From the heights of Iwo Jima to the jungles of Vietnam the veteran is a special breed. He can make an amphibious landing; he can take a hill; he can storm a bunker; he can annihilate the enemies of freedom. But he can also feed the widow and orphan; he can become the friend of children in foreign lands; he can charm more people than the most experienced diplomat. And yet they ask: "What is so special about the veteran?"

Well, I say to you that the very fact that there are those who dare to disagree is what makes the veteran something special. He fought so that all might have the right to disagree, and the irony of it is that it is those who disagree the most who fail to recognize that the veteran is something special. Of one thing both our friends and enemies can be sure, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States shall continue to remind this Nation that veterans are something special.

This year our national legislative committee, after reviewing, digesting, and analyzing our national convention mandates, recommended a representative list of legislative resolutions which have been selected as our key legislative goals for 1966, accompanied with a policy statement which reflects the intense concern of our organization for the welfare and well-being of veterans and their families. I quote:

"WE MUST NOT FAIL THE VETERAN

"Since World War II, the United States has changed from a rural to an urban society. This has led to sweeping changes in all areas.

"The 89th Congress has responded to President Johnson's blueprint for a Great Society by approving a multitude of legislation certain to have a profound long-term influence upon the lives of all citizens.

"The greatest impact has been in the area of medical and health programs, especially for the elderly. There is an alarming tendency to forget those citizens who have offered their lives so that this great Nation could grow, prosper, and endure.

"While veterans are enjoying the most generous veterans programs of any nation on earth, there are signposts along the road indicating that many long-standing veterans rights and benefits and services are in serious jeopardy of being eliminated or drastically curtailed.

"The words of the late Bernard Baruch are just as true in 1966 as when he reported to President Franklin D. Roosevelt 20 years ago at the end of World War II and will be as true as long as this Nation has war veterans—when he stated, 'We must not fail the veteran—for then we fail ourselves.'

"With this background, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has adopted the following top priority legislative goals for 1966. These goals are representative of the almost 300 resolutions which were adopted by the delegates, representing 1,300,000 members, to our 66th National Convention, which was held in Chicago, Ill., last August. Experience reveals that a brief digest of the highlights of their resolutions is an effective way to present the Veterans of Foreign Wars program to the Congress, Government officials, and the public.

"As veterans we recognize that our primary responsibility is the security of our country, the protection of our citizens, and the strengthening of our American ideals. These goals reflect one of the great purposes of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which is to promote and seek improvement of legislation and programs which will assist disabled and aging veterans and their wives, widows, and children. The absence of a particular resolution should not be construed that the resolution will not receive the most vigorous Veterans of Foreign Wars support since this list is a representative group highligthing the objectives and aspirations of the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for 1966."

The 10 key legislative goals for 1966 of our organization are:

1. Our No. 1 legislative objective was the passage of H.R. 12410, better known as the cold war GI bill. It pleases me to note that this legislation has already been signed, sealed, and delivered. I compliment you. As long ago as 1956 the Veterans of Foreign Wars supported such legislation and we thank all of you for helping to make this bill a reality.

The remainder of our 10-point program reads as follows:

2. Greater participation by Congress in operation of Veterans' Administration.
3. Veterans' hospitals, domiciliaries, and medical facilities must be for veterans.
4. Liberalize dependency and indemnity compensation program for survivors of deceased veterans.
5. Liberalize pension program for totally disabled and older veterans and their widows.
6. National cemetery system must be continued.
7. Establish a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the U.S. Senate.
8. No reduction in job counseling and job placement assistance for veterans.
9. Oppose all efforts to weaken veterans preference in Federal civil service.
10. Reopen NSLI program.

It will be deeply appreciated, Mr. Chairman, at this point in my remarks if the entire key goals with an explanatory statement accompanying each will be made a part of the hearing record at this point.

I hope you will make special note that this 10 point program calls for greater participation by the Congress in the operation of the Veterans' Administration. I am sure you realize that this relates to the massive Veterans' Administration closing order of 1965. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is hopeful that legislation will be enacted by the Congress similar to House Resolution 202. Such legislation would provide the kind of participation by the Congress that we advocate and that we feel would prevent any massive closing order by the Veterans' Administration in the future.

We are also asking this year for legislation that would insure that veterans' hospitals, domiciliaries and medical facilities be for the exclusive use of veterans. As an organization we are concerned by the fact that there are cases where these hospitals are being used to care for those other than veterans. We disagree with such a policy and intend to fight for legislation which will correct the situation. I know that many of you support our position in this matter.

Another of our key goals reflects our continued concern over the income limitations which determine pension payments for both veterans and widows. This income limitation should be substantially increased. The 7 percent increase in the social security payments dramatically demonstrated the need for an upward revision of the limitations. An increase in the limitations will avoid the reduction in pension payments suffered by almost 30,000 veterans and widows because of the social security increase. In the same general area and most important are the unrealistic pension payments to the widows of deceased veterans. These pension payments must be increased. I would note here that it is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that you are hopeful of correcting this situation at an early date.

Also of great concern to the Veterans of Foreign Wars is the indemnity compensation program—now 10 years old. I ask you—is it adequate—is it doing the job intended? It is our belief that it is not doing the job for dependent parents of unmarried veterans who were shot down on the battlefield. The strict means test a dependent parent must pass to obtain a very modest compensation payment is in great need of liberalization. Even further, we believe that the whole program should be reviewed to make sure that all eligible survivors of those who are killed or die on active duty are receiving just and adequate compensation.

These few comments represent some of the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars concerning programs for veterans and their dependents. May I again extend my sincerest thanks for this opportunity to appear before this committee and for the opportunity for our leaders to witness for themselves this great committee in action. Many will be visiting with you later today. In addition it is my sincere hope that this meeting has been very beneficial to the 53 Voice of Democracy winners who are here with us.

In conclusion, gentlemen, let me say to you that the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars did not stop fighting for the good of their Nation the moment they took off their uniform. Today, wherever you find a needy veteran—a widow—or an orphan, you will find the men of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. And yes, whenever or wherever you find our Nation in trouble, you will find the men of the Veterans of Foreign Wars leading the way in defense of freedom.

High School Survey in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February 1966, I conducted a survey of high school students in the Ninth Congressional District of Missouri, and of 5,000 questionnaires sent out to civics, history, and government classes, we received a response of 1,781, better than 35 percent.

The questions and results are as follows:

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you approve of our Government's policy in Vietnam?	1,116	641	24
(a) Would you favor withdrawal of troops from Vietnam leaving the area to Vietcong?	220	1,522	33
(b) Would you favor extending the war with widespread bombings and additional troop commitments?	1,014	728	41
2. Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations?	515	1,221	40
3. Is the poverty program effective in your area?	665	848	268
4. Do you favor expanding coverage of fair labor standards and minimum wage laws to farmworkers, restaurant, motel, and filling station employees?	1,302	376	14
5. Would you favor an increase in congressional terms from 2 to 4 years?	921	851	18

I thought this survey of the opinion of this portion of America's youth might be helpful to my colleagues.

I am presently conducting a like survey of 20,000 adult voters in my district and as soon as those returns are in, I shall make them likewise available.

Human Rights in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

HUMAN RIGHTS IN HUNGARY

To the Herald Tribune:

The Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, has accepted an invitation from the Polish Government to attend, with the European members of the U.N., a seminar next year on the realization of economic and social rights contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. At the same time, the U.N. has released details of a seminar to be held in Budapest next June on participation in local administration as a means of promoting human rights, also for European countries.

The agenda of the Budapest seminar, prepared by the U.N. Secretariat in consultation with the Hungarian Government, includes: "Point 4—the local protection of human rights and safeguards against their violation."

We don't know whether we should be angry or laugh bitterly.

Mr. Thant, in the 10th year after the Hungarian revolution, is going to hold a seminar organized with the Hungarian Government on human rights—in a country where human rights do not exist, a country occupied by the Soviet Army, and where the head of the Communist Party is the same Kadar who invited the Soviets to return 10 years ago and who has sent thousands of Hungarian patriots to the gallows and the firing squads.

Our Hungarian compatriots will think that the world has gone crazy and that in this crazy world the Americans are the barbarians and the Hungarian Communist Government—which just arrested the released revolutionaries of 1956 and hundreds of workers and students because they demonstrated for "freedom, bread, and land"—is the humanitarian.

BELA FABIAN,
Chairman, Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners.
ANDRAS POGANY,
Chairman, Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters.
NEW YORK.

Brotherhood Has Many Faces, One Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, during the recent observance of Brotherhood Week, the Associated Newspapers, in my congressional district, published an editorial which deeply impressed me with its simplicity and sincerity.

The editorial was entitled, "Brotherhood Has Many Faces, One Meaning." Its contents were simply brief quotations from the world's major religions—Brahmanism, Buddhism, Judaism, Confucianism, Taoism, Zoroastrianism, Christianity, and Islam.

Each quotation was simply another way of reciting what has become known as the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

The editorial needs no further comment, and I insert it in the Record for the benefit of my colleagues:

BROTHERHOOD HAS MANY FACES, ONE MEANING

This is Brotherhood Week. The dates we don't consider important because it should be a constant, year-round practice instead of a 7-day observation anyway.

But in calling it to your attention, Associated Newspapers would like to point out what we feel is the simplest and perhaps only guide to making it work:

For the 2½ billion followers of the eight major religions, a total of three-quarters of the world's population, it translates as follows:

Brahmanism: "This is the sum of duty; do naught unto others which would cause pain if done unto you."

Buddhism: "Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful."

Judaism: "What is hateful to you, do not to your fellow man. That is the entire law, all the rest is commentary."

Confucianism: "There is one maxim of loving kindness: do not unto others what you would not have them do unto you."

Taoism: "Regard you neighbor's gain as your own gain, and your neighbor's loss as your own loss."

Zoroastrianism: "That nature alone is good which refrains from doing unto another whatsoever is not good for itself."

Christianity: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets."

Islam: "No one of you is a believer until he desires for his brother that which he desires for himself."

For followers of so-called minor religions and the crop of pagans who make up the other quarter of the world's population, it translates:

"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Coast Guard Authorization Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Merchant Marine Committee, I urge my colleagues in the House to support H.R. 12762, to authorize appropriations for U.S. Coast Guard requirements in shore facilities, vessels, aircraft, communications, and navigation needs.

I regret the departmental request, as submitted in the bill, was for only $103 million, which was more than 10 percent below the 1966 appropriation. And I call attention to the fact that the request includes an item of $8.8 million made necessary by the transfer of Navy icebreakers to the Coast Guard. Amendments in committee increased the total authorization to $126,179,000, still substantially less than the Coast Guard estimated it needed.

Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a war in Vietnam and the Coast Guard is performing vital missions and important services to our country. The action by our committee to provide the additional $23,079,000 is wholly justified with the growing activities and added responsibilities of the Coast Guard, the expansion of world commerce, and the tremendous increase in pleasure boating in recent years. The figure of $126,079,000 in this bill represents the minimum with which the Coast Guard can properly carry out its important activities and functions.

I am pleased the bill provides funds for the continuation of work at Governors Island, N.Y., where the Coast Guard will take possession in July 1966.

I am pleased to give my support and vote for H.R. 12762. And I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to commend the distinguished chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz], and the able chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], for their outstanding efforts and accomplishments in behalf of the Coast Guard.

A Great U.S. Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Michigan's distinguished senior Senator, the Honorable Patrick V. McNamara, announced recently that he would not be a candidate for reelection to a third term as a U.S. Senator.

Much has been written in the subsequent period about Senator McNamara; about his outstanding career during 12 years in the Senate, and about his courage, integrity, and dedication as a public servant. I believe, however, that two editorials in the Michigan AFL–CIO News-Detroit Labor News edition of March 2 sum up simply and capably, the things that should be said about this great American as he climaxes his senatorial career. It is fitting that these things should be said in this newspaper, for Senator McNamara had his beginnings in the Detroit trade unions, as a member, officer, and finally president of the Pipefitters' Local 636.

I have permission that the two editorials be placed in the Congressional Record.

A Great U.S. Senator

The announcement by Michigan's senior U.S. Senator, Patrick V. McNamara, that he would not be a candidate for reelection in 1966, left those of us who have known and admired Pat for many years with a feeling of mingled pride and regret.

Pride in the fact that one of our own from the labor movement had demonstrated as a Member of the U.S. Senate, an infinite capacity and courage to fight and win on civil rights, medicare, equal opportunity, the war on poverty program, aid to education, and many other issues basic to the welfare of the American people.

Regret that there came a time when Pat himself felt he could no longer make the contribution that he has always made to common decency and good sense. For it is typical of Pat McNamara that he is as blunt and straightforward about himself as he is about other matters.

Pride too that Pat McNamara was described by his colleagues in the U.S. Senate as the conscience of that body. Pride for all Pat has given to Detroit and Michigan and the Nation in education, legislation, and leadership on progressive issues of our time. Pride too in his courage and integrity which was in the finest traditions of the labor movement.

We regret that Pat McNamara is going to leave the U.S. Senate but no man in public life has earned the respect, admiration, and devotion of his constituents more than Pat; we're going to miss him in the Senate but we want Pat to know that we are everlastingly grateful for his labors in that body, for all of us.

Good luck, Pat, and good health; you've earned both over and over again.

McNamara Has Earned Gratitude of the People

The people of the entire United States owe a big debt of gratitude to Michigan Senator Pat McNamara for his performance during the 12 years he will have served in that body when he retires at the end of the present session.

McNamara, the only union man to break into that most exclusive Senate club, has demonstrated that a man of modest means can win respect and support for the programs he espouses by the sheer force of dedicated service.

And Pat McNamara scored well in the legislation that he sponsored. In one field alone—that of senior citizens, McNamara posted achievements that will forever rank him in the mythical Senate hall of fame.

These victories include passage of the medicare program and the Older Americans Act, which for the first time gives Federal recognition to the problems of senior citizens. For these efforts McNamara justly received the award of merit of the National Council of Senior Citizens.

McNamara also scored legislative victories with the passage of landmark Federal aid to education, public works, conservation, labor, economic development, and war on poverty programs. Throughout this fruitful Senate career there never was any doubt where McNamara stood on controversial issues.

This forthright approach to his Senate duties came in for high praise recently from a colleague, Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, who addressed that august body in the following language with which we wholeheartedly agree:

"I believe it can be said of the Senator from Michigan 'Behold, a Senator in whom there is no guile.' Everyone knows where he stands. He does not make any ambiguous statements. He does not cast any ambiguous votes."

The Chaplain Goes Ahead

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it would be extremely disappointing if I were unable to add a few words to the volumes of appreciation and admiration which followed the passing on of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp.

All of us are familiar with the outstanding events of his life, from his birth in Alton, Iowa, to his quiet "moving on" here in Washington. None of this needs to be repeated here.

In the 16 years that he served as the first full-time Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, all of us became aware of his practice of reciting appropriate verses of Scripture, preliminary to his prayer for divine guidance and support for the deliberations of the Members of Congress.

This mild-mannered and devout man of the spirit was beloved by all. In my frequent contacts and informal visits with Reverend Braskamp, I always felt a warmth radiating from this man. He displayed a kindly consideration and respect for the serious nature of the work of the Congress as well as an appreciation of the Members' desire to acknowledge that the guidance of divine providence entered into the grave decisionmaking in the U.S. House of Representatives.

In going from us, it is comforting to believe that he has gone on—a little ahead of us, and that somewhere he is still repeating those verses which were a testimony to his and our faiths in the mercy and justice he sought to convey to us and to all mankind.

Permitting Hall To Haul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of March 2 has reported that Communist leader, Gus Hall, has been issued a passport. Mr. Hall has stated his intentions of going to Russia.

Since the goal of overturning the American Government, by one means or another, has not been abandoned by the Communist Party of the United States, what our State Department is doing is offering Gus Hall an opportunity to go to the Soviet Union to report on his progress, receive a cram course in riot and revolution, and get instructions for causing more forment and unrest here. This faux pas by our professional international wool gatherers is all the more significant when it is recalled that hard-core Communists were at the bottom of many of the school riots and other insurrections which occurred in our Nation last year.

But, even more tragic than their failure to see the dangers of giving official approval to the Communist travels of card-carrying fellow travelers, is the logic behind it. The age-old mistake that they make and remake is in trying to distinguish between various types of communism.

A Yale professor went to Red China. His passport was lifted. A lifetime Communist revolutionary and activist, Gus Hall, gets a passport to go to Russia, founder and citadel of the world Communist movement. Apparently Russian communism, which today holds millions of captive nations people in slavery, is benign, while Chinese communism is considered malignant.

Classifying communism by grades of brutality will not disguise the fact that the whole idea of communism is a world conspiracy. They all want to see us go down the drain. They only disagree in method to be used.

The text of the Star article is as follows:

United States Issues Passport to Indicted Red

The State Department has acknowledged that a passport has been mailed to Gus Hall, chief of the U.S. Communist Party.

Officials of the passport office said yesterday that the travel document was issued to him although he is under indictment for failure to register the Communist Party under orders of the Subversive Activities Control Board. The officials said there was no requirement that would prevent his departure.

In New York, Hall said "This is welcome news." He said he wants to use the passport to tell the people of the world that policies of peace "are the deepest wish of the great majority of the American people."

"I sincerely wish," he continued, "that I could tell the people of the world that my Government is in fact for a negotiated withdrawal from Vietnam * * * that colonialism in all its forms is ended and that my Government fully respects the right of all nations to be independent * * * that my Government is ready to live in world peace.

"It pains me that I am not able to say these things."

Hall, 55, has said that he plans to travel and study for the next 3 or 4 months in Britain, Romania, Finland, the Soviet Union, France, Italy, and some other areas.

Decline and Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 4, 1966]

DECLINE AND FALL

(By Richard Starnes)

The dreary deescalation of Britain from world power to quaint anachronism is all but complete, and in consequence it is small wonder that so little seems to turn on the outcome of the election that Prime Minister Harold Wilson has called for the last day of this month.

The suspicion grows that not even the British much care whether Mr. Wilson or Tory Leader Edward Heath is the Queen's First Minister when April Fool's Day dawns. The world that confronts the United Kingdom today is no different from the one that confronted it in other and greater centuries. Power is all that matters among governments, and Britain today is powerless in the company of great nations.

It is customary in Britain to lay this decline to two interrelated circumstances—the exhaustion imposed by the nation's prodigious effort in World War II, and the end of colonialism. Both alibis contain elements of truth, but neither tells the whole story.

France could as well offer both excuses if it found itself seated below the salt at the table of nations. But France finds itself in no such humiliating situation. Its President takes surly delight in tweaking Uncle Sam's whiskers and in otherwise acting as if he were the chief of state of a first-rate nation.

But General de Gaulle actually brandishes no more real power than Mr. Wilson, and the difference in the influence which the two men command has to be found in their style, their vision, and in their understanding of the world as it really exists.

"Mr. Wilson," grumbles London's respected Economist, "strove to be a Kennedy; he has turned out to be a Johnson. There is no Wilson charisma. He is where he is because he has outworked all the others. There is little or no Wilson doctrine."

It is difficult after nearly a year and a half of Prime Minister Wilson's stewardship to remember that he came into office on a Labor Party (i.e., Socialist) ticket. Apart from what the Economist calls trivial bits of leftwingery Mr. Wilson has run a centrist government that bears no relationship to the great Labor Party social schemes of the past.

Nationalization of the steel industry, which was a prime plank in Labor's platform, got exactly the same sort of support from Mr. Wilson that repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act got from President Johnson. He had to be for it because much of his support came from organisms that were passionately in favor of it, but no one was fooled.

But it is in the field of foreign policy that Mr. Wilson has so disappointed his own leftwing. The war in Vietnam is intensely unpopular in England, particularly so in the intellectual circles where so much of the Labor Party philosophy is developed and refined.

A Labor Party faithful to its own past would be calculated to follow a line on Vietnam closer to General de Gaulle than Mr. Johnson. And yet Mr. Wilson has dutifully sneezed every time President Johnson took snuff out of the Vietnam issue. He has, with all his considerable skill at practical (that is to say unprincipled) politics, frustrated every attempt by Labor's leftwing to soften Britain's policy on Vietnam.

It is popular to ascribe the Prime Minister's Vietnam policy to the weakness of the pound and the need for support in U.S. dollars. But there is no reason to believe that this is true. Mr. Wilson on Vietnam and Mr. Wilson on Malaysia are part and parcel of the real Wilson—a conservative leader who unaccountably finds himself at the head of a Labor Party.

It is tempting to stretch the analogy between Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnson too fine. But it is quite clear that both men have adopted the same basic tactics to insure personal power at the price of any real doctrinal convictions. The leftwing in Britain and the leftwing in the United States have no place else to go. If Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnson can command the loyalty of the great mass of voters whose commitment is to the middle of the road, then each is politically invulenerable. The election this month will show how well his Johnsonian policy will reward Mr. Wilson.

Riding the Circuit With Congressman Clarence Long

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to bring to the attention of the House the activities undertaken by our distinguished and hardworking colleague from Maryland's Second District, CLARENCE D. LONG, to keep in close communication with his constituents. These efforts have earned Representative LONG the well-deserved reputation in his district and the House as a service Congressman.

A recent article from the Times of Baltimore County describes a typical weekly visit of Congressman LONG to local post offices, where he can listen to constituent's views and help them with their problems. I include this article for the attention of our colleagues and all others who are interested in the tireless efforts of this able Member of Congress to serve the people of his district:

RIDING THE CIRCUIT WITH CONGRESSMAN LONG

Political friends, and those not so friendly as well, are quick to admit that Congressman CLARENCE D. LONG, Democrat, of Maryland, is a hard-working Congressman, especially in light of LONG's now-familiar circuit riding, which finds the genial Member of Congress at post offices around his congressional district, hearing problems directly from his constituents. This policy has done nothing to relieve the enormous workload of the Congressman, but has kept him in personal contact with literally thousands of his people.

At his scheduled appearance in the Arbutus-Halethorpe Post Office on Saturday, January 22, a crowd of nearly 75 persons greeted LONG upon his 10 a.m. arrival. The problems, each different—each vital to the person at hand—are as varied as the facial features of those waiting to see their representative. True, there are some who are on hand just to "see a Congressman" and others are safely tagged as curious.

Mainly, however, the problems that the presented are of a nature to demand considerable time and effort in their solution. Congressman LONG and his staff have learned to tactfully advise each person so as to obtain the maximum success while maintaining the good will that this unique service has built. Success is not always assured, naturally, and the problems that are brought to a happy conclusion are, apparently, motivation enough for the Congressman and his staff to continue the slogan, "When something goes wrong, call Congressman LONG."

Prediction From Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bob Considine which appeared in the New York Journal-American of March 1, 1966.

[From the New York Journal-American, Mar. 1, 1966]

ON THE LINE: PEOPLE, PLACES, PANHANDLERS

(By Bob Considine)

Prediction from James A. Farley:

"President Jefferson was bitterly criticized for paying $15 million for all of the territory between New Orleans and Montana. On it now stand dozens of cities where one city block is worth more than that.

"Secretary Seward was called a fool for paying $7.5 million for Alaska. The fish catch alone now exceeds the purchase price every single year.

"Yet there are those who do not see that President Johnson has discovered a whole new country—1,200 miles long and 250 miles wide—within our own country. I mean Appalachia, and I predict that this Johnsonland will blossom forth with vast new cities on the western slopes of the Alleghenies in the next century as the eastern slopes of the Rockies brought forth their great cities in the last.

"There are those who deride but there are those who decide. I can only say that one of the gateways to Appalachia, Atlanta, is leading the country in expansion. Atlanta will be to Appalachia what St. Louis is to the Missouri Valley."

Don't bet against Big Jim. Remember the *Maine*. (And also Vermont.)

Congressman Fino Introduces Housing and Urban Development Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an honest version of the administration's Housing and Urban Development Act amendments legislation. My reason for introducing this bill is to correct one major, but well-camouflaged flaw in the administration proposal. On first glance, the administration proposal seems mostly technical and procedural, embodying only a minimum of substantive change. Such a first glance, however, is misleading. The administration Housing Act Amendments are a well-tooled part of a national blueprint for socialization of urban and rural development.

On February 24, I introduced an alternative demonstration cities bill as I felt the Republican Party, as a loyal opposition, had an obligation to delineate the conflict with regard to the far-reaching administration plans for control of American residential patterns. My demonstration cities bill stripped the demonstration cities proposal of the controversial Federal coordinator who, in my opinion, has an unfortunate potential for exercising commissar-like powers to the detriment of local self-government. My bill also took out of the demonstration cities program any mention of "economic integration." Economic integration, as distinguished from racial integration, has nothing to do with race relations. It is a pure and simple matter of quasi-collectivist control of residential patterns so as to insure that people do not live in accommodations they can afford, but in accommodations Government social planners decide they need.

Bluntly put, economic integration means that the middle-income taxpayer, in addition to shouldering his rent obligation, shoulders a tax obligation so that the Government can subsidize a poor person to live in middle-income accommodations at middle-income expense. I do not favor this. I know America does not.

Last year, it was my privilege to lead the bipartisan fight against an insidious piece of planning called "rent supplements." The rent supplement scheme has been hailed by every social planner from Seattle to Key West, but I know of no congressional district public opinion survey that has favored it. I understand that the liberal Berkeley, Calif., district opposes the scheme by a 3 to 1 majority.

I am sure that American public opinion puts about the same faith in the administration demonstration cities and related legislative proposals. A recent Lou Harris poll stated that the American people feel that the administration's residential development programs are one of the first things we ought to sacrifice to pay for Vietnam. The American people feel that the space program is number one on the sacrifice list, and right behind the space program, they are willing to sacrifice the urban development program.

I do not completely agree. I think we need the urban development program. I like the idea of the Federal Government offering these carrots to provoke urban self-improvement. What I dislike is the fact that the carrots are not being offered to provoke self-improvement.

The are rather being offered to achieve Federal control. I want to take the fishhook out of the carrots. I want to strip creative federalism of its corollary encroaching centralism. That is what I tried to do in my demonstration cities bill.

The second part of the administration residential planning package is a metropolitan planning bill. Succinctly put, this bill offers bribes to local governments to yield up control of city planning and zoning to Federal criteria. It also resurrects the new town idea which, while it has some very good aspects, also involves the subjection of American townbuilding to Federal criteria. Federalism is not always benevolent or Federal criteria would not be danger signals to the Congress.

I do not think that there is much that Republicanism can do with the metropolitan planning bill. It is an out-and-out power play. The role of the loyal opposition here is, quite simply, opposition. The bill contains a few palatable topics, however. For example, urban information centers. The metropolitan planning bill is also the vehicle through which mass transportation has been consigned to oblivion in the 2d session of the 89th Congress. The bill completely neglects real needs, presumably because they have no power-grab potentials.

I have cosponsored the commuter service bill introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This bill is receiving virtually no consideration this year. Presumably the administration is not interested in helping commuters, but just with taxing them to pay for socialized residential pattern programs. Nor is mass transportation research being realistically dealt with. Research again has no part in a power play.

The administration is fighting Custer's last stand this year. In November, General Custer's troops are going to suffer casualties, and no more of this collectivist blueprint will escape the drawing boards. For that reason, what we do here during this session is crucial. Power ungrabbed this year will be unreachable by the Johnson administration during whatever tenure remains to it.

The scheming of the demonstration cities and metropolitan planning bills is pretty much aboveboard. The scheming of the Housing Act amendments is not. It is quite well hidden as a minor change in the rent certificate program. My Housing Act amendments legislation keeps the rent certificate program honest.

The rent certificate program, you will remember, is the commonsense cousin of the rent supplement. While the supplement is to be used to put low-income people in middle-income housing, with the Government paying the difference between a quarter of the tenant's salary and the cost of the apartment, the rent certificate program is more restrained. The supplement involved committing Government funds for 40-year contracts, making the supplement a multibillion-dollar program.

The GOP-designed rent certificate involves nothing more than short-term commitments whereby low-cost private housing is used to take up the overflow of public housing. Low-cost private housing is used to supplement low-cost public housing, and persons thus aided are getting subsidized rents just as they would be in public housing. The thing is that they are not being given subsidies to live in middle-income housing. The rent certificate program is not now and was not intended to be a vehicle of economic integration. We Republicans originated the program, and we did not originate it as a vehicle of economic integration. We were simply trying to increase the supply of low-cost housing in order to handle the public housing overflow.

Unfortunately, the administration is trying to warp the "rent certificate" program. They are trying to make it apply to middle-income housing which has already been subsidized by the Government. Last year, we Republicans made it very clear that rent certificates were not to be used in housing which had already been subsidized by tax abatement. The hearings on the rent certificate show this conclusively. We had no intention of allowing rent certificates to be used in State-aided projects like New York's Mitchell-Lama houses, which receive New York State loans and New York City tax abatements. This sort of housing is not a substitute for public housing.

The provision that rent certificates cannot be used in housing not paying full taxes does not, regrettably, appear in the law we passed last year. We were mistaken in assuming a good faith adherence to our expressed views. We should have put the full taxes requirement in the bill.

We should have made the bill more specific with reference to rent certificates. We should have done so because the administration is not interested in rent certificates as a means of providing alternative low-cost housing to public housing. The administration is interested in using rent certificates as another program in its armory of swords of collectivism. As compared with rent certificates, rent supplements can only be used in 221(d)(3) housing projects. These are private structures, built with market-interest rates. They are market-interest rate structures in order that the rent supplement does not come on top of another subsidy.

This is important. The rent certificate program, as drawn up by the Republican minority of the Housing subcommittee, also made sure that certificates were not to be used in housing which had already been subsidized. We had no use whatever for the idea of double subsidies. They appear in neither program.

Now the administration is covertly pushing the double subsidy. They are doing so because they need it as a sword of collectivism—as a weapon of economic integration. Because rent supplements cannot be used in housing other than 221(d)(3) projects, there are many types of housing left which cannot be economically integrated. This disturbs some of the malcontented gentlemen in remote backrooms downtown. The rent certificate program can be used only in buildings where the owner offers to let the local housing agency put such tenants in. It seems apparent to me that most landlords are not going to invite these tenants in. Middle-class rent payers, many of whom find their rents a great strain on top of present day tax burdens, are not going to like having neighbors living in similar apartments on subsidized rents. The trick is to find housing where the landlord will invite subsidized tenants in to live with griping middle-income tenants. One such type of housing comes immediately to mind.

There is a growing class of housing in our Nation built by private builders with all-critical State and local loan and tax assistance. In effect, this is quasi-public housing. It is quite effectively controlled by the appropriate public agencies. This is the type of housing the backroom planners want to use for economic integration by way of the rent certificate.

Several weeks ago, there was a rumor in New York City that the Housing and Urban Affairs Department was contracting for rent supplements. As there is as yet no appropriation for this insidious program, I investigated. It turned out that they were preparing to make rent certificate commitments. One type of housing they were considering was Mitchell-Lama publicly subsidized housing. I said that the rent certificate program could not apply to these, citing committee hearings language, and for the moment, I thought they had backed down. Then I saw the administration housing bill.

The present language of the "rent certificate" program as enacted last year allows "rent certificates" to be used only in existing buildings. The administration would like to add to this such appropriate new construction as comes on the market. I have no objection if they mean low-income private construction similar to public housing. But this is not what they mean. The language of the proposed change in the act merely refers to making it read "structures" instead of "existing structures," but in the separate explanation of what they are trying to do, the administration refers to ventures between private builders and public authorities as being the newly built and to-be-built structures they want to apply the rent certificates to. The administration wants to put subsidized tenants in already subsidized housing.

Among others, I imagine they are after New York's Mitchell-Lama houses. These are built with State loans and city tax statements. They are effectively State controlled, so there would be no difficulty in getting the "private owner" to request a few subsidized tenants. I imagine that such a "request" could quickly become mandatory. These are middle-income houses, filled with hard-pressed middle-income taxpayers. I know full well that the tenants of these projects do not want subsidized neighbors living off Government rent handouts.

The people of New York State have turned down a proposal to put subsidized tenants into these housing projects. They did so in a State referendum. No referendum has ever supported this sort of thing. The Johnson administration is flouting the will of the tenants of Mitchell-Lama projects, the people of New York State and, I believe, the sentiments of a great majority of the people of this Nation.

As I have indicated, the rent certificate program was never meant to be warped into a sword of collectivism. It was meant as a program whereby the overflow from public housing could be put into low-cost housing which was private and unsubsidized. There was no intent to provide a second subsidy to put low-income people into subsidized middle-income housing. My bill reaffirms the intent of Congress by merely providing that rent certificates can only be used in housing which pays full taxes. This will keep the program within the original intent of the Congress.

I would like to add in closing that what the President is seeking to do with respect to aggradizement of the Federal power in urban areas, he is also seeking in rural areas. This is a national issue. Free residential patterns versus socialized residential patterns. It is an issue I intend to bring to the fore. My demonstration cities and Housing and Urban Development Act amendment bills stand for local self-determination and Federal aid as opposed to Federal control. On that basis, I think they constitute the legislation most worthy of passage.

Albert Thomas, Colleague and Friend

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, ALBERT THOMAS, U.S. Representative for the Eighth District of Texas whose passing we are mourning, fits precisely into the definition of a "gentleman." He was courteous and respectful, attentive to those with who he came in contact, and respectful of the views of others even though in conflict with his own convictions.

Congressman THOMAS was an inspiration to all who found the need for physical exercise and recreation to enable them to carry on their arduous and demanding duties as Representatives in the Congress. His significant support of physical fitness and recreation for Members of the House resulted in the installation of more adequate exercise rooms and a swimming pool in the new Rayburn House Office Building. At the dedication of these facilities I was proud to join with numerous colleagues from the U.S. House of Representatives to honor AL THOMAS, distinguished lawmaker, valued friend, and leader among men. Both at this hour and during his long years of service, Congressman ALBERT THOMAS' greatness was recognized by those whom he served.

In the course of his 15 consecutive terms in the U.S. House of Representatives he devoted himself unselfishly to issues and purposes most beneficial to mankind's development and common good. The name of ALBERT THOMAS will be remembered with affection and admiration so long as the history of the U.S. House of Representatives is recalled. I extend my sympathy to his widow and to all members of ALBERT THOMAS' family.

Proper Housing for Families of Our Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed that the Johnson-Humphrey administration places no urgency upon proper housing for families of our servicemen, and yet is pushing a bill through Congress to construct a home for Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY costing three-quarters of a million dollars.

Congress had appropriated funds last September for housing for service families which Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara arbitrarily shelved in December. The Secretary listed budget considerations and possible inflationary pressures as the reasons for his action.

It may be desirable to furnish proper housing for our Vice President, but why the rush? Why should we concern ourselves about furnishing an expensive house for the Vice President when the Secretary of Defense refuses to use the funds we have already appropriated to provide proper housing for our fighting men?

If such housing for our servicemen is to be deferred because of budget limitations and inflationary pressures then why cannot the same principles apply to the very expensive house planned for the Vice President?

The following article appeared in the February 19 Journal of the Armed Forces and points out that, although the United States has the greatest tactical weapons arsenal, the military man himself still remains the core of our strength. With this fact to build on, it would be doubly rewarding if the Defense Department eventually recognized that guts, heart, and morale draw their strength at least in part from such things as housing, pay, and medical care.

The article follows:

GUTS, HEART AND MORALE

When Dr. Thomas P. Cheatham, Jr., finished reading his prepared statement during House Armed Services Committee hearings on close air support, Representative Bob Wilson, Republican, of California, commented that he thought one of the doctor's observations should "go down in American literature."

Dr. Cheatham is Deputy Director of Defense Research and Engineering in charge of tactical warfare programs. In this assignment he is charged with broad responsibilities in the management, development, evaluation and procurement of a flexible arsenal of weapons and equipment responsive to the full range of potential tactical military targets.

But the statement Dr. Cheatham made which Congressman Wilson thought was particularly significant (and which the Journal highlighted in its February 12 report on the subcommittee's findings) went to the core of the tactical weapons arsenal—man.

Dr. Cheatham noted that in the field of strategic warfare, forces and weapons are chosen from a relatively few alternatives which are mostly scientific and logical, and which can be analyzed and war-gamed with a small, finite number of moves and countermoves. "To do the same analysis within the regime of tactical warfare," he said, "is much more difficult."

While strategic alternatives are mostly scientific and logical in nature, the DOD official observed, "we find tactical warfare alternatives are blend of both science and art, where changing and imaginative tactics are a significant variant.

"Certainly, for example, we find that tactical airpower and its component parts of close air support and intratheater logistic support are all an intimate blend of men and machines."

Dr. Cheatham said—and this was the statement to which Congressman Wilson referred:

"You cannot estimate in more than a rough quantitative fashion the cost-effectiveness of guts, heart, morale, flying skill, intuition, sixth sense, imagination, and the dedication of a fighting man in a fighting machine in a fighting environment when in defense of his country and freedom."

He added that "the technical and nontechnical factors that could be critical to define an end-game for a war as simple (but only deceptively so) as Vietnam would defy the capacity of the most modern-day computers or group of computers that we have available."

Guts, heart, and morale are certainly nontechnical factors, but they are, have always been, and will always be omnipresent, and if they cannot be taped on a DOD computer then they most certainly must be accounted for in some other fashion.

It is refreshing to hear a high-level DOD civilian acknowledge the existence of the man behind the weapon. There is a saying that men are more important than tools, and that any doubter has only to place a good tool in the hands of a poor workman.

But it might also be said that even a good tool in the hands of a good workman is not always effective if the man's heart is not in his job.

With Dr. Cheatham's statement to build on, it would be doubly rewarding if the Defense Department eventually recognized that guts, heart, and morale draw their strength at least in part from such things as housing, pay, and medical care.

Report on Space Planning—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, recently, Space Business Daily published an analytical series based on several reports issued by the National Academy of Sciences. The subject of these reports is of vital concern to the Congress and the Nation: space exploration goals and program for the 1970–85 time period.

This is the first report on a series of four.

NAS RECOMMENDS POST-APOLLO SPACE PROGRAM (A SPECIAL REPORT)

A priority list of lunar and planetary exploration goals and programs for the 1970–85 post-Apollo period has been submitted to NASA by the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences. The report, prepared by a working group of scientists under the chairmanship of Gordon J. F. MacDonald (Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, University of California), is part I of a three section report produced by the Space Science Board at the request of NASA.

Part I of the report affirms early recommendations from the Space Science Board to NASA that the unmanned exploration of Mars should have first priority in the post-Apollo period, with secondary importance divided equally to more detailed investigation of the lurain and to the unmanned exploration of Venus. Next, in exact order of priority, are exploration of: other major planets, comets and asteroids, Mercury, Pluto, and interplanetary dust.

The Lunar and Planetary Working Group said that the priorities, which it emphasized are "preliminary," were assigned on the basis "of current scientific interest and on the bases of their relevance to the questions of the origin of the solar system, the origin of life, and the understanding of the Earth." The Working Group said the priorities are "preliminary" in the sense that they should be modified by further debate among scientists in general and by the application of new data as it is acquired.

Shift from lunar to planetary exploration urged

More specifically, in regard to overall funding, the Working Group recommended that starting in the 1965–75 period a shift of emphasis be made in the NASA lunar and planetary exploration program with emphasis toward the planets and away from the Moon—a move which would result in a "roughly equal" expenditure for lunar and planetary exploration in the 1970–85 period.

Nonscientific goals termed secondary

The Working Group further recommended that support for the lunar and planetary exploration program, which currently accounts for two-thirds of NASA's budget, be maintained over the 1965–85 time period and "be devoted predominantly to scientific objectives and that programs whose objectives are other than scientific be started only as additional resources become available."

Facility-advisory structure changes urged

With the above recommendation calling for a shift from the current manned Moon landing objective to a program of lunar and planetary research in the post-Apollo period, the Space Science Board said it is mandatory to increase the manpower and facilities available to the lunar and planetary science programs.

The new program also dictates that an advisory committee to the NASA Administrator be formed, largely of non-NASA scientists, to provide advice on current and future efforts in the area of planetary and lunar exploration.

Two reports coming up soon

Parts II and III of the Space Science Board's overall report to NASA (Space Research: Directions for the Future) will be issued during the next few weeks. They will deal with four branches of astronomy and special topics in physics and geophysics; and rocket and satellite research, university programs, physiology and medicine, biology, and man's role in space research. General chairman of the study was Dr. George P. Woollard, director, Hawaii Institute of Geophysics, University of Hawaii.

NAS priorities for lunar and planetary exploration

Mars: Because of its similarity to Earth and its relevance to all of the three central problems, both early probes and landers are recommended in order to efficiently explore the planet. Highest priority in Martian exploration is given to: the existence of life, the chemistry and geology of surface water, the presence and character of carbon chemistry, micrometeorology, and identification and classification of the surface environment. Of secondary importance is the overall broadband exploration of Mars including photographic three-color reconnaissance of surface and clouds, the determination of atmospheric and surface composition, and the reconnaissance of thermal emissions from the surface in the infrared region.

Moon: The Moon and Venus are ranked almost evenly as second and third in importance in planetary exploration. The lunar exploration should concentrate on: the surface of the Moon and the processes modifying the surface; and the history or evolutionary sequence of events by which the Moon has arrived at its present configuration.

Venus: Because of our "lack of understanding" of the atmosphere, surface or interior of Venus, the totally different character of the atmosphere as compared with Mars and Earth, and the apparent paradoxes suggested by our present "limited knowledge", Venus is selected for the next priority. The Board recommended that "NASA support a program of exploration of the planet Venus over the next 10 years on a level comparable to, but perhaps slightly below, that proposed for Mars." The program outlined for the study of Venus includes theoretical studies; ground-based observations; the use of balloons, rockets, and Earth-orbiting observatories; and space probes incorporating atmospheric probes.

The major planets: Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto are ranked as fourth in importance. Because of the extremely large masses and small mean densities characterized by these planets they pose a number of extremely interesting scientific questions. An outline for exploration of these outer planets would include: ground-based observation; studies from balloons, rockets, and satellites; a fly-by mission; a general purpose orbiter; specialized orbiters such as low-altitude orbiters for geodetic purposes, eccentric orbiters for encountering satellites (of the planet) and close inclined orbiters for study of special areas like the Red Spot of Jupiter; and a planetary lander mission.

Assuming that one launch vehicle per year was available starting in 1975, the Board suggested that fly-bys could be sent to all four planets early in the period with Uranus as one of the earlier flights since a minimum energy orbit would require 14 years to encounter. This series could be followed by one or more orbiters. It was noted that data transmission from Jupiter, Saturn, and Uranus would be 12, 40 and 160 times more difficult than from Mars.

Comets asteroids: Of fifth importance in a schedule of planetary exploration is the investigation of comets, the asteroids, the various satellites of the planets, and interplanetary dust.

Mercury: This planet is considered to be next since so little is known of its physical characteristics and it would provide an interesting object to study in comparison with our Moon.

Voyager program change recommendations

Several specific recommendations of the Space Science Board have already been implemented by NASA. The Board called for a shift of the Voyager program from the Saturn I–B vehicle to the Saturn V in order to improve the effectiveness and economy of the program.

In order to meet the requirements of the exobiology mission of Voyager the Board protested the delay in the program and called at the same time for an early planetary probe of Venus. All of these recommendations have been followed by NASA with the shift from the Saturn I–B/Centaur vehicle to the Saturn V vehicle (Space Daily, Aug. 3, Oct. 4) and the reorientation of the program to provide for an early Venus probe and a Mars 1969 Voyager mission (Space Daily, Dec. 23). "High priority" should be given, however, to a simple drop (lander) sonde, measuring at least temperature and pressure of the Venusian atmosphere, which, to date, has not been included in the Venus mission.

Lunar scientific passengers

Even though NASA has selected a number of scientists to undergo astronaut training, the Board indicated that this provision is not sufficient to produce the "fruitful observational work and sampling" in the lunar exploration program. It recommended that, as soon as possible, experienced observational scientists be transported to the moon, as passengers, in addition to NASA's scientist astronauts.

The theoretical science program

In the opinion of the Board the present theoretical effort in support of the space program is "inadequate," and the cause of this situation is placed on the shift of theoretical scientists away from the classical physics and mathematics area. To correct this situation, it was recommended that NASA attempt to develop both research and educational capabilities in the theoretical physical sciences which are required to support the practical program of solar system exploration.

NAS RECOMMENDS POST-APOLLO SPACE PROGRAM

(A SPECIAL REPORT)—PART II

(This is the second part of a three-part report on the National Science Foundation's recommendations for a national space program to follow Apollo.)

Upper atmospheric planetary research

The Space Science Board reports no "urgent national motivation" for investigation of the upper atmospheres of the planets, but it does see, relative to this Nation's overall planetary exploration effort, some "important," "desirable," and "interesting" motivations for such study (in that order).

It says, "There are valid practical reasons for considering upper atmosphere studies in a separate category, but * * * they constitute only one aspect of a complete study. Were the matter one of individual preference for research activity at rather modest costs, no problems would exist. But the emphasis here is on research that forms part of multi-billion-dollar programs, so that the matter of motivation ceases to be mainly private and individual."

The "important" motivations are exobiological. "The escape temperature of the planetary exosphere governs the rate of loss of atmospheric constituents and is a basic parameter to the evolutionary study of a planet. It can be obtained directly from certain spectroscopic observations." Also, "upper atmosphere studies may furnish information on atmospheric constitutents that are important" to a general exobiological search for life.

The "desirable" motivations focus on Jupiter: "After the question of extraterrestrial life, the history of the solar system stands as probably the most important scientific question directly related to the space sciences. We suspect that Jupiter, as the largest and nearest of the major planets, may contain much hidden information bearing on this larger question. It will be important to understand the evolution of the Jovian atmosphere, and upper atmosphere observations that bear on this study should now be considered especially desirable."

The "interesting" motivations concern the comparative composition of the planets' atmospheres. "A purely academic approach to research (in this area) could turn up the most exciting finds."

The recommendations

The Board recommends a diversified program to study upper atmospheres. The program would involve small probes to at least Mars, Venus, and Jupiter; Earth-orbiting laboratories; sounding rockets; balloons; and Earth observatories. It should be "flexible" and "based on minimum space hardware."

The probes should be launched "at every suitable opportunity over the next 10 years." Also, "to involve the academic community in an effective way, an organizational and engineering study should be made to determine the minimum possible leadtime between submission of a good proposal and launch. A target of 2.5 years is suggested, and this is already so long as to be a serious impediment to the involvement of important sections of the scientific community."

The Earth-orbiting labs should include (1) "at least one OAO (Orbiting Astronomical Observatory) with versatile spectrographic equipment" and (2) a platform with a 100-inch telescope, "preferably with manned support."

For the sounding rockets, "immediate steps (should) be taken to develop a fine pointing control capable of guiding the entire payload to 10 seconds of arc with a maximum jitter of plus or minus 2 seconds and maintaining the orientation for 30 seconds of time."

The recommended subjects and means of study are: (1) composition, temperature, and electron densities—orbiter or fly-by; (2) airglow—ground observatory or balloon; (3) densities (from drag measurements)—orbiters (Venus in particular); (4) magnetic fields—fly-by; (5) constitution and escape temperature (from resonance lines)—orbiter or fly-by; (6) raman spectra—rocket on Earth orbiter; (7) composition and density (from ultraviolet photometry)—Earth orbiter, rocket, balloon; (8) vertical distributions of absorbers—orbiter or fly-by; (9) composition (from far infrared emissions)—Earth orbiter; and (10) density (from occulations)—orbiter or fly-by.

NAS RECOMMENDS POST-APOLLO SPACE PROGRAM

(A SPECIAL REPORT)—PART III

(This is the third of a three part report on the National Academy of Sciences' recommendations for a national space program to follow Apollo.)

Optical telescopic research

As a relatively low-cost project within the overall planetary exploration effort, the Board proposes as "particularly important" a project with a "large, ground-based optical telescope."

The Board notes: "There are examples in recent years of programs of planetary observations that have not had the priority they should have been accorded if they had been considered in the light of their importance to an expensive national program. Priorities in astrophysical observatories are, quite rightly, awarded on the basis of overall contribution to astronomy. In order to introduce a different set of priorities it will be necessary for NASA to continue and probably expand its support of ground observatories in a few locations.

"The type of observation most needed at the present time for planning future missions is high spectral resolution spectrometry and high spatial resolution photometry on Jupiter, Mars, Venus, and Mercury. Long-term programs with maximum variation of parameters should be made."

The areas such programs should embrace are: (1) repeated thermal mapping of Venus, Mars, and Jupiter—"It cannot be overemphasized that such observations are potentially just as valuable and may even accomplish the same results as certain space probe observations; e.g. thermal mapping from orbiters. What telescopic observations lack in spatial resolution they make up in (a) accessibility * * * (b) repeatability, and (c) flexibility * * *"; (2) repeated quantitative observations of Venus terminator to augment thermal mapping—"We cannot responsibly ask for deep space probes to investigate planetary structure unless these observations have been developed to the maximum extent possible."; (3) repeated spatial and spectral resolution of Venusian carbon-dioxide bands—"We can hope for pressure, concentration, and temperature measurements as a function of time and related to changes in height and motions of clouds."; (4) repeated spectrographic study of Martian carbon-dioxide bands; (5) study of Martian terminator—"[It] has not been investigated properly. It could yield a surface pressure and some information on the meterology of dust clouds."; (6) study of Martian water vapor—"It is possible that a water-vapor feature on Mars could be used to trace water transfer; this is one of the prime questions of biological interest"; (7) study of Martian and Venusian glows—"The Venus and Mars dayglow, nightglow, and atmospheric fluorescence (ring effect) should be thoroughly investigated."

The Board does not think the status quo can meet these needs: "These and other telescopic programs vital to the planetary missions will, with present facilities, either not be performed at all or only in a perfunctory way. The expansion of facilities proposed by the (1964 NAS) Whitford report * * * may partly relieve this problem, but it is still dangerous to leave the demands of a large national program subject to the priorities of groups which are not directly involved. The two telescopes at present under construction with NASA funds are a more direct contribution, but the entire experiment contemplated at present may be insufficient for these reasons:

"(a) The high spatial and spectral resolution discussed requires the largest telescopes available.

"Practical considerations suggest that attention should be focused upon a telescope similar to the 150-inch Kitt Peak, Tucson, Ariz.) instrument, since this is on the way to development. There are no plans to give planetary observations overriding priority for long periods on such an instrument.

"(b) We are dealing with a meteorological type of geophysical problem. Variability is [its] essence. * * * The programs discussed * * * have to be repeated on a routine basis. Such programs would never be contemplated by classical astronomers * * * but, from the point of view of NASA's expenditures, the costs are very low indeed. Thus the equipment asked for by the Whitford report will not be available for the time that we consider necessary.

"(c) The Whitford committee had no information on the extent of the large scientific program planned by this study group.

"(d) There are sound reasons for a longitudinal and Southern Hemisphere coverage in connection with the space program that may not be met by the instruments recommended per the Whitford report."

The Board declines to submit exact proposals to NASA for expansion in the optical telescope field. It does, however, make two general recommendations: (1) "NASA [should] give very high priority to the construction of ground-based telescopic equipment to the extent required to provide maximum support to the planetary flight program," and (2) "NASA and the Academy [should] make a joint study of the program that could be undertaken in planetary astronomy, with the aim of identifying the gap between existing and projected instruments and the needs of planetary exploration."

The Board adds and emphasizes this comment: "It should be pointed out that NASA is not being asked to support academic astronomy but to support its own interests. * * * We know of examples where existing facilities have been insufficient and we know of detailed planning based on slipshod observations leading to avoidable situations in which poor science was backed by huge Federal funds: we foresee more and more acute problems in the future."

Making the Most of Kentucky Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the third annual Governors' Conference on Forestry, Lexington, Ky., on February 16, 1966:

MAKING THE MOST OF KENTUCKY'S FORESTS

(By Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the third annual Governors' Conference on Forestry, Lexington, Ky., February 16, 1966)

I am very pleased to participate in this third annual Governors' Conference on Forestry. These past few years have been especially exciting for everyone interested in the resources and people of your great State. As a forester, and as a friend of Kentucky, I am personally delighted with the outstanding progress in forestry that is taking place here.

This series of Governors' conferences is just one indication of the high-level, well planned new emphasis on forestry in Kentucky. Governor Breathitt, Commissioner Jack Matlick, State Forester Gene Butcher, members of the State legislature, and all of the others responsible for this energetic leadership are to be congratulated. I am glad that the Forest Service is a participating member of your team.

The progress that your State forestry organization has made in the last 10 years or so is truly outstanding. In 1956 you had only 11 Service foresters; today you have 30 or more. Then your tree nursery output was 6.3 million; now you produce 12 million trees per year.

In 1956 about 6,700 acres were planted on State and private land; last year 16,400 acres were planted.

The average area burned each year is now 70,000 acres less than it was in 1957. An additional 2.5 million acres have been brought under fire protection through the Clarke-McNary cooperative forest fire control program. During the period 1957–64, only 1.2 percent of the protected land was burned over annually—twice as good as the average in the preceding 8-year period—but still not good enough. More recently, Kentucky was one of five States selected for the establishment of a rural fire defense training project. Noteworthy accomplishments have already been reported from the 23-country project.

Ten years ago only 450 woodland owners were assisted through your cooperative forest management program. In 1965 more than 3,000 owners were assisted in management of their woodlands—and the acreage involved had almost tripled.

Ten years ago Kentucky had a whale of a job to do—not only in rehabilitating a forest that had been long abused, but in protecting a battered resource from further damage. It seems to me that you have turned the corner now. The downward trend has been reversed and your State now has built up one of the Nation's top forestry organizations. It has been a spectacular story of achievement—perhaps unsurpassed by any other State during this period.

Fires and pests and floods—insufficient resource management—these and other old familiar problems will continue to demand your attention. But with the progress you have made, and a firm base established, you have a good chance to move ahead into a new phase. Now one of your most pressing jobs seems to be to find ways to utilize your forest resources most effectively. That's really what this conference is all about.

I am impressed by the forests of your State. They are naturally beautiful. They also have great productive potential. Some of the finest timber ever grown has been logged from the slopes and coves of Kentucky, and much of the land is still capable of producing new hardwood crops of top quality.

The new forest survey data for Kentucky reveal an encouraging picture of timber as a basis for economic growth. Incidentally, the forest survey provides a good example of the close cooperation that exists between the Forest Service and your State agencies. Working together, we have collected a vast amount of reliable resource data. Reports are beginning to flow as the statistics and trends are analyzed. A substantial improvement in the statewide timber situation has occurred since our previous survey was completed in 1949.

About 46 percent of the land area in Kentucky—more than 11.7 million acres—is now classed as commercial forest land. This is a slight net increase from previous figures. However, in the eastern part of the State there is a stronger upward trend—for example, about 5 percent in the southern Cumberland Unit and as much as 16 percent in some counties since 1949.

More than 90 percent of the timber-producing land is in farmer and miscellaneous private ownership. The public forests and forest industry lands account for only a minor portion of the timber resources. Many thousands of people must become involved in improving resource utilization, marketing, and land management.

The forests still need a lot of improvement. About half of the commercial forest land is in seedlings and saplings or pole timber-size trees—below sawlog size. Only 38 percent of the forest area is well stocked with desirable trees. Growing conditions are classed as poor and unfavorable on 6 out of 10 forest acres. Clearly much remains to be done before your resource potential is reached.

Kentucky forests are young—they are still rebounding from the heavy cuts of the past. Half of the timber stands are less than 40 years old. Forty percent of the volume is in trees less than 11 inches in diameter. Yet the volume of growing stock is already about 7.4 billion cubic feet—including 26 billion board feet of sawtimber. As you know, more than 90 percent of this volume is in hardwood species.

The survey shows a favorable balance between growth and cut on an overall basis. The net annual growth in 1963 was estimated to total about 362 million cubic feet. In 1962 the timber cut amounted to about one-third that volume. Thus, the forests are building up toward a more productive level of stocking. We estimate that it would be desirable to increase the 1962 level of cut by about 60 percent. Both growth and quality can be improved by thinning overstocked areas and removing more of the less desirable trees.

One of the most serious problems is the overcutting of high-grade, large sawtimber trees and trees of preferred species. There are fewer of those trees available now than there were in 1949. Reversal of this trend is a key factor in any long-term effort to improve utilization and marketing of timber in Kentucky and throughout Appalachia.

Making the most of Kentucky's forests involves stakes that are far greater than those encompassed by your borders. The progress you make here in the Bluegrass State has great significance throughout Appalachia and indeed wherever second-growth hardwood forests occur. Your approach to these problems and the solutions you hammer out will be of deep interest to many, many people.

An expanded wood industry will be possible only if increasing competition from nonwood materials is successfully met. This means, among other things, that production costs must be lowered and marketing effectiveness improved. Unless more wood products can be sold, your timber resources will continue to be underutilized—it is as simple as that.

I would like to tell you about some of the work that we in the Forest Service are doing to help find those solutions.

Our research scientists are concentrating their efforts on many items of direct concern to you. For one thing, they are analyzing trends in the use of hardwoods and competing materials. Scientific knowledge of where wood products—those used in construction, manufacturing and shipping for example—are gaining or losing markets, is obviously a basic need.

Related studies are aimed at determining who makes the choice between wood or other materials and why. The architect, the builder, the homeowner, the writer of the building codes, and others are involved. Their choice is influenced by relative costs, esthetic values, durability, availability, and so forth. This happens whether it is kitchen cabinets, window frames, or the flooring in a huge apartment building that is involved. We need to know more about how this decisionmaking process actually works.

Exploring avenues of possible cost reduction all along the way between the stump and the final product is a huge area of our research. If you ever had a lemonade stand when you were a child you know how vital it is to beat the competitor's prices. Unless you can produce what you want to sell at a price that will attract buyers you might as well close up shop. Wood-using industries are in a real price-cost squeeze and our scientists are working overtime to help ease the pinch. This involves developing improved harvesting techniques—including bucking logs for improved grade yield; more efficient processing equipment; better shipping and marketing methods; and a variety of related studies.

Development of new or improved wood products and markets is another very important area of research. You know the story about building a better mousetrap—our scientists at the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison and elsewhere have done this on a tremendous scale. In addition, they have opened up whole new horizons. The greatly expanded use of hardwood species for pulp is one outstanding example.

Another research activity of special significance throughout Appalachia involves feasibility studies—that is, studies which evaluate opportunities for timber-based industrial expansion in specific locations. This work entails analyses of prospective markets; review of supplies of timber, labor, capital, power, transportation, etc.; and an evaluation of costs, returns, and other pertinent factors. They are a basic first step toward more effective use of timber resources.

The list of our research projects in this broad field of utilization and marketing is a long one. Perhaps two examples may help to illustrate what I am talking about. One study is aimed at developing a low-cost, low-profile wood floor system—a type of construction that can compete with slab-on-the-ground design. This could be quite significant because, on the average, a wood frame house contains 4,400 more board feet of lumber and 800 more square feet of plywood than is the case when a house is built on a concrete slab. This can add up to a lot of timber.

In another project, we are working with industry and Goverment leaders to develop ways and means of utilizing wood in a massive slum rehabilitation project in New York City. If competition with other materials is successful, this could mean orders for 580 million square feet of flooring among other items. And that project only scratches the surface in meeting urban renewal needs of this type throughout the country.

Similar work includes studies relating to lumber, furniture, flooring, pallets, veneer, plywood, pulp—indeed every major forest product that can be produced and marketed in Kentucky.

Our overall forestry research program includes many other areas of vital concern to Kentucky people, in addition to utilization and marketing. Scores of these projects can help you make the most of Kentucky's forests. Strip-mine restoration is one of the dozens of examples that come to mind.

But our Forest Service responsibility does not end when results of a utilization or marketing research project are published. We need to make sure that the people who need this information and can use it are kept informed. In the past we have expected our research staff to do the whole job in putting these research findings to work.

We have now divided this responsibility. We expect research scientists to continue to assist in providing technical assistance and advice on specially difficult, nonroutine problems which occur in their area of responsibility. But we have recently assigned the primary task of keeping industry informed to our State and private forestry specialists. This change was necessary because of increasingly heavy demands on Forest Service scientists to do more research, and because of the pressing need to provide more technical help in applying research information.

The new approach involves a gradual phasing out of the research group in providing direct technical assistance to wood processing plants. Now, utilization and marketing personnel engaged in cooperative forestry work will give direct day-to-day service to loggers and wood processors.

The Forest Service and the State foresters will work together to do the job. Utilization and marketing personnel, both State and Federal, will use all suitable media to keep industry people informed about research findings. These men will cooperate closely with other agencies in this effort. In addition, they will supply scientists with feedback information to help identify problems and needs which require additional study.

The forest service is now preparing a training plan for utilization and marketing personnel. This plan will outline the type of skills needed by forest service specialists and by the State service foresters working in this field. We plan to accomplish the initial training as quickly and as effectively as possible. Additional training will be provided for utilization and marketing personnel as needed. Developing a more effective system for assisting wood processors and for disseminating research information has high priority among our cooperative forestry programs.

We will be working closely with State forestry agencies to achieve this new emphasis—just as we are working with the Kentucky Division of Forestry in reforestation, pest control, fire protection, rural areas development and so forth. Our specialists will work with Chauncey Lohr, for example, to make new information available when and where it is needed within the State.

As loggers and timber processors overcome their technical problems and gain economic strength, new job opportunities are created. And as we use timber more effectively and more completely, the earning potential of the land is increased. Eventually a combination of these factors can help alleviate poverty and raise the standard of living in timber-producing regions of the country. We are enthusiastic about this new emphasis on utilization and marketing—we see it as a program that is concerned with both people and wood.

Bringing timber and people together is part of the answer in making the most of Kentucky's forests. I think that cooperatives or associations of forest landowners could help to assure supplies of timber for industry. They could improve timber markets for landowners, and make possible more efficient wood processing operations. Ready cash and prices that reflect log quality would provide new incentives to the landowner; a source of graded logs would attract the veneer or sawmill man; the pulpwood buyer could tap new supplies of timber; specialty mills would find additional supplies of certain species and sizes made available to them. All of these add up to greater incentives for improved forestry practices.

Much of what I have talked about this morning is closely related to the Appalachia program. Out utilization and marketing research program, for example, has been strengthened because of the impetus of the law enacted last March. We are working closely with the Commission in developing the timber development organization concept. Together with other agencies, we are deeply involved in the survey of strip-mined areas. Access road construction on the national forest has been stepped up—and, so the story goes. We are beefing up the full range of our activities in Appalachia to the fullest extent possible.

We are pleased about our progress to date in establishing the Redbird unit of the national forest system. Thanks to the top level leadership and support here in your State, and from your congressional delegation, we have made a good start in acquiring the headwater areas that should be protected and managed as public lands. By the first of July we hope to have a district ranger on the scene—probably working out of Manchester.

Although the theme of you meeting this year is timber oriented, let's not lose sight of the nontimber values and opportunities to be found in the forests of Kentucky. This alone could be the subject of an entire conference.

As I said earlier, your State is naturally a beautiful one. As forests continue to cover up the scars remaining from the darker years of the past, it will become even more beautiful. Flood control, soil stabilization, strip-mine restoration and so forth, will pay handsomely, just as your efforts of the last 10 years are paying off now. Tourism, recreation, wildlife, stable watersheds, and other benefits will flow from the multiple uses of managed and protected forests. Timber harvesting is an important part of making the most of Kentucky's forests—but it is only a part.

Thank you for this opportunity to address the opening session of your conference. On behalf of your many friends in the forest service I commend you for what you have accomplished already. We wish you every success in the years ahead.

The Last Pocket of Poverty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the great rush by the Great Society to do great things for America's great masses, there has been a shocking and, one can only think, purposeful hog-tying of this Nation's self-sustaining segment. The politically popular push to have the Government protect the rights of every cause and every individual may be justifiable, but, without also fostering the protection of our inventive entrepreneur from invasion by this same Government, the imbalance becomes precariously dangerous.

I ask my colleagues to read the following comments offered by the president of the Strategic Industries Association, William O. Fisher, as taken from their November-December Bulletin:

THE LAST POCKET OF POVERTY?

(By William O. Fisher)

It has been said that the last session of Congress was one of the most productive in our history. Few would disagree that almost every segment of the circle of individual rights and dignities has been touched upon by our legislators. It is not our purpose here to consider the merits of this legislative action—but it is our purpose to support vigorously the principle that individual and personal rights are inviolate and must be protected against any form of infringement—whether such rights are civil, are in private property or are in the conceptions of the mind.

Great steps have been taken by Congress to protect personal rights and dignities—to care for the elderly in times of illness—to protect the minorities against infringement of their equal rights to an education, to own property of their choice, and most important, to cast a free vote—to provide guidance to that small number of our youth who have decided against even a secondary education—to provide equal rights to job training and mobility to the unfortunates who are deprived of livelihood in areas subjected to economic starvation—and yes, even to preserve the right of the motorist driving on interstate highways to scan the horizon without the blemish of a road sign. Each of these issues deals in some measure with the dignity and the rights of the individual.

But what about one of the remaining segments of that circle of individual rights and dignities—that circle which intends to encompass the Great Society? This would be the inventive, competitive entrepreneur, supplying the Government directly or indirectly; who wishes to provide for his own healthy long life and sustenance; who wants to create his own technology at his own expense, and to be able to protect it as private property from invasion by others; who wants to operate freely in a competitive society with the inherent risks related thereto but without the inhibiting regulatory roadblocks created to control those who invent for and are subsidized by the Government. Where is the long-hoped-for legislative action to protect the individual rights of this self-sustaining segment of our society?

Have you heard of any legislation restoring the rights of a patent holder to assert a claim of infringement against the infringer rather than the Government—where the Government has encouraged infringement through contractual protection of the infringer? No—you haven't—even though several bills have been drafted in the House and Senate during the last two sessions of Congress—none of which have been reported out of committee.

Have you heard of any change in approach by the General Accounting Office—even after a special hearing was conducted in the House on the very subject? No—you haven't.

Have you noticed any lessening in the implementation of public laws dealing with costs, pricing, audits and the like beyond that intended by Congress—particularly as such implementation flows down to the smaller, fixed-price private developer? No—you haven't—except for Mr. McNamara's recent statement of concern over the survival of this private developer.

We would suggest that much of the legislative action during this last session was directed toward the Government's providing for and protecting the rights of those who, in today's society, have difficulty in doing so themselves—which is as it should be. Is it paradoxical, then, to suggest that similar action might be taken to provide for and protect the individual rights of the inventive entrepreneur from invasion by this same Government?

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Congressional Chartering of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week commemorates the 50th anniversary of the congressional chartering of the Boy Scouts of America. We salute the members of this organization and their leaders who have contributed so greatly to the growth of America's leaders and potential leaders.

Fifty years of progressive guidance for our young people through the Boy Scouts has produced a tradition measured not only within the boundaries of America but throughout the world.

In Syracuse and Onondaga County, N.Y., there are thousands of young boys who are taught honor to God and country. Within this nationwide organization our young realize the satisfaction of responsibility and the pride of hard work and achievement. They progress within the bounds of capable leadership. They realize the satisfaction of fellowship and the pleasure of solitude. Within the Boy Scouts is the gift of brotherhood.

Offers a Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Constitution believes that President Johnson's renewed plea for peace in Vietnam "goes further than any of his previous utterances."

The paper points out that the President has called for honest negotiations and self-determination for South Vietnam, and has offered massive aid for a reconstruction program in both North and South Vietnam.

The paper states:

> Once more the President puts the struggle in Vietnam in proper perspective.

In the belief that many of my colleagues will want to read this article, I insert it in the RECORD:

PRESIDENT OFFERS A CHOICE

President Johnson's renewed plea for peace in Vietnam goes further than any of his previous utterances. In a ceremony marking the fifth anniversary of the Peace Corps, the President invited leaders of North Vietnam to negotiate peace "and let war stand aside while the people of Vietnam choose."

Pointing out a fact that must be known to Hanoi's leaders, the President declared that victory is beyond expectation for them. He thus calls for honest negotiations and self-determination for South Vietnam, offering massive aid for a reconstruction program in both North and South Vietnam.

After peace and freedom of choice are established in the south, the President declared, "all the people of Vietnam can freely express their will on the great questions of unification and national destiny."

The President again made it quite clear that the United States has no aspirations of conquest or of imposing its will on the Vietnamese people. He made it equally clear that we will not retreat from our ordeal of war, which the North Vietnamese cannot win. Our desire for peace springs not from weakness or hesitation, he said, but from a "recognition * * * that the search for peace requires great skill and great courage."

Once more the President puts the struggle in Vietnam in proper perspective. We will not abandon South Vietnam to aggression and terror but are willing to negotiate an honorable end to the conflict and to leave it to both North and South Vietnam to seek their own destinies.

Report on Space Planning—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, this is the second of four summaries of a report by the National Academy of Sciences on recommended future space activities.

NAS RECOMMENDS SPACE-ASTRONOMY PROGRAM—I

An increased effort on such programs as the now canceled AOSO program (Space Daily, Dec. 16), ATOM (Space Daily, Jan. 24), LOT and MOT has been recommended by the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences in part II of its report, "Space Research: Directions for the Future." (See Space Daily, Jan. 17 and 19 for part I of the report.)

The report was prepared by a working group of scientists, under the direction of George P. Woollard, University of Hawaii, which convened last summer at Woods Hole, Mass. The report was prepared at the request of NASA. Space Agency contributors to the report included Dr. Homer Newell, Associate Administrator for Space Science and Applications, and William B. Taylor, Director of the Apollo Applications Office.

Optical astronomy

The following recommendations were made regarding a short-range program, covering the period 1965–75.

1. The number of coarse-pointing sounding rockets available each year for optical space astronomy should be doubled from the present level. A fine-pointing system for Aerobee rockets should be made generally available as soon as feasible.

2. Two or more telescopes having apertures of 40 inches or larger should be included in the Apollo applications (AA) program. The Orbiting Astronomical Observatory (OAO) program should be continued until AA launchings are definitely scheduled. Recommended experiments: High-resolution imagining; infrared photometry and spectrophotometry with cyrogenics; planetary spectroscopy in the ultraviolet; polarization and photometry; X-rays.

3. Development of various detectors required in space telescopes should be supported by NASA. These include infrared devices, image-registering devices using solid-state detection, new photographic emulsions, cryogenic apparatus, and television techniques for astronomical use.

4. Development of improved gratings and echelles, especially for ultraviolet work.

5. Development of optical interferometers should be pressed, with probably initial operation on the ground.

6. R. & D. concerned with problems of space-telescope optics, especially with the primary mirror, should be supported by NASA.

7. Support of ground-based astronomy should be increased.

8. Studies toward development of a large orbiting telescope (LOT), which would be used after 1975, should be undertaken. The space telescope would have a resolution corresponding to an aperture of at least 120 inches. Man may play an important role for LOT. AA could be an important forerunner of the manned high-resolution LOT.

Solar astronomy

The working group considered the time period 1965–80 and made recommendations for specific experiments that might be initiated in three periods 1965–70, 1970–75, and beyond 1975. (The group said its study was based on the NASA Office of Space Science and Applications' Prospectus 1965, listing program opportunities for 1966–85—in a draft dated June 10, 1965. The prospectus is based on two possible situations: a constant budget—called the minimal growth program—and a 5-percent-a-year increase above this. Note: the AOSO was still in the NASA program at the time the working group made its recommendations.

1. The Aerobee sounding rocket program should continue to receive full support, with highest priority given to the development of triaxially stabilized rocket attitude controls. (The working group pointed out that Britain has successfully flown three solar-pointed Skylark rockets, placing them ahead of the United States in one branch of solar research.) Other improvements, such as increased payloads, peak altitudes, increased reliability and more dependable recovery techniques, should be made in existing rocket systems. The number of rockets available per year for research in solar astronomy should be at least doubled (25 to 40 Aerobee-150 rockets will be needed each year from now until 1975). Funds for payload development should be increased to an adequate level.

2. The presently approved Orbiting Solar Observatory (OSO) program should be augmented by at least four additional launchings during the 1970–72 period. No decision should be made to terminate OSO after 1972 without further review at an appropriate time. NASA should make every effort to improve OSO, i.e., increased power, offset pointing, localized raster scans, provision for slightly longer instruments, greater data capacity and more flexible format, and improved pointing accuracy. Consideration should be given to injection of one or more OSO craft into a polar retrograde orbit.

3. The Advanced Orbiting Solar Observatory (AOSO) is an indispensable next step in NASA's solar program and must be flown close to the coming solar maximum. The working group said AOSO cannot be replaced during the 1970–75 period. (Since the report, the AOSO has been terminated by NASA. See Space Daily, Dec. 16, Jan. 21, and Jan. 25).

4. Manned missions in the 1968–72 time period, such as the Astronomical Telescope Orientation Mount (ATOM) in AA, are desirable to supplement AOSO, but cannot replace it. (See Space Daily, Jan. 24, 25, and 26.) Nonetheless, the ATOM concept merits vigorous support.

5. Solar space observations should be included in the manned space science program of the AA program.

6. Feasibility and design studies should begin immediately on solar telescopes to follow AOSO. These Manned Orbiting Telescopes (MOT) should have at least a 1-meter aperture designed to obtain a resolution of 0.1 seconds of arc at visible wavelengths and 0.5 seconds of arc at far ultraviolet wavelengths. Erection, operation and maintenance of this telescope will require full utilization of astronaut-engineers and scientists.

7. Provisions should be made for a continuing, uninterrupted experimental program while the more advanced manned flights are in preparation, with many flights of various spacecraft, so that a scientist will have frequent opportunities for observation.

8. NASA should find means to continue a strong program with relatively inexpensive rockets and small unmanned satellites at the same time the large manned projects are underway.

9. When a single, large scientific instrument is carred on a manned space flight, scientific observations should be designated the primary mission for the flight.

10. NASA should bring more scientists into the spaceflight program as astronauts or observers.

11. NASA should move to provide additional support for ground-based solar studies. This would include a few major ground-based solar installations.

12. Increased support should be given to physical research in the laboratory as required to develop improved space instrumentation for solar physics research, to assist in data reduction, and to make possible a full interpretation of the results. Lyman Spitzer, Princeton University Observatory was chairman of the Working Group of Optical Astronomy; and Leo Goldberg, Harvard University, headed the Working Group on Solar Astronomy.

NAS RECOMMENDS SPACE-ASTRONOMY PROGRAM—II

In addition to examination of the areas of optical astronomy and solar astronomy (Space Daily, Feb. 2), working groups of the Space Science Board's Woods Hole, Mass., study considered these other programs in the general classification of astronomy.

Radio and radar astronomy

The following recommendations cover major instrumental and observational advances which should take place over the next 15 years.

1. The Radio Astronomy Explorer (RAE) satellite series should be continued and expanded. At peak rate, launches of at least 1 a year will be needed. Leadtimes for approval of programs for RAE must be reduced. Two RAE satellites should be flown near sunspot maximum.

2. The National Academy of Sciences should appoint a panel to study possible conceptions of a space radio telescope with an aperture of 20 kilometers to initiate studies of the scientific and engineering problems connected with its construction.

3. Work should start now on a high-resolution, broad-band antenna system for radio-astronomical observations (in connection with No. 2). The antenna could be a possible payload for AA (Apollo Applications).

4. The exploitation of millimeter-wave and far infrared observing capabilities from ground-based, aircraft-borne, and balloon-borne facilities should be encouraged and supported by NASA.

5. NASA should make studies of the technology, feasibility, and cost of building space telescopes with apertures of 100 feet. Launching and maintenance of such a telescope could possibly be a part of AA.

6. NASA should vigorously support ground-based radar astronomy studies.

7. NASA should include in the Voyager series planetary orbiters containing a swept or multifrequency radar system to detect and measure any planetary ionosphere. The first Voyager to approach Jupiter should carry instruments designed to study the planets magnetosphere, ionosphere, and atmosphere.

8. NASA should include in the Voyager series investigations by means of bistatic radar systems with one element of the radar on Earth and the other on the probe. A similar experiment where the probe is occulted by the planet is recommended for study of planetary atmospheres and ionospheres.

9. Lunar orbiter missions should be used by NASA to test instruments suggested for Nos. 7 and 8, as well as for gathering data on the moon. These missions would again be possible payloads for AA.

10. A substantial extension of existing radio and radar observations of the solar corona and interplanetary medium is recommended. Suitable interplanetary probes (RAE) would be launched in conjunction with ground stations. The ground-based equipment should be regarded as a national facility and its construction given high priority.

11. NASA should devote a much larger fraction of its resources to the construction of ground-based deep-space telecommunications terminals, with the objective of increasing the amount of information that will be returned from solar and planetary spacecraft now proposed.

As for the question of the use of the lurain for radio and radar astronomy, the working group stated: "From a strictly scientific point of view, despite the possible attraction of the back of the moon as an interference-free site, all the future plans that the group considered appeared to be more easily and better done in orbit than on the moon."

Solar radio and radar astronomy

1. A substantial extension in existing radio and radar observations of the sun should be made. Large, new, versatile instruments, to be regarded as a national facility, should be constructed. The national facility should be given highest priority so that observation may be started during the coming sunspot maximum.

2. A series of solar RAE satellites should be flown during the sunspot maximum, to provide data on low-frequency characteristics of solar radio bursts.

Remarks of President John W. Oswald to Members of the Kentucky General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the University of Kentucky, my alma mater, recently concluded its centennial year. During that time its board and faculty conceived a new academic plan, a program which is attracting the attention of leading American educators.

The other day, as the centennial year ended, members of the Kentucky General Assembly were guests of the university. Dr. Oswald, the dynamic president of the University of Kentucky, spoke to them and outlined the academic plan and other events of the year. I believe his message has real value to Kentuckians especially and to the academic community in general.

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT JOHN W. OSWALD, TO MEMBERS OF THE KENTUCKY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

We are coming now to the close of an enjoyable day, and a busy day. I would like, however, to take a few more minutes of your time to share with you some of our hopes and dreams here at the university.

As you know, 1965 was our centennial year, the celebration of our 100th birthday. It has been a great year here on the campus and at our community colleges. And, by the same token, I hope and believe that our Commonwealth has shared in those triumphs, both major and minor.

During the past 52 weeks the leadership of the world of politics, the world of commerce and industry, and the academic world—that leadership has made its way to the Lexington campus—and the buildings of our community colleges.

The President of the United States joined us to speed us into our second century of service. The delightful leader of the minority party in the U.S. Senate, Senator Everett Dirksen, came to help us dedicate the statue of the great Kentuckian Alben W. Barkley. The Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren, dedicated our law school building. And—just a few days ago—the Ambassador to the United Nations, Dr. Arthur J. Goldberg, helped us celebrate the 101st birthday of this great institution.

This afternoon and tonight we have you as our guests—the leadership of our great State, the members of the Kentucky General Assembly and our executive officers.

It is fitting and proper that we join together for you, the members of the general assembly, and we, the members of the University of Kentucky family, are in a very real sense cotrustees of an important phase of higher education in our Commonwealth.

In these past several weeks you have demonstrated your belief and support of higher education and the university. And now we here must assume the responsibility you have entrusted to us. The stockholders of our university, which is to say every Kentuckian, are watching us in the discharge of those sacred obligations.

Actually, our cotrusteeship, yours and ours, is not of recent vintage. We have been joined in a crusade for higher education for many decades.

Your basketball program today made brief mention of that association. It told how the first chief executive of this institution found his first lodgings in the home of Henry Clay.

A few years later the general assembly assumed responsibility for the fledgling institution then known as the Agricultural and Mechanical College. However, that burden was not undertaken without several years of debate and the news columns of that day called the discussions bitter.

On one side in those early days there were those who felt that higher education was solely the responsibility of private institutions.

Opposing them were those who felt that the instruction of the youth of the State was the responsibility of the Commonwealth. They felt that if the mission were left to private schools, only the children of the wealthy would be able to afford such education.

Ultimately, those who felt the public responsible prevailed and the general assembly took the institution in charge.

We then today face the mutual mission in terms of the 20th century. Just what is that mission today?

The late Adlai Stevenson summed up the mission in a speech at Columbia University.

He said, "The university is the archive of the Western World, it is the keeper of Western culture, the guardian of our heritage, the teacher of our teachers. The dwelling place of the free mind."

And then, in still another speech, Governor Stevenson declared that "We must make it clear that the goal of education is to teach Western man not only just to survive but to make man and the world what God intended them to be."

It is with thoughts and definitions such as those that during this past year the university embarked on two special programs during its centennial year.

One involved the extension of the community college system to still other areas of our State, to extend the service of the university to added thousands of young people and old who seek an understanding of Western culture.

That task, of seeking problems to solve, is continuing. That mission of extending university facilities is a never-ending mission.

The other program involves the new academic plan.

It has been said, and I claim no authorship, that American institutions of higher learning are producing overtrained and undereducated products. The University of Kentucky faculty took cognizance of that accusation. Studies were conducted, surveys were made, conferences were held.

But unlike many other studies, surveys and conferences, results were forthcoming.

Thus, in September of this year, all freshmen students entering your university will be enrolled in the college of arts and science.

There, under proper counsel and guidance, they will undertake an examination of several of the broad fields of study, the several fields of academic discipline.

They shall be exposed to the literature of the ages, the discovery of the scientists, the philosophy of the economist and the sociologist, the exacting mental exercises of the mathematician and linquist.

And then at the close of 2 years they shall, by virtue of their probing and study, be better able to make that all-important choice, the choice of the field to which they want to devote their life.

But in doing so, in making their choice, they shall not be unaware of the activity of their neighbor.

The engineer will understand the searching of the historian.

The teacher will be aware of the trials and tribulations of the businessman.

The lawyer will share the fears and joys of the sociologist.

Hopefully—all this will make for a well-rounded personality, the educated person.

I could go on to recite details, to dot the "I" and cross the "T." But the hour is growing late and we have had a good day together.

I believe then it is sufficient to say that of all the events of the centennial year, of all the joys we have experienced, of all the projects undertaken, the creation, development and adoption of the academic program will go down in the annals of Kentucky higher education as the most significant and long-lasting project of the dozens conceived and executed.

If our anticipations become our realizations, then in the words of Governor Stevenson we may actually contribute to making man and the world—what God intended them to be.

And you, as members of the general assembly, must share in the credits for it is men and women such as you who make these things possible.

Bay Area's New Left Connections With U.S. Old Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 25, Mr. Ed Montgomery, Pulitzer Prize winning reporter of the San Francisco Examiner, addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject "Bay Area's New Left Connections with U.S. Old Left." Mr. Montgomery, who is a resident of the 11th District of California, is undoubtedly the best informed non-Federal civilian on Communist activities in the bay area. He speaks from a wealth of experience in investigation and contact with the party throughout the San Francisco Bay area.

His disclosures of what went on at Berkeley and what is continuing to be condoned in their schools and the University of California is almost unbelievable, yet he documents all of his accusations and names names.

The Communists must have picked on the University of California and Berkeley in particular as the headquarters of their activities because they knew full well that they had strong alliances both in the faculty of the university and in some of the public schools. His address, which follows, should command the attention of every loyal American:

Examiner Reporter Montgomery Blueprints Bay Area's New Left Connections With U.S. Old Left

(By Ed Montgomery)

There's been a lot of water over the dam since the city hall riot in May 1960. At that time we knew most of our leftists around town as either members of the anti-House Committee on Un-American Activities group or with Fair Play for Cuba, or Women for Peace.

We saw their faces over and over again, sometimes demonstrating twice in 1 day for separate causes.

We even wrote about the infiltration of Communists into the Women for Peace, and I named such individuals as Maude Rose, Frances Tandy, and a few others.

Then things began developing: more and more activity, particularly at the college front. We received a warning eventually from J. Edgar Hoover who spoke of what was happening on the college campuses because all of a sudden we found that we had 9 or 10 organizations instead of 1 to 3.

Fair Play for Cuba closed up in a hurry following the assassination of President Kennedy. Hoover said the U.S. Communist Party is capitalizing on a current insurrectionary climate on American college campuses to serve the Moscow cause. "On many campuses (the student) faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order." Even with that warning some colleges have been most tolerant of what's happening.

OUTCASTS FORM NEW PARTY

Nine or ten organizations have come to light within the past few months. The DuBois Club is best known of the lot, perhaps because of its widespread acceptance on various campuses. It is a Communist-born organization brought about by Gus Hall of the Communist Party following a meeting in Chicago and a founding convention here.

Students for a Democratic Society has been in the forefront of the antidraft campaign, urging burning of draft cards—and even the advice to pretend to be homosexual as a means of avoiding induction.

The most militant group of all, the Progressive Labor Party, sprang up very quickly. It originated in New York but gained its greatest emphasis at the University of California. The Progressive Labor Party was founded by individuals who had been expelled from the Communist Party U.S.A. because of their militant attitude: they would not go along with Khrushchev and his coexistence policy. They follow the Peiping line; are perhaps the most revolutionary of the various Communist groups functioning today—such men as Mortimer Scheer who is very active about the Berkeley campus although he is not a student—there is rarely a demonstration of any magnitude over there where he is not present. He came out from New York to found the west coast chapter; he is vice chairman under cofounder Milton Rosen who was expelled with him from the Communist Party in Buffalo in 1962.

NEW GROUPS AID COMMUNISTS

The May 2d Movement is a splinter group from the Progressive Labor Party. The Young Socialists, a youth movement of the Socialist Workers Party, has been deemed by the Attorney General of the United States to be a Communist front.

You have the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam. You have the War Resisters League and the Americans for Reappraisal of Far Eastern Policy and there are a few more.

APTHEKER'S CONFESSION NO SURPRISE

Gus Hall, secretary of the Communist Party, himself said that few of these organizations are true Communist fronts. But he says Communist Party fronts are a "thing of the past: we don't need them, we've got the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Students for Democratic Society. We have them going for us and they're not fronts in the usual sense of the word." He refers to the rest of these memberships as part of that vast reserve of 100,000 campus minds who follow the Communist doctrines, although not being dues-paying members of the Communist Party—and they would just as soon have it that way.

Some of them are becoming more bold. It came as no surprise to those who follow these matters that Bettina Aptheker declared herself an out-and-out Communist. We were a little surprised today that Dorothy Healy, head of the Communist Party U.S.A., in southern California, is announcing herself as a candidate for Los Angeles County assessor. She said she will advocate a moratorium on property taxes, and higher assessments on corporations.

VIETNAM A VEHICLE FOR VDC

There's no question but that the Vietnam Day Committee (VDC) reflects Communist influence. Jerry Rubin, of whom there is no proof of Communist membership, more or less the official spokesman, was interviewed in the Daily Californian Weekly magazine of November 17. He said: "Yes, changes are needed. We can begin by economic and political changes structurally that would make the American economy work on the basis of need, rather than profit. This would require taking control from the few who own and manage and locating it in the many who work."

Rubin continued, in the VDC News, that the VDC should use as a major criterion whether or not an activity will increase the number of people opposed to the structure and value system of the American society, rather than increasing the number who are tacitly opposed to the Vietnam war. In short, he is saying that the Vietnam hositlities of today are nothing more than a convenient vehicle for the Vietnam Day Committee, whose true underlying purpose far exceeds the question of foreign policy in southeast Asia.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL DEMONSTRATIONS

Who else is in the VDC? You find people like Steve Cherkoss, an admitted member of the Communist Progressive Labor Party. He was assigned to the VDC to head its antidraft committee. He carried on the antidraft demonstrations at Berkeley High School and then over at Garfield Junior High in Berkeley. He was even recruiting youngsters 12 and 13 years old to form a Junior Vietnam Day Committee at Garfield Junior High.

BURN, BABY, BURN IN OAKLAND

He was also active in the group heading the demonstration that was to have marched in Oakland—at a time when there suddenly appeared on the telephone poles and mailboxes in West Oakland, printed posters reading "Burn Baby Burn," "Watch Whitey Run." Certain intelligence agencies have traced those stickers: they know where they were printed, who brought them into town and who placed them where they later were found.

At Garfield Junior High, the principal suspended the student for a day and then the board of education said, "No, take him back," and the principal said, "Well, I'm going to have to speak to the boy's parents." And those familiar with the situation know that the boy's parents have been identified with the Communist Party since 1932.

ASTOUNDING SEVENTH-GRADERS' ASSIGNMENT

What else is going on in that particular school? As of January 17 of this year, an assignment was given to a seventh grade class on the subject, "Why Is It Important for Us To Study Russia?" The students, most of whom are 11 and 12 years old, were asked to expound on the following statements (saying that these are the views held by certain groups and, in essence, what do you think about them?):

The first question: If we wouldn't be so anti-Communist many of you in this classroom wouldn't have to serve in the Armed Forces.

The second: A large share of our tax money goes into building useless bombs. By laying down our arms, this would set a good example for the Communists and also save us money.

Third. We shouldn't hate or dislike the Russians; after all they're only people like ourselves.

Fourth. If we would be more willing to give in to what the Russians want, we wouldn't have to worry so much about fighting the war.

Fifth. We should stop opposing the Communists so that we would not have to spend any more money on influencing underdeveloped countries, such as Africa, to follow American thinking rather than Russian ideas.

Sixth. The best way to fight communism is to worry about our own problems at home and let the rest of the countries of the world do the same.

Seventh. What do we care if other countries become communistic; after all should not they make their own decisions as to what they want to do?

Eighth. (This may start to reach some of you): Why should some people have more than others? Under the Communist system everyone could have as much as the next person.

Ninth. There are many inequalities in this country, such as racial discrimination, poor housing, and unfair employment practices. Perhaps it is time for a change, as our way of life hasn't solved these problems. The Communists offer equality for all so why shouldn't we try their way for a while?

This, if you please, an assignment to the seventh grade class in Berkeley on January 17 of this year—funny how all roads with a left-hand sign seem to end up in Berkeley.

FULFILLMENT OF CHARTER DAY SPEECH

It's been over a year now since they greased the skids under Chancellor Strong, but the president of the university saw fit to bring it all out again in print. I thought they'd let sleeping dogs lie, but perhaps, as the bard once said, he protests too loudly, maybe there's something on his conscience I'm not sure. But he did give an interview in which he implies that the situation that ensued in Berkeley in the "free speech movement" was not of his making. He said, "looking back, I can see now that I should have overruled the chancellor. When you take away a historic right from people without consulting them, you can never negotiate with them afterwards with clean hands. And the chancellor's office started the trouble."

Well, that's a little hard to take by someone who has done a bit of research on the matter as I have. I found that the university administration, and particularly the statement of September 14, handed down by Dean of Students Katherine Towle, was nothing more than a fulfillment of a program laid down by Dr. Kerr himself in his Charter Day address at Davis, early in the spring.

I questioned Dr. Kerr about this and the fact that his Charter Day address had laid down two things: (1) there was to be no more political activity on the campus, and (2) the campus was not be be used as a springboard from which to mount activities off the campus. I asked, "Were you correctly quoted?" and he said, "Yes."

And I said, "How do you reconcile what you're saying now with the findings of Jerome Byrne, the Los Angeles attorney who with his staff conducted a $75,000 investigation for the board of regents?" I said, "Attorney Byrne says the program laid down by the administration of Berkeley was one laid down by yourself at Davis and, further that you yourself, upon returning from Japan, not only concurred but actually took a leadership in the policies carried out and that your policy was later reflected to the regents at their meeting of September 1964." And he said, "That's wrong. And that is not the only mistake Mr. Byrne has made."

I went back to Mr. Byrne and said, "How do you account for his saying that you are in error? Could there have been an error?" He said, "No, our report was predicated on written material. I have no way of accounting for his thought processes." With that, he chose to say nothing more.

KATZ NAMED EX-COMMUNIST FUNCTIONARY

We wonder, then, what is happening in Berkley, particularly when once again they bring in the Katz case? Professor Katz who has come and gone, Katz who has been rehired suddenly by Chancellor Heyns—at least, we're told it was by Chancellor Heyns; I presume so. The Berkley Gazette referred to the chancellor having contacted Katz. I'm told he has never talked to Eli Katz.

Be that as it may, the record is clear: there's no question that Eli Katz was a functionary of the Communist Party in Los Angeles. There's no question that Eli Katz on two occasions signed the Levering Act statement prior to his knowledge that his presence within the Communist Party had been made known to certain people.

Where then does the pressure come from? I understand that the file on which Dr. Heyns predicated his final judgment—if in fact it was he who predicated this judgment—does not contain the legal opinion by the head of the law department of the university that Chancellor Strong was both legally and morally right in not renewing the Katz contract.

KATZ PRESSURE TRACED

There is a good deal of pressure within a certain academic segment. Within that segment there is one individual who makes his presence known; even his youngster is active in what's going on around the Vietnam Day Committee and other groups. I'm talking about Leon Wofsy whose father was cofounder of the Communist Party, U.S.A. back in 1919, who for years was himself a functionary of the Communist Party and head of its youth recruitment program, from coast to coast—who contends that he gave up the Communist Party and is now on the faculty at Cal. We dig deeper and we discover that Leon Wofsy's wife and the wife of Eli Katz are related, and you wonder just what goes on in Berkeley.

I wanted to tell you one little thing about what you can or cannot believe from over there. I'd been advised that Mario Savio, one of the foremost figures in the "free speech movement," was on the payroll at the University of California, even after the December 3 sit-in at Sproul Hall. And I inquired of the proper source, the vice president in charge of public relations. I said, it is my understanding that he was hired by so and so and he was paid such and such and the check is number such and such. Within an hour and a half back came a phone call that there must have been some error because they could find no record where Savio was on the payroll at the university.

Three weeks later Senator McAteer announced that very fact on the floor of the legislature in Sacramento. Within moments I received a phone call from the University of California and an apology: Too bad but there had been a human error; apparently two cards were stuck together.

WHO HIRED SAVIO?

Now, who put Mario Savio on the payroll? He was hired by Prof. John Searle in the philosophy department. Professor Searle and I have tangled in the past. Soon after the city hall riots, it was John Searle who wrote a couple of magazine articles published from coast to coast describing the city hall riots, with the emphasis on police brutality.

I debated him on television. He gave a graphic account of what happened at the city hall riots, after implying that he had a white ticket and was one of the fortunate persons who had been able to attend the hearing that day. He related certain incidents that didn't ring a bell with me—having covered it myself. I stood alongside Mike McGuire when he reached for the firehose.

Yet here was Professor Searle on television relating what the student said to the policeman before the policeman hit him over the head and knocked him unconscious, and I became more and more suspicious.

Following that telecast I ascertained that Prof. John Searle was not even in San Francisco the day of the city hall riot. I accused him of this fact and he said, "That's right, I was not there."

LIAISON FOR STUDENTS

Then I said, "How could you have written the things you have written? How could you have gone on television and said the things you said, when in fact you were not even in the city hall." He said, "I had personal friends who were there and I had good firsthand information."

This is the man who has been named liaison between the administration and the students. I don't know what John Searle is doing today, but I'll tell you where he was on the night of September 18. He attended the wedding reception for Bettina Aptheker, at which admission was charged and the proceeds went to the Peoples' World and the Vietnam Day Committee.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. (R. R. Gros). Any evidence yet of Communist infiltration in the war on poverty program?

Answer. One of the boys who's calling the shots in the Mission District for the war on poverty, John Ross, is a Communist; admits it. He was arrested in the Sheraton-Palace demonstration. They took his fingerprints, found out he was a draft dodger from New York; he served a little time on that. Over in Berkeley you have $1.8 million, I think, of poverty funds for all projects. I've been trying for 3 weeks to get the names of students employed in this project. They say it's "not available." There must be a payroll somewhere. They tell me the payroll would read very much like the police plotter on Sproul Hall. Several projects are being carried on off campus.

There's one project for maintenance and cataloging of a private library at the home of Ann Fagan Ginger Wood. She is the wife of James Wood, the guitar strumming Communist folk singer. She stood on top of the police car at Berkeley a year and a half ago telling the students—Don't worry, just give your name and address if you're arrested and we'll bail you out, and so forth. Her little project has been allotted, if I'm not mistaken, $2,496. There's a private school where students are being paid to work. Betty Halpern—and if you want to know who she is just check the House Committee on Un-American Activities—runs the private progressive Berkwood School, and it is down for several thousand dollars.

In East Oakland they are paying students $2.50 an hour to organize blocks, a block committee, a block chairman, and if you don't think that's going to be a political machine just wait until the next election. You have people from the Progressive Labor Party, and people from the editorial board of the magazine Soulbook (perhaps the filthiest, most obscene and pornographic literature that's ever come down the pipe) supported—if you please—by war on poverty funds for the University of California.

Question (E. J. Duffy). Why has the Bay Area become a subversive stronghold?

Answer. We're very liberal minded here, perhaps too much for our own good. In my own mind I'm satisfied that, within the university faculty, there is a hard core of extreme leftists—and they have a capacity for attracting more and more.

Question (G. M. Carr). Where do demonstrators get money for living, travel, financing activities?

Answer. In the case of the Progressive Labor Party, I heard the sworn testimony from bankers, travel agents, and aviation people. I know for a fact that the Progressive Labor Party obtained $43,000 in Peiping money, converted to U.S. currency. It was picked up at the Mexican City National Bank in Mexico City by Yvonne Bond, a UC coed who brought the money to Berkeley. Part of that capital was used to finance the trip to Cuba, by those from this area and elsewhere, in defiance of the Government ban. That money came from Red China by way of Mexico. Look at this publication (exhibited)—this is an expensive piece of work; it cost somebody something, and they're not getting it out of tin cups.

Question. Why do some college students fail to realize responsibility?

Answer. Perhaps it's because the parents don't care. I heard General Myers, of the 6th Army, addressing a Boy Scout dinner. He pointed out that in American history books our youngsters are being shortchanged: they don't know the heroes of American history. Prior to 1920, the statement by Nathan Hale, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country" appeared in 11 standard texts. In today's modern textbooks, General Myers could find this reference only once. Patrick Henry—"Give me liberty or give me death"—prior to 1920 appeared in 12 out of 14 standard textbooks; today 2 out of 45. John Paul Jones—"I have just begun to fight"—prior to 1920 9 out of 12 standard textbooks; today, not 1. Now you wonder why these youngsters don't realize their responsibilities.

Question (W. Russell Werner). Will the newspaper Tocsin start up again?

Answer. Presently there has been a suit brought against them. From what I understand, it's an effort by a certain faction to find out what's going on, and who may be financing them. I wouldn't be too surprised that later in the spring or early summer you may again see Tocsin being published; I certainly hope so.

Now, as Then

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Los Angeles Evening and Sunday Herald Examiner, Feb. 22, 1966]

NOW, AS THEN

"I am under more apprehension on account of our own dissensions, than the effort of the enemy."

The deeply concerned words could well have been spoken by President Johnson who has, indeed, expressed similar concern. But they were written by George Washington. They are as applicable today as then and his birthday makes their recollection appropriate in this time of national stress when our difficulties without are rendered the more serious by our dissensions within.

The quitters are in full, loud voice. They would have us pull out of Vietnam, willy-nilly, in virtual surrender and world disgrace, in shameful abandonment of pledge and honor.

There are, too, sincere doubters who believe our engagement in Vietnam should never have been started. These, too, are in demanding chorus.

And there are, of course, the outright Communists within our midst, their duped peaceniks and the ilk that seeks by clamor to frustrate reason.

There are dissensions by many whose stature gives importance to their views and by many of low station whose importance is that their noise may convey to Hanoi the tragically mistaken assumption that our Nation prepares to unfurl a white flag.

But the flag still is and will be, to the day of victory, a banner of meaningful stars and stripes so historically made possible by George Washington and now so historically maintained by President Johnson and the vast majority of the American people.

Report on Space Planning—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following.

This is the third of a series of four summaries of a report by the National Academy of Sciences. As I mentioned earlier, the subject of these reports is highly important to the Congress in considering approval of basic national objectives in space.

NAS RECOMMENDS SPACE-ASTRONOMY PROGRAM—III

Additional sections of Part II of the Woods Hole report, prepared by working groups of the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences, deal with X-ray and gamma-ray astronomy. For such space studies balloons, rockets, satellites, and lunar bases are recommended. As for rockets, small relatively inexpensive satellites of the Explorer class, often designed to carry out a single experiment, will continue to have a major role. Experiments carried aloft while attached to the instrument unit of a Saturn rocket offer advantages intermediate between those of rockets and Explorer-type satellites. Apollo applications (AA) vehicles offer additional advantages.

X-ray and gamma-ray astronomy

Every ingredient exists in this field to guarantee its development in a manner that may soon lead to results comparable in importance to those of radio astronomy (yesterday's Space Daily). Advances will bring a large number of weaker galactic sources within range and permit the observation of strong extragalactic sources. (See Soviet proposal in yesterday's Space Daily.) The following recommendations were made:

1. A substantial increase in balloon flights should be authorized. At least 40 balloon flights per year will be needed. Greater support should be given to balloon programs (as well as Explorer-class satellites) for observations in the energy range 0.1 to 30 MeV.

2. Two new types of balloons should be developed: One capable of lifting 250 pounds of scientific payload to altitudes of 145,000 feet; the other capable of 2,000 pounds to 130,000 feet. National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) should direct the program. Total cost for 3 years: $2 million. NCAR personnel should be increased.

3. Funds should be provided to develop a prototype controllable star-guided orientation system, with an accuracy better than 1 minute of arc.

4. A twofold increase in rocket flights—from the present 6 to 12 a year—is required for X-ray astronomy.

5. Weight-lifting capacity greater than Aerobee is needed. One possibility: Use of Sergeant and Nike-Hercules. It is important these vehicles be made available to the scientific user. Apollo and AA vehicles would be very useful.

6. Pointing accuracies must be improved. An accuracy of 15 seconds of arc to 1 minute of arc is required, with small drift rates.

7. X-ray experiments should replace other more conventional experiments which have been accepted for the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory (OAO). In fact, the first unassigned OAO should be set aside for X-ray observation, supplemented, if possible by lower priority gamma-ray observations.

8. X-ray experiments should be included in OAO pickaback plans. Optical focusing devices with focal lengths comparable to length of OAO should be considered.

9. Experiments utilizing focusing X-ray optics should be flown on pointed rockets and satellites currently available or being developed.

10. Plans should be begun for orbiting X-ray telescope with focal lengths of 30 to 100 feet. Unfolding of an extensible system in space may be possible.

11. A NASA research center should initiate a strong program in the technology of soft X-rays.

12. Continued support should be given to development of detection devices using actively shielded collimators or Compton scatter telescopes.

13. Space flight assignments should be given only to proven instruments which offer clear improvement in background reduction, energy resolution or angular definition. One instrument that is needed: Device with large collection factors which provide angular resolution of better than 1 degree.

14. Support should be provided for continued study of solar X-ray and gamma-ray spectra during both quiet and active phases of the solar cycle.

15. Experiments should be undertaken in balloons to search for point sources and to define the design requirements for satellites.

16. Measurements of the diffuse radiation flux should be attempted in the immediate future with small Explorer-type satellites.

17. One of the forthcoming Saturn vehicles should be scheduled to study spectral composition and directional structure of the diffuse flux and to measure weak fluxes from and spectra of discrete sources.

18. Support should be given for the design and construction of a prototype universal supernova monitor. Serious consideration should be given for the inclusion of this monitoring device on many future spacecraft.

The role of man

There are certain observations where man will be helpful. However, the scientific mission will take up a great part of man's role. Because of the great expense only experiments that are clearly excellent should be expected for Gemini and Apollo extended systems: (a) Large area (110 square meter) X-ray detectors equipped with mechanical collimators. This could be assembled in orbit; (b) Focusing X-ray telescopes; (c) Spark chambers and Cerenkov counters. These do not need to be assembled in space, but manned repair may be warranted; (d) Small detectors for the nuclear gamma-ray region could be assembled, coarsely oriented and occasionally calibrated by an astronaut; (e) An X-ray astronomy observatory on the lurain.

NAS RECOMMENDS SPACE-ASTRONOMY PROGRAM—IV

The final section of part II of the Woods Hole study by the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences deals with the physical experiments that can be advantageously undertaken in space to answer questions of physics and geophysics.

Physics and geophysics

The working group in this area was almost wholly concerned with the question: "What would physics be like if it had developed in a space environment?" The recommendations:

1. A program of experiments in relativity and gravitation should be undertaken as soon as practicable. Suggested experiments: (a) Use of the asteroid Icarus or a special satellite for determining the relativistic rotation of the line of perihelion rotation of a planet or asteroid; (b) gravitational deflection of light; (c) the precession of a spinning body in space; (d) the secular change in gravitational constant through laser tracking of corner reflectors on the Moon to determine lunar deceleration; (e) use of a timekeeping satellite for studying changes in gravitational interaction; (f) an (Eotvos) experiment in space for studying the relation of inertial and gravitational mass.

2. Development of a high-precision radar altimeter should be undertaken vigorously. Existing equipment should be used on presently available space vehicles to determine problems inherent in the conduct of precision measurements. Problems of a gravity gradiometer should be examined. Related studies, now underway, for the more precise determination of orbital constants should be continued.

3. NASA should incorporate the installation of corner reflectors on the Moon as part of the lunar landing program. Some consideration might also be given to the use of reflectors on long-lived satellites.

4. Support of ground-based experiments, and of balloon and rocket programs, should be expanded to provide information which is essential to supplement observations carried out with spacecraft or which cannot be obtained by spacecraft.

Man in space

Most of the programs mentioned above lie in the future, do not depend on a man as a manipulator, but do depend on further technological developments. While most of the programs specified can be done by remote-controlled or automatic devices, there are some problems that will eventually require man, although science by itself cannot justify the costs of manned effort. Typical of the kinds of major problems to which a man can contribute are planetary investigations, emplacement and adjustment of large telescopic systems, and some plasma studies. It must be emphasized, however, that in space as on Earth, scientific investigations will call upon man and device as necessary to the research goal. The distinction or separation of space research into a manned category and an unmanned one is artificial. The nature of the problems and economics dictate how a given task can best be carried out.

This is the conclusion of part II of the Woods Hole report, Space Research: Directions for the Future. Part III of the report—which will be out later this month—will deal with rocket and satellite research, space research, and the university biology, medicine and physiology, and the role of man in space research. Part I, dealing with lunar and planetary programs, was reported last month (Space Daily, Jan. 17, 18, and 19). The report was prepared at the request of NASA.

NAS ROCKET-SATELLITE RESEARCH PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

In response to a request from the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, the National Academy of Sciences undertook an examination of the present state of research by rocket and satellite experiments. The recommendations of an ad hoc committee formed by the NAS Space Science Board make up the major portion of part II of the Woods Hole report. The report, "Space Research: Directions for the Future," evolved from talks between the Space Science Board and NASA.

Funding

Funding of the U.S. rocket research program, currently $50 million a year, should be doubled or tripled over the coming 5-year period. The U.S. near-space satellite program for scientific research, approximately $500 million at present, should be maintained at the level currently planned (including modest expansion). However, if both programs cannot be maintained, and some tradeoff is obligatory, the expansion of the rocket program should be undertaken, even if this can be done only at the cost of a stretchout of the satellite program. Some specific recommendations:

1. NASA should program funds for rocket research, such as development of boosters (improving Aerobee 150), which is now mainly funded by military agencies.

2. Universities should have a greater role in the rocket research program.

3. The United States should continue efforts toward space cooperation with other countries, working toward the next period of solar maximum 1967–70. Special effort should be made to support national rocket and satellite program during the SM. Work can be coordinated through COSPAR.

4. Sounding rocket facilities should be improved: (a) Suitable shipboard launch facility should be developed; (b) Rudimentary rocket facilities at Fairbanks, Alaska, should be enlarged; (3) Facilities and support at Fort Churchill and at White Sands should be improved.

5. That a national committee be established, consisting of all the disciplines that use sounding rockets, to establish policy, and recommended and coordinate the U.S. rocket research program.

6. The Aerobee 150 should be improved by providing a modern booster of increased specific thrust, strengthening the tail section and making other engineering changes to raise reliability. Estimated cost: $300,000 to $500,000. Also, if recovery of payloads from new Aerobee 350 is required, a launcher should be built at White Sands. Cost: $2 million.

(7) Full support should be given to the perfection of various families of pointing or attitude-control systems as a high-priority item. NASA is spending about $1 million (fiscal year 1966 and 1967) for a solar-pointing control.

(8) A detailed study, including a cost analysis, should be made of all factors in-

volved in air recovery. It is also recommended that a special effort be made to improve the reliability of parachute recovery techniques and to decrease the weight penalty of the existing system.

(9) The number of sounding rockets to be launched for probing the neutral atmosphere in the 1966–70 period should be about 950—about double that launced in 1960–65.

Cost will be three times higher (due to increased sophistication of payloads). A total of about seven scientific satellites devoted to the same types of studies should be launched in the 1966–70 time period. Coordination and comparison of experiments should be arranged among the investigators.

(10) The number of rockets provided in support of research concerned with the ionized components of the atmosphere, including airglow observation, should be increased from the present level of about 36 per year to over 100 per year in the next 5 years, reaching about 130 per year during the solar maximum (about 1970).

A Message of Cheer From Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to an article in the Paterson News of March 1, 1966. It is an encouraging example of unity among divergent groups to aid the morale of our men in Vietnam. I think that Mr. Harry B. Haines, the publisher of the Paterson News and Mr. Charles Van Wagner, the coordinator of the project described in the article are to be warmly commended for the parts they played.

The article follows:

Message of Cheer From Back Home: 600,000 Cigarettes to Viet Boys From Paterson

Over 600,000 cigarettes, each package carrying a personal message of good wishes from the donor will be sent to the men of the armed services on the fighting fronts of Vietnam through the cooperative effort of the Paterson News and 30-plus prominent organizations of this area.

The "Smokes for Our Boys" drive was spearheaded by Harry B. Haines, Paterson News publisher, as a demonstration of concern and support from the folks back home.

Indicative of this vast reserve of solicitude for the boys, was the enthusiastic response with which this program was met.

GOAL QUICKLY MET

As a result, the goal of 400,000 smokes for the soldiers overseas was reached within 10 days. Funds necessary to purchase these cigarettes have been oversubscribed, and interest still runs high.

Through the cooperation of the Liggett and Myers Tobacco Co., arrangements have been made to purchase these cigarettes at a special price of $25.60 for 250 packages of 20 cigarettes each. This figure includes delivery to Vietnam and insurance. Each package of cigarettes will be clearly stamped, "For Free Distribution—Not to Be Sold," and contains a special label on which is included a message from the donor.

An acknowledgment card, for use by the recipient and carrying the donor's name and address, is also included in each carton.

Representatives of the particiating organizations met in the office of Mr. Haines, to turn over their contributions to underwrite the drive.

Accepting their gifts, Mr. Haines said he was proud to have been able to sponsor such a worthwhile program.

MR. HAINES HAILS IDEA

"This is a significant and inspiring occasion, made so by its ties to America's struggle for world freedom," he said.

"You people by your presence, and those whom you represent, have made this most important program possible.

"Never before have I witnessed such a diversified group of people, representing so many important phases of our community and our American way of life, coming together in one cause * * * giving of your time, money, and effort.

"This indeed has been a successful venture * * * with two of America's greatest unions, the AFL–CIO and the Teamsters, bankers, and officials of one of our country's most important industries, the Liggett and Myers Tobacco Co., joined by the police of Paterson PBA, the FMBA, and men of the fire department, the personnel of our Post Office Department, these and veterans' organizations, the Elks Club, the Musicians Union, the Knights of Columbus, the Passaic County Democratic and Republican organizations. All of you indeed represent truly our American heritage."

SPIRIT OF PATERSON

"Your gift of cigarettes to our boys in the Armed Forces in Vietnam, along with your messages of good will and encouragement, are so typical of the true spirit of this community and will be long remembered.

"The presence of Mayor Graves as well as representatives of the four branches of the Armed Forces of our country, is most appropriate and much appreciated.

"It has been a very special privilege to have personally participated, and also the pleasure of the Paterson News staff to have worked together with such an important and representative group of people for so worthy a cause."

COLOR GUARD PRESENT

Color and flair were added to the proceedings by a delegation of uniformed representatives of the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps with their color guard.

The cigarettes will be delivered to the port of New York for shipment by a trailer truck, the truck and driver supplied by President Michael Ardis' Clifton Teamster Local 945 and Teamster Local 999 of Paterson, headed by Lawrence De Angelis, president. Both unions also made substantial donations to the drive.

Steve Wilson, president, Local 158, AFL–CIO, served as coordinator for the unions and their membership of the Passaic County AFL–CIO Council, performing above and beyond the call of duty in their efforts to make this program a success.

Roy J. Schleich, air coordinator of the New Jersey National Guard, is making arrangements for the Air National Guard to fly the cigaretes from McGuire Air Force Base direct to Vietnam.

THE CONTRIBUTORS

The following organizations, by their contributions and enthusiastic cooperation have joined the News in making possible the achievement of this objective.

The New Jersey Bank and Trust Co.; GI Pup Tent 9, Military Order of the Cootie; PBA Local 1 of Paterson; Paterson BPOE 60 Elks; Passaic County Republican Organization; Alexander Hamilton Post 139, VFW; First National Bank of Passaic County; Passaic County Democratic Organization; Teamster Local 999; Paterson Post Office Employees; Amalgamated Meat Cutters Local 464; Market Associates; Teamster Local 945 of Clifton; Bartenders Culinary Workers and Motel Workers Union Local 158; Local 637, United Rubber Workers; Local 276, United Textile Workers of America; Passaic County AFL–CIO Labor Council; Local 1245, Retail Clerk's Union; Raymond Pellington Post 77; American Legion and its auxiliary; Retail Store Employees Local 1262; Broadway Bank and Trust Co.; Musicians Mutual Protective Benevolent Union, American Federation of Musicians; and the Paterson Mutual Benevolent Association, International Laborers of North America; and Bricklayers Local 12, AFL–CIO.

The total membership of the cooperating organizations is over 40,000.

After a substantial donation had been made by the Broadway Bank, employees of the bank contributed an equal amount, which in effect resulted in a double contribution.

Big Job Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, in his message on conservation President Johnson said he hoped future generations would say "1966 was the year of the new conservation, when farsighted men took farsighted steps to preserve the beauty that is the heritage of our Republic."

In quoting this Presidential hope, the Baltimore Sun points out that the emphasis in the program is on water pollution. The Sun adds:

> America's rivers, lakes, and atmosphere were not polluted overnight and they cannot be cleansed overnight, either.

The Sun urges that "good faith and determination" be demonstrated to begin the work that's to be done.

This editorial is most timely and I insert in the RECORD:

The New Conservation

President Johnson said in his message to Congress on conservation that he hoped future generations would say "1966 was the year of the new conservation, when farsighted men took farsighted steps to preserve the beauty that is the heritage of our Republic." That hope should be realized, if Congress acts along the lines that the President recommended, and if future Congresses continue and expand the work. America's rivers, lakes, and atmosphere were not polluted overnight and they cannot be cleansed overnight, either.

The emphasis in the President's program is on water pollution. There are a great many recommendations. The most important ones are those that allow the Government or individual citizens to go into court to stop any activity that creates pollution that menaces the public's health or welfare; that lift the present ceiling on grants for sewage treatment plants; and that begin offering Federal aid for new antipollution facilities. The President describes these as "strong measures," but we believe they are not. The first is a wise compromise between those who prefer no governmental role and those who believe in administrative instead of judicial power to stop pollution-creating activity. The second will merely extend an existing Federal program to large cities: the present $1.2 million limit on individual grants restricts the program to smaller communities. The third is fully in keeping with the Federal philosophy: Washington will make grants to cover part of the enormous cost of antipollution works to local groups, then those groups will collect revenues from users to maintain the expensive operation.

The goal of clean water everywhere is going to cost a lot of money. Most experts foresee a total bill of $20 to $30 billion in the next decade, about a third of that Federal money. The President has only asked for an initial $50 million. Congress can show its good faith and determination by voting that relatively small amount, thus making the start that will justify the hope that future generations will mark 1966 as the year the new conservation began.

Report on Space Planning—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth of a series of four summaries of a report by the National Academy of Sciences. In earlier remarks I discussed the importance of these reports.

[From the Space Daily, Feb. 16, 1966]

NAS ROCKET-SATELLITE RESEARCH PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS—II

This is a continuation of part III of the Woods Hole report prepared by working groups of the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences. Included in part III of the study, which was originated at the request of NASA, are recommendations concerning the role of the university in space research, and a detailed look at space biology.

NASA funding for university research programs

NASA must turn to the universities not only for trained manpower but also for basic research. NASA should develop a program of university participation in space science and technology. Accordingly, NASA's budget for training should be increased from its present level of $20 million, to $30 million per year. The budget for facilities grants, which has been shrinking at the rate of $2 million per year over the past 2 years to the current $8 million level, should be increased to approximately $15 million or $20 million. Sustaining research grant funds should be doubled. As for a research program, the committee recommended:

1. Suitably space-oriented ground-based, balloon, and rocket programs should be expanded as promptly as possible. The present rocket program should be doubled or tripled as soon as possible.

2. Competition among various proposals should continue to be encouraged. Screening of proposals by competent experts is crucial. Therefore, formal panels of outside consultants should be established for the scientific screening of all specific research grants and in-flight experiments.

3. Consideration should be given to extending the NASA sustaining university program to engineering as well as research. This subject might well be studied by a committee of the Space Science Board.

In the area of biology, the report recommends:

1. Experimental studies on the synergistic or antagonistic effects between weightlessness and radiation should be supported.

2. Biorhythm studies in space flight should be conducted on an exploratory basis. Experiments should be to determine whether biorhythms are altered in near Earth orbit and in deep space.

3. Broad exploratory studies on effects of weightlessness on growth and development should be given high priority.

4. The NASA biosatellite program should be continued beyond the currently planned series (six flights scheduled at 3-month intervals, beginning in mid-1966). Follow-on biosatellite programs should be based on the use of a launch vehicle capable of boosting a several-hundred-pound scientific payload into orbit in a manner that avoids "the undersirable constraints" of the current program. A centrifuge should be included in at least some future biosatellite flights.

5. Biologist experimenters should have access to ample NASA engineering advice and aid in developing their experiments. One step would be increasing the number of personnel at NASA-Ames.

6. NASA should take immediate steps to develop a program to explore the biological effects of vibration.

7. If higher animals are placed in orbit to determine their tolerance to conditions of prolonged space flight, every effort should be made to acquire in-flight scientific data as well. "Before and after" measurements have little scientific value.

8. In the forthcoming unmanned and manned exploration of Mars, attention should be directed to the possibility that no extraterrestrial life exists there, and that therefore, studies should be made of all stages in the evolutionary development of life, with the prebiotic phase holding special interest.

9. Sterility precautions should be strictly enforced in the early stages of Martian exploration. Strict sterility enforcements should be an announced national policy.

10. NASA should develop a device to encapsulate, sterilely and hermetically, samples of the Martian surface (marain) and subsurface. Such devices should be sent with an early Martian lander to collect samples to be retrieved by later manned missions.

11. Reconnaissance by optical images be made in early as well as advanced phases of the unmanned exploration of Mars. NASA should make a major effort to remove critical limitations on communications of data over the Earth-Mars distance.

12. NASA should implement, as an item of great urgency, the development of a Mars lander—an automated biological laboratory (ABL). In this connection, NASA should reexamine the feasibility of using the Saturn V for Voyager missions (Saturn I-B-Centaur now planned).

13. A continuing committee, advisory to NASA but preferably outside NASA; should be established to monitor and to advise on the scientific programs of planetary exploration.

14. Because investigations will ultimately require that scientists travel to Mars, NASA should continue to support research on bioregenerative life-support systems.

15. Safeguards should be incorporated into Voyager and Apollo missions to prevent back contamination, chance of which is probably very small, but potentially catastrophic.

16. Scientist-passengers should be included in the program of the Office of Manned Space Flight for space travel.

17. Stronger research support be given to a NASA research center in order to meet the biological needs of the space program.

18. Formal panels of non-NASA scientists should be established to assign merit rating, exclusively on scientific grounds, to proposals for research and for in-flight biological experiments.

NAS ROCKET/SATELLITE RESEARCH PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS—III

Concluding sections of part III of the Woods Hole study, prepared by working groups of scientists under the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences, deal with medicine and physiology, and the role of man in space research.

Space stations needed to close biomedical gaps

The primary question in this area was whether knowledge and technology are or can become sufficient for flights lasting from 30 to 1,000 days. The conclusion: While there "are gaps in biomedical knowledge that could affect the progress of the manned program," projects can be conducted in time "to allow for final system development of a manned planetary mission by 1980–85." The recommendations:

1. A series of manned space flights specifically designed to study the biomedical (in opposition to engineering) prolonged space flight must be undertaken.

2. Before man can be safely included in missions of planetary duration, an orbiting research facility for the study of long-term space flight must be established. Therefore: Development of a series of manned orbiting research laboratories should be authorized to conduct the medical, physiological and behavioral research required for prolonged space flight up to 1,000 days. Present spacecraft allocated to the manned program "are probably not capable of performing all the necessary research." Needed: Space laboratories which can accommodate at least six to eight men with room for experimentation. Twenty-one and thirty day primate flights will precede manned testing.

3. Life-support systems currently in use or in advanced stages of development are inadequate for use in prolonged flights, and therefore, it is urgent that these systems be improved for long-term flights.

4. Supporting ground-based research must be broadened and accelerated.

5. A study should be initiated to find the best means to attract specialists in bioastronautics to NASA and training and retraining them.

6. Number of scientist-astronauts should be increased.

7. Results of research on the biomedical aspects of spaceflight should be consistently and promptly published in appropriate scientific journals.

THE ROLE OF MAN IN SPACE RESEARCH: CONCLUSIONS

1. Scientifically satisfying studies of the planets will require the presence of scientists, preferably on the planetary surface. They should at least be in a spacecraft orbiting close to the planet. "It is clear that here man is essential."

2. There "are many ways" in which man can be usefully employed in space for scientific research; i.e., observers; for the assembly, placement, repair and operation of instruments; for preliminary analysis, screening, sampling, data collection storage and retrieval.

3. While the entire cost of manned space flight cannot be justified on the basis of scientific value alone, man should be utilized for scientific purposes "whenever it seems possible to do so."

4. Up to missions of the Apollo duration there appears to be no apparent reason why man cannot survive and function effectively in space. Further it is believed that most physiological constraints will yield to work now in progress, and that man may in the future embark on longer missions "with reasonable confidence that he can perform meaningful scientific studies."

5. Four types of programs are visualized for utilizing man for scientific studies in space: (a) Current Gemini and Apollo; (b) later manned orbiting laboratories, such as the manned orbiting laboratory (MOL), Apollo applications (AA) spacecraft, or the large orbiting research laboratory (LORL); (c) large, complex, special purpose space assemblies, such as optical or radioastronomical observatories; (d) and scientific operations on lunar or planetary surfaces.

The Woods Hole study, conducted last summer, grew out of discussions between members of the Space Science Board and NASA. The talks indicated that "it was timely" for the Board to undertake a study of certain principal areas of space research. The purpose was threefold: (1) To develop a program of planetary exploration and to recommend priority within it (Space Daily, Jan. 17, 18, and 19); (2) to determine the needs of astronomy in space (Space Daily, Feb. 2, 3, 4, and 7); (3) and to consider the role of man in space research. These factors were considered for the post-Apollo period, extending through about 1965. Members of the working groups which prepared the various reports included many industry scientists, top-ranking NASA scientists and directors, and a great percentage of the leading university scientific investigators.

[From the Space Daily, Feb. 18, 1966]

THE WOODS HOLE REPORT—IV

(A brief analysis)

The study of the U.S. space program conducted last summer by working groups of the National Academy of Sciences' Space Science Board meeting at Woods Hole, Mass., directed itself to the question that has become of overriding significance to the space business and to the future of the country itself: Toward what end should the U.S. space program be directed after the Apollo lunar landing mission this decade.

Space stations first—manned Mars next

The hundreds of pages of the report boil down to this: "The exploration of Mars, with initial emphasis on the detection and characterization of possible Martian life, should constitute the major scientific goal of the U.S. space program in the period following the manned lunar landing." The Woods Hole report recommended that in the 1965–75 time period a shift be made in NASA funds with more money going to planetary rather than lunar programs. (See Space Daily, Jan. 17.) The manned planetary landing goal would be set for the 1980–85 period. Associated planetary flybys, orbiters and landers would be an integral part of the program.

Second, "before man can be safely included in missions of planetary duration, an orbiting research facility for the study of long-term space flight must be established" (yesterday's Space Daily). This would encompass a series of orbiting laboraties capable of supporting 6 to 8 men with room for scientific experimentation. Testing would be directed toward flights of up to 1,000 days.

Manned orbiting observatories a "defense" requirement

The other primary conclusions of the study: (1) There is a definite requirement for developing, building and orbiting a large telescope, which would be tended by man (Space Daily, Feb. 2). (2) The exploration of space requires the utilization of both ground-based observations and studies with balloons, sounding rockets and satellites (Space Daily, Feb. 15). (3) The distinction between manned and unmanned programs is an artificial one and should not be a primary factor for mission consideration. Scientific objectives should be the determining factors (Space Daily, Feb. 7).

The Woods Hole report is a clearly stated view of the scientists of the country. However, there are many factors left untouched. What about the considerable time gap between the 1970 manned lunar landing and the 1980–85 manned Mars landing? Other programs will be ready for full implementation. The U.S. space program, after 1970 as well as now, must be supported to approach its unlimited potential. The benefits of lunar exploration (Space Daily, Feb. 15) as well as the untapped billions of dollars in potential gains from the infant NASA/Government agency remote-sensor program (Space Daily, Jan. 14) will also be shouting for support. The question remains, as stated by the NASA Administrator: Will our plans for our future in space be drawn by a timid hand?

Foundation for the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Chairman of the Equal Opportunity Commission and a former colleague of ours is doing an excellent job in the implementation of the equal opportunity of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Chairman Roosevelt's interest and ability is firmly based in a background as Vice Chairman of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights and as the first chairman of the New York City Commission on Human Rights.

It is with pleasure that I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article by Chairman Roosevelt which appeared in the January 1966 edition of the bulletin of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The article follows:

FOUNDATION FOR THE GREAT SOCIETY

(By Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.)

Behind the scenes at the recent heated White House Planning Conference on Negro problems an even more heated debate raged. Earnest and competent planners had proposed a panel on Negro family life—fatherless families, delinquency, illegitimacy.

It is, of course, the jobless, the aimless, and the hopeless who turn up in the statistical tables on deserting fathers and illegitimacy—as they turned up in the case of the rioters in Watts and Bedford-Stuyvesant. Still, no less competent—but more relevant—planners stormed back, "Just give us the jobs. We'll take care of our own family life."

It is a futile exercise, long since given up by civil rights leaders, to argue which is the key right—voting, education, housing, or jobs. They are inseparable parts of a whole in the search for human dignity. But no one will deny the crucial role of job equality.

In the last decade, the American people have faced a crisis of principle and good faith. Did we believe deeply enough in our heritage of freedom and equality to enact laws that would end practices which have denied this heritage to large groups of Americans?

The series of pioneering civil rights laws which have been achieved provides a part of the answer. The rest of the answer lies in the way we put those laws into action.

July 2, 1965, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission undertook the responsibility of trying to eliminate discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Our charter is title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is a new and ringing declaration of national purpose.

Tools of the Commission's trade are conciliation and voluntary compliance. Our allies are the conscience of America and a reservoir of goodwill in business, labor, and voluntary organizations.

In the first 6 months, 3,263 complaints charging discrimination in employment practices have been received by the Commission. This avalanche far exceeded anyone's expectations. It represents more than the former President's Committee on Equal Opportunity received in 3 years. It is only a few less than all the complaints received by all the State fair employment agencies in a year.

The message is clear—the people of the United States look to this new Commission with confidence that we will be able to bring them relief from unfair employment practices.

Almost 70 percent of the complaints the Commission has received have been filed by Negroes. About 20 percent of the complaints are based on discrimination against women. Seven percent do not specify the grounds, and the remaining handful of complaints allege national origin or religion.

The Commission is acutely aware that the Negro community is highly organized with activists who are bringing cases to our attention. The same cannot be said, for example, of the Mexican-American community—or of the Jewish community. Of the 3,263 complaints received, only 8 were from Jews.

The paucity of complaints from Jews has been plausibly explained by the Commission's Executive Director, Herman Edelsberg. Mr. Edelsberg, former director of the Anti-Defamation League's Washington office, suggests that while anti-Semitic discrimination in industry is pervasive, it is not actually experienced by many Jews because they turn away from the industries where they know they are not welcome.

Discrimination against Jews is most palpable in the higher management positions, but those who experience rebuffs at that level are the kind of people who don't file official complaints.

The problem of the executive suite calls for an affirmative action program in cooperation with such experienced and vigorous organizations as ADL. Indeed, ADL has been engaged in such a program for many years.

The Federal presence appears today in places where it was only a distant and hazy symbol before. The Commission's investigators and conciliators are in every corner of the country, speaking for a Nation that is ashamed of what has been done to its minorities. Happily, we are finding that we speak to a growing body of citizens who are anxious to eliminate a history of discrimination. Some remarkable results have been achieved.

In many instances, employers and unions have gone beyond the fact of a single complaint and initiated positive actions to do away with overall discrimination. For example, thousands of dollars have been committed in the southern plant of a major corporation to tear down and rebuild formerly segregated washrooms.

In another corporation's southern plant, agreement to merge horizontally segregated seniority lines was reached within the past few weeks. Negroes and whites in Crown-Zellerbach's Bogalusa, La., papermill met in New Orleans with us and with company representatives—we took a step together that could ultimately effect a major change in the rights of promotion for 70,000 paper workers in the South. What began in one small department of the Bogalusa plant has every good chance of being extended to other departments of that plant and eventually throughout the industry. Crown-Zellerbach is to be applauded for its cooperation.

It was, in one view, simply a question of agreeing that persons doing the same job have the same chance at progressing, without regard to their race. But it happened in Bogalusa, a city riddled with Klan-inspired violence. It is, then, a happy omen for future racial peace.

But, we don't kid ourselves. Discrimination in the United States is a very real and stubborn fact. It is, in many instances, a conscious bigotry, with angry, built-in resistance to the law. In as many, or even more instances, discrimination is unconscious or habitual—an entrenched institutional practice and every bit as damaging.

Our experience has shown that employers and labor unions sometimes move toward compliance because they cannot afford litigation or the unfavorable public image discrimination can bring them. In the most coldblooded corporation, the possibility of widespread publicity resulting from a Federal court suit in a discrimination case will often warm the blood with a willingness to make practical amends.

Fair employment has become a matter of dollars and good sense in other ways. Economic boycotts and purchasing power are factors the most hardhearted businessman must reckon with. But we do not sell short the national conscience. We approach our objective of a fair chance at a job to the qualified person with the belief that Americans have always acted, in the final analysis, on the principle of fairness.

Our assignment under title VII is not just a responsibility for the handling of complaints—important as that task is. If this Commission is to accomplish fully its role, the affirmative action programs of our technical assistance division provide the key.

Therefore, the Commission has embarked on a liaison with the business and industrial community to help establish programs which will bring about equal employment opportunity for minorities—and help them qualify so that they may exercise that opportunity. It is not enough to open the door. We must, as President Johnson has reminded us, make it possible for a person to walk through that door.

Within the coming months, regional conferences will be held involving 60 U.S. cities. The Commission will offer a model merit employment program to the business leaders of these cities and urge them to undertake realistic recruiting and training of minorities to qualify for employment.

The economic boom of today has created one of the tightest labor markets in our Nation's history. It is a basic economic principle that the free private entrepreneur should make the broadest possible use of the available labor supply in order to achieve the most efficient and profitable progress and development of his enterprise. Equal employment opportunity is simply good business. There are large segments of our labor market which are not being used. In the main these segments are composed of minority groups. To train them and seek out those who are trained, is a pressing responsibility we all share.

There is a story about three bricklayers working on a foundation wall which explains the goal of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. When a passerby asked them what they were doing, he received three different answers.

The first said: "I'm putting one damn brick on top of another—the way they told me."

The second said: "I'm laying bricks to build a foundation."

But the third bricklayer said: "I am helping build a beautiful public building where the welfare of the Nation will be decided."

We in the EEOC believe we are doing more than finding jobs for minorities—we are building the foundation for the Great Society. The kind of vision that leads American businessmen to support the work of organizations like the Anti-Defamation League can make that foundation unshakable.

National Eye Institute Gains Distinguished Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, March 7, 1966, I introduced H.R. 13358, to amend the Public Health Service Act, to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health. In my statement supporting this legislation—Congressional Record A1232—I discussed the need for an institute devoted to research on blinding eye diseases, blindness and visual defects and I related to my colleagues my experience as President of the National Council To Combat Blindness, Inc.

As I stated in my previous remarks, I wrote to the members of the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Fight for Sight, requesting their comments on the proposed National Eye Institute.

I have received the following replies from members of the Scientific Advisory Committee as well as from others, including officers and directors of the Fight for Sight expressing their opinion on the proposed legislation:

The Wilmer Institute,
Johns Hopkins Hospital,
Baltimore, Md., February 1966.

Herbert Tenzer,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Tenzer: Thank you very much for your letter of February 10. I am delighted to know that you are interested in cosponsoring the bill introduced by Congressman Frederick B. Rooney, of Pennsylvania, for a National Eye Institute. I sincerely believe that this would do more to promote research into the causes of blindness and the prevention of blindness than anything else that could possibly be done in this country.

Last year, when I testified before Senator Hill's committee with Mr. Jules Stein of Music Corp. of America, both of us strongly recommended that a separate institute for eyes be initiated in the NIH.

If I can send you further information about this, I would be most happy to do so. I am delighted to know that you are going to cosponsor this bill.

Very sincerely yours,
A. E. Maumenee, M.D.

New York, N.Y.,
February 12, 1966.

Re H.R. 12373.
Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Herbert: Thank you for acquainting me with the proposed bill to establish a National Eye Institute and for affording me an opportunity to offer my comments regarding it.

My first reaction is, of course, one of great pleasure and deep satisfaction. It is extremely gratifying to see that Congress will soon consider (and I do hope will approve and adopt) legislation providing for such an institute. Clearly a National Eye Institute could be effectively instrumental in furthering, improving, and increasing research in the field of blinding eye diseases—the very aim and purpose that has inspired the efforts of the Fight for Sight for almost 20 years. I think the potential creation of the National Eye Institute is a wonderful project, and I think you and Congressman Rooney deserve widespread gratitude and support for your sponsorship of H.R. 12373.

The only thought that occurs to me, after a careful reading of the proposed act, is that (except by implication) it does not mention the prevention of blindness. I realize that more intensive research relating to blinding eye diseases and visual disorders will, as a consequence, lead to the prevention of blindness, but, nevertheless, it does seem to me that the bill might specifically include reference to the prevention of blindness among sighted people, as well as to treatment for those already afflicted. However, this is merely an incidental observation, and in no way lessens my profound regard for H.R. 12373 as it now stands, which I think is just great.

Thank you again for your very welcome communication.

With warm personal regards, and all good wishes.

Sincerely,
Sydney A. Mayers.

The University of Iowa,
Iowa City, Iowa, February 14, 1966.

Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Tenzer: I am in possession of your letter of February 10, 1966, and wish to thank you most warmly for your interest in the proposal for a National Eye Institute as suggested by H.R. 12373 introduced by Congressman Fred B. Rooney. I believe that it would be a very fine thing, indeed, if you would cosponsor this bill. In view of your great concern with blindness and blindness research, you would be the obvious man to do so.

The establishment of the National Institute of Neurologic Diseases and Blindness has been a great boon to research on vision and eye diseases, especially in the early years of its existence when neurology was less prepared than it is now to avail itself of the facilities offered by the Institute. However, today, as I understand it, ophthalmology has materially been reduced in its share and the establishment of a separate National Eye Institute has become most desirable.

Again, thank you for your interest in this matter. With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,
Hermann M. Burian, M.D.,
Professor of Ophthalomology.

The Institute of Ophthalmology,
The Presbyterian Hospital,
New York, N.Y., February 14, 1966.

Mr. Herbert Tenzer,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Tenzer: Thank you for your note of February 10, 1966. I am wholeheartedly in favor of H.R. 12373.

The establishment of a National Eye Institute would have a major effect upon our efforts to attack the causes of blinding diseases.

I would be happy to write in support of this proposal to any of your colleagues you think desirable.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
Arthur Gerard DeVoe, M.D.

HOSPITAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 15, 1966.
HERBERT TENZER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TENZER: In reply to your letter of February 10, I can only say that I strongly urge you to cosponsor, and guide through Congress, the proposal for a National Eye Institute as suggested by H.R. 12373.

The problem of eye disease and blindness is becoming increasingly important, particularly in its geriatric aspects. In my opinion, ophthalmologic research and teaching would be greatly stimulated by a separate institute. The Director, of course, would be responsible for eye alone. He would be able to devote his entire time to the program. I am somewhat concerned that blindness has not been given a position as prominent as cancer, heart disease, stroke and even other fields of medicine where greater knowledge is needed.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD G. SCHEIE, M.D.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., February 15, 1966.
Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. TENZER: Thank you for writing concerning H.R. 12373, introduced by Mr. ROONEY. I know what an active role you played in the establishment and subsequent development of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and of your desire to see ophthalmic research flourish. In the early years of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness the major portion of their budget was diverted to neurology with the excuse that there were no adequate areas in which to spend research money wisely. With the expansion of ophthalmic research the complaint was that the research projects were not of comparable quality to those in neurology. This misinformation persisted although the research requests were judged by different committees, with the neurologists having one basic and one clinical committee while the eye programs were judged solely by a basic committee. Now with the tightened budget of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, worthwhile research programs in ophthalmology already approved are not being funded. Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had led to specific recommendations for the allocation of funds for ophthalmic research. This has led to a sequestering of funds as required by the exact interpretation of the subcommittees' report, but not to an increased dollar amount for ophthalmic research.

It all points up, I believe, the need for an independent institute whose major attention is upon blinding disease and the mechanisms of vision. Such an institute would be able to attract an institute director and deputies of talents comparable to other institutes. This is not possible at the present time when a deputy directorship (one of several) is offered ophthalmology. I know very little about the mechanism of implementation of a bill such as that proposing a national eye institute. I should hope however that the activities, laboratories, funds, et cetera now encompassed in the blindness portion of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness would be turned to the National Eye Institute. I believe that this constitutes my major concern in respect to this legislation.

Thank you for your letter.

Very truly yours,
FRANK W. NEWELL, M.D.,
Professor and Chairman, Division of Ophthalmology.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SAN FRANCISCO MEDICAL CENTER,
San Francisco, Calif., February 15, 1966.
Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TENZER: Thank you for your letter of February 10 asking for comments on the proposal for a National Eye Institute as suggested by Congressman FRED B. ROONEY, of Pennsylvania. I am very happy to learn that you are going to cosponsor H.R. 12373. In my opinion a National Eye Institute is long overdue and is greatly needed at the present time as a forward step in the prevention of blindness program that is of concern to all ophthalmologists, and indeed to all Americans. Preventable blindness is a world problem, and the impact of a National Eye Institute would extend far beyond the confines of the United States.

It is true that much progress has already been made in the prevention of blindness through the efforts of such organizations as the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and such private foundations as the National Council to Combat Blindness, Research to Prevent Blindness, and the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness. A very much greater effort is needed, however. The fact that 80 percent of all blindness is the result of diseases whose causes are either unknown or inadequately defined makes it imperative that present research efforts be multiplied many times. Fortunately, there is an increasing number of young investigators being trained by American universities who would be available for this greater effort if there were funds to support their work.

As the director of a small eye research foundation, I have been struck by the boundless possibilities for investigation into the causes of blindness and the means of preventing it. There is no question in my mind but that we greatly need the establishment of an Eye Institute that could assume leadership for eye research in this country and abroad. I do not wish to minimize in any way the good work accomplished by the Eye Section of the NINDB, but such effort could be expanded many times by an Institute devoted solely to eye diseases.

Please feel free to call on me for anything you think I might be able to do to promote the passage of H.R. 12373. You may be sure that I will work actively to that end.

Sincerely yours,
PHILLIPS THYGESON, M.D.,
Director, Francis I. Proctor Foundation for Research in Ophthalmology.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SAN FRANCISCO MEDICAL CENTER,
San Francisco, Calif., February 16, 1966.
Mr. HERBERT TENZER,
Fifth District, New York, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TENZER: Thank you for your very nice letter and it is good to hear from you, especially from the exalted Halls of Congress. We have kept track of you through Mildred.

I had correspondence and personal communications from members of an organization which has just been formed in the country; namely, the Association of University Professors of Ophthalmology. This organization comprises the heads of ophthalmology of all the medical schools in the United States and it might be well to get an official statement from the organization. You could do this through Dr. A. E. Maumenee, John Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md.

I am in favor of a separate National Eye Institute for the reasons that it is difficult for the public and Congress to be clearly oriented with regard to the exact position of eye disease and their connection in relation to neurological diseases. Since the eye field also is a surgical specialty there is very little connection between Eye and the Neurological Institute. In spite of the efforts of the very capable people who have administered the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, it has not been possible to maintain a proper balance in the administration of eye research and training. The problems involved with blindness are so distinct from neurological diseases that the two have no real connection. Very little work has been done on prevention of blindness or in research in this area and it has not been possible at the present time to properly handle this aspect of the problem. I think that it can only be done through separate departments.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,
MICHAEL J. HOGAN, M.D.,
Professor and Chairman, Department of Ophthalmology.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT THE MEDICAL CENTER,
Chicago, Ill., February 16, 1966.
Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TENZER: I am glad for the opportunity to put myself on record as being strongly in favor of a National Eye Institute in the National Institute of Health.

An institute designed and operated primarily for research in the field of ophthalmology could, in my opinion, most effectively demonstrate its potential as a major factor in the Nation's eye health. Such an institute would also, I believe, have an excellent chance of having its financial needs recognized and met.

I am pleased to learn that you are planning to cosponsor H.R. 12373, as introduced by Congressman FRED B. ROONEY, of Pennsylvania.

If my memory serves me right, I had the pleasure of being introduced to you at one of the annual meetings of the Advisory Council of the National Council To Combat Blindness, the organization to which we in ophthalmology sort of lovingly refer to as Miss Weisenfeld's organization.

Thanking you in advance for all the support you are giving ophthalmology, I am.

Sincerely yours,
PETER C. KRONFELD, M.D.,
Professor and Head, Department of Ophthalmology.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *February 17, 1966.*
Representative HERBERT TENZER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of February 10 concerning the proposal for a National Eye Institute.

At first glance, this would appear to be a good idea. However, before really giving you a considered answer, I should like to know how much money was appropriated for research in neurology and how much for research in ophthalmology during the past 5 years.

Upon receipt of your letter, I will give this matter further thought and communicate with you again.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,
SAM SALTZMAN.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
St. Louis, Mo., February 18, 1966.
Mr. HERBERT TENZER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TENZER: I am most enthusiastic about the proposal of Congressman ROONEY for a National Eye Institute. Such an institute will afford those of us interested in eye research with the opportunity for investigating causes and means of prevention of blinding diseases.

I would like to encourage you in every way I can to cosponsor the proposal.

Best regards.
Sincerely,
Bernard Becker, M.D.,
Professor and Head of the Department of Ophthalmology.

University of California,
School of Medicine,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 21, 1966.
Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Tenzer: In reply to your request for comments concerning establishment of a National Eye Institute, may I state that I wholeheardedly endorse this proposed legislation and am pleased to know that you are planning to consponsor this amendment to the Public Health Service Act.

Prior to receiving your communication, I wrote Congressman Alphonzo Bell, representative of the district in which I reside, indicating my support for this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,
Bradley R. Straatsma, M.D.,
Professor of Surgery and Chief,
Division of Ophthalmology.

New York University
School of Medicine,
New York, N.Y., February 24, 1966.
Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Tenzer: May I express my gratification at being asked to discuss the proposal for a National Eye Institute, introduced as H.R. 12373 by Congressman Rooney. I am heartily in favor of this measure which will go a long way toward meeting one of the most critical needs in the health status of the Nation. For a good many years the problems of the eye have been subsumed within the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and very good work has most assuredly been carried out. It is presently clear, however, that we have evolved far beyond the abilities of a joint institute to adequately serve the problems of blindness. Under the programs initiated by the NINDB great progress has been made in establishing first-rate departments of ophthalmology and affiliated research units around the country along with the development and training of personnel dedicated to research careers in vision. The time has now come to divorce the field of vision from its subsidiary role within an institute whose primary responsibilties and concerns have related to matters other than the eye and vision. To be sure, there are ties that bind ophthalmology and vision to the general field of neurological science and these ties must be maintained but the unique problems of the eye now require an administrative organization which can devote its efforts, undiluted, to the study and the implementation of programs of basic research and training centered on vision and blindness.

I predict a great increase in productivity of programs in vision under the aegis of a National Eye Institute. The disadvantages of isolation from the Institute of Neurology will be more than made up in the enhanced stress which will rightfully be placed upon visual problems. The introduction of this bill by Congressman Rooney, in my judgment, is a merited and necessary evolutionary step in the maturation of a discipline which is more than able to stand on its own feet and which must achieve independence if the problems of blindness are ultimately to be resolved.

I, therefore, enthusiastically endorse your cosponsorship of this most important and progressive bill.

With very best wishes,
Sincerely yours,
Goodwin M. Breinin, M.D.,
Professor and Chairman.

Pittsburgh, Pa., *February 25, 1966.*
Mr. Herbert Tenzer,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Herbert: Sorry we did not have time to discuss proposal for National Eye Institute bill, H.R. 12373—as presented by Fred B. Rooney, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, at our meeting of February 14. This proposal has been under consideration for about a year. At our SAC meeting last June, the members that I was able to speak to, were about equally divided on the subject.

Since receiving your letter, I have done some checking with the leaders of various private agencies who would be vitally interested—i.e., J. M. Ulmer, secretary, National Foundation for Eye Research—a paper organization but with political influence; Dr. John Ferree, National Society; Dr. Arthur Keeney, Secretary, National Commission for Research in Ophthalmology and Blindness, director of Wills Eye Hospital, Philadelphia, and a new member of our SAC. I also tried to get hold of David Weeks, executive director, Research To Prevent Blindness, but he was out of town until next week.

Dr. Keeney gave me the most important factual information. He personally is very much in favor of it. He advised that at a meeting in Chicago January 30, of one of the professional associations, attended by most of the leading ophthalmologists in the country, the news release of January 27, and Congressman Rooney's bill was discussed fully and they were nearly 100 percent in favor of it.

I think this is very good because the ophthalmologists have been riding on the coattails of the National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, who have been very active through Col. Luke Quinn, Washington lobbyist, in getting appropriation increases for the National Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness (NINDB). Keeney said the ophthalmologists realize that if they don't get behind this bill and get off the seat of their pants, that the optometrists are going to take the play away from them, through the influence of the brother of Representative John Fogarty, who through some connection in Bethesda, is strong for the optometrists.

The ophthalmologists feel they have enough "get up and go" to do their own lobbying through their influential patients and contacts and they will be able gradually to obtain appropriation to fund the program that is now working out to some degree through the NINDB.

I also understand that Research for Prevention of Blindness—through a Gallup poll conducted last November—found that the loss of sight is the second illness feared by the public. This is mentioned in Rooney's "fact sheet." Jules Stein, chairman, M.C.A., as well as chairman of Research for Prevention of Blindness, is sponsoring this through Rooney, who was a patient of one of Mr. Stein's very close, friendly ophthalmologists. This is all background for your information.

Dr. John Ferree of the society told me this was going to be discussed Thursday afternoon by their executive committee and he could not give an official opinion until after the meeting but he personally was very much in favor of the bill. J. M. Ulmer, of Cleveland, has the same opinion.

I have not discussed this with Mildred yet but I personally think it would be a wonderful thing for the expansion of eye research. I am glad to know that you are planning to cosponsor the bill. I would like to point out one thing that I don't think is included. If and when the bill passes, and I surely hope it will, it will probably take 3 to 5 years before appropriations are established, building complex secured or built; that is.

Haven't time to finish this today. In the meantime, I have talked to Fred Rooney and his executive secretary, Leonard Randolph. Will try and complete my report the first of the week. Keep well. Best wishes.

Sincerely yours.
S. Adelsheim.

Fight for Sight,
New York, N.Y., February 25, 1966.
Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Herbert: Only now am I able to respond to your letter of February 10, asking for my opinion with regard to a National Eye Institute.

Although I have a very definite opinion, based on my almost 20 years of service as executive director of the Fight for Sight, I wanted the views of leaders in the field of ophthalmology, many of whom serve on our scientific advisory committee and others with whom I am in contact.

I should like you to know that all are extremely enthusiastic and feel that the establishment of a National Eye Institute is past due and mandatory in order that the necessary progress be made in the fight against blinding eye diseases which, as you know, are on the increase.

This consensus from particularly qualified and conversant men in the field of sight, underlines my own conviction that a separate Institute concerned with visual impairments and blinding eye diseases is vital. I wish to go on record in urging the establishment of a National Eye Institute, and hope I may have the opportunity to testify on its behalf during the hearings.

I appreciate your own interest in this matter, but then again, in view of your association with the Fight for Sight over the years, first as a director, then vice president and then president, an office you still hold despite your many other commitments—I can only say that this is an extension of the leadership you have already given in the effort to conquer blinding eye diseases.

With continued appreciation for your devotion to the cause of preventing blindness, and kind personal regards.

Sincerely,
Mildred Weisenfeld,
Founder and Executive Director.

Bascom Palmer Eye Institute,
Miami, Fla., February 28, 1966.
Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
Congress of the United States,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Tenzer: I have been impressed with the interests of ophthalmologists around the country in the bill introduced by Congressman Fred B. Rooney, of Pennsylvania, H.R. 12373.

Recently, at a meeting of university professors, the significance of this bill was discussed and there was unanimous opinion that everything should be done to establish a National Eye Institute. We are all convinced, as Mr. Rooney has so aptly put it, "that the enactment of this bill into law and the resulting establishment of a National Eye Institute will be the most important step ever taken to rid mankind of the scourge of blindness."

I hope that you will see your way clear to lend your support to this bill and that by next year we will be well on the way to establishing such an institute.

Sincerely,

Edward W. D. Norton, M. D.,
Professor and Chairman Department of Ophthalmology.

The City of New York,
Office of Housing and
Development Coordinator,
New York, N.Y., March 2, 1966.

Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Herb: I have read the bill proposing a National Eye Institute which you are planning to cosponsor with Representative Rooney, of Pennsylvania.

I think the bill is great. However, I have two comments:

1. Are the necessary funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this bill, and
2. I believe that somebody from our organization should be included as a member of the Advisory Council, if consonant with section 452A, as set forth in the bill.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel Z. Nelson,
Deputy Coordinator of Housing and Development.

The Mount Sinai Hospital,
New York, N.Y., March 2, 1966.

Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Tenzer: There are many cogent reasons for the establishment of a National Eye Institute and I do feel that the Fight for Sight and National Council to Combat Blindness should support this vigorously.

Sincerely yours,

Irving H. Leopold, M.D.

Woodmere, N.Y.,
March 2, 1966.

Congressman Herbert Tenzer,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Tenzer: I am in full support to Congressman Fred B. Rooney's (Pennsylvania) proposal to establish a National Eye Institute.

Sincerely,

Arthur A. Gold, M.D.

New York, N.Y.,
March 2, 1966.

Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
House of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Herb: Thanks for your enclosures on H.R. 12373. I can see the need for a separate institute; but I also see inherent dangers. The public wants eye diseases cured and prevented. The optometrists want greater status—and this bill will offer them an opportunity to attain that by wasting millions on so-called vision research. I am for this bill if it is emphasized in the bill that the prevention and cure of blindness is the chief goal of the Institute.

Sincerely,

Dan M. Gordon, M.D.

Harry Moss Jeweler,
New York, N.Y., March 3, 1966.

Congressman Herbert Tenzer,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Herbert: I have just returned from a lengthy trip, and I was pleasantly surprised to have received your letter advising me of the intention to open a National Eye Institute. Certainly, I am all for it.

In my position as national vice president of Fight for Sight, we have always urged what you have outlined in your proposed bill.

A National Eye Institute has long been needed and will help countless upon countless of thousands. Had there been a National Eye Institute my sight might have been saved.

You have my complete support, and if there is anything further I can do to help pass this measure; please do not hestiate to call on me.

I trust you are enjoying good health, and I am looking forward to seeing you in the very near future.

Kind regards,

Harry Moss.

Mr. Speaker, the support for the bill is to establish a National Eye Institute, illustrated by the correspondence which I have quoted above, is encouraging and should be considered by the Congress. The need for a new program to assist the fight against blinding eye diseases is clear and I urged my colleagues to join this effort to establish a National Eye Institute.

One Citizen's View on Southeast Asia Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the Congressional Record a letter to the editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal. The letter, written by Rabbi Jacob H. Epstein, is an excellent presentation of one citizen's views on U.S. policy in southeast Asia. I considered it thought provoking and believed that other Members of Congress would enjoy the opportunity to read it:

To the Herald-Journal:

Although we can sympathize with the humanitarian impulses of the church and other groups who vehemently protest the involvement and escalation of the war in Vietnam by the United States, yet it is nevertheless noteworthy the lack of comprehension envinced by these groups as to the true nature of this conflict.

By now it should be quite clear that South Vietnam is being used as a testing ground by the Red Chinese for their militant ideology. It makes little difference if it's Ho Chi Minh or another Chinese puppet who is in power and must bow to the Chinese masters, we know that it is the determination of the Red Chinese to prove to the entire world that the West is weak and disunited and cannot stand up against the overwhelming forces of Communist revolution.

In its ideological struggle with Soviet Russia, the Red Chinese also want to prove that such terms as coexistence and mutual understanding with the West are sheer nonsense. Therefore, any means within reason can be used to further the objectives of the school of militant Red Chinese communism.

It matters little if millions of people will perish as a result. To the Red Chinese human life is the most expendable item in their program for global conquest. If a country loses its inhabitants through war, then the Red Chinese can always pour in their hordes to fill the gap.

America is today the only country in the entire world that is making a real stand against communism. Even its former allies for whom she gave so much are deserting her. It is therefore tragic to note that Americans act so dissident and cause disunity.

Whenever protest marches take place and national leaders vent their opposition, the Red Chinese gloat. Their propaganda organs blow up every act of protest to impress the Chinese people that America is weak and disunited.

Really, what I fail to understand is why it has suddenly become so fashionable to protest loudly. If I recall during the Second World War when millions of people were sent to their fiery graves by the most brutal murders ever perpetrated, nary a protest was heard. In 1959, when Red China plunged into Tibet and hundreds of thousands of innocent people were ruthlessly murdered, little protest was heard. When the Egyptian Dictator Nasser sent 60,000 Egyptian troops to Yemen, and they massacred thousands of Arabs, I did not see any picketing of the Egyptian Embassy. No pipsqueak students have protested against the Chinese penetration into many other countries. And pray what are Red Chinese advisers doing in Syria? It seems that only the United States can do wrong by sending its troops to fight communism. Ruthless war by other people is perfectly permissible.

Perhaps these groups do not realize that if the United States should ever retreat in Vietnam and the Red Chinese gain their coveted victory, it will only mark the beginning of a far bloodier and costlier series of conflicts. As with the evil Hitler whenever he won a victory, it only whetted his enormous appetite until he tried to swallow the entire world.

If instead of being dissident, we would show determination to back our Government, our enemies might be brought to their senses and realize that their militancy will not prevail. Only then can the Red Chinese warlords order the North Vietnamese to end the conflict. I doubt that the Red Chinese will remain intransigent in the face of real American unity. These Reds may be ruthless but they have probably studied some history and even they would not dare plunge this whole globe into a war of annihilation.

Rabbi Jacob H. Epstein.

A Polish-American Art Exhibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1966, I was pleased to attend an exhibition of the art of Bernard Lewandowski, sponsored by the Polish-American Youth Association of Passaic, N.J.

The artist who created the impressive paintings now resides in Passaic. He was born in Poland, and studied at the Kracow Academy of Fine Arts until the war. Leaving Poland in 1945, he studied in Paris, and after 18 years in France he came to the United States. His works can be found in many private collections, and also in museums in his native land.

I am proud to have an artist of Mr. Lewandowski's stature in the congressional district which I represent, and I compliment the Polish-American Youth Association of Passaic for its contribution to the cultural life of the community in sponsoring the exhibition of Mr. Lewandowski's stimulating work.

No Justification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I filed legislation to reverse the Customs Bureau's recent adoption of new guidelines for the appraisement of imported rubber-soled canvass footwear. At that time, I pointed out that the Custom Bureau's action constituted a drastic reduction of the tariff traditionally applied to these goods, and that this reduction posed a serious threat to the economic prosperity of the domestic footwear industry. A recent editorial appearing in the February 25, 1966, issue of the Naugatuck News sumarized the concern of the many residents of my congressional district who depend upon the continued vitality of this domestic industry for their livelihood, and I have unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record for the consideration of my colleagues.

No Justification

We are quite pleased with the proposed legislation filed by Congressman John Monagan to correct the "highly discriminatory" action of the Customs Bureau when that agency recently lowered tariffs on rubber-soled canvas footwear.

The Monagan bill would reestablish the Presidential proclamation of 1933, which set tariffs on such products at the high cost of American production (now approximately $2.65 per pair). The new guidelines established by the Customs Bureau this past month would base tariffs on the lowest of domestic production (about 90 cents). Obviously, the new tariff is based upon a much cheaper shoe than is produced by most of the leading manufacturers of rubber-soled canvas footwear.

We doubt if the Customs Bureau can justify the recent action which was taken. Economically it doesn't make sense. The move will throw American workers out of jobs in order that workers in foreign countries will be employed. It is obviously a political favor for a few importers of foreign-made products—all at the expense of the American workingman and American industry.

In taking the action, the Customs Bureau ignored the pleas of union and management officials as well as the advice of other Federal agencies. We seriously question the motives of Customs Bureau officials.

Even under the $2.65 base, the imports of foreign made rubber-soled canvas footwear has increased from 40,000 pair in 1954 to 21 million pair in 1965. A fantastic rise during an 11 year period.

What will happen now? The floodgates are open. One would suspect that the Customs Bureau has made it a goal to destroy the rubber footwear industry in this country.

Noting the figures which show the fantastic increase in competing foreign-made products, one would think consideration would be given to raising tariff barriers, not lowering them.

It is appalling to us to note, that the Customs Bureau has not been collecting the tariffs on rubber-soled canvas footwear for the past 3 years—and now wants to make the 90-cent base retroactive to February 4, 1963, when evaluations on such products were suspended.

As Congressman Monagan put it. "Now, after postponing the importers' obligation to pay any tariffs for 3 years, the Bureau is retroactively reducing the tariff which has accrued during that period. In view of the large Federal revenue loss involved." Congressman Monagan feels the matter deserves more study. We feel a full investigation is called for.

Previously, the Customs Bureau reduced tariffs on rubber overshoes under similar circumstances. Statistics reveal that in 1955 only 185.412 pairs of waterproof footwear were imported from foreign countries. But by 1963, when the duties were lower, the level had advanced to more than 12.8 million—and, it is somewhat higher now.

We call upon the entire Connecticut congressional delegation to take up the fight. Not just Naugatuck stands to suffer, but the life of an entire American industry is at stake.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce into the Record of today's proceedings a great essay. These inspiring words were written by Miss Linda A. Gowing, of Bellevue, Wash. With them she won the top award for the State of Washington in the voice-of-democracy contest sponsored in our State and nationwide by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary.

We, and all Americans, could profit by reading this young lady's definition of democracy.

Voice of Democracy

(By Linda A. Gowing)

A young girl stared into the barren hills of Letcher County, Ky. She embraced the cracked figurine of a Madonna and child. Her life: a void. Who am I?

An Argentine farmer walked his dead land. He pulled from the earth a rusted stalk of wheat. His fields: a wasteland. Why am I here?

A Negro boy struggled to recite the Pledge of Allegiance. Nigger, nigger. His status: subhuman. Where am I going?

"And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the earth and breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living being."

Living beings, all of them. And what has democracy created for each? The answer: Identity, a sense of worth, integrity.

The young girl today wears shoes; she can print her name, and sing "America, the Beautiful," *she is a child of God.*

The South American farmer plants his crops in irrigated land. His children have bread—and his children have laughter. He has found a place, a purpose.

The Negro boy is learning the meaning of the words, "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and *justice for all.*"

Democracy does that. It is a spirit, a thing that breathes, a fire sometimes, but it is vital. And it is very specific.

To the young girl, democracy becomes a pair of shoes, and a government that cared enough to extend its concern to the welfare of her family.

To the farmer, democracy became the Peace Corps, and a man who puts the power of his heart into the strength of his hands.

And to the Negro boy, democracy became the simple gesture of standing among white children, hand to his heart, pledging "liberty and justice for all."

All three of these human beings are the beneficiaries of democracy.

How then do I participate in democracy? How do I assess it? How define? And what is the prospect for my generation?

Here's my answer. Democracy is not measured in antiballistic missiles, nor world marketing computers, nor even in man's conquest of the outer universe. It is now power, nor wealth, nor triumph. My democracy is measured not by things, but instead, by complex and simple—ever fallible human beings. Generations are made up of those people. I am as fallible as the next—as hopeful—as fearful. My generation, though, is going to be that government that puts shoes on the Kentucky girl. My generation is going to be the compassionate hand of the Peace Corps in Argentina. We will be also the soldier, the Rabbi, the mother. So we take our part, invent our personal share.

Democracy is a working thing. And it is a pretty down-to-earth thing. I'm involved in it, too, as all of us are. We're already a part of it. Killer diseases, racial conflict, international tensions, the population explosion. These issues are very specific too.

And we shall meet them. I am making an investment in democracy. I am committed by birth, circumstances, volition, and pride. Multiply this by the hundreds of thousands of high school students across this country—and you see the future is proud, clear, and triumphant.

Inflation, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the concern of our people over the inflationary trend of our economy has been increasing for the past several months.

The sharp rise in prices, the additional costs of the war in Vietnam, and the restoration of some excise taxes are but a few of the factors that are giving impetus to this deep concern.

Just yesterday we were all shocked to see the stock market take its worse loss since November 1963.

Recently the newspapers in my district have frequently discussed this subject, and I insert at this point in the Record their comments on the present situation.

[From the Bristol (Tenn.) Herald Courier, Feb. 24, 1966]

A Dollar's Value

"How Real Is Inflation in the U.S.?"

That is the title of an article in the January 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report. It is accompanied by a full-page chart which makes informative, and woeful, reading.

Assume that the 1955 dollar was worth 100 cents. On that basis, your present food dollar has lost 15 cents in value; your rent dollar 13 cents; your home-building dollar 20 cents; your college-cost dollar 24 cents; your auto repair dollar 20 cents. So it goes, down the list of the things we use and buy.

All in all, the magazine says, your cost of living dollar has lost 15 cents in its buying power over a mere 10-year period. It doesn't take an expert in higher mathematics to figure out what will happen if that trend continues—or worse, accelerates.

And accelerate it undoubtedly will if the creation of huge deficits continues. The big domestic question now is whether Congress will take steps to protect what is left of your dollar's value, by really applying a heavy blue pencil to nonessential spending.

[From the Beaunit Spinnerette, February 1966]

INFLATION SIGNS OBVIOUS

Although labor union leaders last month were saying that they saw no danger of inflation, the Department of Labor hoisted one clear sign, a 0.4-percent jump in the Consumer Price Index.

This was the increase of the several preceding months.

The key reason for the price increases was not hard to find, according to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Union wages have been booming.

In manufacturing in 1965, the average wage increase was 45 percent higher than the average for the preceding 5 years. This was coupled with a 25-percent drop in the average worker's increase in productivity.

Here is an analysis, based on Labor Department statistics:

1960–64: Average increase in hourly earnings in manufacturing, 2.9 percent; 1965—4.2 percent.

1960–64: Average increase in worker productivity, 3.4 percent; 1965—2.5 percent.

In the construction industry, the situation was worse. Latest Labor Department figures show that wages and fringe benefits are rising 4.8 percent annually. As a consequence, construction costs in 1965 rose roughly 3 percent.

Although labor leaders may not see them, the danger signs of inflation are clear to others. Wage restraint obviously is needed in 1966.

[From the Jonesboro (Tenn.) Herald & Tribune, March 1966]

A NEW CLASS OF POOR

There is skepticism, within both parties, that the deficit for the 1967 fiscal year can be held to $1.8 billion, as forecast by the President in his state of the Union message.

The projected budget is $112.8 billion. Anticipated revenues are $111 billion. The skeptics feel, for one thing that actual spending will run well beyond the anticipated figure—no one, for example, can now tell how costly the Vietnam war, which is being constantly escalated, will be. And they feel, for another thing, that revenues will not reach the estimates even if Congress goes along with the Presidential request to reimpose certain of the recently reduced Federal excise taxes, which is doubtful.

The trouble lies in the effort to wage a costly war on the one hand—while embarking on all manner of social welfare projects on the other. We find its fruits in increased inflation. The Portland Oregonian made a cogent comment in these words: "The truth is that inflation and the Government's vast spending to help the poor have already created a new level of poverty above the old. Ask anyone whose welfare or veterans benefits have been out back because of the other pocket addition of social security benefits. Ask anyone struggling on a fixed income in retirement. There has been created a new class of poor."

There will be more new classes of poor if present inflation breeding policies, based on a "guns and butter, too" philosophy, prevail. This is the fact that now confronts Congress.

[The Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, Feb. 28, 1966]

HOW DO WE STAND ON INFLATION?

President Johnson's administration at times seems to be taking a serious interest in the inflation threat, but at other times not.

At a press conference Saturday, the President said he didn't want to "put the brakes on too fast." And he minimized the revolt signaled by the AFL–CIO executive council meeting in Miami Beach.

Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz, questioned on a Sunday TV program, at one point said the country is "obviously at the point where there has got to be vigilance at every moment." And while he admitted there is "a very real resistance" from labor unions to the administration's price-wage guideline limits, he was really confident this all could be amicably worked out.

But there was little that was amiable in the remarks of the union leaders. George Meany said the guidelines were "impractical," that they were devised in "trickery." That what's needed is a tight restraint on profits, not wages. He also demanded the Government's domestic programs be expanded.

Wirtz said the administration would rely on "constant pressure" to keep prices and wages in line and got off an implied threat that the Government, as far and away the biggest spender in the country, might withhold its business in cases where the guidelines were fractured.

But then he said there is "no present plan along that line."

In short, it appears the administration is reluctant to meet the labor union challenge head on, and that mainly it is hoping the challenge somehow simply will go away.

The President, Wirtz, businesses out for high profits, and the labor unions all need to understand a statement made at the Saturday press conference; that the first people to suffer from inflation and the high cost of living were working people. Author, L.B.J.

And it is a fact nobody can dispute: Living costs now are at an alltime high and still climbing.

Water Pollution: Public Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's proposal "to clean and preserve entire river basins from their sources to their mouths" is—in the opinion of the Minneapolis Tribune—one of the President's most important messages to Congress.

The paper states that "man is threatening his own existence by poisoning his environment." It adds that the President's water plan is timely and that "it is heartening also to have him ask for an intensified attack on air pollution."

Because of its clarity on issues before us, I suggest that we make the editorial a part of the RECORD.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Feb. 27, 1966]

WATER POLLUTION: PUBLIC ENEMY

In one of his most important messages to Congress, President Johnson last week proposed a vast program "to clean and preserve entire river basins from their sources to their mouths." He would start with a $50 million demonstration project and a national water commission.

Man is threatening his own existence by poisoning his environment—water, air, and soil—with industrial wastes, pesticides, detergents, sewage, noxious gases, etc. Thus, the President's water plan is timely, indeed overdue, and it is heartening also to have him ask for an intensified attack on air pollution.

Mr. Johnson wants Congress to transfer to the Interior Department the Water Pollution Control Administration which now is in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That's an excellent idea, and Interior probably should be given other natural resources, such as national forests, now in the Department of Agriculture.

In asking that Congress authorize completion of the national park system by 1972, the President listed a number of areas either for study or inclusion. The proposed Voyageurs National Park in northern Minnesota was not among them. However, a study already is underway and maybe it is due for a presidential blessing soon.

With military spending on the rise, other Federal expenditures need to be held in check. But only modest sums are needed now for starting the conservation programs the President has urged. In the long run, pollution seems of greater consequence than Vietnam.

Peace Drive Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, even though the war in Vietnam has resumed in full fury, "the peace drive is not over," the Des Moines Register reminds us in a recent editorial.

The paper quotes President Johnson's urging North Vietnam to "negotiate peace," and "let war stand aside while the people of Vietnam choose. For our part, we will be willing to abide by the outcome."

The editorial, which states a simple truth—"peace makes *sense*"—will be of interest to many of my colleagues, and I include it in the RECORD:

PEACE DRIVE CONTINUES

The decision of all but a handful of the peace group in both Senate and House to support the $4.8 billion supplementary Defense Department appropriation made the consensus on President Johnson's Vietnam policy look greater than it really is. So did the President's new appeal to North Vietnam for peace negotiations, in the course of his speech honoring the fifth anniversary of the Peace Corps and the swearing-in of its new director, Jack Hood Vaughan.

"If you can't lick 'em, join 'em," runs the old political maxim. President Johnson could lick the peace group in Congress. Before the day was out, he did lick them—92–5 and 392–4 in the key votes in the two Houses. Yet he joined them the same day.

"Negotiate peace," he urged North Vietnam, "and let war stand aside while the people of Vietnam choose. For our part, we will be willing to abide by the outcome."

Before the President spoke, commentators had been saying that the peace drive was over, and that now the United States would do nothing but get on with the war. Large majorities in Congress seemed willing to do just that, and the bulk of the peace groups themselves in Congress had decided to vote for the extra appropriations for the war, after 7 weeks of hesitation and earnest debate.

Important differences remain between the President and such peace moderates as Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas. Fulbright added a new difference in his speech reluctantly supporting the Defense appropriation. He advocated an international agreement to neutralize all southeast Asia, not just Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia which were supposedly neutralized in the 1954 Geneva agreements (and which both belligerents say they are willing to reneutralize). Fulbright would add Thailand, now a stanch U.S. ally, and perhaps Malaysia and Singapore, which are British allies.

The debate will continue, as it should, and so will the official U.S. efforts to get peace.

In words at least, the official position of the U.S. Government has come remarkably close to the official position of North Vietnam and the Vietcong on how to make peace. The words are still largely drowned out by the sound of exploding grenades and bombs, and large differences in interpretation of the words remain.

But peace makes sense. Both sides, after thinking they could win militarily have been learning that everybody loses in so prolonged and bloody a war. Both sides think they have the people in South Vietnam on their side, and at least say they are willing to abide by the results of free elections.

The peace drive is not over, even though the war has resumed in full fury.

What Democracy Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this week a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Christi Bayless, is in Washington to represent the State of Oregon in the annual Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I have read her speech and was deeply moved by the obvious sincerity of her faith in democracy. There is a famous saying by Judge Learned Hand which reads:

> Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it.

It is evident that for. Christi Bayless "liberty" is much more than a word and that for her the democratic ideal involves, as her speech indicates, one's basic "attitude toward man."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Congressional Record at this point the full text of this thoughtful and impressive speech.

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

Once every 2 seconds a new life is given to the world and is cast into the moving stream which is the force of history. Sooner or later, as all human beings have done since the beginning of time, each individual begins his search for a faith by which to live. In his quest for that faith, each turns to something higher than himself—a body of ideals which promises to give meaning to his life. To me, this higher power—this source of life—is democracy.

It is not easy to state with certainty what democracy is—or what it can do—but it is to the people who ask and wonder and work that it is dedicated. Democracy is in the people who create it and in the principles by which they live. It is their handiwork and it belongs to them. Man has known democracy in many ages, in many lands. From Rome, several centuries before the birth of Christ; to Washington, D.C., in the 20th century—during all this time the ideas and the words of democracy expanded and moved relentlessly forward, like a twisting stream. They endured and adjusted, through wars and plagues and the long night of the Middle Ages—when there was little communication between those who believed in democracy, when the flame men followed was in their minds and hearts.

Yet democracy's story is incomplete, and it will remain so as long as just one individual remains to add his own contribution to its growth. Democracy is the government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It depends upon a love of freedom. It requires lasting respect for many principles not incorporated into legislation. It requires rule by the majority, with the preservation of the rights of the minority. Democracy is as much a way and a philosophy of life as it is a political form.

Unlike most of the other philosophies with which it has always had to contend, democracy has no rigid dogma, no set of rules. If we searched for an exact definition, the chances are that the answers we received would be nearly as many and as varied as the people who tried to define democracy for us.

But it takes ideals to make a democracy important to the people. Ideals give democracy a goal to which the people can aspire. They are beliefs that the citizens have found they can trust. In a truly democratic country.

A man can make friends with his neighbor without anxiety or distrust.

He can express his friendliness toward people of other lands.

He can worship the unknown power of the universe in his own fashion.

He believes in mankind's right to change.

Now these are only a few of the beliefs of a democratic society, but to me they are necessities for a happy and satisfying life.

Throughout the ages, the criterion which distinguished the democratic ideals was an attitude toward man. It is this fundamental attitude which has kept democracy strong, and will keep it strong in the future.

He Did and It Happened

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in last Saturday's Akron Beacon-Journal a most interesting letter to the editor appeared. Imagine the plight of this poor man.

To the Editor:

I was told in 1964 that if I voted for Barry Goldwater that taxes would go up and there would be further war in Vietnam.

They were right—I voted for Goldwater and taxes have gone up and there is more war in Vietnam.

Charles Church,
First National Tower Building.

President on Right Track

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the New New Orleans States-Item editorially has sounded support of President Johnson's Vietnam policy in stating that the President in his New York address gave assurance that dissension on Vietnam policy is minor. The editorial said:

> Throughout the country there obtains an overwhelming unanimity of purpose in America's respect for its commitments and dedication to freedom for besieged peoples.

The paper quotes the President's declaration:

> Our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the success of aggression. It is not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination.

The summation which the editorial makes is concise and, in the belief that it may be worthwhile reading for others, I ask that we make it a part of the Record.

The editorial follows:

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Feb. 25, 1966]

VIETNAM COMMITMENT SPELLED OUT

President Johnson increases his stature at home and abroad by spelling out in clear, resonant tones his country's policy with regard to Vietnam.

The speech he delivered on receipt of the National Freedom Award by Freedom House was a necessary one, coming as it did in the immediate wake of Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on U.S. activities in the Far East.

Those hearings perhaps suggested to the casual or uninformed observer that there might be grave lack of support for U.S. policy.

But Mr. Johnson swept aside the obscuring haze by giving assurance that such dissension is minor; that throughout the country there obtains an overwhelming unanimity of purpose in America's respect for its commitments and dedication to freedom for besieged peoples.

"Our purpose in Vietnam," the President made clear, "is to prevent the success of aggression. It is not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination.

"It is to prevent the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam."

For those who fear escalation of the war in that country he had this to say:

"Some ask if we are caught in a blind escalation of force that is pulling us headlong into a wider war that no one wants. The answer * * * is 'No.' We are using that force—and only that force—necessary to stop the aggression."

That the United States is not interested in forcing its will on any other nation was demonstrated when Mr. Johnson declared:

"Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice.

"We will insist for ourselves on what we require from Hanoi; respect for the principle of government by consent of the governed."

And, lest the Communist world read lack of American resolution into open debate as fully honored in this country, the President cautioned:

"We are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also are we united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness."

As a result of President Johnson's signal explanatory effort, Peiping and Hanoi now stand warned that "wars of liberation" aganst countries to whose defense the United States is committed are no short cut to world domination.

Girl Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, Ga., Girl Scouting was established in the United States bringing the many benefits and advantages of this movement to the girls of our Nation. This week, we are celebrating the birthday of the Girl Scout movement and I feel it is fitting that the Members of the House of Representatives pay tribute to this fine organization.

I would like to call to your attention the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Marengo, Iowa, Pioneer Republican, as I feel this editorial very aptly expresses the significance and importance of the Girl Scouts. I am sure we will all agree that the Girl Scout movement is certainly very deserving of our recognition.

The article follows:

Deserves Recognition

Some of the innumerable "days" and "weeks" which we are supposed to celebrate each year in this country are without any notable significance and importance. Some are unconsciously silly. Some are highly specialized and are of interest only to the few. But, there are some which have earned and which deserve the recognition and support of us all.

That is true a dozen times over of Girl Scout week, which is to be observed this year during the March 6–12 period.

There are 150 girls and adult leaders in the Scouting program in Marengo and they will hold a court of awards at the high school auditorium Sunday afternoon, March 20. During Girl Scout week there will be a display in Gode's window.

The week's stated purpose is: "To celebrate the birthday of Girl Scouting in the United States." That birthday took place on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, Ga. In the intervening years, the movement has spread across the Nation, bringing life-long benefits to legions of girls. They learn the arts and crafts and domestic virtues which are particularly suited to feminine temperament and inborn talent. They learn of the wonders of nature. They learn how to get along with each other, and to show respect and understanding and tolerance for the thoughts and aspirations and ambitions of others. They learn the disciplines and attitudes that are vital to a happy and useful life in society.

Above all—and this was never so vital as today—the Girl Scouts build character. They are the enemies of delinquency and the firm and dedicated friends of the moral standards which are the real strength of any nation and its citizens. Let us salute them during the forthcoming week—and let us all help their cause in any way he can.

Choice Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, in a timely editorial the Washington Post makes it clear that passage of the supplemental appropriation for the Vietnam war by overwhelming votes in both branches of Congress ought to make it clear that there is no obstruction to the prosecution of foreign policy.

The Post believes this "ought to help countries that do not follow democratic practices to understand our system." It adds that the administration and Congress "have chosen a hard course—and with understandable anguish. They have chosen it because they recognize that the only alternative course might be even harder."

Because of its forthright comments, the article is submitted for inclusion in the Record:

The Hard Choice

Passage of the $4.8 billion supplemental appropriation for the Vietnam war, by overwhelming votes in both branches of Congress, ought to make it clear, at home and abroad, that dissent in Congress is no obstruction to the prosecution of foreign policy.

The combination of a great deal of opposition talk and a very few opposition votes puts the situation in exactly the right dimension. It ought to help countries that do not follow democratic practices to understand our system. If North Vietnam was misled by the angry words in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on the Senate floor and in the House, it ought to see the situation more clearly now.

The five votes to rescind the Tonkin Gulf resolution give a fair measure of the importance of Senate opposition to the President's policy in the terms of practical action. Nothing could more clearly show North Vietnam that Washington in 1966 is not Paris in 1954. What the North Vietnamese confront in South Vietnam is not the foreign legion of a tottering parliamentary regime, on the edge of political chaos and in the midst of postwar reorganization. They face the Armed Forces of a strong American Government, in full political control, back by immense financial and military resources and supported by a people who are not demoralised, disorganized, or disaffected.

This is not to say that either Congress or the country likes this distant conflict over difficult issues. Many are unhappy and distressed, not only by the jeopardy in which Americans must act, but also by the hardship of war that they must inflict upon others. A people indifferent to these anguishing considerations would be devoid of heart or mercy or compassion. The anguish of the Nation was reflected in the speeches in Congress. And it is an anguish of which Senators and Congressmen have no monopoly. There is no delight of battle anywhere in this country.

Government that is capable of making an intelligent choice between a good course and a bad course is not unique in the world. There even have been many capable of choosing wisely between two good courses. The highest test of government is the capacity to choose wisely from available courses when every course presents its difficulties, dangers and hardships and sacrifices. And that is the kind of choice that the administration has had to make and that the Congress has had to make.

They have chosen a hard course—and with understandable anguish. They have chosen it because they recognized that the only alternative course might be even harder. They have embraced the known risks of today, because those risks, however formidable, seem smaller than the risks that would confront us tomorrow were we to seek an easy escape from present danger. This is not the kind of choice that is accompanied by cheers and shouting—but the courage and wisdom to make such a choice is the mark of a stable, mature, and resolute government that cannot be easily shaken from its appointed purpose.

Milwaukee Journal Praises Watchdog Role of the General Accounting Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Elmer Staats as Comptroller General not only brings a very able man to the post but calls attention to a department unique in our Government.

This is the editorial opinion of the Milwaukee Journal, which points out that the General Accounting Office which the Comptroller heads "keeps constant check on expenditures" with auditors not only in this country but around the world. I include the editorial hereafter:

Washington Watchdog

The appointment of Elmer Staats, longtime Federal career employee, as Comptroller General not only brings a very able man to the post but calls attention to a department unique in our Government.

Staats will head the General Accounting Office. While appointed by the President he reports to the Congress. His appointment runs for 15 years and he can't be reappointed. Thus he need have no fear of treading on toes or of political repercussions.

Congress created the post in 1921 to give it a combination watch and hunting dog to prevent and track down mismanagement and wasteful spending. In 1964 the Comptroller General's Office got back $320 million for the Federal Treasury. It keeps constant check on expenditures, and most particulary Defense Department expenses, for they are the highest in Government. The Office has auditors not only in this country but around the world. Often the Office is able to get voluntary return of funds paid in excess. When it can't or when it finds actual dishonesty or corruption it turns matters over to the Department of Justice.

Federal departments often complain about the Comptroller General and his staff, claiming that they are nit picking and pay too much attention to minor matters. The Comptroller's traditional answer is that minor matters in numbers can add up to major savings. And one thing is sure—the taxpayers whose money the department saves have no kick coming.

South Bend Comes Out From Under

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Record the text of a thoughtful and perceptive article which describes the extraordinary comeback of the city of South Bend, in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, from the shutdown of the Studebaker plant there over 2 years ago.

The article, which appears in the February 19, 1966, issue of Business Week follows:

South Bend Comes Out From Under

Two years ago, Studebaker Corp. moved its auto production from South Bend, Ind., to Canada, wiping out a $45-million annual payroll and 8 percent of the city's jobs. Government agencies rushed emergency aid. Panicky citizens wondered when—if ever—South Bend could recover from the loss of its major employer.

Today South Bend, though scarred by its experience, is in excellent economic health. Its unemployment rate is less than 2.5 percent. Its major problem is a labor shortage. United Auto Workers representative James D. Hill barely remembers the days when he served up his shoulders for workers to weep on. Representative John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana, says he hasn't received a job-hunting letter in months.

I. AID FACTORS

In great part, this amazing recovery stems from boom times, rather than from specific attempts to alleviate the effects of the Studebaker shutdown. But experts say in retrospect that emergency measures by Government and private agencies also helped in varying degrees. And they feel there is much to be learned from the South Bend experience, one of the most publicized and analyzed plant closings in U.S. history.

The No. 1 conclusion is that the publicity itself benefited South Bend. Doom-laden predictions roused public sympathy and—with an assist from the district's Congressmen and Senators—brought all-out action from the Johnson administration. In quick succession:

The Agriculture Department loosened income restrictions to permit distribution of surplus food to 1,500 families.

The Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration sent representatives to urge postponement of hasty mortgage foreclosures.

The Small Business Administration stepped up regional activities.

Several agencies set up an area procurement conference to teach local businesses how to bid on Federal contracts.

South Bend was declared a surplus labor area, giving it prime consideration for Government contracts.

The Labor Department's Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, in cooperation with the National Council on Aging, created a job hunt and assistance program called Project Able (ability based on long experience).

Some $4 million in Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) funds poured into the area.

How it worked

An experimental interagency committee created under the Area Redevelopment Administration conducted liaison among the various groups. On it sat representatives of Studebaker, the UAW, and Federal agencies. Harold L. Sheppard, of the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research served as coordinator.

Some projects paid off. Others didn't. The FHA and VA pleas to postpone mortgage foreclosures turned out to be unnecessary. Few Studebaker workers were that close to financial rock bottom. Most companies ignored the procurement conference and SBA programs. The surplus labor area designation had more effect outside South Bend than in it.

Project Able and the MDTA, however, were judged unqualified successes.

Operation

Project Able used a staff of 15 and a budget of $330,000 to serve 3,500 workers over the age of 50. Staff members prepared resumes, got in touch with 1,800 employers, arranged 2,600 job interviews, cranked out propaganda on hiring older workers, and counseled out-of-practice job hunters on how to groom for and behave during interviews. The UAW, Studebaker, and closer to home, and finally in South Bend itself.

Settling down

The first blue collar jobs found after the shutdown were in auto plants in Chicago and Indianapolis, where groups of Studebaker workers rented apartments for Monday-to-Friday use. Then the mobile home industry boomed in Elkhart, 20 miles away; Project Able made most of its earliest placements there.

Then heavy steel mill construction generated jobs in Burns Harbor, and mounting steel production set off a kind of relay race headed for Gary 70 miles away: workers in Michigan City, halfway between South Bend and Gary, left their jobs for the high-pay Gary jobs, and South Bend workers moved into the vacated Michigan City jobs.

Then the hiring wheels started turning again at Bendix Corp., U.S. Rubber Co., and other South Bend area plants, and the Studebaker workers came home.

II. IMPACT

In all, some 500 Studebaker alumni moved away permanently, according to Frank J. Fahey, Notre Dame sociologist retained by the interagency committee to study the shutdown's aftermath. Most of these were management people, many from out of town, or skilled workers. Only a handful of unskilled workers left despite State employment service offers to pay half the moving expenses and provide liberal loans.

Studebaker workers who have failed to find steady jobs number 316. "They work for short periods, sometimes take county relief, have relatives helping out," says Julius C. Graveel of the older workers relocation project.

In general, the company's workers turned out to have been relatively well prepared for the shutdown—possibly because the auto industry's seasonal layoffs had accustomed them to rainy days. About 27 percent moonlighted (compared to a national average of 5 percent), 34 percent had working spouses, and 35 percent had nonwage sources of income such as dividends or veterans' benefits. About 72 percent had money in the bank before the shutdown, and 65 percent still had it 6 months later. Only 3 percent were forced to return items purchased on credit.

Perhaps the attitude toward credit would have been different—and the impact on South Bend retailers sharper—if the work force had been younger, Fahey speculates.

Studebaker suppliers, too, had long since diversified. No business went under. In fact, at its worst—9.1 percent—South Bend's post-Studebaker unemployment rate was nowhere near the 19 percent of 1954. South Bend's real crisis came during the recession of the 1950's, according to the Reverend Edward Keller, a Notre Dame economist.

Assessment

Father Keller argues that the "bad work habits" bred by Studebaker's cost-plus contracts of World War II discouraged new industry from coming to South Bend, while the ups and downs of auto employment undermined community confidence. He contends that the change came when a new Studebaker management improved work habits, setting a citywide pattern. Now, he says, Studebaker's replacement by diversified industry—together with the confidence-building effect of working together to weather the storm—has completed South Bend's rehabilitation.

Not everyone, of course, sees the shutdown as an unmixed blessing, even in disguise. South Bend now has a higher percentage of nondurable goods manufacturing and service industries. This means that workers earn less. The tax base is down by $10 million. Some Studebaker workers had to give up retirement plans because they are too old to qualify for pensions on their new jobs. Many employees are working beneath their skills. Some skilled workers have left permanently.

On balance, however, the conclusion appears to be that, although there were casualties, the full-scale, intelligent use of Government and private resources—bolstered by a burgeoning economy—have enabled South Bend to wrest victory from defeat.

School Milk Program and the School Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, budget proposals to curtail funds for the school milk program and the school lunch program have alarmed parents and school administrators all across this Nation.

The views on this subject of Thomas J. Farley, the director of the school lunch program in Wisconsin's largest city, probably are representative of administrators all over this country.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Farley's recent letter to me in the Record:

Milwaukee Public Schools,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 2, 1966.

The Honorable John Race,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: As director of the school lunch department of the city of Milwaukee public schools, I am concerned at the pending legislation designed to cut back appropriations relating to the Federal school lunch program.

The proposed legislation seems to spring from a mistaken concept that the school lunch program is intended chiefly for indigent people. It definitely is not. It is intended for all our people. Children from all economic strata benefit by the Federal lunch program. The proposed reduction in appropriations will benefit only those with higher incomes and those who are indigent. The vast bulk of our student population will suffer.

Here in the city of Milwaukee we are currently serving complete meals to over 40,000 children per day in our elementary and secondary schools. We have always provided free meals for indigent students. This has been taken care of by professional welfare counselors specially trained in investigative procedures. I feel that the new proposal of having indigency certified by classroom teachers would be a giant step backward.

The proposed legislation providing for increased indigency and removing, or sharply reducing, assistance to the great mass of pupils will in all likelihood markedly curtail the lunch program. At present the vast bulk, perhaps 95 percent of our students, are able to buy their meals because Government assistance permits the serving of highly nutritious and attractive lunches at comparatively low cost. The changeover to free meals for indigents and the reduction of Government commodities will sharply increase the cost of meals to such an extent that few pupils will be able to afford what we have always judged to be an educational program of nutrition available to all.

During this school year, the price of food which we purchase has risen 3 cents per plate. This is in contrast to a price increase of a quarter of a cent per plate in normal years. It, therefore, follows that the price of food we buy on the open market has risen as much in 1 year as would normally be expected in 12. We need the support of our Government at this time more than ever before. The rapid rise in food cost coupled with the annual increase in labor would be most difficult for us to absorb. As milk subsidies and Government food commodities are withdrawn simultaneously, it is difficult to see how the school lunch program will survive as we know it today.

The school lunch program as we know it is nutritional education to teach children to learn to like a wide variety of foods and give them the opportunity to participate at the lowest possible cost.

I urge you to work for a continuation of the Federal lunch program and the Federal milk program which has progressed so successfully for 20 years.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. FARLEY,
Director, School Lunch Department.

Congressman Horton Salutes Grant Pike for Monroe County, N.Y., Air Pollution Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy of my distinguished constituent Wayne M. Harris, Esq., chairman of the Air & Water Pollution Committee of the Monroe County Conservation Council in my home community of Rochester N.Y., I have been alerted to a unique air pollution study. Conducted by Mr. E. Grant Pike, the report represents an important involvement by private parties in a field that is going to demand the best talents and techniques of all agencies if we are going to curb contamination of our atmosphere.

In sharing Mr. Pike's study with my colleagues and calling its contents to the attention of those in Congress working on means of combating air pollution, I am pleased to include, as a preface, excerpts from Mr. Harris' letter that transmitted the report as well as an article from the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union by Reporter John W. Brown which revealed the Pike study story to many thousands of my constituents.

KEENAN, CARROLL, HARRIS, CREARY & BECK,
Rochester, N.Y., March 3, 1966.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: The conservation council is holding its annual dinner at the Irondequoit Country Club on April 21 at 6:30 p.m. and we would sincerely appreciate the honor of your presence.

We are going to award Mr. E. Grant Pike, our County Sportsman Conservationist of the Year Award. As you perhaps are aware, Mr. Pike is a chemical engineer who has worked with me for the past 12 years in the field of water pollution.

He, together with Jack Bennett, a P.E., were the first independent engineers to prove by extensive tests that our lake beaches were seriously polluted.

Since 1954, when they worked on these tests, Mr. Pike has also assisted me in the classification of the Irondequoit Bay Water Shed, Lake Ontario, Upper Genesee and the reclassification of Irondequoit Creek.

In 1962, shortly after the adoption of the New York State air pollution law, we requested that the State make air studies in Rochester, but we found that the State could not come to the Rochester area for some 7 to 10 years. We then requested that the Monroe County Health Department undertake air pollution tests, but they refused to conduct such tests.

The Monroe County Conservation Council then determined that it would undertake air pollution tests providing that Mr. Pike would conduct these tests. Mr. Pike agreed, and the council with the Genesee Conservation League expended approximately $500, which was used to purchase the necessary test equipment.

In 1965, Mr. Pike made air pollution tests, the results of which are contained in an official report herewith enclosed for your information. (I assisted Mr. Pike in all the tests, and I am very familiar with the extensive amount of time he contributed to make these said studies.)

The importance of these tests are not only their scientific findings; but more importantly, that this is the first time to my knowledge that anywhere in the country a private group has conducted an air pollution study and these studies have not been overly expensive.

I would appreciate any assistance you may be able to give me in bringing this matter to the attention of any national media as I believe that our efforts could assist people in other parts of our country.

With kindest regards to you and your family, I am,

Very truly yours,

WAYNE M. HARRIS,
Chairman, Air Pollution Committee, Monroe County Conservation Council.

[From the Times-Union (Rorchester, N.Y., Mar. 2, 1966]

CITY COULD BE A MODEL IN AIR-POLLUTION FIGHT

(By John W. Brown)

Rochester could become a model for one phase of the coming battle to protect the world's most important resource—its atmosphere.

First State recognition of local do-it-yourself efforts to assess air pollution levels has come in a request from Alexander Rihm, executive secretary of New York State Air Pollution Control Board, for a report on the methods and findings of a study conducted here by the Monroe County Conservation Council.

A report on the study, the first by a private group ever conducted in the United States, also has been requested by Representative FRANK HORTON for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter from Rihm came to Wayne Harris, chairman of the conservation council's committee on air and water pollution. The report was being typed for delivery to him today.

Local tests were made last year and will be continued this spring by E. Grant Pike, a chemical engineer, with the assistance of Harris and other members of the council.

Appeals to local and State health departments revealed that Rochester was low on the priority list of communities to be studied.

The tests were made with a Gelman sampler and spectrophotometer, equipment purchased for about $500, and most of the work was done on a volunteer basis.

The preliminary tests revealed that there were significant quantities of sulfur dioxide in the aid, but that more exhaustive testing must be done to establish exact levels of this and other contaminants which could become a health hazard.

The tests so far have been made solely for sulfur dioxide and for nitrogen chloride, contaminants from autos and other internal combustion engines which, so far, appear to be at a low level here.

State interest in the local tests may stem in part from new emphasis on the air pollution problem at the State level where Dr. Edward Teller, noted H-bomb scientist, has been retained by Governor Rockefeller to recruit leading scientific talent to attack the problem.

Dr. Teller reported to a panel on air pollution at the Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty in New York last weekend that air pollution may be one of the country's greatest problems, that it must be solved and that it will be very expensive.

It was brought out at the panel that air pollution levels in the Boston-New York City corridor along the Atlantic Coast already approximate those of the Los Angeles area and that newly completed studies in New York City have definitely established a significant relationship between levels of air pollution and the health of healthy people as well as those already suffering from some respiratory disease.

Possible solutions include substitution of atomic energy for power generation by steam, blowby devices on auto crankcases, compressors to complete combustion on waste incinerators, complete removal of chemicals from industrial waste, State regulation of fuel content, tax incentives for homeowners, landlords, and industries, and education and training of more experts in the field.

AIR POLLUTION STUDY

(By E. Grant Pike)

It is well known that a number of locations in New York State have excessive amount of atmospheric contaminates in their surrounding atmosphere. Early studies of these atmospheric conditions lead the State to establish priority ratings among communities in the State; of the need to define permissive levels, and establish the nature of the contaminates involved.

Since Rochester, N.Y., had a low priority rating and the State testing of the atmosphere in the Rochester area was to be done in the distant future and the Monroe County Health Department refused to conduct air pollution tests, the Monroe County Conservation Council requested that I undertake atmosphere tests. These following tests which were conducted by me with the assistance of the Monroe County Conservation Council are, to my knowledge, the first air pollution tests conducted anywhere in the United States by a private group.

SELECTION OF ATMOSPHERIC CONTAMINATES FOR TESTING

Although a large number of physically dangerous atmospheric contaminates are known to possibly exist in the Rochester area, it was decided that initial tests would be made for nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide. These two compounds are known to have high toxicity values.

Nitrogen dioxide, a product of internal combustion engines; i.e., automobiles, has high irritating effects on membranes and is perhaps the most toxic of the nitrogen oxides. It also has the ability to break down or form other hazardous compounds.

Sufur dioxide, one of the major indicators of industrial and domestic air pollution, was considered to be the major contributory cause of the large number of deaths in London, England, and Donora, Pa.

SELECTION OF TEST SITES

Sampling locations were based on a random selection. A map depicting the city of Rochester and its surrounding area was divided by rectangular coordinates into 100 squares. A random number table was then used to select the square to be tested.

The actual test site within each selected square was established in the same manner. Squares were divided into 100 blocks and test sites were then chosen with a random number table. No sites were preselected.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Sampling was based on a designed experiment. Each site was subjected to a duplicate and a replicated test. The duplicates being taken on the same test date, the replica at a later date. These gave a total of four tests per site. The results were used to establish the confidence limits of the test and testing procedures.

EQUIPMENT AND TEST PROCEDURE

All samples were taken with a battery-powered portable Gelman sampler. For particulate measurements, the unit operated at 10 liters per minute for a 5- to 10-minute period. This data is not reported here. For gas sampling, the equipment was altered to permit a midget impinger to operate as a bubbler sampler. To assure complete gas contact with the liquid in the bubbler, the tip of the impinger's inlet was fitted with a porous gas distributor and sampling rates were held to 0.2 cubic feet per hour for 2 minutes. Ten milliliters of solution were used in each sampler. The low flow rate held evaporation losses to a minimum.

All samples were measured within 2 hours after the tests were taken. The gases measurements were made with a calibrated Coleman, Model II, Universal Spectrophotometer. All of the equipment used in these tests was checked against known standards.

The method used for determining the sulfur dioxide or the nitrogen dioxide content of air is reported in literature by P. W. West, and G. C. Caeke, "Fixation of Sulfur Dioxide as Disulfitomercurate II and Subsequent Colormetric Estimation." Analytical Chemistry, 1956, 28, 1816–1819 (December), and B. E. Saltzman, "Colormetric Microdetermination of Nitrogen Dioxide in the Atmosphere" Analytical Chemistry, 1954, 26, 1949–1954 (December). The sulfur dioxide method is referenced in the New York State Ambient Air Quality Objectives—classification system publication.

The complete data obtained for the sulfur dioxide is reported in table I. The average nitrogen dioxide results are shown in table II.

TABLE I.—*Sulfur dioxide content*

[Parts per million]

	Test site							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Test I	0.07	0.13	0.13	0.07	0.15	0.06	0.06	0.08
	.11	.13	.12	.07	.06	.15	.10	.08
Test II	.04	.14	0	.12	0	0	.04	.08
	.06	.14	0	.14	0	0	.04	.08

TABLE II.—*Nitrogen dioxide contents*

[Parts per million (average of 2 values)]

	Test site							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Test I	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.08	0.08	0.03
Test II	.02	.02	0	.06	.02	.03	.02	.03

A statistical analysis of sulfur dioxide test indicated a number of significant findings. The sulfur dioxide content of the air varies from test site to test site. There can be higher or lower content of sulfur dioxide at different times on the same test site and this variation is not necessarily the same for all locations.

The standard deviation for the tests are 0.01 part per million.

Although the tests were spot checks based on short time testing, the results are interpretable. The variation in results between test sites would be expected primarily due to the scattered locations in which the tests were taken and the type of environment surrounding the test site. The variation among several of the sites on different dates may be primarily due to weather conditions. The wind from a particular direction may raise or lower the contaminating content. On several occasions measurements were made during or immediately after rains.

The variation in nitrogen dioxide is probably due to reasons similar to the sulfur dioxide variation. Throughout the city there was no definite fixed level.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of this report, the sulfur dioxide and the nitrogen dioxide levels found were below danger level as recommended by the Los Angeles Commission. Several definite locations had consistently high results and should be more carefully surveyed. In those locations where erratic results were obtained, further testing on a more frequent basis should be made to determine why the results vary.

Needless to say, the tests herein were of short duration and sampling over long periods would tend to average results; however, the period of testing should be no longer than current known danger levels—for 1 hour, 8 hours, 24 hours. The actual test time should be based on an experimentally designed screen test which should yield valid testing periods.

The limits of sulfur dioxide or other dangerous gases should not be permitted to exceed dangerous limits at any time.

Put the Breadboard in a Museum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Undersea Technology, February 1966]

PUT THE BREADBOARD IN A MUSEUM

As this issue of UST went to press there were strong indications that the Navy was seeking ideas on the feasibility of using a submersible positioning vehicle to take its SeaLab III to the 400-foot level.

This is a commendable move. Such a vehicle could be compared to the inner space equivalent of a booster for an orbital space capsule. More imaginative actions such as this one must be taken. The deep submergence systems project (DSSP), elated and probably a little apprehensive about the smash success of its Man's Extension-Into-the-Sea Symposium last month, must now face up to using the vast national storehouse of technology and technical talent.

So far it hasn't. The two SeaLabs were low budget. They were put together through the "by ear" herculean efforts of a small group of dedicated technicians. In every aspect they were "breadboard"—hardware, selection of personnel, training and operations. "Breadboard" is a term familiar to the applied researcher who puts his gadget together in a logical, workable, but not exactly tidy manner. The breadboard approach is used by highly motivated individuals in both Government and industry. Depending upon the individual's organizational capabilities, his financial resources, his stamina, and the magnitude of the task a lot can be accomplished, but this is the exception, not the rule.

Now DSSP is faced with preparing for SeaLab III, among many other projects. (How the Air Force must wish that DSSP had been started years ago so that its A-bomb lying on the bottom off Spain could be readily retrieved.)

It is our fervent hope that funding will permit at least a partial systems approach to the project. By systems approach we mean—first, the thorough technical feasibility study, usually through industry contract, of a project before any part of the project is begun; second, systems engineering, or integration of the whole and determination of what each part should do; third, the selection of a prime contractor, whether Navy or industry.

One result of this kind of planning, now familiar to the aerospace industry through defense and NASA contracts, would be the logical scheduling of personnel assignments from the top on down. The Navy's SeaLabs I and II and Jacques-Yves Cousteau's Conshelfs I, II, and III create utter exhaustion in many key responsible officials. In this way they resembled the early days of the Mercury and Gemini space fights. Now NASA has the shift system and it works well. Admittedly, it means delegating authority down the line in order to get some sleep, but that is the mark of true leadership.

Another systems approach result would be cleaner hardware subsystems. By taking subsystems offered by industry and subjecting them to multiple thorough tests, the integrated whole could be built up until it, too, could be tested to satisfaction. As with space capsules going into orbit, there comes a time when the undersea habitat must be in place with all systems "go". Then it is time for the decision to get started and hope for the best.

Finally, as with aviation and space (and with driving an automobile for that matter), the risk element must be considered but not to the extent that it is an overriding factor to the detriment of the mission or a rock in the path of progress. Early aviation has its fatalities. Space (as far as we know) has had none. But an astronaut recently warned that as surely as the sun rises and sets, there will be a space tragedy some day. There have been diving fatalities in the past. But the diving fraternity must not let that deter progress. Pioneers, historically, fight on.

With these management and policy points stitched into a presentation for top defense officials—engineers, scientists, and budgeteers—a more liberally funded program could be forthcoming. Out of such a program a neat module would grow.

In the meantime a poor man's systems approach can be created using available talent in the Navy, especially that in the Special Projects (Polaris) office, and in industry. Then the breadboard could be put into a museum.

Who Does the Fighting—How About a Check?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today, 29 Republican colleagues joined me in calling for a congressional inquiry into inefficiencies and inequitabilities of the draft. I have been greatly encouraged by the tremendous response of the press and the general public. The following two articles, the first from the Lawrence Daily Journal World, of Lawrence, Kans., and the second from the New York Herald Tribune of New York City are especially thought provoking and I commend them to your attention:

[From the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, Mar. 1, 1966]

HOW ABOUT A CHECK?

If Republican congressional charges about Selective Service inefficiency are soundly based, the Johnson administration owes it to the American public to make some changes promptly.

Twenty-seven GOP members of Congress, with Lawrence's ROBERT ELLSWORTH as spokesman, have outlined three "bone of contention" about what they consider inefficiencies and inequities in the draft system. ELLSWORTH first announced the step during a visit to Lawrence Monday and that matter was aired nationally at a press conference today in Washington.

The three points stressed by the GOP group:

While the Selective Service system talks about reclassification plans and increased draft calls, there appear to be some 279,000 men in 1–A classification whose papers are bogged down between their boards and their induction centers.

"This means 279,000 men are available right now if we can cut the inefficiency," ELLSWORTH said.

On December 31, 1965, the Comptroller General of the United States reported to Congress that the Army, Navy and Air Force have over 9,000 enlisted men working at nonmilitary jobs like running officers' clubs, bowling alleys, golf courses, and such.

Except for South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand, none of the U.S. allies have any combat troops in South Vietnam and our European allies haven't even met their manpower commitments in Western Europe.

The most immediately disturbing of the three points to most Americans right now is the first—the charge that some 279,000 draft-eligible young men already are snarled in Federal redtape while at the same time there are plans to ensnarl even more, perhaps at great cost and inconvenience.

Military service is a fact of life for virtually all young American males in this so-called cold war period, and it follows that everyone has to expect a certain amount of inconvenience, risk and disruption of plans and timetables in the interest of defense and public welfare. But the Government owes it to the citizenry that pays the bills and supplies the men to minimize all this just as much as possible, with fair and efficient operation of the draft system.

Selective Service bungling, as charged by the Republican group, touches many lives in many frustrating ways.

Take the student who is trying to complete his education; the young husband-father trying to get established on a new job; the businessman trying to keep a sound employee force. These are just a few of the examples. In a dangerous time of national emergency, all such people have to expect to make sacrifices of varying natures, but the Government owes it to them to keep the incidence as low as humanly possible.

Suppose there are as many 1–A young men available, as the Ellsworth group charges. Why not get maximum mileage from this group, with greater efficiency in Selective Service operations, before going into costly and inconveniencing reclassification and needless call-ups that waste manpower?

It would seem that such a 1–A pool could meet manpower needs for a long time to come, even with the Vietnam escalation, or at least until more thorough studies can be made to see just what needs will be. This could well be a case of the all-too-typical Government policy of using a shotgun to do the job of a rifle—of howling for far more than is necessary to make sure you get enough.

It will be interesting to see how the Johnson administration responds to these latest charges about the Selective Service setup.

Just about anyone who has been closely connected with administration of military bases and installations will admit that efficiency is not normally a long suit of such an agency. It stands to reason, then, that there are quite a few personnel in nonmilitary jobs such as the GOP group cites in its charges. However, there are a number of instances where such nonmilitary duties can be justified, particularly where base recreation programs are involved.

As for displeasure over the fact that allies have not responded in helping American efforts in places like Vietnam and Europe, that is understandable. This is a valid criticism. Chances are nobody would like to remedy this more than President Johnson. It is well to keep him aware that people want something done, but there are so many uncontrollable elements involved that it is unrealistic to expect miracles which will bring drastic changes.

The most vulnerable spot in the Johnson armor in this case would seem to be inefficiency and inequity in operation of the Selective Service System. If, as the GOP Congressmen say, there are problems due to mismanagement and redtape, the administration should swallow its pride and get something done in a hurry.

Selective Service participants and their families can vote, too.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 3, 1966]

WHO DOES THE FIGHTING?

The 30 House Republicans who are calling for a congressional investigation of the draft and the overall problem of recruiting military manpower have opened a different side to the Vietnam debate. Its gist is not whether or how we fight, but who does the fighting.

The Congressmen urged that the war be prosecuted—it must be. But they are also saying that it can be prosecuted most feasibly and effectively with a broad base of international support for the South Vietnamese and, in America, by elimination of the anxiety-causing confusion and inequities of our present manpower procurement policies.

Whether we are doing all we can to persuade allies to provide troops, technicians, and economic assistance is a delicate matter of diplomacy best investigated in closed sessions. However, Congress can properly ask the question.

Domestically, any investigation of manpower procurement should start with the draft. Selective Service System Director Gen. Lewis B. Hershey defends the operations of his agency, but the statistics which describe the inefficiency of the draft (which, in fairness, includes the Army's operation of induction centers) are right out of his own office. In any case, an independent survey of conditions in the draft process could be profitably undertaken by Congress.

But the draft, so long ignored by Congress, is just one part of the manpower procurement problem. Indeed, the other parts—policies affecting regulars and reservists, and such as poverty program and Peace Corps personnel—usually have been treated apart from one another, and there is need for coordination. Inefficient utilization of the 3 million men already in uniform may seem at a tolerable level to the eyes of a particular military service, but if it means more draftees—married men or students, as examples—it should be a matter of high level concern. The Reserves may worry solely over their responsibilities in case of activation, but if an incentive program for individual reservists to volunteer for Vietnam is feasible, it, too—as a prospect for relieving the manpower strain—is a proper interest of higher authority. Congress, until the manpower policies are reformed, should exercise that authority.

Matter of Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, any differences over U.S. policies in Vietnam are matters of degree, rather than of substance.

This, in the opinion of the New York Herald Tribune, was the principal truth emerging from the Senate hearings on the Vietnamese war.

The paper is convinced:

> The Vietcong do not want a compromise. If given a portion of the South Vietnamese Government, they would almost certainly use it—as the Communists in every "popular front" government have done since the end of World War II—to subvert the whole structure.

This agrees with the warning which I issued in this connection in my February 21, 1966, statement to the House when I questioned the proposal of the junior Senator from New York to admit the Vietcong to governmental responsibility. The subsequent Chinese statement lumping U.S. hawks and doves together as "fools" confirms the Communist intransigence.

Overall, the hearings—the Herald Tribune believes—have developed "how broad the consensus on aims really is."

I thought the editorial a good analysis of the matter, and because I feel that others may glean informative material from it, I insert it in the RECORD.

THE PROBLEM OF DEGREE

If any fact has emerged from the Senate hearings on the Vietnamese war, it is that, in the main, differences over American policy are matters of degree, rather than of substance. There are some in the Senate (Mr. MORSE, for example) who believe that the United States is in a fundamentally immoral position in southeast Asia. But these are relatively few. More are concerned with the rate of escalation and the ultimate prospect. They would limit rather than change the American commitment.

General Taylor made a convincing refutation, from the military point of view, of the charge that the United States is engaged in a limitless adventure in Asia. Secretary of State Rusk, in the course of replies to questions that brought repeated expressions of praise from Senators representing every point of view, took up the charge that while the American purpose in southeast Asia might be limited geographically, it was, so far as South Vietnam was concerned, politically unlimited.

This charge took two forms. One was that the United States, if it expected the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to come to the conference table, should state specifically its terms for a settlement. An aspect of this was the idea that the Vietcong should be directly approached with compromise suggestions.

Now, obviously, once the United States sets forth terms of settlement, it would be bound by them while the enemy would not. It would be an open invitation to Hanoi and the Vietcong to insist upon more; it would leave no flexibility for bargaining—indeed, it would virtually rule out bargaining. So far as direct relations with the Vietcong are concerned, Mr. Rusk cited the case of Laos, where the Pathet Lao Communist faction were not content with the 1962 Geneva agreement (which involved the acceptance of a "neutralist" as Premier, at Communist insistence) but sought to undo the agreement by force and fraud and are now fighting their own former allies.

The Vietcong do not want a compromise. If given a portion of the South Vietnamese Government, they would almost certainly use it—as the Communists in every "popular front" government have done since the end of World War II—to subvert the whole structure. There is absolutely no indication that they are as yet willing to rest their case on free elections. No revolutionary group dominated by Communists has ever done so, from North Vietnam to Cuba.

So, if the United States is to achieve its goal of allowing the South Vietnamese to determine their own destiny, it cannot do so with the Vietcong recognized as a part of the government or even as a state within a state. They must be willing to take their cause to the people in an internationally supervised election. The results of that, Mr. Rusk said, we would accept.

Another phase of the question of degree is the matter of somehow limiting American participation. This, in a shooting war, is virtually impossible to do in advance. The rate of escalation, too, is in large part determined by enemy action. Given agreement of fundamental goals, the manner of achieving them is largely a practical military matter. And the hearings have developed, possibly to the surprise of the chairman, Mr. FULBRIGHT, how broad the consensus on aims really is.

Soviet Reassesses Atheist Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the status of religion in the Soviet Union has been of deep and continuing concern to the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have been directly involved in the subcommittee's activities intended to place in the public record such facts as we may be able to obtain about the condition of religion in Communist-dominated countries.

Last year, for example, the subcommittee held extensive hearings on this subject. These hearings, and the accompanying report, were published under the title, "Antireligious Activities in the Soviet Unon and in Eastern Europe."

Mr. Speaker, because of our interest, I was very pleased to note the lengthy and informative article by M. S. Handler entitled "Soviet Reassesses Atheist Drive," which appeared in the March 7, 1966, edition of the New York Times. I believe that the information contained in the article will be of interest to Members of the Congress. For this reason, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

SOVIET REASSESSES ATHEIST DRIVE—VIGOR OF ORTHODOX CHURCH BEWILDERS PARTY AGITATORS

(By M. S. Handler)

The Soviet Communist Party is in the process of reappraising its campaign against the Russian Orthodox Church.

The reappraisal, as discussed in Communist Party newspapers and publications, indicates that the official antireligious agitators are bewildered by the resistance of the provincial remnants of the Russian Orthodox Church.

They are disturbed by what seems to be the growth of an underground church among the peasants and villagers who, deprived of regular churches and priests, are practicing religious rites in secret.

The reassessment was initiated last year by atheist agitators critical of false assumptions on which the half-century campaign to eradicate religion was based. These assumptions were that police, judicial, and arbitrary administrative measures could uproot religion.

Evidence of the reassessment and the harsh measures still employed against the Russian Orthodox Church in remote areas was assembled by scholars in Western Europe and the United States from published Soviet and confidential sources. Because of the physical problems of attempting in Moscow to assess the condition of a church that is still believed to have as many as 45-million believers in the farflung regions of the Soviet Union, the task was undertaken in New York.

It is generally agreed by Russian Orthodox authorities in this country and in Western Europe that Patriarch Aleksei, leader of the Soviet church,, has fought a hard and resourceful battle to save Russian orthodoxy.

However they believe that the real power has passed from the 89-year-old patriarch to Archbishop Nikodim, a young churchman who seems to have the full favor of the Soviet authorities and who represents the Russian Orthodox Church at the World Council of Churches.

Archbishop Nikodim is said to represent the face of the Russian Orthodox Church that is turned to the outside world. He completed his secondary and higher theological education by correspondence in 5 years instead of the normal 12. Nikodim took monastic vows in 1947 and his rise in the hierachy was swift.

The curtain was raised on the reappraisal last August 15 by G. Kelt of Lwow with a harsh attack in Komsomolskaya Pravda, newspaper of the Young Communists, on the concepts and methods employed in the atheism campaign.

The writer, active in the campaign, acknowledged, in the following passage, the existence of an underground church:

"Today we are deceiving ourselves again that 'many believers in our country leave the church and religion.' This is self-delusion. It is true there are not churches and no ministers in a large part of the Soviet Union. But there are believers. If they are not orthodox, they are members of one or another of the multitude of finely differentiated sects.

"Where do they come from? From the ranks of those who leave the church. For, as has been said in official statements, closing a parish does not make atheists of believers. On the contrary, it strengthens the attraction of religion for people and it embitters their hearts besides."

The reports of the existence of an underground church in the Soviet Union are supported by the Very Reverend Dimitry Konstantinow, an Orthodox scholar and priest who teaches at Cornell University. Father Konstantinow, born and educated in Leningrad, served as a lieutenant in the Soviet Army during World War II and later entered the priesthood.

"I am convinced that the Orthodox Church today resembles an iceberg," he said. "All that we see is the visible upper part. The main structure is submerged underground where it has been driven by persecution."

Unlike previous Soviet debates on Christianity and other religions which were treated as systems of demonology and superstitions invented by the "exploiting classes" to enslave the poor, the current reassessment in the Soviet Union takes into account religion as a historical phenomenon and a cultural pattern deeply rooted in the history of the Russian people.

ROLE IN HISTORY STRESSED

"Religion was created and developed in the course of centuries and it is impossible to abolish it in a single day," Miss Kelt wrote in Komsomolskaya Pravda. "It is pertinent to recall that religion is not an idle fiction. Religion is a historical phenomenon that has existed for thousands of years, up to and including the present. Just as everything in history develops, so, too, does religion."

Soviet publications participating in the debate include Nauka i Religiya, an atheist periodical founded in 1959, and Kommunist, the official ideological journal of the Communist Party. Nauka i Religiya, with a circulation of more than 200,000 recently attacked the conservative literary journal Oktyabr, the publishing house Molodaya Gvardiya and Izvestia, the Soviet Government newspaper, for what it considered their primitive approach to the problem of religion in the Soviet Union.

In a paper titled "The Crisis in Soviet Atheism," the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. based in Munich, West Germany, reported recently:

"The basic principles of militant atheism are undergoing thorough revision. This process, which is indicated in recent articles in the Soviet press, has led to official Soviet re-evaluation of religion as a Weltanschaung (world outlook)."

CAMPAIGN UNABATED

Despite the reappraisal of the techniques there is no evidence of any abatement in the campaign to isolate the Russian Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Baptist and other Christian churches and to dismantle their institutional structures.

For reasons that are not yet clear, it appears that the institutional forms and cultural patterns of Judaism have been among the worst suffers. According to some available evidence, institutional and cultural Judaism appears doomed to extinction in the Soviet Union.

As the dominant church in Russian history, the Russian Orthodox Church has been and still is the principal target of the atheist campagin.

According to John Lawrence, a British specialist in the field, Soviet policy toward churches and religion passed through three phases. The first was one of savage persecution which had spent its force by the beginning of World War II.

KHRUSHCHEV RESUMED OPPRESSION

In the second phase, the church rallied to the national defense when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union in 1941, with the result that in 1943 Stalin permitted the restoration of the Moscow Patriarchate. A modus vivendi continued until 1959 when in the third phase, the policy of repression was resumed under former Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev.

According to assessments by specialists the number of Russian Orthodox Churches in the Soviet Union was reduced from 22,000 to 11,500 between 1959 and 1962. They believe the number of churches was further reduced to about 10,000 by 1965.

The extent to which the Soviet regime dismantled the structure of the Russian Orthodox Church is reflected in an analysis made by N. Struve, a leading church historian who lives in France. According to Mr. Struve, in 1941 there were 54,174 churches, 1,025 monasteries, 25,593 chapels, 4 theological academies and 57 major and 185 minor seminaries. The church in that year also operated 37,528 parochial schools, 291 hospitals, 1,123 hospices, and 34,497 parochial libraries.

CHURCH GREATLY WEAKENED

As of 1965, it is estimated there were probably fewer than 15 monasteries and about 5 theological academies and seminaries. The rest of the Orthodox Church's structure of 1914, except for 10,000 churches, had passed out of existence through police, judicial, and administrative measures.

Struve reported in his book "Christians in the U.S.S.R." that in 1914 there were 87,123,604 baptized Orthodox. There are no official statistics for today, but specialists' estimates range from 20 million to 45 million believers out of a total population of 230 million. This figure includes baptized and unbaptized.

For a long time, the official atheist campaigners and the Communist Party contended that the believers were mainly in the older age groups but it was acknowledged recently that at least 30 percent were under 40 years of age.

In 1961 the Soviet authorities fashioned a new legal instrument, one of the most effective in the atheist campaign, to accelerate the dismantlement of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Under new regulations, the priest, traditionally a member of his parish council, was reduced to the status of an employee who could be dismissed at any time by the council.

Also under the new regulations, a priest may be expelled from his pastorate if his registration certificate as a priest is revoked by the Government Commission on Religious Affairs. The parish council may not appoint a successor who does not possess certification. This has become an important weapon in removing refractory priests as well as a means of controlling the parish council.

MANY RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED

According to Father Konstantinow, the following Soviet regulations are in force against the church:

Missionary work is forbidden; sermons are subject to censorship; teaching of Scripture to children is prohibited; services and prayers outside officially recognized places of worship are banned; rites such as baptism, weddings, memorial services are permitted only on the condition that those requesting the rites are registered by name.

Also, religious organisations are prohibited from performing any charitable or social work; children and adolescents between the ages of 3 and 18 are not to be admitted to church service and children may be baptized only up to the age of 18 months.

The recent history of the Pochayev Monastery in the western Ukraine near Lwow illustrates the arbitrary methods used by the authorities in trying to close a religious institution, and the fight of monks and villagers to keep it open.

The monastery was founded in the 16th century and played a role in the cultural development of the Ukraine similar to that played in Italy by the great Benedictine and Dominican monasteries. A printing press, said to be the first in the Ukraine, was installed in the 17th century and Pochayev became one of the great theological centers in the Orthodox world.

DOCUMENTS DETAIL OPPRESSION

Documentary evidence of the Pochayev struggle was published last year in Paris by the Committee of Information on the Situation of Christians in the Soviet Union. The committee is composed of some of the most distinguished writers and churchmen in France.

The documents include bitter letters and petitions to the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, to Mr. Khrushchev, and to legal authorities, the Moscow Patriarchate, the World Council of Churches, the United Nations, and other organizations. The letters, many written in rough, untutored peasant language, describe brutal methods used by the local authorities in their campaign to expel the monks and close the monastery.

The principal weapon against the monks was Article 196 of the Ukrainian Penal Code. This article stipulates that persons taking up residence without an internal passport and without permission may be subject to 2 years of imprisonment and a 50-ruble fine.

NIGHT RAID DESCRIBED

One petition, signed "The Inhabitants of Pochayev," was addressed to the Ceneral Committee and to Mr. Khrushchev. It declared:

"The inhabitants of Pochayev have lost all patience. How can one continue to live under these conditions? When it this illegal regime going to end? Who gave the orders to enforce it?

"Let us submit several facts. On July 2, 1963, the militia (police) of Pochayev carried out a complete pogom. The leader of the pogom was Major Belochkoursky, chief of the Pochayev militia. He organized several raiding groups consisting of militiamen and auxiliaries. The first was commanded by Captain Bialik, the second by Lieutenant Gordeyev, the third by Maksimiouk, general staff chief of the auxiliaries.

"The raid began at midnight and continued until morning. The doors and windows of many inhabitants were smashed because they were afraid to open up at this late hour in the night. All their possessions, beds, cabinets and other furniture were turned topsy turvy. The raiders were looking for pilgrims. All night long the raiders conducted a debauchery because they are allowed to do anything. Did the orders come from the Central Committee?

THEFTS BY POLICE CHARGED

The letter accused the police chiefs of having robbed pilgrims of their prayerbooks, icons, religious medals and then of having sold them to speculators. They also accused the officials of having forced pilgrims and the drivers who brought them to Pochayev to pay graft to escape arrest. Pilgrims, the letter charged, were forcibly taken to psychiatric hospitals.

Other documents reported that aged and feeble monks, with no surviving relatives, were expelled from the monastery and compelled to fend for themselves. The handful of monks remaining, other documents said, were subjected to harassments—the cutting off of fuel supplies, the severing of electricity wires, and interruptions of food deliveries. Pochayev, the petitions protested, was declared off limits for nonresidents to prevent religious pilgrims from reaching the monastery.

The history of the Pochayev struggle became known but little is known about the situation in other areas in the vast expanses of the Soviet Union, where a curtain of silence seems to have fallen on the Orthodox Church's struggle to survive.

The believers' reaction to such harassment has been to go underground.

Perhaps an even more significant aspect of the religious situation has been a slow reawakening interest of Soviet intellectuals in religious philosophy. A ranking Russian Orthodox scholar said that the remarkable thing about this reawakening was that the intellectuals had no ties with the Orthodox Church since childhood. They are ignorant of the church's ritual, theology and liturgy and not interested in the church as an institution.

Their interest, purely intellectual, has been aroused by reading the works of Jean Paul Sartre, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, the late French Jesuit scientist-philosopher; Nikolai Berdyaev, the Russian religious philosopher, and other writers.

The ideas of these writers has had a powerful impact on Russian intellectuals, who by tradition are trained to cope with abstract philosophic concepts.

In the opinion of the Russian Orthodox scholar, this reawakening of interest in the philosophy of the great humanists and humanist—religious thinkers may prove of greater historical significance than the ultimate fate of the Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union.

The spread of these ideas among the Soviet intellectuals may, for the first time, put into the arena a potent and dangerous ideological and esthetic counterforce to Marxism.

Dedication of E. L. Huggins Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of the work of Dr. E. L. Huggins, a beloved and honored physician in De Funiak Springs, Fla. Now retired, his great record of service was marked by dedication ceremonies, in which a local hospital was designated "The E. L. Huggins Memorial Hospital."

The people of my district are proud of Dr. Huggins and appreciative for his great services. I enclose a statement from the Pensacola News Journal of Sunday, February 6, which outlines his career and the speech by the Honorable Millard F. Caldwell, former Governor of Florida, at the dedication ceremonies.

TURPENTINE WORKER TO HOSPITAL FOUNDER, DR. E. L. HUGGINS SERVED WALTON

(By Allen Robinson)

DE FUNIAK SPRINGS.—A "turpentine gypsy" who saw sickness in the wilds of South Walton County more than 50 years ago stayed on to become the "father of public hospitals" in Walton County.

Dr. Evans Lewis Huggins, a country-type doctor, has administered to the needs of the citizens here since shortly after the turn of the century. He has been the familiar house-visiting doctor to three generations of many families of the area.

From this beginning, Dr. Huggins was recently honored by his neighbors when the Walton County Hospital was expanded and rededicated as the E. L. Huggins Memorial Hospital.

Dr. Huggins was born August 24, 1888, in Fork, S. C. His father, Stephen Emery Huggins, was a native of North Carolina and his mother, Mary Ella Rogers, was a South Carolinian.

Stephen Huggins was a naval stores operator and manufacturer. He plied his trade in the Carolinas, Georgia and Alabama and made his way to the virgin timberland of South Walton County when his son Evans was just 3 years old. His operations centered in the Freeport community.

Evans was educated with a tutor through kindergarten and primary levels and then attended Broxton Institute in Broxton, Ga. and college at Atlanta College of Physicians and Surgeons which is now Emory University Medical School.

Before going to college Dr. Huggins was a railroad fireman and flagman and during summer vacations a construction worker, building rights-of-way and shanties for turpentine laborers. His senior year at college he spent the Christmas holidays in Freeport with his parents and what he saw decided him to return to practice in the remote area.

During an interview this week Dr. Huggins said he remembered that there was widespread chronic malaria in the camp area and childfen were faced often with colitis. "Pneumonia was a killer in those days."

The area of West Florida was only sparsely settled in those days and the contemporaries that Dr. Huggins recalled where Dr. Hooten, Dr. E. Porter Webb in Laurel Hill; Dr. Mashburn in Mosseyhead and in the De Funiak Springs area, Doctors. Simmons, McKinnon, Rayburn, and Thompson.

He started work with the Gulf Cypress Lumber Co. and then left for a time during World War I to serve in the U.S. Army Medical Corps. He returned to the wilds of northwest Florida after the Army and in 1931 moved to De Funiak Springs.

During the last several years he has been active in practice with Drs. Howard Currie and Charles Roehm.

Justice Millard Caldwell, Florida Supreme Court, and former Governor, said of Dr. Huggins that he had been "unselfish of his talents and energy, serving alike those who could pay and those who could not."

Dr. Huggins says of this period himself, "It was the bedside practice that I most enjoyed because I feel that the new doctors will never know the pleasures of this relationship with the patient. It is the time when you get to know them well."

Dr. Huggins said he could recall the flu epidemics of World War I and the lack of facilities with which to work. There were only a few standard medicines during his early days and the nearest hospital was at Mobile.

"There has been a tremendous change in medicine," Dr. Huggins said. "The most significant improvements have been the antibiotics and the progress made in surgery and in teaching methods at the medical schools. The greatest change has come since the days of World War II when progress was made in every field of medicine."

In addition to his service to the county, one of the most significant accomplishments of his busy life has been the establishment of the county hospital.

Dr. Huggins said the first effort was for a "little clinic" to be supported by a county bond issue. But this had to be dropped, he said, because of the heavy load of charity cases. Then the Lakeside Hospital was started as a clinic and later enlarged.

Dr. Huggins during the World War II had urged State officials to keep the county health department operating in the community when they found it difficult to be staffed. After putting in a day in private practice he would spend several hours with the patients at the county health department.

Soon after the war Dr. Huggins began working with individuals and groups in seeking a facility through the Federal Hill-Burton Act. The new facility became a reality in 1949 as the Walton County Hospital, with Dr. Huggins as one of the trustees and chief of staff. The Walton County Hospital was the first of the Hill-Burton units built in Florida and one of the first in the Nation.

Due to the changes and the delay in getting the facility established, the original plans had to be shaved and the hospital was smaller than originally hoped.

The rededication of the hospital was held in November and Dr. Huggins became ill and had to be hospitalized himself after the ceremony. His activity since has been curtailed, one of the very few times in his career.

"Doc" Huggins was also honored in 1962 with a large banquet at the end of 50 years service to the community.

He was honored again in June last year when he received the Citizen of the Year Award from the Woodmen of the World.

Dr. Huggins is an avid outdoorsman and has followed the hobbies of fishing and hunting through the years with a great deal of enthusiasm. He is a champion caster and spends much of his leisure time with his bird dogs.

These interests led him to an undertaking with other citizens of the county to push for the building of the Choctawhatchee Bay Bridge in South Walton County. Dr. Huggins, Bowers Campbell, and Howard Cawthon spearheaded the campaign and the bridge stands as a monument to their efforts.

The Choctawhatchee Bay Bridge was completed November 1940, opening the area and providing additional hunting and fishing possibilities for residents and visitors alike with better access to the Gulf Coast area from De Funiak Springs.

Another of Dr. Huggins major interests has been in the Masonic orders, where he was grand master of Herman Lodge 108 at Freeport for 20 years, and was district deputy grand master of the grand lodge of Florida.

Nor has he neglected his own profession because he has established a perpetual scholarship at Emory University in memory of his parents, Mr. and Mrs. S. E. Huggins, and his nephew, Haynes Gordon Huggins, who was killed in World War II.

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE MILLIARD F. CALDWELL, JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF STATE OF FLORIDA, AT THE DEDICATION OF DE FUNIAK SPRINGS, FLA., NOVEMBER 30, 1965

Just 40 years ago it was my privilege to become acquainted with a splendid young lawyer of De Funiak Springs—a lawyer recognized by the bar of Florida as one of great ability, high principles, and the courage of clear convictions. My acquaintance with Judge Gillis ripened into warm friendship and admiration for his considered judgment in matters of public importance. We served together in the legislature where his eminent qualities of leadership manigested themselves and where, on questions touching the welfare of Florida, his voice was heard and his influence pressed with telling effect.

When I became Governor, Judge Gillis was good enough to assist in the troublesome problems with his sage counsel and guidance. When the opportunity presented itself, I appointed him to the bench in full confidence that he would dispense justice with an even and tempered hand. The esteem in which he is held by the bench, bar and the public has justified my every anticipation.

And, so it is, that when Judge Gillis transmitted the invitation to come and be with you on this delightful occasion I was doubly pleased to accept and join with you in honoring an old friend who has distinguished himself in the practice of medicine. Again, it was nearly 40 years ago that I first knew Dr. Huggins, then a handsome virile young doctor just making his way into the hearts and confidence of the people in this county. A South Carolinian of Carolina parents, a graduate of one of the fine medical schools, Dr. Huggins even then was unselfish of his talents and his energy, serving alike those who could pay and those who could not.

He worked long hours, day and night, in the high incidence of killing diseases—colitis, typhoid, malaria, and hookworms, and by sheer force of his dedicated efforts helped make Walton County one of the healthy, delightful places in which to live and raise fine families.

With the exception of time devoted to medicine in the armed services during World War I, he has practiced in Walton County since 1912, devoting his time and his efforts not only to his profession but to the community as a whole, as a churchworker, as a worker in the field of education, in public service, in fraternal activities and, in general, offering a broad shoulder upon which the people of his choice could lean in time of need.

It was largely at Dr. Huggins' instigation and as a consequence of his determination that Walton County finally secured long-needed hospital facilities. And it was because of his guidance over the years as chief of staff of that hospital that it attained a high degree of perfection and efficiency in ministering to the ills of the people. All in all, Dr. Huggins' life with you here has been one of public service and it is more than fitting that you recognize him as one of your great citizens in naming the hospital the E. L. Huggins Memorial Hospital. I should like to join all of the people of this county in thanking the board of trustees for their recognition of this man and his devotion to their needs.

I am apprehensive that none of us here will again see in this country of ours the development of a medical center built, maintained, and operated on the public will and dogged determination of private citizens. I doubt if few of you will ever experience in the future the quality of personal attention Dr. Huggins and his colleagues have been able to give to his patients. The medical profession is fast being handcuffed to a Federal bureaucracy under which care will be dispensed with a computerized sort of impersonal and detached indifference.

And it staggers the imagination to contemplate the changes which have occurred in the last 30 years. Our manner of government and our way of life are, for the United States, new and novel, with little in common with what has gone before. Our forebears would be astounded by the insidious encroachments of centralized government in our everyday life.

Government is in the business of housing the people, in prescribing the hours we can work, with whom we must work, the salaries we are paid and the tax to be withheld from the salary, the schools our children can attend and with whom they must sit and play, the highways we can drive on, how and where our food is grown and processed. The Government concerns itself with the products you buy, the conditions under which they are manufactured, the manner in which they are advertised, the kind, the shape, and the size of the package in which they are offered and how they are labeled. It is meddling with your health, your general welfare, your old age and your retirement, your security after retirement, your savings and the banks in which you place your savings, the conduct of your city, its police department and its department of health; the conduct of the affairs of your State, its law enforcement, its elections, the composition of its legislature, and every other facet of your life, private and public.

But the people of this country may like all this—to say the least, they have asked for it. They have elected the public officials who brought it about and they sit around with their tin cups waiting for more. If that's what a majority of the people of this Nation want, those of us who disagree can't complain. The majority has the right to change our form of government if it wishes.

But one unfortunate aspect is that, once the die is finally cast, it will be too late to change our minds; it's altogether unlikely we could then ever reestablish the kind of government, the kind of independence and individuality our forefathers conceived and anticipated for posterity. We will have come too far and given up too much.

For that reason it is important that we give some thought to what is happening and reach some conclusions about what we'd like our future to be. We must count the cost of all the politically inspired humanitarian claptrap and be sure we're willing to pay the price in freedom, liberty, and independence.

In good conscience, we cannot say the Federal encroachments upon our rights and the rights of the States have come with any surprise. We have been warned and warned again. Cicero told us what to expect. When our ancestors were considering the adoption of the Federal Constitution, Patrick Henry warned: "Be extremely cautious, watchful, jealous of your liberty. Instead of securing your rights, you may lose them forever." He said, "This Government will * * * destroy the State governments and swallow the liberties of the people."

George Mason said that a centralized government "is totally subversive of every principle which has hitherto governed us."

William Grayson, suspicious of the proposed Supreme Court, said, "This Court has more power than any court under heaven * * *" and George Mason agreed.

Benjamin Franklin, anticipating a people negligent in safeguarding their rights, said he thought our Government would be well administered for a few years but that it "can only end in despotism."

George Washington warned of the dangers inherent in an unrestrained Supreme Court.

Thomas Jefferson warned of the evils of judicial encroachment.

Some years later Lord Macauley warned our Government would be destroyed from within by our own people.

Abraham Lincoln warned against allowing the Supreme Court to meddle with policy questions.

Woodrow Wilson in 1912 told the people: "A concentration of governmental power is what always precedes the death of human liberty."

No, we cannot have been surprised by what has happened because, from our earliest days we have been on notice it would happen. We, very simply, have refused to heed the warnings.

It is no longer of first importance whether we collectivize the professions or bankrupt the Nation in abolishing poverty or in supporting our enemies abroad—the vital question, the question in the face of which all others fade to insignificance, is whether we save the Constitution of the United States and the republican form of government established by it.

Perhaps Benjamin Franklin knew what he was talking about when, in substance, he told the young Nation, after it had adopted its Constitution, they had gained a free and independent Nation but did not have the commonsense to keep it.

Thank you for asking me over to have a part in this ceremony and to express, once again, our warm affection, respect, and esteem for our mutual friend, Dr. Huggins.

The Escalating War on Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, "It isn't too late yet, but someday, perhaps sooner than we think, it could be." This is a warning from a recent Chicago Sun-Times editorial which focused on President Johnson's natural resources message.

How true those words ring when we think of the horribly polluted water and air throughout our country. Millions of citizens are deprived of clean drinking, fishing, and swimming water. As an example, Lake Erie, bordering on my own district, is a disgrace to our Nation. Some even say that it is beyond help.

These same citizens, particularly those in urban areas, must breathe poisonous air every day of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message to the Congress was forthright and practical. It asks nothing that can not be accomplished through cooperative earnest efforts. And it provides funds to those localities which are willing to take action immediately.

The editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times points out that many will feel that the President's message went too far. This is hardly the case in light of our present polluted water and air. Others will feel that it has not gone far enough. Perhaps they are right, for sooner than we think it will be too late.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times for all to read in its entirety:

SAVING NATURE'S BOUNTY

President and Mrs. Johnson have consistently made known their concern for the natural beauty and resources of America. The President has now focused that concern in a massive program to clean the Nation's air and water and preserve its scenic masterpieces.

In a special message presenting the program to Congress, the President emphasized the "magnitude of the choice before us, and its consequences for every child born on this continent from this day forward." Much is at stake, and much is proposed. The total cost of cleaning up the Nation's rivers, for instance, was estimated at between $20 and $30 billion (under the proposal the Federal Government would pay 30 percent and the communities 70 percent).

Thousands of acres would be encompassed in a nationwide enlargement of parks and preserves (the President urged approval in 1966 of Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in Indiana and Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan). The President would also revise procedures to facilitate the curtailment of air and water pollution, including increased authority for the Government to act against pollution that "constitutes an imminent danger to public health and welfare."

Large as are the proposals, one phase proved disappointing to California conservationists. David Brewer, executive director of the Sierra Club, said that President Johnson's plans for a Redwood National Park in northern California placed it on the wrong site and did not envision a large enough acreage. There will no doubt be other objections, including the expected ones from the loggers and from citizens who object automatically to governmental spending.

But the President has attacked a large problem that calls for large solutions. Millions of city dwellers live near water they cannot drink, and cannot swim, fish or boat in, because it is polluted. Industry and municipalities are so polluting large bodies of water that they will no longer support fish and cannot be used by people in any way. The very existence of some water resources is endangered. The President pointed out that every river in the country now suffers some degree of contamination, and that in Lake Erie alone 32 swimming areas had been closed and the blue pike catch there reduced from 20 million pounds in 1937 to 7,000 pounds in 1960 because the oxygen supply necessary for fish had been consumed by algae fed by pollutants. Unless the process is reversed, Lake Erie is doomed.

So will be other bodies of water, and so will the redwoods of California and many another of nature's magnificent creations, unless man's spoilation of his own environment is halted. The job is one for all to undertake, as individuals and as citizens of communities, States, and the Nation. It isn't yet too late, but someday, perhaps sooner than you think, it could be.

Charges Against the Bank Merger Act Confirmed by Justice Department Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a few day ago the objections and charges that have been made against the Bank Merger Act passed this year were confirmed and reinforced by the Department of Justice. In a letter solicited by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California in connection with a bank merger case pending before that court, the Department of Justice expressed its views on the recent bank merger legislation.

In the opinion of the Department of Justice, the new bank merger legislation has not substantially changed anything. The letter from the Justice Department dated February 28, 1966, says of the new act:

> It is our view that it has not resulted in any substantial change in substantive antitrust law.

It is also the opinion of the Department of Justice that while the purpose of the new law is to define uniform standards to be applied by the banking agencies and the courts in judging bank mergers, the supposed differences in the standards have been overstated. The letter from the Department of Justice continues:

> Moreover, insofar as uniformity is concerned, what the new law does is impose on th banking agencies responsibility for giving—not just equal—but paramount consideration to the competitive implications of bank mergers. This is what the courts in antitrust cases, including Philadelphia, have always done.

In other words, it is the opinion of the Department of Justice, that as far as the law with respect to bank mergers is concerned, the recent Bank Merger Act makes no substantial contribution. This, of course, is what those of us who opposed the act claimed. But it explains only in part my opposition in committee and in debate. And it only partially explains my strong recommendation that the bill be vetoed.

For, if it is true that the Bank Merger Act makes no substantial change in the law with respect to bank mergers, it may well be asked by the Members of Congress and the people, why did we spend so much time, effort, and money to pass the bill? Why, indeed, did we enact a public law containing no contributions to the public law, but granting retroactive forgiveness to three bank mergers and extending private relief to the banks involved?

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of the letter from the Department of Justice to the U.S. District Court in California, dated February 28, 1966:

FEBRUARY 28, 1966.

Re *United States* v. *Crocker-Anglo National Bank, et al.* (Civ. action No. 41808 (N.D. of Calif. S.D.)).

Hon. ALPHONSO J. ZIRPOLI,
U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Southern Division, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR JUDGE ZIRPOLI: This letter is submitted in response to the court's "Notice to Counsel" dated February 10, 1966, calling for an expression of views as to further steps, if any, to be taken in this cause in light of the recent bank merger law passed by the Congress, and signed by the President on February 21, 1966. A copy of the law (Public Law 89–356; 80 Stat. 7) as so enacted is attached hereto for the convenience of the court.

We do not believe any additional steps need be taken by the court.

While a purpose of the law is to define uniform standards to be applied by the banking agencies and the courts in judging bank mergers, it is our position that the supposed differences in the standards applied have been overstated. Moreover, insofar as uniformity is concerned, what the new law does is impose on the banking agencies responsibility for giving—not just equal—but paramount consideration to the competition implications of bank mergers. This is what the courts in antitrust cases, including Philadelphia, have always done.

Under paragraph 5 of the new law, bank regulatory agencies are now prohibited from approving merger transactions which have substantial anticompetitive effects, unless those anticompetitive effects are "clearly outweighed" in the public interest by the probable effect of the transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served. This is a substantial burden. As noted from paragraph 7 (A) and (B) any judicial proceeding attacking a merger is to be a de novo proceeding with respect to which the courts are to apply the same standards as those specified in paragraph 5.

While the new legislation thus gives emphasis to the need for uniformity in the bank merger field, it is our view that it has not resulted in any substantial change in substantive antitrust law. In this respect the court already has before it the evidence submitted under the term "convenience and needs." As a factor in the Bank Merger Act of 1960, the date on it was already elicited from the merging parties and appraised by the Comptroller at the time the matter was pending before him in 1963. It is contained in the record of this court in exhibit 13 of defendants' detailed application to the Comptroller (court's exhibit 195) and pages 43–44, 50 of the Comptroller's Opinion approving the merger (defendants' exhibit BK–A).

Respectfully yours,

DONALD F. TURNER,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division.

HERBERT G. SCHOEPKA,
Attorney, Department of Justice.

Steadfastness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Rusk is "a man who has looked good when the going was rough," the Omaha World-Herald has observed, adding:

> We admire his steadfastness, and we hope that he never will waver.

The paper states that the thought of the Secretary "is clear and unqualified: America is fighting 'Communist aggression,' and America cannot afford to let the Communists win."

According to this paper, "The message is simple. It is effective," and it hails the Secretary as "perhaps the administration's most effective civilian spokesman, the most uncompromising, the most unswerving in his view that 'Communist aggression' must be stopped."

I believe others may want to read the opinions voiced in this forthright editorial, and with that in mind I am herewith offering the article for the RECORD:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Feb. 10, 1966]

UNBENDING MR. RUSK

A few months ago, it would have seemed remarkable if Columnist Alice Widener had written a column giving Dean Rusk a pat on the back for his "word-bullets" directed at those who would weaken America's war effort in Vietnam.

Mrs. Widener's column saying exactly that appeared on this page yesterday. And there was nothing remarkable about it.

Mr. Rusk may be colorless and softspoken. But on the Vietnam war he is perhaps the administration's most effective civilian spokesman, the most uncompromising, the most unswerving in his view that Communist aggression must be stopped.

If the test of a man is to be found in those who dislike or fear him, Mr. Rusk comes off very well. The mild little Secretary of State has the appeasers seething with indignation. He has been called worse than McNamara or the President because he chooses to talk about Communist aggression. His foes are sick to death of the phrase and of Mr. Rusk.

The Secretary of State brought that matter up himself during his testimony before the Fulbright committee Friday. He said:

"I have observed in the course of your hearings that some objection has been raised to the use of the term 'Communist aggression.' It seems to me that we should not confuse ourselves or our people by turning our eyes away from what that phrase means. * * * The Communist world has returned to its demand for what it calls 'a world revolution.'"

We Americans must recognize, said Secretary Rusk, that "expansion and extension of Communist domination by the use of force" against weak nations bordering Communist powers is a key part of that world revolution. As for the present war, Mr. Rusk said:

"We are in Vietnam because the issues posed there are deeply intertwined with our own security and because the outcome of the struggle can profoundly affect the nature of the world in which we and our children will live."

Mr. Rusk is no orator, and perhaps his training as a diplomat causes him to use more words than are necessary. But the thought is clear and unqualified: America is fighting Communist aggression, and America cannot afford to let the Communist win.

The message is simple. It is effective. The Hanoi radio is said to mention Mr. Rusk's name more often than that of any other American except President Johnson, and his name always is prefaced by a fusillade of vilifying adjectives.

So here's to Dean Rusk, an unlikely hero if there ever was, but a man who seems to have a one-track mind about Communist aggression—a man who has looked good when the going was rough. We admire his steadfastness, and we hope that he never will waver.

Cities Demonstration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1966, there appeared in the New York Times an article dealing with the President's cities demonstration program.

I submit for the consideration of my colleagues the article, together with my comments thereon:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1966.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I read with interest your article on Monday, March 7, 1966, dealing with the President's cities demonstration program.

The President's proposal, which is currently being studied in Congress, outlines a dynamic approach to eliminate blighted areas from a physical, social, and economic standpoint in a number of cities. As a New Yorker, I am vitally concerned with the waste of human resources and the poverty which characterize a number of sections in Manhattan. I believe that the $2.3 billion requested by the President for the cities demonstration program is a beginning in America's battle to adequately improve urbanized society, where 4 out of 5 Americans will live and work in cities by the year 2000.

To suggest that the appropriation is insufficient to achieve a meaningful contribution in the rehabilitation of urban areas would be correct if this were a terminal point. However, in addition to the suggested appropriation, other Federal funds from existing programs, carried out by many departments of Government, will also be channeled into the designated cities demonstration areas.

I am also hopeful that my amendment to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (H.R. 10855) authorizing Federal economic development assistance to compact and contiguous areas with a population of 200,000 or more will be enacted in the current session of the Congress. I have reason to believe that the figure may be reduced to include compact and contiguous areas of 100,000. If this amendment is enacted, additional funds could be applied to the city demonstration approach.

We must approach the problem of rehabilitating great urban areas with a degree of prudence to insure that local initiative and foresight are brought into the planning and execution of the program. As the President said in his message to the Congress: "Let there be debate over means and priorities. Let there be experiment with a dozen approaches, or a hundred. But let there be commitment to that goal." I echo these sentiments. We in Congress must decide the scope of the cities demonstration program, given our current fiscal commitments to defense and other existing domestic programs. I, personally, shall do all I can to assure adequate funds for this important new program.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 7, 1966]

SLUM PLAN STIRS CONCERN IN HOUSE—KEY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS BELIEVE JOHNSON PROGRAM NEEDS BIG RISE IN FUNDS

(By Robert B. Semple, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—There is growing concern here that the proposed demonstration cities program, for cleaning up slums, cannot work unless substantially more money is poured into it or existing Federal programs.

Key members of the Housing subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee have reached this stark and potentially troublesome conclusion. The subcommittee has heard a week of testimony on the much-publicized plan, on which President Johnson has pinned his hopes for improving city slum areas.

Under the President's plan a city applying for Federal aid would select one or possibly two blighted neighborhoods and submit an over-all plan for their rejuvenation.

AID PLANNED—$2.3 BILLION

The project would include housing for different income groups, with emphasis on those with lower incomes, as well as the health, education, welfare and other social services necessary to change the environment of the projects' residents.

Cities meeting a list of broad Federal criteria, including need and administrative capability, would be eligible for a share of $2.3 billion in Federal aid, spread over 5 years. They would also receive what Mr. Johnson described as "the complete array of all available Federal grants and urban aids in the fields of housing, renewal, transportation, education, welfare, economic opportunity and related programs."

The President's message submitting the proposal to Congress said that 60 to 70 cities would be chosen to participate in the demonstration program.

A survey of subcommittee sentiment suggests that most members accept the administration view that the plan is an imaginative and long overdue approach to solving slum problems.

But they fear $2.3 billion is not nearly enough to fulfill the program's promise.

Nor are they happy about the possible courses they believe are open to them if they try to match the capabilities of the program to the President's rhetoric

COULD INCREASE FUNDS

One course would be to increase funds for the program or, alternatively, the authorized levels of the many existing programs that are expected to be used as part of the demonstration cities plan. But they believe this course would involve enormous legislative difficulties and would invite criticism from the inflation-conscious Congress.

A second approach would be to reduce the number of cities involved in the plan. This would be equally risky because the program needs broad support on the House floor to pass.

A third course would be to revise downward the expectations of the plan by limiting the funds available to each participating city. But this might violate the Presidential dictum that the program be of sufficient magnitude to make "a substantial impact within the coming few years on the development of the entire city."

This largely unexpected concern has arisen in the last week for three main reasons:

First, the committee has been troubled by repeated testimony from mayors of large cities. The mayors have said that if the program, as Mr. Johnson promises, makes available to demonstration cities the "complete array of all available grants and aids," it will tend to divert these funds from communities that do not participate in the demonstration program.

Despite assertions to the contrary from Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, committee members tend to agree that this would be true. To avoid such discrimination and diversion, they believe that the total Federal outlay for urban renewal and other Federal aid would necessarily have to be increased.

Second, some committee members believe that the problem of diversion or discrimination could be aggravated by a financing mechanism in the administration bill. They believe it would tend to encourage cities competing for the demonstration funds to put still further pressure on existing Federal programs.

The bill says that the Government will pay 80 percent of the local share of Federal grant-in-aid projects that are focused on the demonstration area.

Communities usually pay one-third of the net cost of urban renewal projects and the Government two-thirds. Under the bill, the Government would pick up 80 percent of the community's old one-third share.

This mechanism, some committee members believe, would encourage communities to seek additional funds from a wide variety of Federal agencies to be able to enlarge the base on which their share of the demonstration program's money would be computed. Many of these agencies are already oversubscribed and short of cash.

Third, there is a growing belief in the committee and among housing experts here that the administration badly underestimated the cost of certain important social aspects of the program. As a result, they believe the $2.3 billion requested by the President is grossly inadequate to do the kind of job he set out to do.

The $2.3-billion figure proposed by Mr. Johnson was arrived at by determining how much it would cost to meet certain physical and social goals in 60 to 70 cities and then subtracting from this the amount the cities would recover by selling to private owners the dwelling units constructed or rehabilitated under the program.

It is now clear however, that the costs of providing a family with all the social services envisioned in the President's message were grossly miscalculated.

Accordingly there are two separate moves afoot to "rationalize" the program as one committee member put it. One is to enlarge greatly the $2.3-billion fund to meet the program's targets without increasing other Federal programs. The other is to keep the $2.3-billion figure and limit the number of cities involved.

Colonel Cawthra's Action in Vietnam War Cited in Recent Story on Wolfhounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to bring my colleagues' attention to the bravery and perseverance in the defense of his country of Col. James Cawthra, a Wyoming constituent. As commander of the 1st Battalion of the 27th Infantry's Wolfhounds, Colonel Cawthra's courageous activity was reported in the following Associated Press release, which I am proud to submit to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COLONEL CAWTHRA'S ACTION IN VIETNAM WAR CITED IN RECENT STORY ON WOLFHOUNDS

(NOTE.—The action of Lt. Col. James Cawthra, of Riverton, in the Vietnam war was recently cited in an Associated Press article on the 27th Infantry's Wolfhounds. The story, as printed in the February 10 issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, follows.)

(By Al Chang)

CHUCHI, VIETNAM.—During the Korean war the Wolfhounds were known as the fire brigade. They're moving into the same role here in Vietnam.

The 27th Infantry, part of the U.S. 25th Division, came here last month from its home base in Hawaii and ran into its first big clash with the Vietcong over the weekend.

The 27th added the adjective "Gentle" to the name "Wolfhounds" in Korea and Japan because of the outfit's work with orphans. Members of the unit have contributed thousands of dollars for establishing and maintaining orphanages.

But here they haven't yet had a chance to develop the "Gentle Wolfhounds" tradition. Shortly after reaching Vietnam they moved into this area about 25 miles northwest of Saigon.

It has long been a Vietcong domain. Weeks later they still find that every day means an ordeal of sniper fire—sometimes even in headquarters areas—mines and boobytraps.

And sometimes they find there is more to it than daily harassment from the almost unseen enemy.

A Wolfhound company operating out of Chuchi ran into a strong Vietcong force well hidden in trenches and spider holes. The Vietcong popped up and mostly by means of rifle grenades, hit the American troops hard.

The company's first sergeant, Leonard Letota, of Honolulu, described it this way;

"They came out of deep entrenched foxholes and an array of tunnels, fired a few rounds and moved underground to fire from different positions. Their fire was very accurate.

"During the heavy firefight the company took more casualties by trying to save and carry out the wounded. I saw two medics get hit. One of them was hit twice and another three times."

The company commander was hit by shrapnel but he stayed with his men and kept fighting throughout the day.

Sgt. Robert L. Little, of Doraville, Ga., ran under a deadly blanket of heavy fire for 150 yards to pick up and help carry back dead and wounded.

There were many examples of heroism among the Wolfhounds that Saturday.

The battalion surgeon, Capt. Donald G. Winningham, of Seattle, Wash., told of the toll suffered by the Americans.

"We started having casualties from about 10 o'clock in the morning and it went on until late at night," he said. "They were mostly from shrapnel and fragments. The medical aid tent was busy throughout the day and into the night after the battle had broken off.".

A dark the fighting ended and the Wolfhounds could look back on their first major fighting in the Vietnamese war. Although they had taken casualties, they believed they inflicted bloody losses on the Vietcong. There was no estimate of enemy dead or wounded.

Lt. Col. James Cawthra, of Riverton, Wyo., commander of the 1st Battalion, spent 7 hours hovering above the battlefield in a helicopter, one of the many choppers that came under enemy fire.

When the day ended, he said

"The Wolfhounds have done a good job. We have had a lot of casualties, hitting us from those dug-in tunnels and trenches. But considering the number of casualties, only a few will be evacuated out of the unit.

"Most of them will be back in a day or so to fight again. Their morale is high. You can see that by the spirit of the wounded."

(NOTE.—Al Chang, Hawaii-born A.P. photographer, was with the U.S. 27th Infantry Wolfhounds in the Korean war. He was with them over the weekend when they had their first sharp engagement in Vietnam with the Vietcong.)

Support Given

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the country is more united and therefore the prospect of a solution and peace in Vietnam should brighten, the Columbia, S.C., State editorially asserts.

Speaking of the Senate hearings, this great paper said:

> It was not pleasant to hear the hard facts of the situation, but it is right and necessary to face up to them. Congress has done so in a demonstration of bipartisanship at its best. The country should, and will, do likewise.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the State's splendid editorial of March 3 to my colleagues and to the people of our country:

SUPPORTING THE WAR

Congress having again expressed itself, the prospect of solution and peace in Vietnam should brighten.

Although there was never any doubt but that the extra appropriation for the war would be made, the debate over policy inevitably cast fresh doubts over the country and undoubtedly tended to encourage Communists everywhere.

And the debate will go on. Open and free discussion is in the American tradition and it is a tradition which should not be abandoned.

But the almost-unanimous vote in the Senate on the additional funds strongly suggests a national rallying behind the effort and a resolve to be energetically about the business of gaining a firm and honorable termination of the war.

The testimony of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor and Secretary of State Dean Rusk unquestionably clarified the issue for most citizens needing further explanation. And while critics in Congress could scarcely have been expected to confess a sudden transformation on their part, they, too, felt the impact of the showings made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the two men.

General Taylor said we must not change course, and Mr. Rusk propounded once more, with convincing clarity, the requirements of freedom which are so deeply involved in our stand.

It was not pleasant to hear the hard facts of the situation, but it is right and necessary to face up to them. Congress has done so in a demonstration of bipartisanship at its best. The country should, and will, do likewise. This should give the Communists pause and instill fresh hope in free men.

W. Perry Doing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Mathias and I were deeply grieved by the tragic death of W. Perry Doing, member of the Maryland House of Delegates from Montgomery County.

Perry Doing was a generous, energetic, and conscientious man who will be sorely missed by his countless friends and his colleagues in the Maryland General Assembly. Mrs. Mathias and I extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Doing and his four children, Michael, Patricia, deForrest, and Ronald.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the resolution passed by the Maryland General Assembly on February 21:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 40

Resolution expressing the deepest regret of the House of Delegates of Maryland over the sudden passing of the Honorable W. Perry Doing

The members of the House of Delegates of Maryland were grievously shocked and saddened over the sudden passing of our good friend and colleague, the Honorable W. Perry Doing, a member of the house from Montgomery County.

His loss brings to every member of this body a deep personal sense of sorrow and regret and a poignant recollection of the close ties of respect and friendship we held for him.

W. Perry Doing was born in Washington, D.C., on March 3, 1921. He attended the public schools in Washington and in the year 1942 received the degree of LL.B. from Columbia Law School. He became a member of the Maryland bar in 1954.

He served in the Armed Forces during World War II, during which time he received two citations; and he achieved the rank of major in the Army Reserve. Over the intervening years, he was a highly active member adn leader in numerous legal, fraternal, service, veterans, educational, civic, and commercial organizations. He served in the House of Delegates of Maryland beginning in January 1963.

We knew Perry Doing as an able and effective legislator and as a warm and generous person.

In his leigslative work, he was a dedicated public servant and a hard-working productive leader in this general assembly. He served on three committees: Metropolitan affairs, alcoholic beverages, and Chesapeake Bay affairs; and he was the Republican minority whip. Always of good conscience, he constantly strove for the public good and held always before him the welfare and the advance of the people of his State and community.

In personal demeanor, Perry Doing was a kind, cheerful, and friendly man. He delighted in the company of his friends and was ever responsive to their companionship and interest.

In simple truth, Perry Doing was one of the most popular members of this general assembly. In his passing, the State of Maryland and Montgomery County have lost a man of rare promise and ability. Every member of the General Assembly of Maryland is sad at heart over the loss of this wonderful friend and outstanding legislator: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the deepest sympathies and heartfelt regrets of every member of this body are expressed over the sudden passing of Delegate W. Perry Doing, of Montgomery County; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Montgomery County delegation are requested to convey personally to the family of the late Perry Doing the sincere condolences of each member of the Maryland Legislature; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of delegates is directed to send copies of this resolutoin to Mrs. W. Perry Doing, 17230 Donora Road, Ednor, Md.; to the surviving children of Delegate Doing: Michael, Patricia, deForrest, and Ronald Doing, at 10608 Hayes Avenue, Silver Spring; to his mother, Mrs. Ralph Endicott, 10201 Grosvenor Place, Rockville; and to his brother, Clayton E. Doing, Darnestown, Md.; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Delegates of Maryland adjourns on February 21, 1966, with honor, respect, and affection for the memory of a fine gentleman, a conscientious public official and a cherished friend, the late W. Perry Doing.

How To Cut the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, May 1, 1957, the then majority leader of that body, Lyndon B. Johnson, said:

> I know of only one way to cut the President's $72 billion budget. That way is to cut the appropriations bills that come before Congress.

To echo the words of Mr. Johnson, who is now occupying the Presidency himself, I know of only one way to cut the President's $113 billion budget. That way is to cut the appropriations bills that come before Congress.

Economy was certainly important in 1957, but there is even more need to reduce the budget for fiscal 1967. While we were at peace 9 years ago, American young men are now fighting and dying in Vietnam.

The budget contemplated for the next fiscal year, which will start July 1, will be 57 percent greater than the one which President Eisenhower submitted for fiscal 1958, which our Democratic friends criticized so severely.

If we are to prosecute the war in Vietnam successfully, we will have to cut all unnecessary spending from the budget. Americans are willing to spend whatever can be spent effectively for fighting and defeating our enemies, but they want the money to be spent judiciously and not merely for the sake of spending. They are willing to pay whatever taxes are necessary, they are willing to make whatevery sacrifices are justifiable, and they are willing to undergo privation if need be to defeat communism.

My Republican colleagues and I are going to do all we can to eliminate unnecessary spending from the fiscal 1967 budget. We will take Lyndon Johnson's 1957 statement to heart and look at each and every appropriation bill with an eagle eye.

In 1957, when our Democratic colleagues cried out against excessive spending, there were 233 Democrats and 200 Republicans in the House of Representatives. Today there are 292 Democrats and 141 Republicans—59 more Democrats and 59 fewer Republicans than there were 9 years ago. If the members of the President's own party in this body will cooperate with us, we will be able to eliminate wasteful spending.

The Illiberal Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have the freest nation in the world and one of the most of our treasured rights is freedom of speech.

Inevitably, however, there are those who abuse their rights and while no one can or should keep them from exercising freedom of speech or assembly they do provide a sad spectacle and a poor example.

Particularly pertinent to this point is Roscoe Drummond's column which appeared in the February 27, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The column follows:

THE ILLIBERAL LIBERALS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Peaceful picketing is one of the vital rights of a free people.

But raucous, name-calling protestors are debasing this right when they use it to harass a public assembly simply because it is a forum for views they don't like.

This is a reckless and revolting abuse of the rights of others.

It is extremism which can only beget extremism.

It is coming to a point where those who practice it had better pause before they do great harm.

It reached its peak of defamation in New York this past week when pickets, hurling epithets and abuse at the President of the United States, sought to hamper a vast public gathering to honor the President.

While the pickets outside were screaming, "Hey, hey, L.B.J., how many kids did you kill today?" the President was telling his Freedom House audience: "We have learned to despise * * * the unprincipled harassment of a man's integrity and his right to be different."

While the pickets were chanting, "The black vote first, the Vietnamese vote later," the President was saying that freedom cannot be fully protected at home if the rights of others to freedom is allowed to be suffocated by aggression abroad.

While the pickets were protesting because a public assembly was advocating views they oppose, the President was saying: "Just as strongly as I believe in other men's freedom to disagree, so do I also believe in the President's freedom to attempt to persuade. So let me assure you and my fellow Americans that I will do everything in my power to defend both."

When the President rose to begin his speech, one member of the audience leaped to his feet and tried to shout him down.

What do the pickets and those who condone this abuse of free assembly think they are doing? Are they furthering that full public debate which helps democracy work? I submit that theirs is an extremist tactic which serves to limit, rather than foster, the free interplay of thought.

It is time to stop it. It is the tactic of extremists who don't care what happens to democracy in America. George Field, executive director of Freedom House, gives this wise warning of where such abasement of free speech can take us:

"The extremist, unable to tolerate views other than his own, perverts the expression of his dissent into a weapon. He seeks to hamper his opponents, to drown them out, sometimes even to interfere physically with their expression.

"This is the tactic that leads the Americans for the Preservation of the White Race to announce that they will demonstrate when Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY speaks at the University of Mississippi. It is the tactic of those who called for demonstrations in the streets around the building where the President received the Freedom Award. It is the tactic of the extremist who, even while loudly proclaiming his own right to dissent, cannot bear to allow others to express their views unharassed."

Expression of dissent by petition or demonstration is an essential element of a free society. But when pickets use the precious right of free assembly to harass free assembly—what a defacement of the true purpose of the picket line.

Surely, of all people, liberals ought to be condemning, not condoning, such illiberalism.

How can the picketing protestors expect to retain for themselves the right of free assembly when they act to harass others exercising the same right?

It's time to stop it.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*	
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*	1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*	
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg*	914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*	
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*	1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*	301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn*	119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George, *Idaho*	
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*	800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	4517 Wetherill Dr., Westmoreland Hills, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*	The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*	
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	

Appendix

Michigan Navy Beans Least Expensive Means of Fulfilling Nutritional Requirements of Food-for-Freedom Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Bean Shippers Association, in a communication to the Secretary of Agriculture, has pointed out the advantages of including Michigan navy beans in the Department's program to meet the nutritional needs of countries where food is in short supply. Since there are no reserve stocks of beans, the association is seeking to get beans on a competitive basis with other crops being proposed for the program.

The Michigan Bean Shippers Association sets forth its position in the following presentation to the Secretary:

POSITION OF THE MICHIGAN BEAN SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION RELATIVE TO MICHIGAN NAVY BEAN PRICE SUPPORTS

We feel that the support price on Michigan navy beans should be increased for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that it conincides with the objectives of the Food for Freedom Act and the food and fiber reserves which President Johnson enunciated in his farm message to the Congress and which Secretary Freeman detailed in his appearance before the House Committee on Agriculture, February 23, 1966.

Emphasizing as it does self-help the food-for-freedom concept points out that until the emerging countries are able to be self-sufficient in the production of food and fiber that American food products will be made available to them. There is discussion by Secretary Freeman in his appearance before the House committee on the shortage or lack of protein in the diets in developing nations. He stated:

"One of the most serious manifestations of hunger in the developing nations lies in nutritional deficiencies, particularly the lack of proteins and vitamins, among infants and young children."

It is submitted that one of the least expensive means of fulfilling these nutritional requirements is with Michigan navy beans. The need for protein is emphasized by the fact the President directed the Secretary of Agriculture to provide incentvies for the production of rice, wheat and soybeans. Since Michigan navy beans are as high or nearly as high in protein content and since they are less expensive than most of the other high protein foods it is submitted that an incentive for production should be provided for Michigan navy beans. We believe that the incentive should be a $7.50 support price.

We do not want to appear completely altruistic in our approach to increasing the support price and we do agree with Secretary Freeman's statement before the House committee when he states:

"The link between self-help and food aid is likewise important to the people of the United States. Paradoxical as it may seem, agricultural development in the poor hungry nations offers to us the best opportunity for expanding exports of the products of our farms and factories."

The Michigan Bean Shippers Association is embarked on a program of foreign market development for Michigan navy beans in conjunction with Foreign Agricultural Service. Parentheticaly we may point out that it is the only type of bean produced in the United States which is conducting such a foreign market development program. However, we do feel that in cooperating with the President and the Secretary of Agriculture in these two programs we are also to some extent preparing future foreign markets for Michigan navy beans. We need the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture in providing the incentive of the higher support price so that we can cooperate more fully with the administration's wishes. The concomitant benefit in the long run will be increased markets for Michigan navy beans.

Again we would like to quote from the message of Secretary Freeman before the House Agriculture Committee. He stated:

"Commodities available to food recipient countries will no longer be as limited as they have been in the past. The commodity 'mix' sent abroad under concessional programs will be geared to the kind needed rather than circumscribed by the kind held in stock. We can expect the trend to be in the direction of commodities with special nutritional values."

As has been pointed out Michigan navy beans have such "special nutritional values" and fulfill in every respect the very thing the Secretary emphasizes. In addition to fulfilling the nutritional requirements, Michigan navy beans have another attribute which should be considered. They can be used in these developing nations without being processed and utilization of the beans will not require an educational campaign on their use. It is noted with interest the high protein foods listed by the President and the Secretary all require milling, pressing or some other processing before they can be used by the hungry in the underdeveloped nations.

This is not true of Michigan navy beans. They can be shipped and used immediately. Insofar as the second point is concerned, Michigan navy beans have gone into most of the underdeveloped nations in the past either under Public Law 480 as a donation or in commercial sales. It is not like trying to introduce a new product into these countries and then have to explain how it is used. There is no such problem as there is with the other commodities discussed as to conducting an educational program among the hungry of the world.

The President in his message speaks of soybeans and recommends action that will increase soybean production in 1966. He stated:

"The demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960. Despite record crops we have virtually no reserve stocks. To assure adequate supplies at prices fair to farmers and consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture will use authority under the 1965 act to encourage production of soybeans on acreage formerly planted to feed grains. Feed grain stocks are more than sufficient."

It should be pointed out that there are also no reserve stocks of Michigan navy beans. In spite of the fact that Michigan navy beans are much preferred in the school lunch program, the needy and welfare programs, because there are no reserves of Michigan navy beans, these recipients have been forced to take split peas. The way to get these essential reserves is to provide an incentive to the Michigan farmer by raising the support price to $7.50. This will provide sufficient Michigan navy beans to take care of the domestic welfare programs and still maintain a reserve for emergency use. There is no such reserve at the present time.

Because of the emergency needs for food throughout the world, we feel that increased production of Michigan navy beans can be rushed in to fill the need. If the farmers are given early assurances that the support price will be $7.50, by next September Michigan navy beans will be available for use both domestically and in the underdeveloped nations of the world. If there is an extended delay, in making this announcement, farmers will make plans to go into other commodities, perhaps even corn, which the Secretary and the President say we do not need. If the support price remains where it is at $6.65 there probably will be few, if any, additional acres planted to Michigan navy beans. It should be noted that support prices on Michigan navy beans was reduced by 25 cents in 1965 with departmental comment that "production of these beans has been increasing in recent years, and much of the added production has been taken over under the price support program." If this statement is correct, then the support price should be increased to $7.50 to provide the additional production called for by the President and the Secretary.

Finally, it has been commented that other bean producing areas of the United States have been almost uniform in asking that support prices be removed. We will not argue with the wisdom of such a philosophy, but do point out that the Michigan bean shippers have always supported the price support program and have worked with officials of the Department of Agriculture in trying to make it an effective vehicle for assuring producers fair prices for their beans.

In spite of this seeming disagreement within the industry, it should be pointed out that all beans are not the same and all their problems cannot be solved by one solution. Not only do the areas disagree on support prices but generally speaking the various classes of beans seek different domestic and world markets, they differ in the prices at which they are sold, they appeal to different tastes, and they are grown for different end uses. Thus, the fact is that all beans are not the same and the fact that some areas want price support removed should not have any bearing or effect on the decisions of the Department of Agriculture in setting support prices for Michigan navy beans.

It is respectfully requested that the utmost consideration be given to increasing the support price on Michigan navy beans for the reasons cited above. In a sentence, increasing the support price to $7.50 for Michigan navy beans will help accomplish the programs of President Johnson and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman.

Dr. Dorman Winfrey: Outstanding Texas Librarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in modern times, one of the major tools of knowledge, research, and information is our libraries. Without these facilities much of our progress and success would never be achieved. Yet, perhaps one of the most neglected and unsung heroes of our age is the man who devotes his life to seeing that our libraries become the efficient and outstanding institutions which we all expect.

One such man is Dr. Dorman Winfrey, head of the Texas State Library. Noted as one of the Nation's outstanding archivists, Dr. Winfrey is also a historian and author.

As a tribute to this outstanding man who is responsible for the excellence of the Texas State Library. I ask that an article from the Dallas Morning News of March 5, 1966, entitled "Dorman Winfrey: Books Are His Business" be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DORMAN WINFREY: BOOKS ARE HIS BUSINESS

(By Carolyn Patrick)

AUSTIN, TEX.—Dr. Dorman Winfrey runs an intellectual, educational State agency in a political environment.

His problems range from women who would like to cook their lunch at the office to national legislation affecting what he considers the foundation of education.

Dr. Winfrey heads the complex, massive system under the Texas State library.

There's much more than booklending, however, at the modern granite structure east of the State capitol.

State libraries, one historical writer commented, "were founded in the early years to guide State lawmakers * * * there's no one these days who would dream of trying to operate a modern legislature without an adequate library. Research today is a fundamental part of government.

"These libraries have long since outgrown their origins to provide services so diverse that even the librarians themselves are frequently astounded," the writer concluded.

In Dr. Winfrey's opinion, the State librarian of today must not only be "up to date on library services, but must be a diplomat, lawyer, contractor, electrician, speechwriter, and politician."

Varied services of the Texas State library include—

Continual processing of some 230,000 volumes owned by the library for use by Texas citizens, primarily those in 26 counties which do not have a library.

Running special library services for the blind with a supply of 8,000 braille books, some 18,000 special talking books, and 5,000 tape recordings.

Maintaining archives of value which are obtained, preserved, and cataloged for use by researchers.

Manning a legislative reference library for the State legislature in the State capitol.

Filing and preserving all State records.

Directing bookmobile and rural library service.

Serving as consultants to metropolitan and rural areas on public library service.

In addition, the State library was recently designated as one of two regional depositories in the State for U.S. Government documents and genealogy files.

The library serves as State administrator under the Federal Library Services and Construction Act, charged with dispersing $1,139,425 to Texas libraries for services and $1,438,499 for construction.

In the past year, field consultants have met with librarians at all of the State's 342 libraries.

Overseeing these activities is a short, quiet-mannered historian, writer, librarian, diplomat, and politician who was born and reared in Rusk County.

Dr. Winfrey is considered one of the foremost archivists in the country and is the only Texan named a fellow in the Society of American Archivists.

He is a fellow and executive council member of the Texas State Historical Association, member of the Texas Commission on Disciples History and the Texas Institute of Letters. He heads the State Board of Library Examiners and is a member of national honorary fraternities.

Representing Texas nationally, Dr. Winfrey heads the American Association of State Libraries' joint committee on local and State history. He is a member of the association's planning committee.

An avid historian, Dr. Winfrey has devoted years to recording the history of Rusk County, included in two books, "A History of Rusk County, Tex." and "Julien Sidney Devereaux and His Monte Verdi Plantation."

The latter was the first book written on management of a Texas plantation during the early years of Texas history.

For these two books, Dr. Winfrey became the only Texan to win for two different books the Award of Merit from the American Association for State and Local History.

A graduate of the University of Texas with three degrees, Dr. Winfrey has reached what might be termed a boyhood ambition. The foundation for the ambition came accidentally.

He entered a historical writing contest at Henderson High School and on the State level. The next year, he won in two categories, but his $10 prize was delivered to him at Camp Wallace in Galveston.

His historical writing career was interrupted by service with the 69th Infantry Division of the U.S. Army in Europe in World War II.

Army service whetted his historical appetite and his spare time was spent "seeing all the places of historical interest throughout Europe."

When he returned, Dr. H. Bailey Carroll, director of the Texas State Historical Association, employed him as a part-time writer and researcher.

He became State archivist in 1958 and later became archivist for the University of Texas, where he served until appointment as director librarian of the Texas State Library in 1962.

When Dr. Winfrey came to the State library, 19th-century methods were being used to catalog books and preserve valuable archives.

One staff member threatened to quit when the library commission decreed that something other than flour-type paste be used in preserving the archives. Paste causes paper to harden and deteriorate rapidly, Dr. Winfrey explained.

In addition to outmoded methods, Dr. Winfrey faced problems with female librarians described as "set in their ways."

Some wanted to cook lunch in the new building. This had been permitted when the library was housed in the basement of the capitol. (Reportedly a favorite meal was collard greens cooked in a huge pot, until an agricultural commissioner whose office was within aroma range registered a complaint.)

A ruling against cooking on the premises, made to protect the new building from termites, ended the culinary problem.

Under Dr. Winfrey, giant steps have been taken by the library toward progressive service which the State hopes to provide.

The library staff now has one doctoral degree holder, nine with the masters of library science degree, two with 5-year degrees in library science, five with a master degree in other fields, one law degree and five undergraduate degrees in library science.

Modern methods and machinery for cataloging have been installed. The Texas Library hosted a special conference on automated library services last year, which attracted librarians from throughout the Southwest.

Dr. Winfrey says that being outnumbered by female library employees doesn't bother him. He's used to it at home also, where he has an attractive wife and two daughters.

One current project is to head a legislative advisory committee, studying ways of improving the filing of State records.

As director-librarian, Dr. Winfrey's $12,500 salary is less than that paid some city librarians, whose assistance he is supervising. Example: San Antonio's city librarian receives $12,672 a year. Its Federal aid totals about $230,000 annually.

Dr. Winfrey is encouraged by the increasing interest in libraries among State officials and other leaders. He will direct the first Texas Governor's conference on libraries to be held here March 23.

The State has a well-rounded system of libraries and is improving these facilities, but Dr. Winfrey wants to see increased operations in such fields as microfilming.

"The library should be an area of use, not a museum," is his motto.

He cites inadequate pay as a major problem in staffing the library with qualified people. Turnover has been steady.

Dr. Winfrey said that the last 5 years have helped to bridge the gap of 30 to 40 years delay in modernizing the State library. He hopes that the momentum will continue, and be spread here through the upcoming statewide conference called by the Governor.

Role That Magazines Play in a Free Society—Speech by John K. Herbert, President, Magazine Publishers Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during my years of service as a member and former chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, one of the most rewarding experiences has been the knowledge that, through the work of that committee, we have insured the continued and unequaled success of the periodical press of the United States by providing postal service to readers of newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals.

On January 25, the Advertising Club of Metropolitan Washington, Inc., held its annual Magazine Day. John K. Herbert, president of the Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., spoke to a group of 150 Washington advertising executives concerning the role that magazines play in a free society. The magazine industry of the United States is unequaled by that of any other country in the world.

It is my pleasure to ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD, Mr. Herbert's remarks concerning the dynamic force that industry has created on our economy and way of life.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, guests of the Advertising Club of Metropolitan Washington, you do the magazine industry great honor in affording me this time and attention.

Yet your compliments and interest perhaps reflect that of another Washingtonian who wrote me:

SEPTEMBER 16, 1965.

DEAR MR. HERBERT: I am particularly pleased to extend my best wishes to the members of the Magazine Publishers Association as they meet in their annual convention.

I do so because few avenues of communication in his country play a role as vital as yours.

The extent to which any society can be free and responsive is equated by the degree to which it is enlightened and informed. In this respect, the American people are a classic example. Nowhere are the people of a single nation as intelligently and keenly aware of the ever-changing panorama of global events.

This, I believe, is a direct tribute to you.

Your publications not only inform and educate, but since the days of Thomas Paine, who well deserved the title of publisher, they have been a major force in unifying this country.

The broad spectrum of magazines published in the United States reflects vividly the breadth of interests and concerns of our people. Your publications reach out to every segment of our society to fill an urgent need for the information that is essential in forming the wise decisions on which our democracy thrives.

The American magazine industry is is a vital and indispensable force of which we are all proud, and I wish you continued success in your efforts.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

What are the qualities of magazines that have evoked this sincere and perceptive tribute? What are the characteristics which enable them to accept unblushingly the compliment paid them by Henry R. Luce, perhaps a biased but nonetheless professional witness?

I quote: "Magazines have been educative, especially of adults, in many, many ways. We have educated the American people in the sense of providing information for information's sake. We have also been educators in ways of living, in ways of thinking and believing. In pragmatic terms, magazines have been responsible, to some very great extent, for the standard of living of the American people, the beneficent wonder of the world."

Well, how does this come about? First, the magazine is read. It is read usually at the time and place of the reader's choosing, when the mood, the leisure and the interest coincide.

In this I am reminded of the observations of two oldtime scholars which seem particularly applicable to magazines today.

Noah Porter, when president of Yale University from 1871 to 1886, declared: "No man can read with profit that which he cannot learn to read with pleasure." And the noted English commentator and writer, Samuel Johnson, advised simply and succinctly, "One ought to read just when the inclination takes him, for what he reads as a task will do him little good."

But magazines offer more than selective reading for learning with pleasure. The magazine offers the invaluable act of reading itself, invaluable because reading is the tested and certain path to comprehension, and comprehension is the foundation of learning, of judgment, of decision. Thus, the appealing fusion of text and illustrations produces this component of the magazine character, simply that it is read.

The magazine has timely authority. It also often has enduring entity.

Though the magazine is constantly reinterpreting the lessons of history as new facts and perspectives emerge, it doesn't consume valuable years to do so. Usually it is the first to change ideas which may have been erroneously held for decades.

This quality which gives the magazine its informative vigor is worth emphasis. Day to day changes in the news often relate to central events of major importance. A series of circumstances occurs here or in Asia. Each is reported as it happens.

But the concerned reader is confused. He wants to know what is the sum of these events. Linked together, what do they portend? What is the real significance of De Gaulle? What are the chances of peace in Vietnam? What were the political implications of the New York transit strike? Were any of them national? What is behind the headlines on Soviet commitments in North Vietnam? Medicare? How may they affect the farmer, the businessman, the housewife, the mechanic, the cost of living, a new automobile, a vacation, the children's education?

Here is where the interest lies. Do these bits and pieces of news add up to a passing shower or a Noah's deluge? Where can we get authoritative, reflective answers while they are still meaningful?

The facts must be appraised and interpreted by articulate experts trained in the interests of their readers.

The first place such authority usually appears is in a magazine, to be read at your convenience.

It is, therefore, neither book nor newspaper; neither audio nor visual device, it is a magazine, separate and distinct from all other communication media, and it has authoritative timeliness.

Magazines increase learning abilities among schoolchildren. That's a strong statement—it is also a provable one. A few years ago the National Education Association issued a report on a unique study of the results of effective magazine use in elementary high schools. The only magazines tested were those read widely by the general public. Only one teacher in each school was asked to report. So intense was the interest engendered that replies were received from 900 of the 1,200 schools surveyed.

With the often deplorably slow updating of textbooks—some are used for 5 or even 10 years—magazines were demonstrated to provide a vital means of relating learning to the experience of daily living.

The deep nationwide concern of serious teachers for up-to-date viable learning systems was most aptly expressed by one California teacher who said: "Without magazines our programs would die."

What greater proof that magazines increase learning abilities? They increase them pleasurably. And, I may add, at all literate ages.

I emphasize the word pleasurably because learning is an inevitable process of living and living can and should be always a pleasant process. But learning has a deeper meaning than the discovery of something new. Learning also implies a broadening appreciation of the tested and stanch precepts of the past.

In our youth, studying early American history, we heard about the something called freedom of speech. Coming after some years of parental discipline more or less based on a canon that children should be seen and not heard, the term "freedom of speech" at best elicits a mixed response. It seems that what was right for Patrick Henry may not be right for children; what is right for schoolteachers is interpreted differently for pupils. Only very, very gradually do we assimilate the real meaning of Thomas Jefferson's living words: "Freedom of religion, freedom of the press and freedom of person * * * these are the principles which have guided our steps."

I submit that our national magazines today have more effect in sustaining and maintaining such fundamentals to the democracy of our Republic than any other influence available throughout the entire Nation. Since the first American magazine was announced by Benjamin Franklin in 1740, they have strengthened our determination to uphold and forever preserve the only political way of life tolerable for freeman.

Think of this a little, when you think of the 95 million adults who are magazine readers.

Magazines protect and implement national unity. We are a nation; we are not simply 50 loosely federated States or, if you like, a dozen regions. We are a nation and whatever local rights and customs we may stanchly uphold, our national purpose is indivisible.

Magazines may quickly transport the relaxed and comfortable ranchhouse style of home from the West to the East. With equal speed they can and do widen appreciation and understanding of art, of education needs, of religion, and of our place and purpose in this increasingly complex world.

But, in the fundamental principles of our Nation, even those involving abstruse economics and perplexing politics, there is no other interpretive means whereby widely divergent opinions can be expressed in depth and quickly annealed for a resolute course of action.

Where national unity is of importance, the essential ingredients to its achievement are found in magazines.

There is one quality common to magazines which, to me, is very special: they vigorously express honest and forthright differences of opinion.

Magazines, especially many that may be small in circulation but huge in influence, seem to represent just about all the points of view there are. So long as the reader is selective, he can find high, low, or middle ground on virtually every important domestic and international question likely to concern him. Equally important, he can get timely discussion of all three views. From magazines, readers can learn not just what to think, but what to think about. There is a vast difference.

New magazines are constantly appearing on the market, 33 in the past year. Most of them represent new ideas; new thinking; a fresh approach. Rarely are they aimed at that audience en masse. They do not seek the lowest common denominator of a group interest, though one aim is surely financial success. But that success is expected through effective, articulate, even dramatic presentation of an idea and the idea dominates the mere technical skills of promotion, display, and exploitation.

Magazines affect and motivate people of influence. Top business executives—and their counterparts in the leaders and homemakers among women—are in a position to pick and choose. In fact, they must do so. They are not people with idle time, content to accept any mental stimuli, however slight, rather than none at all. They are people looking for ideas which will enhance their capacity and zest for living, for producing, for broadening the scope of their interests. They select magazines—several particular magazines—only because these provide what they want and what will influence them—help them—meet their wants. The magazine influences people because they want it to influence them. That is why people buy them.

Magazines inspire confidence. The printed word, backed by reputation, has a powerful effect on believability. This is heightened by the timespan over which the printed word is expected to be subject to public scrutiny. Broadly magazines meet this test. The magazine departments—archives—of great public libraries daily demonstrate their value as a continuing source of reliable reference.

Magazines encourage selectivity. Some people regard this as the most important manifestation of the magazine character. Advertising makes possible our rich world of magazines. And advertising helps the selective process. But magazines in themselves suggest and inspire improvement in standards and methods of living which excites ambition among many classes of people. Because they are magazine readers, these people generally have or can accumulate the means to pay for desired and desirable improvements. Further, they have the will, the tenacity and the job security which makes possible early accumulation of such improvements. Moreover, they tend to have a plan for developed living which encourages thoughtful consideration of their purchases. They read. They reflect. They compare. And finally they buy. And what they buy and where they buy are strongly influenced by the editorial content which surrounds and often provides essential background for their decision.

It provides background, too, for consideration of well-planned, effectively executed and appropriately placed advertising designed specifically to appeal to the special groups within the heterogeneous 49 million families of loyal and consistent magazine readers.

In summary: The magazine is read. It has timely authority. It increases learning ability. It offers widely varying opinions. It motivates people of means and influence. It covers literally—universal interests. It inspires confidence. Its audience is vast but entirely self-selecting. Finally, it distributes the products, the ideas, and the ideals of our educators, our philosophers, our writers: the sum of our creative talent in the arts and in business and industry.

Anyone aware of the recent changes and impressive growth in the magazine business cannot avoid being impressed by the dynamics of this vast and influential industry. For 200 years magazines have helped mold the minds, the ambitions and the achievements of mankind. Where else, with meaning, can we find a continuously vivid influence on our daily life, with so rich an experience in the past, from which we may resolve our problems of the present; and develop to the full, our opportunities of the future?

And in these achievements, accumulated over more than two centuries and actively and vitally working today, are embodied the real power inside your magazines.

Travel Gap Widens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1966, the following editorial appeared in both the Gatlinburg Press and the Sevier County News Record in Sevier County, Tenn.

The Great Smoky Mountains area, which these papers serve, is one of the most beautiful natural settings in our Nation and one which offers many recreational and relaxing advantages to our people.

It is understandable that the editorial would speak out on the "travel gap," which is of great concern to the area and which should be of great concern to all of us.

I insert this editorial at this point in the RECORD:

TRAVEL GAP WIDENS

As was anticipated, efforts of the administration to curb travel abroad and encourage the expenditure of that money in the United States backfired and the public spent more money than ever with other nations.

Purpose of encouraging travel in the United States was to reduce the difference between what visitors from other nations spend here and what our citizens spend abroad.

The travel gap amounted to $1.9 billion and represents a serious drain on the national economy. Problem is that this greatly exceeds our anticipated balance-of-payments deficit.

However, despite the difference of $1.9 billion, Uncle Sam does not intend to hamper or restrict travel abroad, and no special effort is to be made to keep our citizens and their dollars from going abroad.

Getting more foreign people to visit this Nation presents considerable difficulty, one important aspect being the restriction which other nations place upon those who visit the United States in limiting as well as restricting the amount of money they can bring with them.

Part of Uncle Sam's problem is that little money is being expended to attract visitors from other nations. In 1961 the U.S. Travel Service was organized to encourage more from other nations to visit the United States but only $3 million a year has been appropriated to meet the cost—equal to about 44 cents per traveler visiting our Nation in 1964.

Nearby Canada finds it profitable to lure tourists from the United States spending $6.8 million annually—more than double the amount Uncle Sam has been spending. Greece spends $4.6 million while tiny Ireland finds it wise to spend $5.2 million a year to interest tourists in visiting their country.

More effort should be spent nationally to attract tourists and thus reduce the lopsided trade balance which spending abroad creates.

—THE ARCHBOLD (OHIO) BUCKEYE.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past weeks and months about the situation in Vietnam. The Senate hearings, and the discussions on the floor of the House and Senate, have served to air many points of view, but one action, above all else, has clarified where we stand.

The overwhelming approval of the House and Senate of the $4.8 billion supplemental defense appropriation measure has clearly given the President the support he needs to conduct the honorable struggle in which the United States is now involved.

It is my pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on March 4 upholding both the vote of the Congress and the efforts of the President in Vietnam.

The editorial follows:

RESOLUTE WASHINGTON

The Senate did the right and sensible thing in resoundingly and overwhelmingly voting the $4.8 billion supplemental Vietnamese war budget (the House voted for it even more strongly) and in keeping the famous Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Although not all those who voted affirmatively support all aspects of America's military policy, the vote gave the President the backing he needs to conduct resolutely the difficult, thankless yet honorable struggle in which the United States is engaged.

The size of the vote must have a salutary effect upon those abroad who of late may have been led to believe that there is greater opposition to the President's course than actually exists. Things are thus back in somewhat better perspective.

At the same time we welcome with equal warmth President Johnson's renewed and urgent plea to "negotiate peace and let war stand aside while the people of Vietnam make their choice." We also say bravo to the President's reiteration that America would stand by the outcome of any freely held election.

As we discuss in the editorial immediately following, we hope that there is a growing realization on the Communists' part that they cannot now hope to win the war in Vietnam. Negotiations must someday come. And, frankly, we do not see how they are likely to come on better terms or at a more favorable moment for the Communists than today. Moscow knows this. Peiping may be realizing it. Why not Hanoi?

If such a Communist change is possible, might this not eventually lead to a serious study of the latest proposal from Senator FULBRIGHT, who suggests an agreement with Communist China for the neutralization of all southeast Asia? It is hard to think of any achievement which would draw wider and deeper sighs of relief from the world than this.

Yet it would be naive to underestimate the difficulties in the path of such an accord. Neutralization would have to be underwritten by foolfast guarantees. It would require that both Communist China and the local Communist parties end all armed attempts to change the status quo. It would necessitate that the Communists also end all subversion, placing their future hopes on free elections and peaceful politicking. On the other side, it would require adherence to democratic principles.

The American people and Government yearn for such a solution. The Communists can have a neutralized southeast Asia tomorrow if they are prepared to make the reasonable adjustments required.

School Lunch Cutbacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if many of us here were much misled by the President's proposed drastic cutback in funds for school lunch and special school milk programs. These were never conceived as relief programs nor designed to provide nutrition for only those who could not acquire these products for themselves.

It seems passing strange to me that the sociologists of the Great Society rebel in tongue-clucking horror at the thought that our Government limit its medical programs to those who demonstrate a financial need, but now register no protest at pointing the finger of poverty at impressionable youngsters.

A most responsible constituent, Thomas J. Farley, who is director of the school lunch department of Milwaukee public schools has written a meaningful letter which I take this means of calling to the attention of my colleagues. My conversations with members of the Appropriations Subcommittee which has cognizance of those items lead me to believe that the President's recommendation will not be sustained.

Mr. Farley's letter follows:

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 2, 1966.

Hon. GLENN DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: As director of the school lunch department of the city of Milwaukee public schools, I am concerned about the President's budget recommendation of a sharp cutback in appropriations relating to the Federal school lunch program.

The proposed legislation seems to spring from a mistaken concept that the school lunch program is intended chiefly for indigent people. It definitely is not. It is intended for all our people. Children from all economic strata benefit by the Federal lunch program. The proposed reduction in appropriations will benefit only those with higher incomes and those who are indigent. The vast bulk of our student population will suffer.

Here in the city of Milwaukee we are currently serving complete meals to over 40,000 children per day in our elementary and secondary schools. We have always provided free meals for indigent students. This has been taken care of by professional welfare counselors specially trained in investigative procedures. I feel that the new proposal of having indigency certified by classroom teachers would be a giant step backward.

The proposed legislation providing for increased indigency and removing, or sharply reducing, assistance to the great mass of pupils will in all likelihood markedly curtail the lunch program. At present the vast bulk, perhaps 95 percent of our students, are able to buy their meals because Government assistance permits the serving of highly nutritious and attractive lunches at comparatively low cost. The changeover to free meals for indigents and the reduction of Government commodities will sharply increase the cost of meals to such an extent that few pupils will be able to afford what we have always judged to be an educational program of nutrition available to all.

During this school year, the price of food which we purchase has risen 3 cents per plate. This is in contrast to a price increase of a quarter of a cent per plate in normal years. It, therefore, follows that the price of food we buy on the open market has risen as much in 1 year as would normally be expected in 12. We need the support of our Government at this time more than ever before. The rapid rise in food cost coupled with the annual increase in labor would be most difficult for us to absorb. As milk subsidies and Government food commodities are withdrawn simultaneously, it is difficult to see how the school lunch program will survive as we know it today.

The school lunch program as we know it is nutritional education to teach children to learn to like a wide variety of foods and give them the opportunity to participate at the lowest possible cost.

I urge you to work for a continuation of the Federal lunch program and the Federal milk program which has progressed so successfully for 20 years. Mr. Gordon Gunderson, the director of the lunch program for the State of Wisconsin, has discussed the subject with me.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS J. FARLEY,
Director, School Lunch Department.

Hoover on the New Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, every loyal citizen of these United States today is concerned that real patriotism of many of our people is at a low ebb. We are witnessing so-called assemblies and rallies, not for the redress of grievances as allowed under our Constitution, but that seem to have as their purpose to create confusion and strife. Many of these assemblies have advocated nothing of worth, but are stimulated by a communistic aspect that is foreign to our way of life.

We need to instill in the hearts and minds of our youth that higher patriotism which calls for devotion and loyalty to our Government and to those elected officials to whom we have committed our trust. Such a high patriotism cannot be instilled by mass assemblies with no other purpose than to confuse and hinder the issues that confront our Nation today.

We need to be reminded of the words of Daniel Webster:

> I was born an American; I live an American; I shall die an American; no man can suffer too much and no man can fall too soon if it be in defense of the liberties and the Constitution of his country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial opinion expressed by station WGR in Buffalo, N.Y., which refers to a recent statement made by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, concerning the danger particularly to the college youth of today:

HOOVER, ON THE NEW LEFT

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, writing in the February Law Enforcement Bulletin, tells of a very present danger to the college youth of today. Hoover states: "The American college student today is being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy perhaps unlike any social challenge ever before encountered by our youth. On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, distain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order. This movement, commonly referred to as the new left, is complex in its deceitful absurdity and characterized by its lack of commonsense."

Hoover said, "Much of this turmoil has been connected with a feigned concern for the vital rights of free speech, dissent, and petition. Hard-core fanatics have used these basic rights of our society to distort the issues and betray the public.

"The Communist Party, U.S.A., as well as other subversive groups, is jubilant over these new rebellious activities. The unvarnished truth is that the Communist conspiracy is seizing this insurrectionary climate to captivate the thinking of rebellious-minded youth and coax them into the Communist movement itself or at least agitate them into serving the Communist cause."

Saying that he firmly believes a vast majority of the American public is disgusted and sickened by such social orgies, Hoover suggests, "One recourse is to support and encourage the millions of youths who refuse to swallow the Communist bait. Another is to let it be known far and wide that we do not intend to stand idly by and let demagogs make a mockery of our laws and demolish the foundation of our Republic."

Multiple Sclerosis and Environment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has a very active and worthwhile medical research program, the latest evidence of which is an article published by Dr. John F. Kurtzke, chief of neurology at the Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration hospital.

The Veterans' Administration will spend in the next fiscal year, assuming the budget estimate is granted, approximately $43,629,000 for medical research. This amount has increased each year since 1963 when $30,500,000 was allocated. The amount for 1964 was $33,742,000; for 1965, $37,783,000; and for 1966, $40,893,000.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has always been keenly interested in this activity and each year publishes a list of the significant research programs in the Veterans' Administration. The current volume, published as of December 31, 1965, bears the designation of committee print 144.

I commend Dr. Kurtzks for his diligence and study in this field, and hope the evidence which he has amassed will be another step in finding the cause and cure for this dread disease.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include a recent item from the New York Times by Mr. Thomas O'Toole in Dr. Kurtzke's study, as well as a release by Science Service and an editorial from the Journal of the American Medical Association dated February 28, 1966:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times]

SCLEROSIS ORIGIN MAY BE EXTERNAL—NEUROLOGIST AT GEORGETOWN DOUBTS THEORIES THAT PUT CAUSE WITHIN THE BODY—RESEARCH TOOK 5 YEARS—STUDY OF DISORDER AFFLICTING 500,000 AMERICANS WAS MADE ON FOUR CONTINENTS

(By Thomas O'Toole)

Victims of multiple sclerosis acquire the disease from outside their own bodies, a

Georgeown University neurologist suggests.

Such a postulation is, more or less, in conflict with two popular theories as to what causes multiple sclerosis, a crippling nerve disorder that afflicts more than 500,000 Americans.

One of these theories suggests that the disease originates inside the body, caused by either metabolic or genetic change. The other is that multiple sclerosis is a familial disease, with its roots in heredity.

Neither theory is correct, proposes Dr. John F. Kurtzke in the February issue of the Archives of Neurology. Rather, he suggests, multiple sclerosis comes from an exogenous or outside factor, which could be a virus, bacteria or a poisonous trace element present in the air we breathe.

CHIEF OF NEUROLOGY

Dr. Kurtzke, who is associate professor of neurology at the Georgetown University School of Medicine and chief of neurology service at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Washington, bases his conclusions on a 5-year study of the disease throughout four continents.

In the study, Dr. Kurtzke found that multiple sclerosis was most common in the northern United States and northern Europe, less common in the southern United States and southern Europe and least common in the tropics of Asia and Africa.

Dr. Kurtzke indicated three distinct zones of multiple sclerosis.

One runs across the northern United States and southern Canada and in Europe from Britain through Scandinavia and into Switzerland. Within this zone are at least 45 cases of multiple sclerosis for each 100,000 inhabitants.

A second zone across the southern United States and southern Europe showed a drop in the disease rate to 10 per 100,000. In the third zone, in the tropics of Asia and Africa, the disease rate was lowest—4 cases or fewer per 100,000.

LOWEST IN THE TROPICS

In the three zones, Dr. Kurtzke eliminated all cases in which victims of the disease had ancestors who may have had multiple sclerosis. Thus heredity could not have been a factor, especially in regions where the disease was most prevalent.

Dr. Kurtzke also found that the rate of disease varied within countries themselves. From Scotland to Scandinavia, the rate of disease was sixfold in some regions to what it was in other regions barely 50 miles away.

From these data, Dr. Kurtzke concluded: "There has to be some outside factor causing the disease."

What the outside causatives are Dr. Kurtzke does not pretend to know.

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS CLUE TERMED SIGNIFICANT

(By Science Service)

CHICAGO, February 27.—A possible link between environment and multiple sclerosis (MS) could be a valuable tool in searching for the cause and cure of the disease, says the American Medical Association.

Cases of MS seem to appear in clusters, and there is apparently some as yet unknown environmental factor that is distributed in the same way, reports Dr. John F. Kurtzke, a neurologist at the Georgetown University School of Medicine and the Veterans' Administration hospital, both in Washington, D.C.

It would be significant, says the Journal of the AMA (February 28), if it does indeed turn out that MS is an acquired disease, caused by factors outside the body.

Dr. Kurtzke studied worldwide distribution reports on MS and published his findings in the Archives of Neurology (February). Although he does not speculate on what these factors might be, he does eliminate some possibilities.

Climate or diet seem to be ruled out because the cluster areas are too small to be affected by these. Heredity may not be a factor, either, inasmuch as two generations of patients in Denmark and Switzerland were surveyed with no familial relationship.

The highest frequency of MS is found in the northern United States, southern Canada, and northern Europe, where there are 30 to 60 cases per 100,000 population.

Medium-frequency zones, in which 5 to 15 per 100,000 cases are found, include the southern United States, southern Europe, and Australia. Asia and Africa seem to have the lowest incidence of the disease, although Dr. Kurtzke concedes that figures may be distorted by a lack of adequate surveys in some areas.

Scandinavia and Switzerland were singled out as places where highly significant concentrations of MS are prevalent. It would be meaningful if the concept of MS as an acquired disease could be proved, the researcher and the editorial say. Identification of the factor in clusters that have been located may lead to discovery of the cause, now baffling researchers.

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS "FOCI"

Multiple sclerosis (MS), one of the most common primary diseases of the nervous system, affects nearly one in 2,000 citizens of northern Europe and North America. The illness is generally considered one of unknown cause, unpredictable course, and unresponsive to therapy. Recent epidemiologic studies in MS, summarized by Kurtzke in the February issue of the Archives of Neurology,[1] indicate that the world may be divided into three parts based upon the distribution of MS. In the high-frequency band (30 to 60 per 100,000 population) lie Europe and Switzerland through Scandinavia, the northern United States and southern Canada; south of this are the medium-frequency zones (5 to 15 per 100,000) of southern Europe, southern United States, and Australia. Low-incidence areas (0 to 4 per 100,000) are found in Asia and Africa.

To define the distribution of the disease in more meaningful terms it is necessary to consider studies in which a large area has been completely surveyed. Within the high-frequency band of Europe there have been a number of nationwide MS prevalence studies. In Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, and northern Scotland, statistically significant deviations from random distributions of MS are observed among the counties of each country, to such a degree that the prevalence rates within these lands vary more than sixfold. In each country most of the counties of high frequency are contiguous, thus forming single "foci" of MS. Furthermore, in Denmark and Switzerland where two separate generations of patients were surveyed, the distributions are basically the same. The "foci" cannot be attributed to collections of familial cases of MS, nor can they be correlated with distributions of doctors, specialists, or hospitals in these countries.

Kurtzke concludes that the distribution of MS cases within clusters of "foci" indicates the concomitant presence of a similarly distributed exogenous factor necessarily associated with the disease; therefore MS may be defined as an acquired exogenous disease. Further, the existence of these "foci" makes most unlikely any direct relationship of MS with climatic or dietary factors. If this concept and the consequent inferences are tenable, a valuable tool in work with the disease may exist. It would be significant to be able to say that MS is an acquired disease.

---

[1] Kurtzke, J. F.: "An Epidemiologic Approach to Multiple Sclerosis," Arch Neurol 14:213-222 (February) 1966.

Cincinnati Rated Top Site for NFL Franchise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD D. CLANCY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, last October a research team from the Stanford Research Institute began a survey of seven cities at the request of the National Football League in an effort to determine which would be the best choice for the NFL's 16th franchise. The conclusion reached by the researchers was that Cincinnati would be the best location for the new NFL franchise.

Cincinnati's top rank in the 216-page Stanford Institute report is supported by reams of statistics about population, income, stadium plans, weather, sports attendance, business strength, and civic support.

Other cities in contention for the franchise are Boston, Houston, New Orleans, Seattle, Phoenix, and Portland, Oreg. The Stanford team visited each city, interviewed local civic and business leaders, viewed stadiums and stadium plans, looked at the health of each area's economy, and studied population and income figures.

I was particularly pleased to note in the report that Cincinnati received a high rating for civic support. To quote from the findings:

> The civic leaders in Cincinnati have done more than civic leaders in other areas to demonstrate their desire to obtain an NFL franchise. They are on record that they strongly want an NFL team and have moved quickly.

We are understandably proud of our city's high rating in this study, and I bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial on this subject which appeared recently in the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star:

AS OTHERS SEE US

The Stanford report, printed in the Post and Times-Star Monday, gave the people of Metropolitan Cincinnati a rare opportunity of seeing themselves as others see us.

And what we saw in that report, geared though it was to the interests of the National Football League, must have given local citizens, even the most apathetic or the most critical, a feeling of being in a community that's a good place to live in, and stay in.

The report, of course, was to advise the football owners about conditions in the communities which were bidding for a franchise. So the researchers didn't go into questions of community culture or education or homeownership; it was not written as a plea to attract new industry.

But just to meet their aim the researchers had to look at population, metropolitan and regional, present and projected, the incomes and the transportation. They had to note and appraise what civic and governmental leaders were doing toward building a stadium—and they were impressed with that and the big job of building downtown. The complacency of just a few years ago, they reported, had been replaced with a new spirit of action.

On total points, Cincinnati outscored the field, though in a number of classifications the city was not at the top. Always, however, the city was in the top half. One might compare the situation to a sports team that doesn't have an all-American on its roster, but wins the championship.

Many honest reports could be written about this community's deficiency in one respect or another. We are gradually correcting some, and moving too slowly on others. We cannot afford to be complacent about any of our shortcomings.

However, a community doesn't often have a chance to look at itself through another's eyes, especially when that look is taken without either hostile prejudices or friendly civic pride. The Stanford researchers had no instructions to produce anything but a fair report on the cities they surveyed.

We liked the results.

Banking and Currency Committee Hearings on City Demonstration Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives is to be commended on its diligence in holding hearings on H.R. 12341, legislation to assist metropolitan cities in demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing public facilities and other necessary services to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas.

This morning I testified before the Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee that has been holding hearings on this legislation.

I hereby submit recommendations set out in my statement to the committee.

Testimony of Ray J. Madden, Member of Congress, on the Holding of Hearings on the City Demonstration Act by the Subcommittee on Housing, March 9, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend Chairman Patman, Subcommittee Chairman Barrett, and the members of the Banking and Currency Committee for holding hearings on the pending bill, H.R. 12341. This bill proposes to assist cities in rebuilding slum and blight areas and providing public facilities and other municipal functions to aid the general welfare of the people.

I know there are many metropolitan cities throughout our Nation that have been undergoing a "population explosion" during the last 20 years and especially since World War II. These congested localities are handicapped and distressed in their efforts to meet the needs of crowded conditions pertaining to housing, transportation, schools, and many other municipal improvements and necessities.

A half century ago our Nation was not confronted with the phenomenal exodus of millions of our population into our urban areas which has taken place in recent years. It is estimated that over 70 percent of our population today has been crowded into metropolitan areas. City governments in these large urban concentrations are financially helpless to meet the housing, school, transportation, and other problems facing millions of their citizens. This legislation which you are considering will be a major step to curtail and solve the problem which is expanding in urban centers as the years pass.

I realize your committee has been hearing testimony from mayors and municipal officials concerning their particular necessities and I want to submit to your committee an outstanding example of a city in my district which would be greatly benefited if the pending legislation were enacted into law.

Gary, Ind., might be an outstanding model as a "logical demonstration city" which needs outside financial aid and supervision to solve its municipal problems. Gary, with a population of a little under 200,000, is the youngest metropolitan city in the United States.

Gary's population started exploding at the beginning of World War II. The largest steel mill in the world is located in the city. We have other steel subsidiaries as well as minor industries pertaining to defense production in the city of Gary. East Chicago, Whiting, and Hammond, three smaller industrial cities, join the city of Gary. East Chicago has two major steel mills, Youngstown and Inland, and refineries from major oil companies are located in the Calumet region. All this concentration of defense industries has caused the population explosion in the city of Gary. In the last 20 years the population has risen in Lake County, which is known as the Calumet Industrial Region, from 240,000 to over 600,000 in 1966. The taxpayers—homeowners especially—are unable to bear the tax load in order to supply the avalanche of municipal needs for workers who have come into this steel producing area since World War II and every year since, defense production has increased annually. During World War II, publicity and newspaper ads called for workers to come into the Calumet region to work in the steel mills, factories, refineries, and other industries in order to meet the national defense effort.

I mention these facts in order to bring out how necessary it is for legislation of this type to be passed in order to solve the urban problems that face areas like the Calumet region of Indiana.

In one of President Johnson's recent speeches, he mentioned the "crowded miles of inadequate dwellings—poorly maintained, and frequently overpriced" as one of the prime reasons for the Federal Government to make an attack on blight and slum areas. The city of Gary, especially, has been spending money and going in debt to "meet the population explosion" to provide adequate housing and eliminate slums, provide school buildings, and other facilities for our overcrowded youth population. If we cannot meet this challenge, areas like these overcrowded industrial centers will be victims of disease, ignorance, crime, violence, and many on public relief rolls.

This legislation will give authority to the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make grants and provide technical assistance to enable city demonstration agencies to plan, develop and carry out comprehensive city demonstration programs.

In determining whether a proposed comprehensive city demonstration program is eligible for assistance, the Secretary would give maximum consideration to whether (1) substantive local laws, regulations, and other requirements are, or can be expected to be, consistent with the objectives of the program; (2) the program will enhance neighborhoods by applying a high standard of design and will, as appropriate, maintain distinctive natural, historical, and cultural characteristics; (3) the program is designed to make maximum use of new and improved technology and design, including cost reduction techniques; (4) the program will encourage good community relations and counteract the segregation of housing by race or income; and (5) the program is consistent with comprehensive planning for the entire urban or metropolitan area.

The bill would also authorize the Secretary to make grants to, or contract with, city demonstration agencies to pay 90 percent of the costs of planning and developing comprehensive city demonstration programs. Such financial assistance must be approved by the local governing body of the city.

No doubt your committee after hearings will meet in executive session and determine in your wisdom practical methods which will provide a means of implementing this legslation to the satisfaction of the Federal, State and the municipal governments concerned.

The Gary Post Tribune over the last several months has been carrying out in various editions, editorials when some dire needs of our rapidly expanding city. These various editorials printed in different editions of the newspaper are too long for inclusion in my testimony before your committee. I might mention some of the titles of the various editorials which included the following:

1. "Revitalizing Downtown Gary."
2. "Look at Our Highways and Streets."
3. Expand Hospitals—Wisely."
4. Need: Places for Children To Play."
5. "The Medical School Drive."
6. "Cleaner Air and Water."
7. "Equitable Tax Evaluation."
8. "Keeping Up With Education."

I wish to include with my testimony excerpts from an editorial written by Dale E. Belles, Jr., editor of the Gary, Ind., Post Tribune, the following inserted on February 20, 1966.

"1. Gary shares the President's view that '1966 can be the year of rebirth for American cities.' It was beginning to demonstrate before the Presidential program was outlined that it meets its requirements of being one of 'those cities who help themselves' and where there is a 'serious commitment to the project on the part of local * * * authorities'.

"2. Gary City Council during the past year has formally adopted a previously promulgated metropolitan plan, sharing with the President, the view that it 'should be an instrument for shaping sound urban growth—not a neglected document.'

"3. Gary's City Council, with urging of civil leadership, adopted last year probably the most liberal open housing ordinances of any city in the Nation, exhibiting its realization of the Presidential point that 'at the center of the cities' housing problem lies racial discrimination.'

"4. On the opposite side, not negative exactly, but showing need—Gary is the core of an industrial area where increasing steel and other production insures growth, but has reached the point where help is needed to make sure that 'the powerful forces of urban growth' do not 'overwhelm efforts to achieve orderly development.'

"5. Gary is still beset with what the President terms 'crowded miles of inadequate dwellings—poorly maintained, and frequently overpriced in which many of the Negroes still live. While twin attacks, through the housing ordinance and the newest urban renewal program, have been launched, help will be essential.

"6. Gary's mass transportation facilities are deteriorated and inadequate. Its major street system, cut up by railroads, is unsuited to carrying the necessary load. Some plans have been drafted, but a coordinated effort, preferably with Federal help, is needed.

"7. Gary's parks, once a point of civic pride, and its indoor cultural and recreational facilities have been outgrown or become outmoded. Assistance is needed in pushing through plans already under consideration for meeting these needs both for the present and the anticipated population.

"8. Gary's 'one industry' image is gradually being altered, but making it one of the major 'demonstration cities' could step up the program of intended diversification which could help make it a better city for all its people."

Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the case of Amerigo Vespucci is one of the strange paradoxes in history. The whole Western Hemisphere bears his name, yet a great deal of controversy exists over the worthiness of the man to whom this singular honor has been extended.

Vespucci, according to the records available, made four voyages to the New World between 1497 and 1504. Two of Vespucci's letters, giving an account of these four voyages, were translated and published in the leading countries of Europe. They resulted in a profound impact on the geographical sciences and caused enlightened changes to take place. Not only did these letters have a decisive influence on the content of the early maps and the charting of unknown territories, but they also helped to give rise to the idea of calling the New World America.

Early Spanish historians, because they did not want to detract from Columbus' glory, began to downgrade Vespucci's character and his contributions in the field of navigation. Strangely, however, Columbus and Vespucci were close friends in Seville from 1492 until Columbus' death in 1506, and there is no indication of rivalry between them. In fact, they shared a warm and understanding friendship. Later, Portuguese historians, as well as English historians, repeated and elaborated on the earlier unfavorable Spanish historians' views of Vespucci.

Contrary to what has been said, Vespucci was both a good man and an educated man. Two basic qualities guided him and served him well throughout his life: a spirit of scientific inquiry, coupled with keen intelligence, and the reputation, which he always upheld, of being a man of trust. He possessed great discretion, and unusual as it may seem, enjoyed the complete confidence of such a diversified group as King Ferdinand of Spain, King Manuel of Portugal, the Medici of Florence, the Florentine bankers in Seville, Christopher Columbus, and other great navigators, and even the ordinary sailors.

Vespucci's greatest contribution to posterity was his correction of a common misconception which existed in his day. The technical knowledge he had at his command led him to make the pronouncement that the new lands, whose location Columbus had discovered, were not Asia or the Indies, but a totally new world.

From 1508 to the time of his death in 1512, Vespucci by order of King Ferdinand, turned his house in Seville into a university of pilots and trained all the pilots who sailed under King Ferdinand's flag. In addition, he drew up all the navigators' charts used by the pilots, and no charts other than Vespucci's were used. And finally, he was given the official title of pilot major for the crown. All navigators who returned with news of new land or discoveries not appearing on Vespucci's master chart had to report their findings to the pilot major. He, in turn, recorded them, and in this way the chart grew in accuracy and was kept up to date for the use of other navigators.

This, then, became Vespucci's final and perhaps most significant contribution to mankind, because, by training pilots in the science of navigation and by charting unknown territories, he opened the door to unlimited exploration and development of the New World.

It is fitting, therefore, that today we pause to observe the 512th anniversary of Amerigo Vespucci's birth and to honor the memory of this great man.

Apathy Prevents Adequate Controls in War on Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Detroit radio station WJBK received a letter that was so thought provoking that the station used it as a part of an editorial on both its television and radio stations. It dealt with what seems to be the prevailing attitude in the war on crime.

Because it is so much to the point, I would like to call the contents of the broadcast to the attention of the House. It follows:

A Letter From a "Forgotten Man"

We have a letter from a man who says:

"I am a worried American.

"I sense that our treasured way of life is being lost * * * and that perhaps we never can regain it.

"Today we seem to have a new kind of 'forgotten man.'

"He is the average citizen, to whom the Constitution was a refuge and a guarantee of civil rights which included justice to all men and a safeguard of domestic tranquillity.

"Now his security and peace of mind—and in fact, the very safety of his life and his possessions are placed in jeopardy by increasingly frequent outbreaks of mass violence and individual excesses.

"Anyone who has witnessed a mob in action * * * or a gang fight in which deadly weapons are used, knows what a terrifying experience it is.

"Like the threat of a senseless animal, the mob stampede has no respect for lives or the rights of the innocent.

"Any street where a child or a grownup cannot walk in peace and dignity has become a slum. The condition of buildings has little to do with it. The deterioration and decay is in people, not only in wood and bricks.

"We have been so lenient and permissive in tolerating outbreaks that now our courts, our teachers, our parents, our government people seem bound by an apathy which stifles indignation and prevents the use of adequate controls or penalties.

"Surely our world of decency and order cannot last if we do not defend it, if we do not protest, if it becomes the accepted thing to riot in the streets, to steal and destroy to defy one's parents and teachers, to resist an officer of the law, to vilify the American flag.

"I am a worried American."

WJBK selects this letter as typical of expressions of anxiety and concern sent us by many good citizens, men and women who feel the fabric of society weakening, tearing, disintegrating.

The worried American is right when he says our world of decency and order cannot last if we do not defend it.

And that, in the long run, means that the individual himself must be brave enough to stand up and be counted, to say what is right and what is wrong, and to say it out loud.

Portrait of a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to have been able to attend the dinner, with many of our colleagues from New York, at which the Freedom House Freedom Award was presented to President Johnson in New York City on February 23, 1966.

In addition to that award, that evening a bronze sculpture of our President was presented to him. Appropriately enough, the sculptor, Leo Cherne, made that presentation. Mr. Cherne is truly a man of many great talents—economist, political scientist, author, and artist.

It was a memorable evening for all of us, one that we shall not forget. The President's remarks that evening were placed in the Congressional Record on February 24, 1966, by our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Carl Albert.

Mr. Cherne contributed greatly to the evening by his sensitive understanding of our President and the occasion. He escaped both the Scylla of sentiment and the Charybdis of pomposity. I commend his unusual remarks, which follow, to the attention of our colleagues:

Remarks by Mr. Cherne

Mr. President, Mr. Chief Justice, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, these observations, with the President's forebearance, will be personal. Of necessity, a portrait of a President reflects a personal view of a man.

The roots of this man are sunk deep in the soil of mid-America. He knows the rigors of the land. He shared the hopes, the disappointments, the courage of those whose lives and fortunes are governed by cloud, wind, sun, and water.

I hope I have captured something of weathered flesh and eyes narrowed in their protective encounter with the elements, bright and bitter. Perhaps you will find, as I did, in the deeply etched grooves of the face, the furrows in the brow, some of a lifetime's imprint of care and concern, of hope and frustration, of disappointment contained, of high purpose strengthened. In the mobile muscles which move this face there are equally visible the quick and spontaneous smile, the warm outreach familiar to stranger and colleague alike. In his face the presence of bone is particularly apparent, strong, unyielding bone, expressive of the purposes which move him. And there are the deep-studying, weighing—sometimes cautiously or set, penetrating eyes—always watching, critically, often dimmed and moistened by inexpressible fellow feeling.

The strength of this head is emphasized by remarkable ears. This man listens, and listens—never satisfied that all has been said, all counsel expressed, all possibilities and consequences voiced. Beyond all else his face will never shed the painful cost of that remorseless choice which involves the lives of countrymen.

I have chosen to follow the portrait style which prevailed 24 centuries ago when Plato said, "Let the philosophers be kings and the kings philosophers." To his pupil, Aristotle, politics was that which "comprehends the ends of all other sciences and is therefore the true good of mankind."

In the President's face lies mirrored something of the anguish of a time and place in history. Familiar with man's inhumanity to man and a community's reluctance to permit fundamental change, this man moved a nation across a new political frontier toward more complete freedom for all men.

Mr. President, you were not an easy man to sculpt. Nor, I know, was it easy for you to even briefly sit for so static a venture. I will long recall your impatient question, "How long will this take, I have so much I must do?"

Mr. President, I will always treasure this opportunity to express my admiration and respect for one to whom public service is the highest order of human endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, the inscription on the tablet affixed to the base of a bronze sculpture of President Johnson reads:

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Freedom at home was never more widely shared nor aggression abroad more wisely resisted than under his leadership of the Nation.

Freedom House, 1966.

Illinois Audubon Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Audubon Society is an alert and public-spirited organization, many of whose members and whose president Mr. Raymond Mostek, live in the 14th Congressional District of Illinois. They have recently written to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and were kind enough to send a copy of the letter to me. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD:

Please enter our organization as opposed to bills that would seek to invade the San Gorgonio wilderness with a commercial intrusion, such as a ski center, as now vociferously suggested by some advocates of wilderness destruction in the California area.

Our organization, like many another, worked long and hard to educate the people of the Middle West to the values of a true wilderness philosophy. We feel strongly that the small areas now in wilderness and primitive state should remain that way for posterity to enjoy.

Many of our members enjoy the wilderness firsthand. Others enjoy them through films and color slides shown by their friends and professional photographers. We sponsor wildlife films to help educate city-bred people to the values of wilderness.

We are appalled that, a few months after the wilderness bill was made into law, some commercial groups now seek to destroy it by piecemeal amendments and changes. California, with its huge population growing hourly, desperately needs these wild areas. San Gorgonio was a key rallying point during discussions on the floor of the House during debate over the national wilderness bill. The attempt to exempt it at that time was soundly beaten. It should be again.

We believe that San Gorgonio is the Alamo of the Wilderness Act. We do not intend to let it fall to commercial interest. Instead, it will be a rallying point for those who wish to preserve some of the great values of our primitive areas.

No Mean Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about the failures connected with the Job Corps, part of the Johnson administration's war on poverty. Like anything new and untried, the war on poverty has suffered from birth pains. It has had its problems in getting off the ground. The Job Corps has not been spared from criticism, some of it just and much of it unjust and overly exaggerated.

In the January 19, 1966, edition of the Christian Science Monitor, there appeared an editorial entitled "No Mean Accomplishment." It deals with the Job Corps. It is a good example of the objective journalism for which the Monitor has long been known. It does not attempt to whitewash problems connected with this program, but it honestly reports on the growing successes being compiled by the Job Corps, which has only been in operation a few short months. I commend "No Mean Accomplishment" to my colleagues, and under unanimous consent make it part of the RECORD at this point.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Jan. 19, 1966]

NO MEAN ACCOMPLISHMENT

The Job Corps has become one of the more controversial of President Johnson's antipoverty programs. In 1 year's time approximately 75 centers were set up around the Nation. Into these came the victims of economic and spiritual poverty—the products of broken homes, slum living, and discrimination.

Given the speed with which the program was put together, the necessity to experiment in the absence of blueprints for such an undertaking, and the unpromising material with which the administrators had to work, we can readily understand the reaction of R. Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, when asked about the violence which took place at several of the camps. He said he was "concerned but not surprised or dismayed."

Recently at the Charleston, W. Va., Job Corps Center for Women, there were reports of prostitution, drunkenness, fights, thefts, and so on. As often happens, reports were apparently exaggerated. But given the location of the Charleston center in a hotel in a relatively poor downtown area, it is hardly surprising that some of the girls repeated the patterns which condemned them to failure in their home environment.

A recently announced Job Corps center in Maine's Poland Spring resort is a most encouraging development. Much more than in the case of the Charleston and other urban centers, it should provide the opportunity for young women to establish new, successful patterns of living.

The entire antipoverty program will come under close congressional scrutiny during 1966, Senate Republican Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN has already served notice that he will expose incompetence and mismanagement in the Job Corps.

Columnist Roscoe Drummond, admitting the "failures and shortcomings, frustrations, and acts of incompetence," nevertheless went on to state: "But nothing could be more inaccurate that the impression that the war on poverty is mostly chaff. The grain is beginning to grow."

The Government, the private concerns which administer the various Job Corps centers, and the educational institutions which serve in an advisory capacity need to take seriously the criticism leveled at the Job Corps. At the same time, the critics need to recognize that the corps is training slum-bred youths to adjust to normal social surroundings, to gain self-confidence, and to get and hold respectable jobs. This is no mean accomplishment.

Princeton Cooperative School Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I take pride and pleasure in calling the attention of the House to the Princeton cooperative school program, now in its third year at Princeton University.

There is a line in Dante's "Divine Comedy" which says, "Great flame follows a tiny spark." I feel this is particularly applicable to the Princeton program because the program takes boys who have shown their teachers a spark of something but who do not show it consistently and tries to fan that spark to a steady glow.

Basic support from the program, which has as its general overall purpose the encouragement of qualified high school boys who are disadvantaged because of race or economic status or both to go on to college, came from the Rockefeller Foundation and additional funds have been received from the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, and Princeton University.

Unique features of the program are the boys' nominations on the basis of "teacher's hunches" that with special help and encouragement they may develop into all-round leaders, and that they are not taken out of their own schools but returned after an intensive 6 weeks' session. Final selection is made by the director of the program, Prof. Sheldon

Judson, of Princeton's Geology Department; Prof. Charles McCracken, of Newark State College, program coordinator; and Robert F. Engs, assistant to the director.

Classes are of the seminar type where students are invited to express their own thoughts and wonder, analyze their own problems, and seek self-expression and objectivity. They include English, science, art, social studies, and photography. Nor is the social atmosphere forgotten: besides the exposure to the beauties of the college campus, the boys have an opportunity to live in comradeship in special dormitories, to exchange ideas freely with the factulty in informal gatherings, and to avail themselves of the services of a staff psychologist. The session begins with a buffet dinner for students and parents on registration day and concludes with the presentation of a certificate of completion at a stag roast beef dinner. There is also a parents day midway during the program. It is significant that in the classes of about 40 16-year-olds there have been no dropouts.

No less important is the second phase of the program as boys are returned to homes and classes. During this time the staff, high school teachers, and counselors continue to work with students through their year of college decision. The university held a reunion 8 weeks after the last session during which time the boys of the previous year recounted their summer experiences in activities ranging from the National Science Foundation Institute at Bucknell University, Outward Bound School on Hurricane Island, Maine, and the U.S. Naval Reserve summer training program. As one teacher put it:

> The boys seemed to feel that they have accomplished quite a bit. Those of us who had worked with them had a paternal feeling and would want to keep in touch and continue to help if possible.

Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Albert Thomas, the House and the people of the United States have lost an old and dear friend. His death leaves a void in the affairs of this Nation and in the hearts of his countrymen that can never be filled.

Although I did not share the long association with Mr. Thomas that many of my colleagues enjoyed, I felt a deep sense of deprivation and sorrow when I learned of his death. On several occasions I sought his wise counsel and sage advice. He was a warm and sincere person, and I valued his friendship.

We shall long remember Albert Thomas for what he was—a knowledgeable and dedicated legislator, an outstanding citizen and, above all else to us, a kind and understanding friend.

He was a man of great courage and endurance. Under stress and pain, he carried on unflinchingly until the Maker called him to his eternal rest.

We in the Congress shall miss him greatly for he was indeed one of our true leaders.

I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to his widow and daughters.

Pursuit of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in our pursuit of peace "new emphasis must be placed on nonmilitary means at our command," the Newark Evening News says in a recent editorial.

This outstanding evening newspaper in my district believes this administration has acted right in checking, by controlled military means, the enemy's aggression while "continuing to develop the ability of friendly peoples to advance politically, economically and socially."

Since this editorial deals with a subject of vital concern to us all, I include it in the Appendix of the Record:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 3, 1966]

PURSUIT OF PEACE

The preponderant vote in House and Senate authorizing an additional $4.8 billion for military needs in Vietnam was a vote to support the Nation's fighting men—nothing more, nothing less.

Control of parliamentary procedure enabled the Johnson administration to restrict voting to this one issue, and thereby leave Senators Morse and Gruening isolated if not silenced. Dissent in the House was commensurately small, with only four votes standing against the tide.

Reservations nonetheless remain—not over whether the men in Vietnam rate every possible support, but over the course the war may now take. In the end even Senator Fulbright had to concede a military appropriations measure was not the means to amend the Nation's foreign policy.

Whether or not Mr. Fulbright's unrealistic proposals gather support, they reflect a growing desire—shared by President Johnson and Secretary Rusk—for a peaceful solution to Vietnam. To date the means tried have been fruitless. Whether Mr. Fulbright's suggestions would fare any better is doubtful.

Would, for example, an enemy who has rejected the neutralization of South Vietnam, as proposed by Secretary Rusk, be inclined to welcome the neutralization of all southeast Asia, as proposed by Senator Fulbright?

Would the ring of bases around Red China suggested by the Senator convince Peiping of the futility of trying to advance communism by subversion, terror and so-called wars of national liberation? Or would such bases merely stand as symbols of 19th century militarism while the territory all around them fell to Communist encroachment?

Hope for a reliably negotiated peace lies in the direction of checking, by controlled military means, the adversary's ability to subvert by force and, at the same time, continuing to develop the ability of friendly peoples to advance politically, economically and socially.

The overwhelming military authorization vote was a clear expression of support for our troops, not necessarily a mandate to enlarge the war. The emphasis must remain on the pursuit of peace by the many nonmilitary means at our command.

ORT in Brief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, today is ORT Day, the annual commemoration of the good works being performed by the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training throughout the world. In Massachusetts, Gov. John A. Volpe has issued a proclamation regarding the work of ORT and a celebration will be held today in New England Life Hall in Boston.

ORT is the recognized agency for the Jewish people in the field of vocational training. It now operates 600 training units in 22 countries around the world serving more than 50,000 students.

There is no doubt that the training of men and women in useful vocations is one of the important keys to individual independence, self-reliance and self-help. Privately financed, privately run, ORT is an outstanding example of what our voluntary agencies can do to assist in the development and training of people all over the world. I think we should extend our thanks to ORT today for a job well done and our hope that they will continue their excellent work in the years ahead.

Under unanimous consent I include in the Congressional Record at this point a brief description and summary of the work of the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training.

ORT IN BRIEF

1. ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training) is a program for rebuilding lives through vocational education. The recognized vocational training agency for the Jewish people, ORT's central creed is that man is bested aided by being helped to become independent, self-supporting, and self-respecting.

2. ORT is the world's largest nongovernmental vocational training agency. Its students include the poverty-stricken inhabitants of underdeveloped countries, refugees and immigrants seeking a new life, and youngsters trying to build secure futures.

3. ORT operates in 22 countries on 5 continents. In 1964, ORT students enrolled in over 600 training units. In Europe, some 13,394; in Israel, 20,821; in North Africa, 3,751; in Iran, 2,223. Other ORT schools are in New York, South America, South Africa, and India. The number of ORT students has doubled in the past 5 years, and ORT has been working unceasingly to grow still further to admit the steadily increasing num-

ber of applicants. By the end of 1965-66, ORT will enroll over 50,000 students.

4. ORT must meet tremendous pressures in France, where a torrential immigration—the largest Jewish population shift since World War II—has posed grave problems for the new refugees. Israel, too, has great and increasing need for ORT-trained workers.

5. The standard ORT school is a vocational high school, with a 3- to 4-year curriculum in which an academic high school education is given along with technical training in the most advanced industrial trades. ORT also conducts special programs for those lacking the time or the requisite prior education to attend a 4-year day school. These programs include apprenticeship and preapprenticeship courses, refresher and adaptation courses, courses teaching rudimentary skills that will enable the student to get a beginning industrial job, and courses to increase the skills and income of those already employed in a trade.

6. ORT gives training in more than 70 modern industrial skills. The trades taught vary according to the needs of the particular area's economy. Thus, ORT students get the greatest opportunity for employment.

7. ORT helps to build underdeveloped economies and to man the industries of free countries striving to keep pace with technological advances. Acknowledging this help, the U.N. and some 22 countries (including the United States), most of which have ORT schools within their borders, have given ORT sizable and repeated grants.

8. Women's American ORT, the American women's branch of the World ORT Union, is the largest World ORT Union affiliate, and the second largest single source of financial support to ORT. It now has 66,000 members in nearly 500 chapters located in all major American cities.

9. The ORT program is financed by the World ORT Union and affiliates; by the Joint Distribution Committee, a member agency of the United Jewish Appeal, and by governments, foundations, etc., throughout the world. Women's American ORT supports the program through its membership dues.

Pittsburgh Area Puts Its Brand on Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps in just 5 brief years has been an outstanding success. Never before in history have a nation's young people proved themselves so worthy on such a grand scale as they have in the Peace Corps, carrying on selfless, humanitarian work in remote sections of the world.

An article in the February 27 issue of the Pittsburgh Press recounts the achievements of some of the Peace Corpsmen who have returned to the United States and to the Pittsburgh area. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BIG ADVENTURE 5 YEARS OLD

(By Sam Spatter)

Five years ago this Tuesday, thousands of young Americans, many from this area, rekindled the American adventure spirit they felt the Nation had lost when the West was won.

On March 1, 1961, the Peace Corps was born.

The thousands who answered the call were idealistic, adventurous Americans who felt they could be part of the "New Frontier."

FOLLOWED J.F.K.

Behind their youthful, energetic President—John F. Kennedy—they were ready to bring American culture, know-how and freedom to the undeveloped and emerging nations of the world.

One of the first to join was Rodgers Stewart, son of Mr. and Mrs. Howard B. Stewart of 513 Emerson Street, East Liberty. Rodgers, now a student at Duquesne University, was Pennsylvania's first Peace Corps volunteer to complete his service abroad. He worked in Tanzania (Dar-es-Salaam) as a surveyor.

Robert Williams, urban extension worker with the Hazelwood-Glenwood Citizens Renewal Council, was another early joiner. He enlisted in Washington where he was a student at Georgetown University School of Foreign Service.

After training, Bob and his coworkers went to the Dominican Republic.

LESS REDTAPE

There he worked in the community organization field—a prelude to his current work. Sometimes Bob wishes he were back because there seemed to be fewer agencies to work through before getting things done.

"All we needed was the Central Government's approval and we got our wish. But in Hazelwood, it seems we have countless agencies to go through to get action on any of our requests," he said.

Don and Suzanne Bryant of Frankfort Springs, near Hookstown, found their 2 years in the corps an opportunity to help others while helping themselves.

SERVED IN PERU

Don, 29, a former cabinetmaker from Wheeling, is now a counselor at the Youth Forestry Camp at Raccoon State Park. His wife, Suzanne, 28, is a former nurse from Wooster, Ohio.

They joined the Peace Corps in September 1963, and worked in Peru until last year.

The young couple ran a model farm for the Maryknoll Fathers, showing Indians how to raise stock and breed cattle besides planting crops. Mrs. Bryant put her medical knowledge to good use by training a native to administer first aid. This was the only medical service available in the community.

Just returned from Africa is Ann DeSimone, 24, of 600 Ravencrest Road, Ohio Township.

TWO YEARS IN NIGERIA

Miss DeSimone, 24, spent 2 years in Nigeria teaching art and English. She signed up after receiving her degree in art education from Penn State in 1963.

Miss DeSimone said she found persons from other nations engaged in work similar to that of the Peace Corps.

"Many British youth are in Africa, working at much lower salaries than we receive ($75 a month) to help the natives. And there are people from other nations under contract to the Government, doing the work many of our Peace Corps people are doing," she said.

Miss DeSimone returned home several weeks ago, although she left the Peace Corps in August 1965. Before arriving in the United States she toured Europe and the Middle East.

WHAT THEY'RE DOING

Some 17,000 volunteers have served or are serving in the Peace Corps.

A study of the first 5,000 returnees showed that 39 percent have continued their education; 15 percent work for some branch of Government; 15 percent teach in the United States or abroad; 8 percent work with a social service agency; 11 percent are in business or industry; 12 percent are unemployed.

In Pittsburgh, the colleges, business schools, and nursing schools have sent 162 people into the Corps as of February 1.

Pitt leads with 69, followed by Duquesne with 39, and Carnegie Tech with 29. Others are Chatham, 13; Mount Mercy, 5; Montefiore Hospital and Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 2 each; and Point Park, Robert Morris, and Presbyterian-University Hospital, 1 each.

What is the future of the Peace Corps?

Bob Williams feels that some of its appeal has been taken over by other movements, such as civil rights, Job Corps, VISTA, and other action-oriented groups.

"We had a feeling we were part of our Nation's foreign policy and that we actually stood in the forefront of it," he said.

Only one item is holding the Bryant family from going back, Mrs. Bryant said.

"We want to start our own family," she explained.

They Fight Battles, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 8, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune points out that most of the reporting on the war in Vietnam concentrates on skirmishes and very limited military engagements, but that full scale battles are also fought there.

This editorial is an important reminder and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

THEY FIGHT BATTLES, TOO

Much of the reporting of the Vietnamese war has tended to emphasize the little skirmish, the role of the individual soldier or the platoon. Many of the headlines have been preempted by air raids over North Vietnam. Opponents of the American role in southeast Asia talk as if that role consisted of killing women and children while showering napalm on peaceful villages. But they fight battles in Vietnam, too.

This was illustrated by the account of the success achieved by the Marines and the South Vietnamese troops against a North Vietnamese regiment near Quang Nai. Apparently, half the regiment were casualties and the rest, in the words of a Marine officer, "just survivors." And General Westmoreland confirmed the picture of real battles and real victories when, almost casually, he referred to four regular Vietcong battalions destroyed in the last few days.

This is an impressive toll. It has been customary to state Vietcong losses in terms of "body count"—a grisly method which was necessitated in part by the guerrilla nature of much of the fighting—enemy units dissolving into the jungle to reform—and in part by public skepticism over communiques that might tell of routed enemies but were far from precise about what the rout actually meant.

But in plain fact, it is possible to win victories, even over guerrillas, and fairly crushing ones at that. No matter how loose a military organization may be, no matter to what extent it normally lives off the country, once it gets past the snipe-and-run stage, it must have bases, it must have assembly areas, it must have some kind of command and supply organization. The Vietcong are mustered into units, and those units can be smashed, uprooted from their usual sources of supply, cut off from the higher command. When that happens, although there may be many survivors, they are not effective—until they can regroup, be brought up to strength and given new leadership. And if they are hustled enough, such a reorganization may not be possible.

It is this kind of defeat that the Vietcong seems to have been suffering, at an accelerating rate, in the past few months. And it is this kind of defeat that can enable the vital political and social role of pacification to be undertaken with a chance of success. Victories can be won in Vietnam—and they are being won now, a few Senators to the contrary notwithstanding.

War on Poverty No Federal Handout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration's war on poverty is not a Federal handout, but a helping hand. It is not a massive Federal dole, but a tremendous challenge.

It is a program designed to help the poor learn how to help themselves. The main thrust of its emphasis is upon education.

One of the biggest tasks confronting those of us who support the war on poverty is getting the story of its growing successes to the American people. The news media of this country can play a vitally important role in this effort. I am pleased to note an increasing number of great American newspapers devoting more space to the war on poverty. In this regard, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article entitled "Attack on Poverty Centered on Education," which appeared in the January 12, 1966, edition of the New York Times. I include it in the RECORD.

ATTACK ON POVERTY CENTERED ON EDUCATION—$2 BILLION SET ASIDE BY UNITED STATES TO HELP THE POOR LEARN BETTER

(By Nan Robertson)

WASHINGTON.—"Why is America suddenly so concerned—to the extent of more than $2 billion—about improving the education of children of the poor? This money cannot fatten a father's paycheck. It will not put bread on tonight's table."

Thus begins "Education: An Answer to Poverty," a Government booklet that will go out soon to thousands of communities and schools, offering ideas old and new on the hows and whys of teaching the poor.

It suggests what many Americans are beginning to feel keenly and statistics support:

That to be ignorant is to be poor.

That hard-core poverty, like established wealth, is inherited—90 percent of the poor are born to impoverished parents.

That the best way to break the "chain of dependence" on the dole that has linked and debased generations of poor Americans is to educate them.

More than $2 billion is available this year under such laws as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to help poor children learn better. Still more public money is being offered to communities for adult education.

When Lyndon Johnson chose the foundation for his Great Society he said, "We begin with learning." This is the vital ingredient in the attack on poverty directed by Sargent Shriver. At no time in our history, under no President, including President Franklin D. Roosevelt, has there been such an emphasis on education to enable the poor to help themselves escape from their lot.

Education is woven into most of the 11 poverty programs and subprograms funded and administered by Mr. Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity and 5 others run by such Government departments as Labor, Education, and Agriculture with OEO money.

It is easy to see why this is so when one considers the problem—and possible solutions—of ever-swelling welfare roll across the country. Each month almost everywhere in America, more people go on the dole than go off. Last year, New York City's Welfare Department closed 100,000 cases that had become self-sustaining, but 119,000 others came in their places.

SUCCESS IN CHICAGO

There have been few exceptions to this discouraging pattern. One such—the most striking—is Chicago.

Chicago's welfare rolls have shrunk 9 percent since 1962. New York's expanded 48 percent in the same period. Officials in Chicago say the percentage of people on public assistance there has gone down mostly because all eligible welfare recipients were assigned to literacy and vocational courses run by the board of education.

Raymond Hilliard, commissioner of public welfare for Cook County, is convinced because of this record that education is the best answer to helping the poor help themselves. New York has no such educational requirement for its welfare recipients.

The educational attack on poverty under Mr. Shriver begins below kindergarten and goes all the way through the learning and earning years. About the only programs without a built-in educational feature are those for the old and infirm.

The most successful and the biggest crash Federal program was last summer's Project Headstart, which reached below school age to 560,000 poor children at 13,400 centers in 2,500 communities. The point was to reach them as early as possible, before they were swallowed up into a traditional school system for which they were piteously unprepared—a system in which increasing inadequacy and frustration would lead to dropping out.

Children who had never seen a book or a doctor, who could not identify colors or grasp the idea of short and long, were instructed in small groups, given medical care and nutritious food. Tens of thousands of Headstart parents became involved in school activities for the first time in their lives, as teachers' aids or participants in parent-teacher association meetings.

Tragically, the crucial followthrough for these children into the school year often did not materialize. The reasons were a lack of unds, facilities, staffs, or local school boards with the drive and imagination to carry on.

Headstart is part of the community action program, the Big Bertha of the attack on poverty. CAP receives 45 percent of the $1.5 billion allotted to Mr. Shriver's agency this year. The initiative and the administration come from local private and public bodies banded together to find new ways to help the poor. The money comes direct from Washington after the community provides feasible plans giving promise of progress toward the elimination of poverty.

In fiscal 1965, the Office of Economic Opportunity gave $118,879,000 to 239 communities for community action programs that got underway immediately. Half the money went toward education programs.

Tht sum did not include funds released for consumer education, birth control information, or planning for projects that would turn out to be primarily educational.

All but 30 of the 239 communities had educational programs in their master plans.

TEST COMES LATER

A teenage and smaller equivalent of Headstart, with a similarly catchy title, is Project Upward Bound. This plucked more than 2,000 poor, bright youths who were simply not responding to traditional high school teaching out of their environments and onto 18 college campuses this summer. These potential dropouts were subjected to strenuous academic instruction.

Many of them, according to Upward Bound officials, "caught fire." Some were able to pass college entrance examinations they had failed before. Others returned for a year or more of high school, where their new zeal to learn and get into college may be severely tested.

Remedial education, literacy courses, the emphasis on reading and mathematics to get and keep better jobs and be participating citizens, are part of most of the adult programs in the fight against poverty.

It is true of the Job Corps, in which 17,400 girls and boys from 16 to 21 years old are now enrolled. Out of school and out of work, they have been summoned from their homes to live in more than 80 conservation camps and urban centers.

About 40 percent are Negro, 50 percent are white farm youth, and the rest Mexican-Americans, Indians, or Puerto Ricans.

More than half their time is spent in education, but not the kind that has made them alienated and hostile—and dropouts.

REASON FOR DROPPING OUT

Dr. David Gottlieb, a young Job Corps psychologist, writer on teenage behavior, and himself a high school dropout gone right, says the "primary reason a poor kid drops out is that he sees no relation between what's going on in the classroom and his own expectations for the future."

A corpsman explained: "I didn't like math before and I don't now, but the important thing is you have to know it to get through the world. That's what I didn't know before and that's why I didn't work at it. If you don't have education, you can't get nowhere."

That is what President Johnson and Sargent Shriver believe, and that is the heart of this poverty program.

Addison-Wesley, Leader in Educational Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding business firms in Massachusetts is the Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., of Reading which has been an imaginative leader in the field of publishing textbooks. Since its founding in 1942 as a distributor of physics books, the firm has grown steadily until it now occupies a 19-acre site in Reading; its stock has split eight times.

This outstanding growth is due to the imagination and good judgment of its management which has continuously sought outstanding authors and manuscripts. Addison-Wesley is a prominent leader in the tremendous educational revolution we are now experiencing.

The most recent issue of the New Englander magazine, published by the New England Council, contains an interesting article about Addison-Wesley and I bring it to the attention of my colleagues by inserting it in the Congressional Record:

Business Backgrounds: Addison-Wesley

For at least one company, the Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass., the new programed text, and conventional textbook industry has been a zoom industry. Founded in 1942, to handle the distribution of several physics books, its stock has split eight times, or 23 for 1 over that period. Thus, the owner of one share in April 1947, with an investment of $200 (going price) would have realized a growth of 1,058 shares, which at $80 per share (average in January) would be worth $84,640 today. And a 3-for-1 split is scheduled for March.

The man calling the shots at Addison-Wesley is Melbourne Wesley Cummings. He majored in engineering at the University of New Hampshire and then became a printing salesman in spite of his father's warning to stay out of the business. His father was a printer in Beverly, Mass., and for a time published two New Hampshire weeklies. The merger of three printers under Lew Cummings (no relation), for whom Mel was a salesman, and the decision to set up a publishing firm in Cambridge, Mass. (with a capitalization of $3,000), brought about the Addison-Wesley Press in 1942. In 1946 Mel bought out Lew and the emerging firm became the Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.

The firm continued in Cambridge until 1956 when it moved into its new quarters in Reading on a 19-acre site designed for future growth. In addition to the main building and a large warehouse, a six-story, $2 million office structure, is under construction on the site. The first floor of the new addition will house a new RCA Spectra 70/15 computer and will house system control programers and keypunch personnel. The company now has about 50 acres of land in Massachusetts and California.

The company conducts its operations through four basic divisions organized by market: the college division, the school division (Palo Alto, Calif.), the technical book division, and the international division. Each division has its own publishing program to develop manuscripts to fit the needs of its markets. Each has its own sales force to market its own books and those of other divisions which may produce supplementary sales. Just organized is a wholly owned subsidiary, Addison-Wesley Canada Ltd., to better serve the Canadian market.

Manuscripts of the books published by Addison-Wesley are written by authorities in their respective fields. The manuscripts are secured through the efforts of the company's subject area editors with the help of outside consulting editors and also through sales representatives.

Once in production, the manuscript is coordinated through copy editing, art, composition, and camera functions. The great bulk of composition is done by the Wolf Composition Co., Inc., which has a plant adjacent to A–W in reading.

"We have been fortunate," says Mr. Cummings. We have had some good authors and our books have found a demand. And we have been fortunate in finding a rising demand for textbooks."

Although he says that he has been fortunate (and there has to be some element of fortune in any success story), nonetheless, it is a fact that there are a limited number of persons who can do the job of creating educational material or individual training materials. This professional creative group who know what they are doing and can project their thoughts are much sought after individuals and Addison-Wesley has a large number of them as consultant and contributors.

Add to this that the growth of student bodies is exceeding the growth of the teaching profession, and the fact that texts are now offering uniform teaching regardless of teacher, and you have a large market which only grows larger as you factor in government and automation influence. For as automation displaces a person, he has to retrain and as the government expands its influence sphere, more money is being poured into the market for education.

Sales in 1965 passed the $15.6 million mark (from $8.3 million in 1964) and management predicts at least a 15-percent increase in 1966. The company's newest venture will be the publishing of low-level books for use by children who can't move ahead as fast as others. In addition, the firm produces a line of mathematics books for use from kindergarten through graduate school. And the future looks even better with the possibilities of production of books and programed texts for use by industry in training programs and the substantial markets being opened by Job Corps program needs.

This is one company which hopes to avoid the merger or acquisition route to the top. Plans call for growth from within and they are not interested in acquiring or being acquired.

Addison-Wesley's business background can be summed up in two words, innovation and the personal approach. And the future can be just as bright because they have an established base or depth of knowledge to build on and a quality reputation to bring into an ever expanding market.

Chancellor Jones: East-West Center Is Key to Planning for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I call the attention of my colleagues to an inspiring speech delivered at the Governor's Prayer Breakfast, in my State of Hawaii, by one of our most respected citizens, the Honorable Howard P. Jones, Chancellor of the Institute for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West.

Chancellor Jones views the conflict in Vietnam with a spirit of hope that is refreshing and encouraging. He sees the war in which we are today engaged as "a climax of 20 centuries of human ignorance." He says:

> Yet, amid the depression and frustration of war, I see hope. For the first time clear recognition has been given to the fact that the ignorance in which wars breed cannot be dispelled by food, or clothes, or shelter, or any other purely material means.

Speaking of the growing importance of education in international relations, he continues:

> Education is envisaged as the way to replace handouts with self-help.

He adds that it is "paradoxical—and significant—and hopeful," that President Johnson in the very midst of conflict "has made clear this Nation's determination to make education our arsenal for peace."

It has thus been the function of Hawaii's still young east-west center to produce the implements for this arsenal of peace by bringing to its campus men and women from both the United States and Asian countries. There is no doubt that from mutual education, a stimulating interchange of ideas and knowledge between the east and west, will come the tools of tomorrow's lasting peace and the men and women who have been trained to use them.

I commend Chancellor Jones for his erudite views for I believe that he has, from his point of vantage as he modestly calls his background of wide experience, arrived at a vision of truth that must be shared by all who strive for peace.

I submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record the full text of Chancellor Howard P. Jones' thought-provoking speech which was printed in the Saturday, February 19, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser:

Education: A War Against War

(Address by Chancellor Howard P. Jones, of the East-West Center, at the Governor's prayer breakfast)

The greatest of leaders feel the necessity in moments of stress, crisis and decision to lean upon a power beyond themselves. During World War II one of my British friends was a general who had trained Montgomery as a young officer. I was lunching with him one day and commented that I had noticed in the paper that Montgomery, confronting Rommel in the desert got up at dawn every morning and never went into battle without reading some Scripture and praying.

"I find that very interesting," I commented to my friend. "But this is the first indication I have had that Montgomery was a religious man."

My friend looked thoughtful for a moment, then he said, "Well, let me tell you what kind of a man Montgomery is. If he thinks he needs the Lord on his side, he will get him there."

Faith, of course, is not all that is required for successful enterprise. Persistent application in a direct line is a necessary ingredient to success. I recall Dean Rusk's story of the itinerant preacher in Georgia who taught him to "pray as if it were up to God; work as if it were up to you." And, of course, truth. A man must have a vision of truth.

Nearly a hundred years ago, Emerson wrote: "When a truth appears—as, for instance, a perception in the wit of one Columbus that there is land in the Western Sea; though he alone of all men has that thought, and they all jeer—it will build ships; it will build fleets; it will carry over half Spain and half England; it will plant a colony, a state, a nation and half a globe full of men."

During the lifetime of most of us here, America's destiny has seemed to be to fight wars not of our own making, in the pursuit of no selfish intent, but to preserve freedom, or at least the opportunity for freedom, for the rest of mankind.

World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and now the Vietnam war, all answer this description. World War II was unique among all wars in the history of the world. For the first time the victor did not exploit his victory but helped his enemy rise to his feet.

Today in Vietnam, America is in another war.

Questions are being asked about our role in this war. What are the issues? How can these issues be resolved without escalation, or without humiliation? Why such misgivings about our aims and actions? When and how can negotiation take the place of retaliation?

Here, on this mid-Pacific island, these questions have a special urgency. This State is nearest to the fighting front. We are a staging area, a landing field, a seaport serving our armies deployed on the field of battle.

Hawaii's contribution to these armies is great. We watch our sons leave for the front. We watch some of them return, broken in body, if not in spirit.

Superb reporting by correspondents of our local press bring the conflict close to us all. One of these correspondents himself has fallen to mortar fire.

The President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and other national figures have visited these islands to deal with issues of war and peace. All have addressed themselves to the questions and doubts that honest men are raising about America's position. It does not lie in my power to answer these questions and resolve these doubts.

All I can bring to bear on the problem is my own experience in peace and war, in military and diplomatic service, much of it gathered in southeast Asia. To this experience, perhaps, I can add certain insights gained from my present work.

As Chancellor of the East-West Center, I have a rare opportunity to mingle with men and women from Asia and America, come together in search of understanding.

Seen from my point of vantage, or disadvantage, war in Vietnam cannot be blamed on the United States.

War in Vietnam is the climax of 20 centuries of human ignorance—20 centuries in which men of different nations, races, and creeds have been divided by distance, by culture, by ignorance, and by the suspicion, intolerance, hatred, and fear which ignorance breeds. This climax coincides with the emergence of the United States as a major power.

America sought this power no more than it sought this war. But providence, or history, or coincidence—call it what you will—brought these two forces together at a time when science has carried war beyond man's ability to recuperate from its carnage.

We could not, we cannot, repudiate the responsibilities inherent in our possession of power. Viewed against the centuries of human ignorance, intolerance, suspicion, misunderstanding and fear in which wars have festered, only a miracle could have spared the world this current conflict.

Were it not Vietnam, it would be elsewhere. For man, knowledgeable in all things including the atom, has lacked knowledge of himself. And without such self-knowledge, there can be no peace.

Yet, oddly, though clouds shadow my point of vantage, I also glimpse a flash of light. Amid the depression and frustration of war, I see hope.

I see hope in the fact that for the first time in history, man is reaching toward a new concept that can replace ignorance with knowledge, suspicion with understanding, and war with peace.

For the first time clear recognition has been given to the fact that the ignorance in which wars breed cannot be dispelled by food, or clothes or shelter, or any other purely material means.

For the first time, ignorance is being attacked on a scale that promises to end it as a major source of suspicion, antipathy, and war.

In this month of February 1966, in Washington and in Honolulu, Hawaii, the President of the United States has made clear this Nation's determination to make education our arsenal for peace.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has taken many initiatives in this area. Our programs of aid and technical assistance, our Fulbright scholarships, our Smith-Mundt grants, our utilization of counterpart funds and wheat loan money to pay for textbooks and teachers—and more recently, our Peace Corps—all these have paved the way for the President's new proposals in international education.

Education at last is recognized as a two-way street, with Americans and Asians learning from eath other. Education is seen as a means of overcoming ignorance and misunderstanding. Education is envisaged as the way to replace handouts with self-help.

Education goes beyond moral equivalents for war, or aid to the hungry and despairing. Education is recognized as an uplifting force, an indispensable ingredient in creating the understanding, the expertise, the self-reliance, the self-respect without which other efforts cannot succeed.

It is paradoxical—and significant—and hopeful—that the President should mount such an effort in international education in the very midst of war. For only war, by contrast can illumine the President's intention and rally mankind to our side.

For the implications of the Honolulu Declaration are enormous. Together with the President's message to Congress on February 2, what is involved is no less than the application of civilized and civilizing solutions to mankind's basic problem—ignorance of each other—on an international scale hitherto limited to military and economic measures. War must, in the meantime, be waged. But for the first time, we can envisage a substitute—knowledge.

Two decades of experience in diplomacy have taught me that it is a lack of basic understanding between people which causes most of our troubles.

Friends can disagree on specific issues and still remain friends, but only if they have a basic understanding of each other's attitudes, motivations, ideals, and ways of thinking.

It is time for us to spend a commensurate amount of time, effort, and money on education to prevent wars.

Four years ago, in dedicating the East-West Center, Vice President Johnson said: "The ultimate defense of freedom lies not in weapons systems nor in the implements of arms. These we must maintain as responsible men to deter the folly of those few leaders who acknowledge no responsibility to God or men or their own people. But freedom's surest defense and freedom's greatest force is the enlightenment of the minds of the people."

Now, as President of the United States, Mr. Johnson has given further fulfillment to these words with another major initiative in the field of international education.

The import of the President's action is not lost on any of us involved in the work of the East-West Center.

The Center's function is stated in its name—cultural and technical interchange between East and West. The key word is interchange.

Specifically, the Center does not exchange people in the sense that Asians are sent to the United States and Americans are sent to Asia. Rather, Asians and Americans are brought together, intermingling, sharing a common experience, pursuing consonant purposes, learning about other cultures through personal contact with a cross section of other peoples, and examining their own cultures in the context of an international community.

This occurs in an environment offering access to a university of unusual excellence in the area of Asian-American studies, and to a community whose multiracial composition provides proof that men of different creeds and cultures can live in peace.

What the Center seeks is a new kind of international colleagueship, composed of men and women whose horizons have been widened, whose capacity to think has been broadened, whose compassion has been deepened by a shared experience.

It brings together scholars and students, administrators, and officials, proponents of the public and private sectors, long isolated from each other.

It creates an atmosphere conducive to the cross-fertilization of experiences and ideas. It induces interaction among men of different disciplines, matching the administrator with the professor, the public official with the entrepreneur, the humanist with the engineer.

It crosses national frontiers, bringing together from different countries groups concerned with identical problems, exposing them to their opposite numbers in other lands. It crosses boundaries within societies, drawing together countrymen formerly separated by sectarianism, geographical distances, and occupations.

It generates ideas as useful to Americans as to Asians, shattering ethnocentricity, combatting condescension, and ordering the traffic in ideas along a two-way street. It forms enduring professional contacts which are in themselves among the greatest stimulants of change.

It confers upon thinkers and doers in every field and of every nationality a common citizenship in a society of scholarship where excellence is revered.

I am a great believer in the idea that exposure to a free society makes a lasting impact upon people. We don't have to propagandize our system. Let people live in it awhile and find out for themselves. This works because freedom and truth and the spirit of honest inquiry among men are irresistible.

Mankind wants peace. Peaceful emergence, constructive evolution, the erection of stable governments responsive to their people's will—these, as opposed to the destruction of men and nations by terror and war—are America's goals no less than Asia's. The East-West Center seeks to serve the achievement of these goals.

And if, in future years, as in the past, it does so serve, it will be because all of us at the center remember the ancient Chinese adage:

"If planning for 1 year, plant rice. If planning for 20 years, plant trees. If planning for a hundred years, plant men."

The center is planning for a hundred years. It is planning for peace. It is planting men.

It seems appropriate to conclude these remarks by quoting Stephen Vincent Benet's famous prayer which President Roosevelt spoke at a moment of great crisis:

"God of the free, we pledge our hearts and lives today to the cause of all free mankind. Grant us a common faith that men shall know bread and peace, that he shall know justice and righteousness, freedom and security, an equal chance to do his best, not only in our own lands, but throughout the world. And in that faith, let us march toward the clean world our hands can make."

Address of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, at Symposium on Research in Agriculture, at Warrenton, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, under *leave to extend my remarks in the* Record, I include the following address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman during a symposium on research in agriculture, at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va., Thursday, February 24, 1966:

When a scientist named Justus von Liebig was just 14 years old, he blew the roof off a drugstore in Heppenheim, Germany.

This explosion, the result of the boy's secret experiments with fulminate of mercury, discouraged the druggist from keeping him on as an apprentice. But being fired didn't destroy young von Liebig's interest in chemistry and plantlife. He continued his studies, his *experiments*.

They led him to the discovery of phosphate and potash in the ashes of burned plants, and ammonia in their vapors. He put all three into barren ground, and made it a wonder of fertility.

"There will be a time," he said, "when the fields will be fed with substances produced by chemical industries, and containing the substances indispensable for plants."

History has treated few prophets more kindly.

Justus von Liebig was born in 1803, and when he died at the age of 70, the U.S. Department of Agriculture was only 11 years old—but already deeply involved in basic and applied research.

I know of no legend which claims USDA researchers began by blowing the roof off a grocery store, a dairy barn, a grain bin, or packing plant.

They have, however, triggered many of the explosions which mark revolutionary changes in the physical environment, the food and fiber production and utilization patterns, and the social and economic aspects of American life.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss with leaders of the science community the role of research in the missions of the Department of Agriculture—but first:

Let me express my very deep gratitude to Dr. Seitz and the National Academy of Science for joining the Department in sponsoring this symposium on research in agriculture, and thank all of you for your participation.

The Department of Agriculture and its research services are honored by your presence, inspired by your interest, enriched by your cooperation.

I am not, as you know, a scientist—unless it can be held that practical politics and government administration hold a place on the fringe, if not actually in the field, of science.

I can measure the B.t.u.'s of a public issue without a thermometer, but I cannot regulate the flame of a bunsen burner with any degree of skill.

I can analyze the generation of turmoil in a political party convention far better than that resulting from combinations of chemicals in a test tube.

I can read between the lines of a Gallup poll, but not between specimens under a microscope.

And I react more quickly to the theory of votability than to the theory of relativity.

So allow me, then, to paraphrase Voltaire: I may not fully understand how you do what you do, but I shall always be grateful for the fact you do it—and do it well.

For without research the politician, the public official, would function constantly in a vacuum—because it is research that both asks and answers the questions related to public policy and program determinations.

Does it need doing? Can it be done? If it can be accomplished in a variety of ways, which method should have priority? How can it be kept in balance with other policies and programs? What type of administrative structure will be required? How is it related *to the various States, to other agencies of* Federal Government, to private industries and institutions? What will happen as a result of the action or actions taken?

I have found these questions and the search for answers applicable across the vast range of the Department of Agriculture's operations—whether it be in finding, as USDA did, *a faster and more economical method of* producing penicillin, or—

Encouraging an environmental adjustment that will solve, in major degree, the population pressures of cities and the underutilization of both natural and people resources along the countryside;

Encouraging, and maintaining, abundant *production of food and fiber while moving* toward the economic goals of parity of income opportunity for farm families and fair prices for consumers;

Protecting food purity and quality, developing new products and new and better distribution, marketing, and processing systems;

Cooperating in the public welfare field with direct distribution of foods to needy families, participation in school milk and lunch programs, and food stamps;

Protecting, developing, and expanding the multiple-use of natural resources on public and private lands, and helping the food-deficit nations of the free world take the lead in the war of liberation from hunger and malnutrition through the improvement of their own agricultural production plants.

I would hesitate, without strong and versatile research arms, to attempt to carry out these and other missions that the people, the Congress, and the President have assigned—and will continue assigning—to the Department of Agriculture.

As I pointed out earlier, the Department of Agriculture was engaged in research long before any of us was born—and for 99 years before I became its Secretary. Consequently, I can point to its research performance with pride without being self-serving.

The first major support provided to research by government was in the field of agriculture. And as recently as 1940, when the Federal Government began broadening its research and development support to a total of $74 million, agriculture research received two-fifths of the outlay.

A quarter of a century later, in fiscal 1965, Federal support for agricultural research alone exceeded the entire 1940 expenditure—amounting to $231 million. But instead of two-fifths of the total research and development budget, Agriculture has 1.5 percent of it. By that time Defense was being awarded $7 billion; NASA, $4.9 billion; the Atomic Energy Commission, $1.5 billion; and HEW, $813 million.

I do not cite those figures to call attention to the fact Agriculture's share of research and development appropriations has declined in relationship to the total Federal expenditure—but rather to emphasize that, as a pioneer in the field, Agriculture perhaps deserves some credit for creating a favorable climate for expanded governmental interest and investment in research. In other words, agricultural research—since 1862—had been demonstrating to the people and the Congress they were getting something for their research money.

Our Government has not only used the Department of Agriculture as a trailblazer in research, but in tieing research to education through the land-grant colleges, and then carrying knowledge to the rural community through *extension services, thus* providing, in fact, a working model for the transition of science into technology.

Out of this combination of basic and applied research, of education and extension, has come in substantial measure the greatest food and fiber production plant the world has ever known—great in the skills and *judgments of its operators*—great in the volume and quality of its output—great in its potential for perpetuating the era of abundance.

American agricultural development is, indeed, one of the miracles of this century.

It was when we freed more and more people from the task of producing food that we made our human resources increasingly available for an ever-widening range of activity in industry, commerce, education, science, and culture.

It was when we began making an adequate supply of food an ever-decreasing drain on family incomes that Americans could increase their investments in living well beyond buying *their daily bread*.

Look at what has happened:

Today one farm worker provides food and fiber for 35 other persons. A century ago he met the needs of just 5 others, and as recently as 1950 only 15.

In 1950 American families were spending about 25 percent of their take-home incomes *for food. A decade later it was 20 percent.* In 1965 it was an alltime low of 18.5 percent. Continued advances in production and marketing efficiencies, and in consumer earnings, are expected to bring further cuts in family food outlays—to about 17 percent of take-home pay in 1970, 15 or 16 percent in 1975.

Meanwhile, average realized net income per farm reached a record high in 1965 and our farm families are well on their way to parity of income opportunity with their urban neighbors—a development which, in turn, improves the tone of the total economy.

Important as it is internally, this production miracle is even more vital this year—and in the years ahead—as an export item while the world accelerates mobilization for an all-out war on malnutrition, hunger—even famine—in its widespread food-deficit sectors.

We have the knowledge accumulated through research and its application, we have the experience in grassroots educational programs, and we have the food—all the weapons essential for leadership in helping less developed nations help themselves achieve the ability to grow—and to buy—enough food for their families.

This is a task that has captured the hearts and the imaginations of our people. It was blueprinted by President Johnson in his inspiring—yet studied and realistic—food-for-freedom message to the Congress. And now legislation in support of the food-for-freedom program is being hammered out by the committees of Congress.

A few weeks ago I visited the fighting front—and the farm front—of South Vietnam. I saw efforts to protect freedom, and to produce food, going on side by side. Agriculture is the key to freedom's victory in Vietnam. Fertilizer is just as important as bullets in the winning of that war.

We must fight in Vietnam. And we shall fight until its people have the right to determine in their own way the type of government under which they shall work and live. Yet, military wars come to an end. The battle against malnutrition, hunger, and related mental and physical health hazards is endless—new victory is demanded every year.

There can be no great love of country, nor firm loyalty to its institutions, in a human heart that beats above an always-empty stomach.

There can be no genuine economic growth future in a nation overpopulated with children whose bodies are thinned, eyes glazed, minds dulled by malnutrition. And even though there are—at least in the judgment of those not their parents—too many of them, these children are in our world, now, and the world must, as Pope Paul pleaded, find them a place at the table. Population control cannot be retroactive.

We can and we shall use our food, or productive resources, and our know-how to help the farm families and the agribusiness structures in those developing nations where production is now losing the race with need.

But our food can only support—not substitute for—their own efforts.

A successful war against hunger and want has its roots in research and education. Unless our food supports research and education aimed at making the agricultures of developing Nations grow and support their total economic development, history will rule it wasted.

The Indian boy who eats American wheat today still must eat 10 years from now—and provide food, at that time, for his own children.

Over a span of a hundred years, agricultural research has asked many questions, answered many, and in the process has raised more questions demanding more answers, because that is the inevitable—and usually desirable—result of the research cycle. Now these questions must be asked, and answered, in increasing volume around the world if it is to adequately feed itself—asked and answered not only by the scholars and scientists of agriculture, but of the entire research and education structure of our society.

During the past quarter hour I have described the Department of Agriculture as an agency of many missions.

We are a production instrument, an economic innovator and stabilizer, a custodian of publicly owned natural resources and a cooperative planner in those privately owned.

We are a teacher, a communications media, a regulatory system, a welfare unit, a rural development promoter, an arm of foreign policy implementation.

But we are not an island. We are a part of the main. And in relationship to every area of science and education we are dependent—and seek to be dependable.

That's exactly why we asked Dr. Seitz and the National Academy of Science to help us bring outstanding representatives of the science community to the same place at the same time.

And that's why, as I enter and leave the Administration Building of the Department of Agriculture each day, I see exhibits in the patio not only of research covering food and fiber, but exhibits of the Corps of Engineers related to buildings that will some day be constructed on the moon, and exhibits of the Bureau of Ships related to making submarines of glass.

Within USDA itself the competition for men and women and dollars in the various units of research is rugged, and fixing priorities in assignments and objectives isn't easy. Reconciliation, cooperation, coordination—meshing the parts to end up with a meaningful whole—demand much of each of us at the Department's policymaking level.

This intradepartment situation is applicable to the entire range of Government-sponsored research and development. It is mandatory, in the public interest, that we constantly develop new bases for coordination of research and the pooling of knowledge among Federal agencies and, hopefully, among other Government and private agencies as well.

If this symposium achieves nothing more than a demonstration of the Department of Agriculture's appreciation for the strength that lies in the creation of broadened understanding, and the promotion of concerted endeavor, we shall consider it most worthwhile.

We are anxious to earn, and to hold, full partnership in the basic and applied research community so that we may contribute to it—receive from it—with the purpose of moving more quickly toward the goal all of us share; improving opportunities for all people, everywhere, to achieve maximum quality in every facet of their lives.

Success Caps 6 Months Operations of Youth Job Information Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary aims of the Johnson administration's war on poverty is helping to bring together jobs and unemployed young people.

The Bridgeport, Conn., Telegram in its February 21 edition contained an interesting story about the success so far of the Youth Employment Information Center, designed primarily to help young people find jobs or continue their education. I commend it to my colleagues.

SUCCESS CAPS 6 MONTHS OPERATIONS OF YOUTH JOB INFORMATION CENTER

The Youth Employment Information Center of 1378 Stratford Avenue, which is designed primarily to help young people find jobs or continue their education, has been successful in its first 6 months of operation, according to an appraisal issued by the center.

OPENED LAST JULY

The center, operated by the Chessmen Foundation, Inc., began its work July 1, 1965, financed by a $29,680 Federal grant for this fiscal year. The grant was obtained under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Center expenses for the first 6 months were $12,939, including $10,547 for personnel, $5 for travel, $655 for rent, $231 for supplies, $1,284 for equipment and $215 for other expenses, according to the center's appraisal.

Paul Mendes, center administrator, said the center's six full-time. salaried staff members earned a total of only $10,547 during the first 6 months of operation "because this is part of the war on poverty and we felt the salaries should be low."

REFERS CLIENTS

The center does not find jobs for people or provide them with further education, but refers its clients to organizations that might be able to provide these services.

Of the 548 persons assisted by the center during its first 6 months of operation, 114 were referred to the Neighborhood Youth Corps, 179 to the Connecticut State Employment Service and other similar services, 45 to testing centers, five to counseling agencies, 36 to organizations which provide scholarship and educational information. Other cases are pending.

The center tries to aid those seeking assistance by:

Obtaining information on application for job retraining and apprentice programs.

Discovering the availability of scholarship grants and loans.

Securing free tutoring service information.

Learning of youth fellowship and recreational programs.

Determining where orientation and guidance in domestic and educational affairs is available.

Contacting and advising dropouts on the advantage of continued schooling.

Securing current information on employment opportunities on Government studies, surveys, and other beneficial information.

A knowledge of pertinent laws pertaining to housing, employment, to promote better living standards among the underprivileged.

Most of those seeking assistance at the center are Negro and most are residents of the East End. Mr. Mendes said, however, that center services are available to all residents of the Bridgeport area.

He said persons in need of assistance learn of the center through word of mouth, from simliar agencies in the area, and through direct contact with center staff members who are in the field daily.

Speaking of the center's early successes, an appraisal released by the center said:

"Since the inception of the Youth Employment Information Center as an informational service for the benefit of the community at large and its youth in particular, much has been accomplished and much is still to be gained.

"GOALS SECURED

"The goals that the * * * center has set for itself have been secured for the most part. Although in some areas we have not accomplished as much as we would like, we feel that the importance of the project such as ours has been realized and finally accepted.

"Our task is a large one, but we have accepted it as being our obligation to the Bridgeport community.

"Our goals are many—helping young people, as completely as possible, to become trained self-supporting taxpaying citizens of our community and to live with their fellowman, to develop educational programs aimed at specific skills required for currently available jobs, and develop job opportunities, where there are needs for a variety of nonprofessional and technical skills."

A JOINT PROJECT

Recently, the center and the Bridgeport Board of Education joined in a work-study program. Youths involved in the program participate for 3 hours a day, 5 days a week. The program offers expanded counseling services and more direct supervision.

The program is called Bridgeport rehabilitation involving disadvantaged gaining employment stability (BRIDGES), Chessman Foundation, Inc. The committee working with the program includes Robert Ashkins, John Bruzas, E. P. Bullard IV, the Reverend Louis A. Deprofrio, George Deeb, Joseph Dolan, Dr. Paul Lane, Saul Schine, Mrs. Philip Smith, Charles Tisdale, Mrs. Sylvia Trachtenberg, Fred Robinson, Mr. Mendes, and Aubyn Lewis.

Center staff members, beside Mr. Mendes, include Aubyn Lewis, youth adviser; Fred Robinson, work-study coordinator; Richard Johnson, coordinator-interviewer; Mrs. Marie Lee, coordinator-interviewer; and Darcy Sanz, clerk.

Some Rather Startling Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, citing Al Smith's recommendation that we look at the record, Joseph Alsop has put together some startling statistics on the war in Vietnam and has made some very cogent comments about them.

Mr. Alsop's article appeared in the March 9, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune and follows:

SOME RATHER STARTLING FIGURES

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Some pretty peculiar reporting from Vietnam plus a lot of flabby thinking here in Washington have combined to produce a mood of defeatism in many quarters in this city. Hence it is high time to have the look at the record that Al Smith always used to recommend.

First, a short preface is needed. At Honolulu, General Westmoreland told President Johnson that he could not expect to see the full effects of his initial troop commitment of 200,000 men until the end of March at the earliest. For logistical and other reasons, there is a long lag between an outfit's assignment to Vietnam and that outfit's maximum impact on the enemy.

If all goes well, therefore, the figures that tell what has been accomplished since the new year somewhat underrepresent what can be accomplished later. None the less, if you cumulate all the announcements of General Westmoreland's headquarters—of a Vietcong battalion put out of action here, and a few hundred of the enemy killed there, and some prisoners taken in another place—you get rather startling results.

Briefly, between the new year and the end of the first week of March, the body count of enemy dead abandoned on the field of battle totaled 7,615. In the same period, American and allied troops took 1,143 enemy prisoners of war. And more than 1,500 of the enemy also defected on the battlefield, to be added to the prisoner-of-war total.

There are several things to be said about these figures. To begin with, they reveal a truly astonishing transformation of the war. Hardly more than 18 months ago, Vietcong and North Vietnamese battlefield discipline was still so excellent that a single abandoned corpse, or just one defector or one prisoner, was a genuine cause for celebration. To those who saw the war at that time, the present results are hardly credible.

A persistent attack on the credibility of these results is indeed one of the forms that the above-mentioned peculiar reporting frequently takes. It is true, of course, that any body count made in running combat is likely to contain some duplication. A reasonable margin of error is 10 to 20 percent.

But unless you assume that all the American officers in Vietnam are engaged in a vast conspiracy of mendacity, that is the outside margin. Any such error is certainly compensated, however, and compensated many times over, by the tally of the enemy who are killed but not counted. The old battlefield discipline still holds to the extent that the Vietcong and North Vietnamese always carry away their dead when they can. Thus, the body count can hardly include more than 60 percent or so of the enemy killed in action or by air attacks.

In addition, the enemy undoubtedly loses a rockbottom minimum of two men severely wounded for every man killed. When you work the figures, therefore, you find that the total enemy losses of all kinds, from January 1 through March 7, must be numbered quite literally in the tens of thousands. After ample allowance for the inclusion of wretched press-ganged porters among the casualties, it can therefore be seen that the enemy's regular and guerrilla forces have been getting a cruelly hard going-over.

In Asia, more than anywhere else in the world, the rule holds that nothing succeeds like success and nothing fails like failure. Thus, signs of trouble in the Vietcong rear areas ought to accompany such Vietcong reverses as those now indicated. These signs are duly appearing on schedule.

The most important sign to date is an article recently published in Tien Phong, an official journal of the People's Revolutionary Party. As the article was then broadcast on the Viecong clandestine radio, it was in fact intended as general guidance for all cadres. It strongly confirmed earlier interrogation results, which have been denigrated by the same persons who denigrate our troops' successes in battle.

Detailed analysis of the Communist gobbledygook would require another long report. It is enough to say that the article warns of greater difficulties, confusion (meaning defeatism) among the cadres and forgetfulness of the precious experience of the time when the Vietcong was winning. It also reveals very bad trouble in the Vietcong villages, and real Vietcong alarm over the great refugee movement of "people with their paddy," which, of course, impairs the Vietcong food base.

In sum, we are by no means winning the war as yet. In order to counter the effects of the massive, additional invasion from North Vietnam, General Westmoreland will certainly need many more men. But the proof is clear that Westmoreland's strategy is already working better than anyone could have hoped. And if we are not winning, the Vietcong is at least beginning to be apprehensive about losing.

Additional District and Circuit Judges

SPEECH

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1666) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, today I would like to note with my approval the imminent passage of a much needed and long awaited bill, S. 1666.

As a direct result of this bill the law's delay will be alleviated to a great extent, especially in my home State of California. At the present time, my State is divided into two judicial districts, northern and southern. Upon enactment of this bill two new districts will be created, an eastern district and a central district. The two districts presently in existence have been called upon to service the Nation's fastest growing State. It has been estimated that the population of California will increase by almost 50 percent between the 1960 census and 1970, from 15,717,204 to 22,075,000. It would be belaboring the obvious to say any more than that these two new districts are heartily welcomed by the people of my State.

All of us are familiar, at least to some extent, with the burgeoning caseload with which judges throughout this country are faced, and justice cannot be served where delay, or the threat of delay, can cause unfair settlement of honest claims.

We have only to consider the ordinary tort action to see in which manner delay can work injustice. A man is seriously injured in an accident and he is the sole supporter of his family. He cannot afford to wait a month for a settlement, much less a year or more. Consequently, in order to provide for his family, in at least some degree, he will settle with the defendant in the action for a sum far below that which he would be able to obtain from a jury trial.

The law's delay can also work for the defendant and against the plaintiff. Often the debtor will rely on the long delay between the filing of a complaint and the trial to force the creditor to settle for a smaller sum than that to which he is rightfully entitled. Examples such as this are too numerous to enumerate but they all revolve about one basic need—the need for more judges and more facilities.

We have today taken a giant step forward in providing truly equal justice and in making our courts accessible to the citizens of this Nation. Our Nation is a nation founded on laws and governed by laws and if the law forums become unavailable to the average citizen, then the concept upon which this Nation was founded becomes meaningless and words, not deeds, form our substance.

In these times of national and international unrest and uncertainty it is one of our primary duties to provide this country with a judiciary that is second to none and one that stands as an ideal toward which others may strive. Quantity certainly does not assure quality, and this is especially true in the administration of justice. We may, though, assert with certainty that whenever the number of judges is unequal to the task of administering, then quality must be compromised and any talk of justice must be as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

Today we are giving substance to our ideal of justice for all. Let us not neglect this ideal again.

United States Warned of Financial Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned at reports that an effort will be made in the near future to lift the historic interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds. In my judgment, the most dangerous move that could be made would be to encourage further increases in the mounting cost of money.

The present statutory ceiling has served as a stabilizer in good times and bad, through peace and war, and throughout the current period of unprecedented economic growth.

The measure of concern being expressed by leading economists in the Nation over the prospect for higher interest costs deserves the attention of every Member of Congress. The following article by David R. Francis of the Christian Science Monitor expresses a cross section of that concern.

UNITED STATES WARNED OF FINANCIAL DANGER

(By David R. Francis)

NEW YORK.—The Nation stands on the brink of a financial crisis. This is the view of a number of prominent economists.

It should be understood these men aren't speaking of a severe market crash or depression. But they do see potential dislocations in Wall Street.

Says Robert V. Roosa, former under-secretary for monetary affairs: "Interest rates are getting dangerously high. They are creating strains within the whole financial structure.

"If they go much higher, they will be dangerously disruptive."

Comments Prof. Gabriel T. Kerekes, economist for a prominent brokerage house, Goodbody & Co.: "If the Federal Reserve System really tightens up money, a wave of bankruptcies would hit this country.

"It would include a few banks."

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, is also concerned. He urges the "Fed" not to overrestrain the growth in the money supply. He wants only "moderate restriction."

WARNING SIGNALS

The prominent economist points to the present "severe disruption" of the bond market and the decline in the stock market as warning signals.

Some of the Nation's biggest bankers are also known to be privately worried.

Most of the concern is related to the high demand for credit in the Nation's money market. It threatens to push interest rates even higher than present skyscraper rates.

One sign of the trend: A group of New York banks this week raised the interest on special "savings certificates" to 5 percent.

Mr. Roosa sees signs of what economists call the "Roosa paradox." Speculating on higher rates, lenders hold off on making loans, and borrowers rush to borrow ahead of need. This forces up interest rates more rapidly than a normal demand-supply relationship would justify.

On top of this, he notes, there is the anticipated sale of financial assets by the Federal Government. A goal of $4.5 billion has been set for fiscal 1967.

ENORMOUS DEMAND

"This is a nice principle, to get these assets back to private hands—that is, fine when the private sector isn't all choked up."

At the moment the demand of corporations and municipalities on the money market are enormous. "Already excessive," Mr. Roosa held.

In such a situation, the central bank should not attempt to supply the commercial banks with sufficient funds to keep interest rates stable, Mr. Roosa says. Such an effort would be inflationary. Instead, the Government's actions should be aimed at cutting the demand for credit.

Last year, he noted, the Fed permitted commercial banks to expand their loans and investments by a gigantic $27 billion.

"The way we have to keep the capital markets from being overburdened is to switch to the other side of the useful two-pronged fork—the fiscal side."

In other words, Mr. Roosa urged a boost in taxes.

He continued. "If you do rely only on the Fed, you will have a continuing (upward) erosion of interest rates that will have a disturbing impact."

APPREHENSION NOTED

"Right now the cause of these high rates is market apprension about the Federal Government's action. It is not any additional restraint applied by the Federal Reserve System."

Mr. Roosa suggested that after a seasonal strain on the money market is over about mid-April, Congress pass a "Vietnam tax surcharge" giving the President power to raise both corporate and individual income taxes by 5 percent to 10 percent (in total revenues, not the tax rate).

"We ought to be thinking right now about the tax change that ought to be made by the middle of the year."

As proposed by Mr. Roosa, Congress would set the amount of the boost but leave the withholding rate and effective date up to the President. The President would exercise this discretion according to the economic situation.

The authority would expire after a year.

"This is a real opportunity to make a meaningful contribution to fiscal flexibility," said Mr. Roosa.

As explained by Dr. Kerekes, the danger of financial disruption lies chiefly in the liquidity position of the Nation's banks. They have some 70 percent of their funds invested in loans today, as compared with 10 percent at the end of World War II. Their supply of easily sold Treasury bills and bonds is correspondingly limited.

More bank money is invested in mortgages. These are also less liquid.

On the supply side, banks are relying heavily on certificates of deposit. These may be less easy to sell as corporations find their own cash positions squeezed.

The result could be financial stress.

"I would rather see more inflation than see these financial dislocations," says Dr. Kerekes. "Price stability is desirable, but we have made a fetish out of it."

TAX BOOST OPPOSED

Dr. Kerekes disapproves of a tax increase. He believes tighter money would disrupt the money market.

And he reckons the benefits of economic boom—its creation of prosperity, its dampening of the civil-rights problem by providing jobs, its capital renewal—compensate for some inflation.

"If we throw too much burden on monetary policy, we could have a modern version of the cross of gold," he said. He referred to a famous slogan by William Jennings Bryan when he fought unsuccessfully for the Presidency against William McKinley, who upheld the gold standard.

Thus, although these economists agree on the danger of financial disruption, they diverge on the best tools to avert such dislocation.

Medicare Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the position of the Republican minority has been one of constructive criticism not blind opposition.

We have made the point again and again that our party is not so much in opposition to some of the administration legislation as much as it is appalled by the carrying out of it.

We have repeatedly stated that it is a terrible waste of the taxpayer's money to pile new program on top of new program before the old ones have been able to get off to a satisfactory start.

A good example of this was the launching of the Job Corps part of the poverty war before the Vocational Education Act had a chance to get underway.

An excellent example of the lack of preparation and planning for a new program is the health insurance portion of the social security amendments. It was a well-known fact after the elections of 1964 that there would be a medicare bill. The provisions of that bill passed last year do not take effect until July 1 of this year.

These has been better than a year and a half to organize to carry out the provisions of the bill and yet the Johnson administration is wholly unprepared to do this.

A good description of the lack of planning and preparation is found in the "Inside Report" column by Roland Evans and Robert Novak, published in the Washington Post of March 3, 1966. I commend this article, which follows, to the attention of my colleagues.

INSIDE REPORT: MEDICARE CRISIS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The medicare program, passed last year amid much self-congratulation by Democratic politicians, is posing the Johnson administration with a full-sized election-year crisis beginning July 1.

That's when the program of medical benefits for the aged begins. This new Federal health care will markedly increase the demand among persons who previously couldn't afford it. But they will come face to face with drastic shortages in every field of medicine.

Even before medicare, big-city hospitals are jammed close to capacity, and the national occupancy rate is close to 90 percent, Naturally, then, there won't be nearly enough beds to handle the demand from 19 million old people who become eligible for hospital care under the pride and joy of the Democratic Party's welfare program.

But that's only the beginning of the crisis. The medicare law provides many different types of medical service for persons 65 or older. Every one of these services—including doctors' services—suffers from serious shortages.

Administration officials carefully explain that the new law does not guarantee hospital, diagnostic; out-patient, nursing-home or home nursing care. It simply guarantees partial payment of the bill by Uncle Sam.

But that explanation may not sit well with people who suddenly become eligible for treatment they could never afford before, and then find the treatment isn't allowable because of lack of space, doctors, nurses or technicians.

Much more likely, they will blame the Federal Government—and that means the Johnson administration. Some politicians, in fact, see this as a major "sleeper" issue in the congressional elections.

Regardless of how they voted on medicare, Republicans can blame the Johnson administration for not being ready to handle the huge influx of aging citizens eligible for the new benefits.

In Oklahoma, for example, a recent conference of medical experts met in Oklahoma City to take an inventory of what will be needed to meet the new demands of medicare.

The Oklahoma survey which is being duplicated in most other States, disclosed a shortage of qualified medical personnel that cannot possibly be met for at least 10 years—no matter how many Federal aid laws are passed.

They also discovered that the 4,000 registered nurses now in Oklahoma must be doubled to meet the minimum standard of 163 for each 100,000 population. They found only 35 qualified home-nursing experts in the whole State to deal with a significant provision of the law offering a discharged hospital patient up to 100 home-service calls a year—a relatively new technique designed to cut down on hospitalization.

Oklahoma is not alone. According to administration estimates, it will take 10 years to develop this home-service call system to an extent necessary to meet demand. But it's supposed to be available to everybody who pays the extra $3-a-month premium for nonhospital care. When they find they can't get the home-service care, they are apt to be boiling mad.

The Labor Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare brought health specialists from all over the country to a meeting in Washington 2 weeks ago. It was a meeting notable for candor and the harshest kind of realism.

Wilbur Cohen, the resourceful Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, put the problem starkly: "Every day we are finding that you can't by directive start a program overnight, because of shortage of health manpower." Cohen conceded that "more and more difficulty will be encountered" in implementing the Great Society because of this shortage.

Admittedly, there may have been little the Johnson administration could do to fill the present need of 500,000 health workers (far greater than the Nation training capacity) before the passage of medicare.

But old people who have to stand in line for weeks or months waiting their turn for what they've been promised are not likely to be mollified by this argument—no more than the angry American voters who couldn't get meat in 1946. The Republicans took over Congress in the election that fall. Even something of smaller dimension ought to worry the Democrats sick.

Brooklyn's Challenge for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Norman Gessley, vice president of the New York Telephone Co. for Long Island before the Rotary Club of Brooklyn on January 26, 1966:

Good afternoon members of the head table and members and guests of the Rotary Club of Brooklyn.

It's a great pleasure to be with you. I say that for several reasons.

For one thing, Rotary International is one of the world's great service organizations and it's a great honor to address such a prestigious group.

For another thing, 101 Willoughby Street has always enjoyed a pleasant and productive partnership with this chapter. Jus Murphy's and Bob Manner's participation in this organization illustrates that relationship.

And there's another reason I'm glad to be here. I'm a fellow who likes surprises, who enjoys the unexpected. And my presence here today, if you look at it the way I do, is pretty unexpected.

If you'd come up to me 10 years ago in St. Louis or even 5 years ago in Seattle and said, "Norm, on January 26, 1966, you will address the Rotary Club in Brooklyn, N.Y., in a hotel a few blocks up the street from your office," I'd have told you you were nuts.

So, I'm surprised to find myself in Brooklyn and I assure you it's the sort of surprise I like. When you think about it, although, a Kansas fellow in Brooklyn is not nearly so hard to accept as such once permanent Flatbush fixtures as Walter O'Malley and Leo Durocher holding forth in Chavez Ravine and Wrigley Field.

I want to talk today about Brooklyn, about some of its problems and potential, and about how New York Telephone is planning to do its part to make this borough a better place in which to live and work. I also want to give you a few of my ideas about what we all need to do to make Brooklyn better.

First of all, let me try to describe Brooklyn the way I used to think it was.

To people in that part of the country where I grew up, where they have a lot of sagebrush but no subways, Brooklyn always seemed a little unreal. You read about it on the sports page and you rooted for the underdog Dodgers against the Yankees in the series.

Later, if you were in the service, Brooklyn became more tangible. Every company or squadron or ship overseas had its Brooklynites aboard. You found it easy to like them. Some became your close friends. They were genuine men. They were men of good will and, when it counted, they were men with guts.

And eventually, for me at least, Brooklyn became a place you'd sometimes catch a glimpse of on your way to an airport after visiting in Manhattan. Sometimes you read in a New York newspaper—or even those at home—that someone had been mugged or murdered or that young toughs had tangled with knives and zip guns somewhere in Brooklyn.

You developed ideas about the place, both good and bad. Yet Brooklyn, for all its legend and lore, might as well have been Bombay, Borneo, or Beirut. It seemed that different and that distant.

The truth of the matter, of course, is that Brooklyn isn't nearly as exotic as Bombay of Borneo or Beirut. It may well be a lot more cosmopolitan, but it's also a lot more familiar. The special Brooklyn flavor is distinct, but her underpinnings, her values, her people, her problems and plans, are essentially the same as in St. Louis or Seattle or any other American city. Brooklyn has always been known, in fact, as "the city of homes" and "the city of churches."

Let me tell you what Mr. Appleton had to say about Brooklyn in his "Dictionary of New York" some 86 years ago.

Quote: "Brooklyn is the third city in the United States in point of population. Unlike New York, it is not cosmopolitan; it has none of the ways and manners of a great city; on the contrary, in most of its aspects, it presents itself to the beholder as a staid, quiet, overgrown village. The fact that it is a great dormitory, where thousands upon thousands of men doing business in New York sleep and keep their families, and that few, if any, great mercantile interests break in upon this quiet, renders this aspect all the more marked. As a place of residence, Brooklyn has many advantages. The greater part of it is considerably elevated above the water, and the streets and avenues are wide and for the most part at right angles with each other, affording a fine circulation of air, Rents are slightly lower than in New York. The air, however, is very strong, and persons with weak lungs or throat disease will do well to avoid Brooklyn, especially the Heights."

Mr. Appleton went on to describe the Heights is a substantial and elegant neighborhood and never did explain why the air seemed so foul. It may have been that he was paying more in Manhattan for a less desirable apartment than he might have had in Brooklyn and this was his way of getting even.

That's how Brooklyn used to be, long before the Dodgers. But how about Brooklyn since the Dodgers? There are those who say that post-Dodger Brooklyn has gone to pot, that when baseball left town, so did the strong spirit and drive that had raised Brooklyn to preeminence.. These critics claim Brooklyn hit its peak somewhere between the 1920's and World War II and has been going to seed ever since. You'll even hear them say that Brooklyn is beyond repair.

I ask you, who are they kidding? Do they want me to believe that the purpose and power have been drained from a community with Brooklyn's heritage and substance? Or that the festering social ills focused in a Bedford-Stuyvesant—and common to every big city in America today—are enough to make the solid citizenry of Brooklyn throw up its hands and quit?

Let's look for a moment at Brooklyn, 1966.

It helps you have faith in Brooklyn if to start with you like people a lot—because Brooklyn has a lot of people. We have 2,630,000 people here, more than 26 of the States. If we were a separate city we'd be the fourth largest in the United States. When you consider we were third largest in 1880, and think of the urban growth that's gone on everywhere since then, I'd say Brooklyn is certainly holding its own.

Brooklyn is endowed with cultural and educational facilities unmatched by any city of comparable size anywhere. It's odd, in a way, with its bounty of museums, libraries and the like, that Brooklyn should have become so well known for baseball. I'm a baseball fan, and I'm glad baseball and not ballet is the national pastime. But the fact is that most of our major cities are only now building the sort of cultural facilities that Brooklynites have been enjoying for decades.

Where else will you find an array of institutions to compare with the Brooklyn Museum and its rare collections of oriental, Egyptian, and primitive art; with the botanic gardens, whose cherry trees in the spring are every bit as bright as those along the Potomac; with the Brooklyn Public Library and our children's museum? What other hometown community has its own symphony orchestra, its own grand opera company, and an academy of music like Brooklyn's, where 300 programs are given in a single year? What other town can match Brooklyn's 12 college campuses and variety of top vocational schools?

It's not surprising that cultural institutions have always been such an integral part of Brooklyn. Our past is liberally puctuated with creative people whose thoughts and energies went into the shaping of this borough. Walt Whitman used to edit the famous "Brookyln Eagle" a few blocks from here, and Henry Ward Beecher preached to three thousand people every Sunday in Plymouth Church. Robert Fulton launched his first steamboat from our waterfront.

What many people don't know is that Brooklyn's present residents are no less illustrious. Truman Capote, the author of the new best seller, "In Cold Blood," lives here, and so does the novelist, Norman Mailer. Eugene Black, former president of the World Bank, lives in Brooklyn, and so does Jules Fifer, the famous cartoonist. Rod Steiger and Claire Bloom, one of the country's top acting teams, live in Brooklyn. So does J. Victor Herd, board chairman of the Continental Insurance Cos., William Zorach, the internationally known sculptor, and a host of leading Wall Street bankers, brokers, and lawyers.

Appleton's Dictionary of 1680 described Brooklyn as a quiet town, untainted by commerce and industry. Thank goodness that's no longer true. It wouldn't do in this day and age. The completion of the Brooklyn Bridge in 1883 started changing things, and the Verrazano Bridge, with the world's largest single span, is evidence that 83 years later change is as constant as ever in Brooklyn. Brooklyn has become a major port catering to 5,000 ships a year, and an important center for the manufacture of machinery, textiles, paper products, and chemicals. There are some 30,000 retail stores in the borough, which gross $3 billion a year. Our savings institutions have accounts totaling $8 billion.

All of these facts and figures add up to a solid, thriving community of creative and productive people. Brooklyn in 1966 is a big and diverse community, both in industrial hub and an inviting hometown. And New York Telephone is proud of its part in the development and progress of both sectors. Let me cite some examples:

Of the 45,000 New York Telephone employees who work in the five boroughs of New York City, 10,000 of them work in Brooklyn. The annual payroll to these 10,000 is $66 million. Taxes on our operations last year in this borough totaled $11,309,000.

On an average business day, some 6½ million calls originate in this community. I think it's also interesting to note that Brooklyn has 1,300,000 telephones—more than the nations of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, or Denmark.

That gives you some idea of our commercial impact. From the hometown point of view 17,000 employees of New York Telephone and other Bell System Companies—such as Western Electric, Bell Labs, and A.T. & T.—live here. So Brooklyn must be doing something right.

More important than what we are doing now is what we intend to do in Brooklyn. Our construction program for this year will amount to $37 million including a $2½ million addition to the central office building on Albemarle Road in Flatbush. This unit will house new switching equipment which will make Brooklyn telephone service better and more versatile in 1966. New York Telephone is not among the cowardly when it comes to betting on Brooklyn's future. Dodgers or no Dodgers, we like it here and we are investing heavily in this community's future.

In this connection, I want to cite two things that have enabled us to contribute to the continuous growth and improvement of Brooklyn.

I mentioned a moment ago that some 17,000 people from several Bell System organizations live here. The combination of companies that comprise the Bell System is a primary reason New York Telephone provides the world's best communications service. Let me give you a case in point.

Last September we were contacted by one of our larger customers who was moving some of his activities from Manhattan to Brooklyn and consolidating them in a single building. He asked what sort of communications equipment we'd advise. That was on September 1.

We made a recommendation and on September 10 the customer ordered a new dial switchboard system which Western Electric manufacturers in Omaha. Normally, we would have needed at least 2 months to do a job of this size. But the customer's target date was Otcober 1—just 20 days away.

New York Telephone worked hand in glove with our counterparts from A.T. & T. and Bell Laboratories. Western's manufacturing people in Omaha rushed the job to completion, engineers flew in from Omaha with the gear, and we picked it up at the airport the minute it landed. At Western's distribution center in Springfield Gardens, technicians worked together around the clock and on weekends.

The job, I'm happy to say, was turned over to the customer on time. We were able to do it because we could call upon compatible resources and skills from all over the system on a moment's notice. This kind of teamwork is multiplied many times every day across the Nation and is often only noticed in time of crisis such as a hurricane or some other large-scale disaster.

A second reason for this community's highly sophisticated telephone service, is that New York Telephone in recent years has been able to earn a profit somewhat closer to the level to which we believe we are entitled, than was the case for a long time. This has put us in a better position to grow and to serve.

Everything I've said so far has been complimentary, and every complimentary Brooklyn receives, Brooklyn earns. But I'd be the first to acknowledge that Brooklyn also has some highly critical problems. We have every problem Manhattan has and perhaps a few of our own to boot.

Let's face it, we have serious tax, labor, and land problems that discourage business and industry from locating or remaining here.

We do have polluted air and waterways and we have mounting problems with our schools. Increasing crime makes many Brooklyn sidewalks and parks unsafe to use.

We have burgeoning human problems which are the root of all our other problems and which create enormous welfare problems.

But, as I said at the outset, we are not alone in our pains. Every big city—from Los Angeles to Miami to Boston—has the same sort of problems. Where we may differ from many large urban communities is in our attitude and approach toward the problems of change.

Brooklyn both benefits and suffers, I suppose, from its proximity to Manhattan. One way we suffer, it seems to me, is through our willingness to ride along on the coattails of city hall, or some Manhattan-oriented organization, instead of shouldering our own responsibilities for making Brooklyn a better place to live and work.

Three months ago, for example, 25 New York City business, educational, and other leaders formed the economic development council. Its main purpose is to work with the city administration to win new business and industry to New York, and to keep what is already here. Their purview is all of New York, not just Manhattan. But let's be realistic. Most of the members of the new council work in Manhattan—not Brooklyn, Staten Island, or Queens. And it is quite natural and probable that Manhattan is going to feel the main impact of their effort, even if they don't design it that way.

The economic development council is a good step and we stand to gain from its activity. But my point is this: If our fences need mending in Brooklyn, no one is going to mend them—not city hall—the statehouse—nor the White House—the way they need to be mended, except those of us who live or work within the fences.

If we are aghast at the slums and addiction in Bedford-Stuyvesant, let us, the business leaders in the community, lead the fight to rehabilitate the area—to teach the people skills, give them jobs when they qualify, help them find their identity and their place as constructive contributors. Our Borough President Abe Stark, works many miracles but he can't do the job alone.

If we really object to the pollution of the air we breathe and the beaches we once enjoyed, let us, the business leaders in the community, get together and remedy the situation.

If we're fed up with the mobsters who seem to enjoy immunity in some sections of our town, let's kick them out. Most cities wouldn't tolerate many of the things Brooklyn seems to take for granted.

Is Brooklyn being strangled by its slums, its air pollution, crime, and the lethargy of its citizens and its leaders? Or are these the symptoms of a more serious illness?

Can we hope to substitute State or Federal aid for the profit motive? We have been pursuing this course with increasing regularity for the past 20 or 30 years and the problems seem to be getting larger and more complex.

Let me suggest we businessmen get back to reality and reexamine some fundamental concepts.

Our economy gets its drive from the profit motive. Many countries in this world—older than ours—are just now learning the value of this stimulus.

When men organize resources for production and profit, then and only then do we truly provide useful jobs for people, provide services and products for the society, and gain the ability to contribute tax money for these things that a representative government can do for the people better than they can do for themselves.

A profitable business generates revenues and government consumes revenues. This is not bad so long as we do not all desert the ranks of producers and become consumers.

Is this what happens to a community which faces a growing population without seeing to it that productive—profitmaking, taxpaying, job creating private enterprise leads the way?

Is this the real illness in Brooklyn? You know Brooklyn better than I—but I'll bet you will agree with me that the answer is yes.

If that be the answer, then our work is cut out for us as business leaders with community interest.

Sure we must continue our efforts with our local government to get our share of national and State funds but more important to me is that we organize and adopt a sense of urgency to correct the imbalance between those who continue tax moneys and the production sector of the community which provides those moneys.

Let me be specific and suggest a few areas in which business leaders should begin work immediately.

1. Study our business climate to ascertain those factors which discourage new business across the Nation from thinking of Brooklyn. For example: Tax structure; labor availability and union attitudes; laws and regulation; a community spirit of progress, "can do,"—not "can't do"; land availability and elbow room for development.

2. What have we done about the navy yard? We tried to keep it open and failed but have we tried as hard to turn it into an attractive industrial development paying taxes rather than consuming taxes?

3. What about our downtown traffic problems? How long does it take to move trucks essential to industry through our narrow streets. Is this a penalty which makes a new plant locate in Dallas instead of Brooklyn?

Now, in addition to correcting those things which discourage business, we must mount an offensive across the Nation as well as across the ocean to sell those assets in Brooklyn that are attractive in the business climate.

Not so long ago I was invited to meet with a group of Seattle businessmen, who had chartered a plane and, together with the Governor of the State of Washington, had set out to sell their State and city to industrial leaders along the east coast from Boston south. Each man had the assignment of personally calling on individual industrialists and acquainting him with all of the advantages his particular industry would have if located in the State of Washington. These individual calls were followed by group lunches at which very attractive color movies of the State were shown and the Governor spoke of what he and the legislature were doing to enhance the climate for enterprise in the State.

Detroit organized three citizens' groups which are making great progress on problems of unemployment, discrimination against Negroes, and the once widening breach between the city and its suburbs.

In New Haven, a group of businessmen, city and church officials, and other leaders organized Community Progress, Inc., which built new, low-income housing and revitalized the city's commercial area.

In St. Louis, a 300-member citizens' committee was instrumental in raising money to build new expressways, clear slums, and construct new parks and health centers.

In Seattle, when they felt they needed an economic shot in the arm, a group of businessmen generated that city's highly successful world's fair, with a $10 million profit.

In Pittsburgh, business leaders joined with the city administration, the local press, educators, and others, and built the famous "golden triangle" on what had been a blighted area.

In Philadelphia the same combination of leaders has wrought wonders out of what a few years ago seemed to be a city in decay.

Many other cities in this country and abroad have pooled their energy and leadership to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. They haven't waited for others to do it for them. It seems to me that Brooklyn, city of homes and churches, is ripe for such initiative.

In his inaugural address, Mayor Lindsay summoned his fellow citizens to enlist in the fight for a better New York, including a better Brooklyn, with these words:

"The New Yorkers of today will decide the destiny of the New Yorkers of tomorrow, by proving their readiness to accept the inconveniences and irritations, the hardships and responsibilities, that must accompany any transition."

I amend that to say that Brooklynites of today are waiting for local business leaders to point the way.

In closing, I'd like to quote from Fred Kappel's recent book "Vitality in a Business Enterprise." He writes and I've substituted here and there to bring his comments into Brooklyn's focus.

What makes a vital business community? Vital people make it. The very sense of the word "vitality" tells us it is wholly an attribute of human beings. It is not to be found in things, in machines, or dollars, or material resources of any kind. Vitality is something people demonstrate through sustained competence; through creative venturesome drive; and through a strong feeling of ethical responsibility, which means an inner need to do what is right and not just what one is required to do.

As I look at it, Brooklyn's need for a stirring up of the human qualities summed up in this word "vitality" seems very clear. Not only the economic welfare of our borough is at stake, but our whole philosophy of how people can build and live a good life.

We in business are doing more than earning profits. We are doing more than furnishing goods and services. We are producing more than material wealth. We are working to help build a political and social system different in important respects from any other the world has ever known. The lives of our heirs will depend in great measure on how successful we are.

The challenge to us is to demonstrate that the initiative of freemen can continue to build strength for the future that will assure the prospect of freedom.

In this setting, business vitality is not merely desirable, it is an obligation. It is not too much to say that beyond meeting the immediate requirements of day-to-day operations this is the first and foremost responsibility we have. Everything else will flow from it.

These, gentlemen, are your tasks and mine, if Brooklyn is to become a better place in which to work and live and enjoy the fulfillments and satisfactions of life.

Thank you.

Basic Issues Face Us and Our Key Allies—Crisis in the Atlantic Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, our colleague Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, gave an excellent keynote address to the Cincinnati Council on World Affairs' 12th Annual Conference on International Affairs.

The topic of the conference was "Basic Issues Face Us and Our Key Allies—Crisis in the Atlantic Community," and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN used this opportunity to remind us how many crucial problems still face us in Europe. He pinpointed the subjects of German reunification and a halt to nuclear proliferation as two of the areas to which we must continue to give our attention.

Our colleague wisely highlighted the constructive achievements of the Atlantic Community during the postwar period, not as a sign that the job is finished, but as evidence of what can be accomplished when wisdom and patience inform our policy. I include the text of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

KEYNOTE SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, BEFORE THE CINCINNATI COUNCIL ON WORLD AFFAIRS' 12TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

A keynote speaker has a tough assignment, especially when, as is the case today, the topic which brings us together is broad and complex. His job is further complicated when his audience consists of so many distinguished scholars and public servants, such as are participating in this conference. My aim will be, therefore, to get the ball rolling, to identify some of the issues so as to encourage fruitful inquiry, to suggest lines of inquiry into other issues, and generally to provide some perspective for the forthcoming discussions.

Many of you have worked for years on Atlantic affairs; many have written and spoken with passion and lucidity on Atlantic problems. On some issues you are united, on others you are divided; there are few on which you are not experts. Under such circumstances it would be presumptuous for me "to lay down the law," or to review familiar issues in great detail. So, too, I hope the informed and concerned citizens who are attending this conference will understand my reluctance to anticipate in a methodical manner the proceedings of this afternoon and evening.

What then should I say? Perhaps the best way to begin is as a Member of Congress—and incidentally a stanch Republican, presently in the minority in the House of Representatives. I shall try to avoid being parochial, but inevitably my views have been shaped by my experience of nearly 14 years in Congress. I do not wish to speak, however, of my experiences on the Foreign Affairs Committee, as a sometime delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, nor even my recent service as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations.

At the outset let me say that I am convinced that most of the Members of this 89th Congress recognize—as did earlier Congresses—the continuing importance of close ties between the United States and the other members of the Atlantic Community. We take pride in the fact that the bulk of our population emigrated more or less recently from Europe, and we cherish that heritage. We may take our neighbor Canada too much for granted but we have long had very close associations. Furthermore, the ties forged in war and strengthened for a period of 20 years since that conflict bind us still, and bind us strongly. Admittedly, the reasons for close ties have changed since the end of World War II, but the need still exists.

So, too, I am sure most Members of Congress feel that the Atlantic Alliance remains a most practical and effective way—although not the only way—of coping with international problems today. Admittedly there are those in Congress who feel that the best way to pursue the interests of the United States is by going it alone, by minimizing our commitments to and reliance on others; they would shun discussions on such subjects as arms control, and economic progress and development in other parts of the world. Then too frequently there is heard criticism that the United States helps its allies but that there is insufficient response by our allies in matters of interest to us. As one Senator put it, any alliance should be "a two-way street." The lack of interest of others in our involvement in Vietnam, and especially the continuing trade of some allies with North Vietnam, is a growing, and in my opinion, a legitimate grievance.

Experience is still the best teacher, however, and in my opinion the realities of the difficult world of today have given the death knell to the old isolationism of the past. The dramatic political and economic developments of the postwar period, coupled with almost unbelievable technical progress, including development of awesome weapons of destruction, have brought a broad awareness of the necessity of closer associations among all nations, and most particularly among nations sharing broad common interests.

It is perhaps inevitable that our increasing commitments in support of Vietnam have raised questions about our continued willingness—indeed our ability—to support the Atlantic alliance as we have in the past. Let me say here that I feel strongly that our efforts in southeast Asia, massive as they are, in no way cause us to minimize the importance of the alliance to our own national security. Today, no less than at any time in the postwar period, a strong Europe—strong militarily, politically, and economically—is of vital importance to the United States. Our problem essentially is how best to promote that strength and to harness it for the common objectives of the Atlantic nations.

Turning to the Atlantic scene, we should, I feel, look more at what has been done, and what is being done, than at what is being said. Observers of the Atlantic alliance should not overlook the very substantial achievements of the past, and the potential for the future, by their heavy and often pessimistic emphasis on the problems we face.

We hear much talk, for example, of the disarray of the Atlantic alliance, its decline, and even its end. To me such pessimistic talk is unjustified by the facts; it is unrealistic as a description of the problems which we face today. To tell you the truth, I am not enamored of the word "crisis," even though it occupies such a crucial spot on the agenda of this conference.

The word "crisis" connotes to me some kind of dire emergency, requiring immediate action. In emergencies one is often obliged to act hastily, without much forethought or planning. If there is a crisis in the alliance—and I do not wish to bicker over words—the problems do not seem of a kind which lend themselves to precipitate action—indeed haste might do harm rather than good. Nor do I feel we should be unduly pessimistic about the situation we face today, even though we may see no early, or even long-range, solutions to some of our common problems.

We must admit, for example, that the drawing together—I hesitate to use the word "integration" lest I offend the French—of the countries of Europe has not been as rapid nor as complete as we had anticipated. Indeed, we find two NATO countries, Greece and Turkey, at serious cross-purposes over the future of Cyprus. Let us admit therefore that considerable unfinished business needs prompt attention. The task of this conference today will be to consider how best to cope with this business. But let us not bemuse ourselves with the difficulties we face.

In our examination of today's problems let us keep firmly in mind the solid achievements of the past, which were made possible because of the firm cooperation between allies. Let us recognize also that it is the very success of our past cooperation which has made possible this period of transition which so disturbs the pessimists.

Let us avoid the tendency to exaggerate the differences between us. Let us beware lest emotionalism and polemics gain the upper hand in the Atlantic dialog. Let us guard against encouraging confusion and misunderstanding as we seek solutions to current problems. Also, let us not forget the immense amount of practical activity and cooperation which occurs daily between us. These exchanges at all levels have vastly increased over the years, especially since World War II, and reflect the many realities among the Atlantic nations—financial, cultural, economic, political, social, scientific, and military.

Perhaps the reason why we must be basically confident and optimistic about the future of the Atlantic nations is because of the problems with which we have already wrestled, and which in some cases we have surmounted. We need only recall the blockade of Berlin and the airlift, the Khrushchev ultimatums and the disagreements over how they were to be met. We are hardly likely to forget the Korean war, or the ill-fated invasion of Egypt by Great Britain and France. We remember the abortive European Defense Community, and sputnik, and the confrontation with the U.S.S.R. over the missiles in Cuba in the fall of 1962.

In a sense all these events, and others too, were crises of varying degrees of acuteness. In each case some or all members of the alliance believed their vital interests were threatened. In no case, however, was there a crisis within the alliance in the sense that it was in danger of being split irretrievably.

So now, looking at the current state of affairs, I am not pessimistic though it be foolish to minimize the problems we face. Our course is not clear, and there are admittedly differences among us. However, the fact that such differences exist should not disturb us unduly. If we look to the past we are reminded that on several occasions there were sharp disagreements on how to meet external threats, even when those threats seemed most ominous. As those external threats appear to have diminished, the opportunities for internal problems of dissension have increased. Thus the problems of today in many instances differ from those which we faced a decade ago. But let us not forget that the reasons for our concerns which resulted in the growth of the Atlantic institutions and organizations are still present. We still have need of this community of preparation and action even though its form may be changed as its goals and objectives are modified.

Let me touch on just a few of the problems we face today. Together they may justify the word "crisis." However, if we are armed with a sense of proportion founded on past experience, and if we maintain a common desire to solve them, we can be confident that further progress will be made.

I mentioned earlier the problem of Berlin. Certainly the status of that city, and also the lack of progress toward the reunification of Germany, should give us all concern. Ever since the achievement of German unity more than a century ago, Germany has held the key to the shape of Europe. And no one can forget the two ghastly wars which Germany precipitated. Nonetheless, in my opinion, a divided Germany today is as serious a problem as was a united Germany after World War I. The present division of Germany introduces a fundamental instability into European relationships, and thus into the Atlantic Alliance, that no prudent man can ignore.

The United States, and Europeans also, have reason for pride in the handling of the German problem since World War II. Recognizing the shortsightedness of the vindictive policies toward the Weimar Republic after World War I, we have consistently faced up to the problem for two difficult decades. It is enough to look at the shambles which followed the pre-World War II diplomacy to see how far we have come. It is enough also to recall the moral strength and political courage that led France in 1950, despite the bitter experience of the past, to take the lead in creating the framework for treating West Germany as a moral and political equal.

West Germany and its allies deserve equal credit for creating a new Germany from the wreckage of the Nazi nightmare. The wisdom of our support for the Bonn government has been evidenced by the quality and character of German postwar leadership. The Bonn government has pursued prudent policies designed to encourage democratic government. In its foreign policy it seeks to achieve reunification by responsible relationships both with the Soviets to the east and with the free world. It has, furthermore, made a historic break with the past by seeking its political and economic future in a united Europe, and by tying its defense into close relationships with NATO. This course has made far more likely a bright future both for Europe and the Atlantic Alliance.

These are developments which the United States and its allies have encouraged and supported. These are accomplishments which add measurably to our common ability to build a postwar world assuring economic well-being, national security and political democracy.

Yet these genuine accomplishments cannot conceal the festering problem of German reunification. Germany is still brutally divided, and Berlin is beseiged by a hostile East German regime. The division is primarily because of the attitudes and actions of the Soviet Union, and the sad fact is that the reunification of a democratic and independent Germany may have to wait for many agonizing years. Reunification must remain, nonetheless, a firm goal of the Atlantic Alliance.

Mention of Germany inevitably raises the thorny question of nuclear proliferation. Despite the danger of assuming that complex questions can be easily solved, no current problem seems to arouse such a search for simplistic solutions as that of control over nuclear weapons. Rather than attempting to suggest any general solution, I shall merely touch on certain aspects of the problem—a problem, I might add, which needs a pragmatic approach.

The problem of nuclear proliferation is not primarily a dispute between the United States and the Soviet Union. There is little reason to suppose that the Soviet Union, any morethan we, desires to create any new nuclear powers. At the same time there is no reason to believe that any United States-U.S.S.R. nonproliferation agreement would deter Communist China in its efforts to establish itself as a nuclear power. And a nonproliferation agreement between the two great nuclear powers, or even among all five existing nuclear powers, would have little impact on the real problem—the desire of nonnuclear countries to gain either security or prestige by building their own nuclear arsenal.

Each existing nuclear power was a major political power in the world even before it achieved nuclear capacity. But the countries now reported to be on the verge of building nuclear weapons—Sweden, Japan, Israel, India, United Arab Republic—are "second" or "middle" or "developing" powers. If one of them were to achieve nuclear capacity, the race for equal prestige among their colleagues would be on.

Many insist that a pragmatic approach to the nuclear problem must begin with recognition that additional nuclear weapons in the hands of new nuclear powers would be virtually meaningless—that they can provide no real defense because their use is not credible. I would suggest the opposite—that a pragmatic approach to the problem calls for recognition of the fact that the French nuclear force, the British nuclear force, the Chinese nuclear force, and all potential nuclear forces are very meaningful indeed to the governments involved.

Who would suggest that the French nuclear force has not added to French prestige or that the French nuclear force is meaningless? Certainly France's nuclear capacity must be of interest to Soviet military planners.

The eventual solution of the nuclear proliferation problem undoubtedly must involve a greater willingness between nuclear powers to submit to international inspection. It is unlikely that the nonnuclear powers would sign a nonproliferation agreement that requires international inspection of their peaceful nuclear facilities unless the nuclear powers, including the U.S.S.R., also submitted to meaningful inspection. In addition, as Ambassador Goldberg proposed to the United Nations last fall, there is a need to freeze and reduce nuclear capabilities.

We shall have to find constructive solutions to the genuine security problems of the nonnuclear powers. Without firm assurances we can only expect the drive toward nuclear weapons to continue, elusive as the security which those weapons provide may be. If the complexity of the problem seems staggering, so too are the implications if serious steps are not taken. This will require the highest degree of statesmanship. And before we complain of the performance of others in the alliance, before we regret the smallness of their sacrifice, we must first ask ourselves whether our own commitment to halting the spread of nuclear weapons has been sufficient.

In any discussion of the Atlantic Community today, the name of General de Gaulle inevitably comes up, frequently in a critical way. Although few will argue over the value of De Gaulle's leadership to France, or the vigor with which he has articulated his views, his policies are often controversial.

De Gaulle, for example, vetoed Great Britain's entry into the Common Market in 1963; he has insisted that France develop its own small nuclear force, the force de frappe; he has withdrawn from NATO the French fleet and major French land forces; he has increased trade with Cuba; and he advocates neutralization of Vietnam.

This hasty cataloging indicates why De Gaulle has complicated the search for a common purpose and policy among the Atlantic nations. The alliance today is an alliance of sovereign states, and will probably remain so for the foreseeable future, but there is real danger that the alliance itself will be disrupted if one member country continues to insist on pursuing policies which are independent of its allies, or even contrary to their wishes. Even though it is a major power, the United States has learned that no nation can any longer afford to go it alone. For that reason, therefore, the search for greater unity—with or without France, but hopefully with her eventual full cooperation—must continue.

Let us look at another area where the Atlantic allies have been pursuing quite different policies and where greater coordination appears indicated—trade with the East. We all know, of course, of the ban on certain strategic items agreed upon following World War II; over the years that list has been considerably shortened. We know too of the "gentleman's agreement" reached among Western nations in 1934 to limit credit guarantees for normal business transactions to no more than 5 years.

In recent years Western Europe has been much more aggressive in resuming trade with the East than has the United States. In addition, the countries of Western Europe, led by France and Germany, now frequently extend credit to Communist countries for periods of up to 15 years. Since 1948 U.S. trade to the East has doubled, whereas the Western European countries have expanded exports fourfold. It is worthy of note also that U.S. exports to the East are still unimportant compared to our worldwide trade, whereas for countries like Turkey and the Netherlands this trade is much more significant.

If closer coordination of policy could be achieved it almost surely would result in a considerable liberalization of U.S. policy. A special study mission of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I was a member, recommended to Congress a year ago that this whole question be reviewed and that expansion of nonstrategic trade be encouraged. President Johnson has only recently made recommendations to the same effect. Even with the President's support, however, the going will be tough. There are many in Congress who are strongly opposed to any significant increase in trade with the Communist world, or in any easing of our credit policy.

There is, of course, considerable urgency about some of these problems. Because of France's boycott of the Common Market, ended just a few weeks ago, there has not yet been a meeting of the minds by those six member countries. Without that preliminary agreement the so-called Kennedy round can make little progress. It is obviously *impossible for the United States to* utilize the powers granted under the Trade Agreements Act of 1962 until Europe puts its house in better order. And we need not remind ourselves that powers granted under that act will lapse in June of next year.

So, too, we need to give immediate attention to the broad problem of monetary reform. There is, I am glad to say, growing *recognition that something must be done in this* area. The sooner we wrestle directly with the various specific suggestions which have been made, the sooner a solution is likely to be found.

One additional problem which has not been *mentioned is the necessity for exploring* the interrelationship of the Atlantic nations with respect to science and technology. In this connection, we might explore the possibility of joint scientific and space ventures, as suggested by the President at the time of Chancellor Erhard's visit to this country last December.

In the face of this growing list of pending business one can sense a certain restlessness on both sides of the Atlantic, and indeed in Congress, too. There is uneasiness about what change bodes for the future, and a reluctance to contemplate the unfamiliar. Then, too, there is the fear that fear is all that has held us together. There is feeling that without the threat of an imminent invasion, or the danger of flagrant subversion in Europe, centrifugal forces may take hold.

This current hesitation is in sharp contrast to the high hopes of 1962. That was the year, you will recall, when we appeared on the threshold of a new era of economic expansion. In the United States we passed the Trade Expansion Act, Great Britain appeared about to enter the Common Market, and the trend toward greater unity appeared both imminent and inevitable.

That was the year, too, when we heard much talk about a "grand design," Atlantic Federation, and so on. It was in 1962 that Secretary of Defense McNamara gave a lesson in strategy to our European allies, in a speech in which he deplored independent nuclear efforts in Europe as redundant, divisive, and dangerous. Speaking more tactfully, President Kennedy on July 4, 1962, stressed the interdependence of nations, and outlined his idea of a future equal partnership between Europe and the United States.

In the years since 1962 those high hopes for one reason or another were shattered. Divisions among allies increased, and in many areas Europeans assumed a tougher stance with respect to the leadership of the United States. Understandably these developments produced confusion in this country. We were disappointed and disillusioned, we were frustrated and even angry—and in our disappointment we overreacted. If anything, we became more dogmatic about our ideas. We attached our hopes to new chariots and sped off.

Take, for example, the multilateral force. This idea was first put forward as a limited but negotiable step in the sharing of major responsibility with our allies. Gradually, however, the MLF proposal became almost a panacea for all sorts of problems. The MLF would promote military and political unity in Europe; it would help sell our strategic doctrine to the Europeans; it would enable Great Britain and France to rid themselves gracefully of their burdensome nuclear forces. In our enthusiasm we pushed the project with increasing energy, apparently oblivious to an evident lack of enthusiasm in most of Europe.

Recent experiences will teach us, I hope, *to avoid going through another such cycle* of high expectations, impatient activity, sharp disappointment, and overreaction. Such an approach will do little to solve the vital unfinished business of Europe. Indeed, as the preponderant power in the alliance, the United States should exercise special *care* in *preventing* the development of unnecessary frictions and potential crisis situations.

In your work here today I would ask that you keep the broad objectives of the community uppermost in mind: that we are all part of one community dependent each upon the other for our freedom and prosperity. Centuries ago the psalmist sang this song: "Behold, how good and how *pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together* in unity." The bold vistas of a truly united community of nations are indeed pleasant to contemplate. To achieve our goals, however, demands more than contemplation.

We should take care *not* to *downgrade* what we have already accomplished. Our alliance was necessary and it has been productive; it has brought us safely through a dark period. What we need now is to ask, are we ready to undertake new tasks to achieve new objectives? Are not the values, the ideals, and the culture of the West worth this further effort?

The answer to this can only be affirmative.

Let us Americans take the lead again now as we did in 1949. Let us not be timid, even when we argue over which is the wisest course of action. This time let us lead our friends with patience and understanding, in a spirit of cooperation among sovereign and equal nations. In our common search for greater unity let us recognize and understand the desires of each of the Atlantic nations to participate in decisions which affect them—and to participate in the decisionmaking process before final commitments and actions are taken.

As our Secretary of State has said:

"So let us proceed with quiet determination, avoiding both the drag of inertia and outmoded concepts, and the seduction of sloganeering and apparent shortcuts, seizing the opportunities for more cohesive action with vigorous and open minds. In so doing we will demonstrate anew the vitality of the North Atlahtic Alliance in meeting the needs of our time."

"Paradise of the Pacific" Has Great Potential

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the city of Honolulu has recently been the center of national and international attention, and the Joint Declaration of Honolulu announced by President Johnson and Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam will no doubt go down in world history as one of the great documents of this era.

Because of the growing importance of the Asian nations as they relate to our international relations, and because of the strategic geographic location of Hawaii's capital city, it will continue to serve as the situs for many more important events to come.

Businessmen, too, have recognized the great potential of Honolulu and have converged upon a *booming economy. As* a consequence, Honolulu attained a rank among the 11 leading cities of the United States in the value of building permits issued from January through November last year. Dunn & Bradstreet lists the *building volume for the city and county* of Honolulu for the 11-month period involved as $191.6 million, a huge 44-percent *increase over the same period in* 1964.

Honolulu, which ranks as the Nation's 43d largest city, overtook San Francisco—12th largest—last October. San *Francisco's volume for the same period* was $181.6 million.

This all experts agree is truly a phenomenal record for a city located in the youngest State of the Union. I bring *this matter to the attention of Congress* in the *hope that the important* role which

Honolulu is destined to play in our national and international life will be more fully appreciated by its Members, and through them the people of America. Now is the time to look to the "Paradise of the Pacific" for pleasure, for business, or international culture, technical, and *political exchange.*

Free Import of Ship Model

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my very dear and gifted friend and my former neighbor, Rev. Cyril Mark Wismar, now pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio, and former pastor of the Trinity Lutheran Church of my hometown of Clinton, Mass., I am filing today a companion bill to one introduced by my able, distinguished colleague, and friend, the gentleman from Ohio Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL. This bill is designed to permit the importation into the United States duty free of a certain ship model which Pastor Wismar is very anxious to use in his beautiful church.

I believe that the bill is a very meritorious one and I am very happy to urge its adoption by the House Committee on Ways and Means and the House. As Reverend Wismar points out, ships and ships models have long been associated with the churches of Northern Europe, and I am persuaded that our Government and this Congress should be willing to assist in the free importation of this particular model which has been procured through the personal generosity of Reverend Wismar.

The New York Times of Sunday, December 5, 1965, treated of this matter and under unanimous consent I insert this news account be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

IMPORTED ITEMS: DEFINITIONS VARY—CUSTOMS BUREAU AND PUBLIC SEE THINGS DIFFERENTLY

CLEVELAND, December 4.—The unending tug of war between persons who import things and the Bureau of Customs men who assess the duty centered on a new sort of dispute this week.

The latest question is: Can you call a model ship a religious article?

It follows such questions of equal complexity as:

Must miniature soldiers, tanks, and ships be classified as toys, or may they be admitted as hobby material?

May a complex little model train chug under the tariff wall as a therapeutic device?

Is a plastic jack-o'-lantern necessarily a toy when it is designed to be worn as a hat?

The case of the model ship arose when the Reverend Cyril M. Wismar, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Convenant in Maple Heights, went to Pier 26 to pick up a model ship built by Arne Peterson of Store Hedding, Denmark.

DOUBLE ASSURANCE

The model is of the frigate *Olber*, which brought a group of German immigrants from Hamburg in 1839 seeking religious freedom in America. The immigrants eventually founded the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church.

Mr. Wismar assured Customs that the model, which he planned to hang in his church, was a religious object and hence duty free.

The Customs officials assured Mr. Wismar that the model was a model, subject to duty totaling $210 on its value of $600.

Mr. Wismar is considering an appeal to the customs court.

"It isn't that we don't like to buy American," he said. "I tried 3 years ago to get a model built in Massachusetts. But it involved so much research they couldn't do it."

DIFFERENCE OF OPINION

Pending in the U.S. Customs Court at Philadelphia is a case in which a business catering to hobbies says that 16 million imported plastic soldiers, tanks, and ships, built to scale, are hobbyists' and collectors' items. The Government says they're toys.

The import duty on toys is 35 percent. The duty on hobby items ranges from 10 to 19 percent.

In another pending case, a miniature train was called a therapeutic device because it was intended to calm the nerves of the consignee, an adult.

The case of the plastic jack-o'-lantern has been settled. Customs finally ruled that it was neither a hat nor a toy but a "plastic article."

Firmness in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, our mail on Vietnam varys from expressions of concern and doubt whether the war is worth winning to the complete support and approval of the vigorous prosecution of our military efforts. The American public has just witnessed by the media of television the hearings on Vietnam held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The witnesses presented arguments both for and against our military action.

We received recently from the Tirey J. Ford Post No. 21 of the American Legion, Independence, Mo., as the adjutant put it, "a short but concise resolution which expresses the feelings of many of us in your home district." This resolution was prepared by the post judge advocate, John J. Phillips, and attested to by the post adjutant, Ben Turoff, Jr.

This is the home post of former President Harry S Truman, and it is a high privilege and a great honor to claim membership in the American Legion in this same great post.

The American Legion, true to its long tradition, has quite straightforwardly set out in the resolution that it is always ready and willing to be counted in times of national crisis. The resolution follows:

Whereas our country is presently engaged in a vicious and brutal armed conflict with the forces of Communist enslavement, and

Whereas our President has called for the support of our policy in Vietnam by all patriotic citizens devoted to liberty and opposed to world communism, and

Whereas there are those in this country who would exercise their right to free speech for the purpose of condemning and belittling the brave efforts of those young men of our Nation who are daily suffering and dying in Vietnam, and

Whereas the American Legion has ever been ready and willing to stand up and be counted in times of national crisis: Now, *therefore, be it*

Resolved, That we, the members of the Tirey J. Ford, Post 21, American Legion, Department of Missouri, do hereby express our approval and support of the policy of our President in the vigorous prosecution of the conflict in Vietnam: Be it further

Resolved, That the membership of said Tirey J. Ford Post is on record as remembering with reverence our fighting men in Vietnam who have fallen, honoring and supporting those who are fighting now and pledging our continued support and encouragement to all who may yet be called there in the defense of liberty.

The Apathetic Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News has written a powerful editorial which I believe more than adequately answers the question raised here on this floor by critics of the poverty program regarding involvement of the poor in the planning and operation of such programs.

I would like to call this very important editorial to the attention of my colleagues because it describes so succinctly how hollow are the arguments of those who criticize the program.

I have always held, here on this floor, that the maximum feasible participation of the poor in the planning of these programs is not only desirable, but absolutely necessary for their success.

However, I do not agree with those of our colleagues who insist that these antipoverty programs must be entirely managed by the poor.

I agree even less with those who insist that representatives for the administration of the antipoverty program in local communities should be designated by local elections limited to participation only by the poor.

It is my understanding that in the Los Angeles election described in the Daily News editorial, Americans who wanted to participate had first to show either their relief check or their income tax return. If they had neither, they had to sign a sworn statement that their income did not exceed the limitations.

I can think of nothing more repugnant to the American tradition of democracy than to have a citizen show his proof of income before being allowed to participate in an election. Yet this is the very formula that the minority party spokesmen and critics of the poverty program here in this House of Representatives are proposing for the poor people of America.

Mr. Speaker, the Daily News editorial *follows:*

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 7, 1966]

THE APATHETIC POOR

Four hundred thousand poor people in Los Angeles were eligible to vote for representatives on the policy board that will direct the city's vast antipoverty program. In the wake *of the bloody Watts riots it was expected that interest among the poor would run high.*

Actually, it turned out that only 1 percent—one person in a hundred—cared enough to vote.

The case is not isolated. Similar tests in other cities have disclosed monumental apathy among the indigent toward participating in their own economic betterment.

The fact throws interesting light on all the political breast beating that has gone on over giving the poor a voice in the antipoverty program. For the most part, the poor couldn't care less.

There are, of course, many other symptoms of the same ailment. One is the high dropout rate among youths who could stay in school if they wished. Another is the filth that invariably piles up inside and outside the dwellings of the hard-core poor. In each instance the apathy works to the obvious detriment of the apathetic. But the dropouts still drop out, and the filth keeps piling up all the same.

None of this is cause for cynicism as to the redeemability of the disadvantaged. They must be rehabilitated, unless society is willing to go on bearing steadily more crushing financial burdens for their care.

But it does raise sharp questions as to how much of the poverty program is on target, and how much of it is simply slush money calculated to win votes.

The fundamental job is to teach the poor to care enough to help themselves. Part of it can be done through intelligent educational programs like Operation Headstart, where society begins very early to offset the deadening effects of environment, and with adult instruction carried out in the communities.

Part of it can be done through job training programs—and gratifying progress is being made not only in the area of public works, but among private employers vigorously and systematically opening up training and employment opportunities.

But the antipoverty program's success depends first of all upon the skill and wisdom and imagination and integrity with which it is carried out. And that calls, we should think, for policy boards manned by persons whose experience and talents equip them to exercise the judgments involved in the selection of projects and the allocation of vast amounts of tax funds. Every community has its dedicated groups and leaders in the welfare field, and these should, of course, be represented. But it would be dangerous, we think, to leave vital judgments up to those who manifestly do not know why they should care.

The GEB Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an article which appeared in the March 1 edition of the Advance, a publication of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, which has its national office in my congressional district at 15 Union Square, *New York City. The statement of the Amalgamated's General* Executive Board relates to the situation in Vietnam. The article speaks for itself. I hope all of my colleagues in the House will take the time to read it:

THE GEB STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

The principal issue *facing the United States today is the war in Vietnam. For many* Americans, at war far from home, it has become a matter of life or death. The burden of expense it imposes on the Nation as a whole is enormous; already it has cost us more than the entire Marshall plan. Furthermore, the course of the war affects all our other foreign policy problems, and may interfere with our ability to solve pressing domestic problems as well.

The immediate prospects in the war are unknown. Increasing our involvement has not brought us closer to a solution. We have reached an impasse to which there is no end in sight.

An issue of such critical and overwhelming importance to each and every one of us calls for objective and thorough consideration by all elements of society. In the U.S. Senate, which has a constitutional obligation to oversee foreign policy, the current hearings conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee under the chairmanship of Senator FULBRIGHT, are making an indispensable contribution to our understanding of the issues.

The report issued by the group of Senators led by Senator MANSFIELD also dramatized the risks and complexities facing us. We know that there is need for more, not less debate. Those who support present policy and those who oppose it, should feel free to express their points of view without fear of retribution. No military threat exists that is so catastrophic as to warrant abusing our basic right to discuss and even to disagree. As a matter of fact, some of the problems now facing us might have been alleviated had there been greater dissemination of information and more candid discussion of the facts earlier in the war.

The information we are now getting through the Mansfield report and the Fulbright hearings and the interpretations submitted by such authorities as General Gavin and former Ambassador Kennan are significant building blocks in the formation of an enlightened public opinion.

In our democratic society, an enlightened public opinion is a vital ingredient in the making of public policy, particularly when the consequences are so grave. Occasionally, no doubt, the complexities and risks involved as public opinion develops may displease those in authority.

For certain leaders, particulary those who are responsible for military decisions, the temptation probably exists to cut through the processes of democracy and make policy arbitrarily and unilaterally. It is a dangerous temptation which must be resisted at all costs. Decisions based exclusively on military considerations have been fallible too often in our past and could be fallible now. Sound policy must be based on the broadest considerations, involving all aspects of public policy—and it must be made only following ample opportunity for democratic discussion by all interested parties in our society. This has been the keystone of our growth and strength in the past and must continue to be in the future.

Our original purpose in Vietnam—to give advice to a friendly nation seeking to build its own security—appeared to be in the tradition of our post-war programs. But our involvement grew, and today we find ourselves heavily involved militarily on behalf of a government not enjoying full popular support, in an area where the possibility of military victory is remote, and with little support by even our most committed allies.

There is no comparison in Vietnam with our post-war position in Europe, where we joined with other nations in containing *Communist advances by bolstering the economic and political stability of non-Communist* democracies. There is no comparison in Vietnam with our efforts in other areas, where the free world, under the banner of the U.N., has set limited goals on which to make a stand.

In Vietnam, the political and military factors *have eroded our original hopes for swift victory. Although the options before us are* limited, certainly the one we would oppose the most vigorously is further escalation of our military effort. Escalation has failed to prove its usefulness. On the contrary, almost every step forward taken by the United States has been more than matched by the opposition. Further escalation could eventually be met by the massed armies of China, an eventuality which could endanger the survival of mankind. Whether we hope for military victory for our troops, political security for Vietnam or diplomatic support in the world community, none of these goals would be served by further escalation.

Our recent efforts to find a solution to the impasse of war through negotiation deserve our support. We urge the administration to continue and expand its efforts to achieve a negotiated peace, using the U.N. or the good offices of third parties or any other method available to end the fighting and settle the problems around the conference table.

The Amalgamated, and the labor movement generally, has a major stake in Vietnam. Our goals are sharply affected by the political and economic state of the Nation, and it is the sons of workers who are being drafted first for military duty.

We consider it a civic duty to participate in the national debate and to express ourselves responsibly on this problem. No single group may have a monopoly of wisdom on Vietnam, but no responsible group should be ignored or silenced as the Nation gropes for a solution to this somber issue.

Minimum Wage for Farmers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, since the start of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, our mail has been quite substantial from industries asking they be included or excluded from the extension of coverage of the proposed minimum wage law.

It is impossible, it seems, to make all groups happy and satisfied. For some, it is a problem of inclusion or exclusion. For others, it is a matter of the level of the minimum wage and when that level will be established. For others, the problem is one of overtime.

In the field of agriculture, we have received mail from farm organizations that express the hope there will be no minimum set. I feel sure the matter will be fully debated and an opportunity for complete expression of viewpoint of every Member of the Congress.

A somewhat different viewpoint was received recently which pointed out the merit of broadening the wage and hour laws of farmers as a means for farmers to retain scarce farm labor, or in other words, to keep the remaining farmers on the farms. Without subscribing to the support of this position until there is a determination in the Education and Labor Committee of all the groups that may be included or excluded and what levels may be established for the years ahead, I thought the letter recently received might be of interest and perhaps some guidance to the committee and of interest to Members who may not have received this kind of letter.

The letter we received was on the stationery of the National Egg Producers Organization and was signed by Forest Nave, Jr., chairman, of Lexington, Mo., in our congressional district. The letter follows:

Representative WILLIAM J. RANDALL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Outside of the Vietnam issue, the broadening of the coverage of the wage and hour law is the most important legislation facing this Congress.

We are hearing a lot about eliminating poverty in rural areas and redevelopment of rural America. Frankly, there is very little wrong with rural America that a decent income level wouldn't cure.

Our country towns have been bled white by loss of millions of their people who have flocked to the big cities in search of greener pastures. This exodus has added to such urban problems as housing, traffic, air pollution, etc., and much of it could have been prevented if we had been realistic and included all workers, including farmworkers, under the minimum wage and hour law at the very start.

We have known for a long time that the population explosion and world food supply are on collision course and the experts are now predicting famine in the next decade.

Too many millions of farmers in the last 50 years have gone off to the cities and we now have a predominantly overage farm population; dwindling livestock numbers and runaway meat prices are proof of this. Only recently we have discovered that milk production is declining.

We strongly urge inclusion of all farmworkers in the wage and hour law, and at the same minimum wage as other workers, so that farmers can compete on even terms for scarce labor to produce more meat and milk for Americans and more grain and soybeans for a hungry world.

Let's keep the remaining farmers on the farms producing food instead of going to the cities to produce more smog, slums, and traffic jams. Immediate inclusion of all farmworkers is a must. I remain.

Sincerely yours,

FOREST NAVE, Jr.

Congressman Horton's Tribute to the Late Honorable Albert Thomas, of Texas

SPEECH
OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the final departure of ALBERT THOMAS, of the Texas Eighth District, is a serious loss, not only to those of us who knew, admired, and respected him for his talents as a Congressman, but also to the many thousands who valued his political accomplishments, even from afar.

Throughout his lifetime ALBERT THOMAS was a citizen of Texas, and he burned with a desire to serve the needs of the people and strengthen the traditions of his State. And—in keeping with this desire—he had the capacity to comprehend the needs of the times and to serve his constituents with unflagging energy and unswerving devotion.

ALBERT THOMAS was born in 1898 in Nacogdoches, Tex., where he attended the public schools before entering Rice Institute. Obtaining a commission in the Army, he left college to serve in World War I. Following the armistice he returned to college, graduating from Texas Law School in 1926.

As a young lawyer he was sufficiently impressive to win election as district attorney, which office he held for two terms. In 1930 he was appointed assistant U.S. attorney for the southern district of Texas, and in 1936 he was elected to Congress.

In Washington ALBERT THOMAS found that lawmaking was as much to his liking as law enforcement. In short time he revealed his knowledge and abilities in several phases of the law, serving on committees as different in nature as Appropriations, Un-American Activities, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He was for a time chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, and was for many years chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. He also served as chairman of a special appropriations subcommittee with jurisdiction over supplemental appropriations.

President Johnson, who knew ALBERT THOMAS for many years, has praised him for his unfaltering "devotion to the people the served," and surely there was never praise more well deserved than this. For undoubtedly, as the President observed, ALBERT THOMAS "worked hard" and "served well," far beyond the mere call of duty.

Yes, we who admired the political ability of this remarkable Congressman will miss him dearly in the days ahead. And those of us—myself included—who knew and loved him as a person, will be doubly mournful. It was indeed an honor to know and to work with ALBERT THOMAS, and to have experienced the satisfaction of dealing with an outstanding public servant wholly dedicated to the interests of his flag, his country, his district, and his fellowman.

A Resolution by the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in presenting to my colleagues a resolution which was adopted on February 13, 1966, at Webster Hall in New York City by the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York, other interested Lithuanian-born, American citizens and permanent residents.

As we read this resolution, I know we all share the hope of the people of Lithuania that their motherland will one day again be free.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY ON FEBRUARY 13, 1966

We Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, citizens and permanent residents of the United States, gathered on February 13, 1966, at Webster Hall, New York City, to commemorate the 48th anniversary of the restoration of the Independent State of Lithuania,

Protesting vigorously against the forcible incorporation and continued occupation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia;

Reaffirming the unswerving determination of the Lithuanian people to regain independence and freedom;

Expressing our gratitude to the Government of the United States for its steadfast policy of nonrecognition of the situation created in Lithuania by Soviet aggression;

Thanking the U.S. House of Representatives for Resolution No. 416 of May 19, 1965, climaxing the hearings on conditions in the Baltic States;

Recalling the United Nations Declaration of December 14, 1960, which proclaims that "all peoples have the right of self-determinaion; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development";

Resolve, (1) to appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to promote the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania;

(2) to demand that Soviet Russia withdraw its military police, and administrative personnel from Lithuania;

(3) to request that the United Nations Committee of 24, dealing with the liquidation of colonialism "in all its forms and implications," immediately fulfill its overdue duty and take up the case of Soviet colonialism in Lithuania;

(4) to ask that the Free Europe Radio extend its broadcasts to Lithuania;

(5) to urge the American Lithuanians to support the policy of the U.S. Government opposing Communist expansion everywhere and aiming at the restoration of the right of self-determination to the captive peoples.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK,
STEPHEN BREDES, Jr., *President.*
MARIJA ZUKAUSKAS, *Secretary.*

Free World Owes United States Immense Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the position of the United States as a bulwark against the spread of communism has been ridiculed, maligned, slandered, and downgraded. Some of the "doves" in our midst see no threat of Communist expansion. Some of our "hawks" say none of our efforts are appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I include an editorial which first appeared in the Sydney, Australia, Telegraph and which was reprinted in the Salt Lake Tribune on March 5, 1966.

The editorial upholds our commitment to contain communism stating that without it "the free world today would fall like a ripe plum into the hands of communism." It recognizes, as some of our "doves" do not, the ever-present threat of communism. And to our "hawk" friends it shows that our efforts are probably appreciated more than we think.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the pride of the writer "that Australia is one of the countries that have never asked America for financial aid." Our friends down under are a proud and resourceful people—a people who are ready and willing to roll up their sleeves rather than hold out their hands.

The editorial follows:

[From the Sidney, Australia, Telegraph]

AN AUSTRALIAN VIEWPOINT: FREE WORLD OWES UNITED STATES IMMENSE DEBT

The grim struggle for freedom in South Vietnam was underlined for the American public last week.

A casualty list of hundreds killed and wounded in the bitter fighting against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese was released in Washington.

It drew the attention of the world as well as the American public to the huge U.S. buildup in Vietnam.

America so far has committed more than 200,000 men to the struggle against Communist aggression.

Do we in Australia fully realize what we owe to the United States?

It is fashionable in many quarters to deride America, to exaggerate the occasional diplomatic gaffe, and to scoff at errors of judgment

But without the vast strength of America the free world today would fall like a ripe plum into the hands of communism.

America today is the policeman of the world.

How many people realize that she has under arms outside the United States more than 1 million servicemen?

And that her police duties involve these farflung responsibilities:

West Germany, 250,000; France, 50,000; United Kingdom, 35,000; Mediterranean, 35,000; Spain, 10,000; Italy, 10,000; West Berlin, 6,500; Azores, 1,900; Libya, 3,000; Turkey, 8,000; Thailand, 4,000; Philippines, 10,000; Pacific Fleet 55,000; Okinawa, 50,000; Japan, 40,000; South Korea, 40,000; Greenland, 6,000; Iceland 4,000; Caribbean, 20,000.

But men of war are only one side of the story. America's Peace Corps, serving in 46 countries, now has 15,000 volunteers, dedicated to the assistance and guidance of countries in need.

Foreign aid—and let it be said with pride that Australia is one of the countries that have never asked America for financial aid—cost America $3.2 billion last year.

The quest into space and nuclear research are costing the United States billions of dollars.

But that outlay means that the free world is able to keep a jump ahead of the section of the world dominated by Moscow and Peiping.

The tasks and responsibilities of the United States are almost terrifying in their magnitude.

We in Australia, like all freemen, should thank God for the protection and friendship of the United States, and its contribution throughout the world to the cause of peace.

General Dalton War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the late Brig. Gen. James L. Dalton, U.S. Army, who died at the age of 35, the victim of a sniper's bullet at Balete Pass, Luzon, Philippines, is to be memoralized in a most effective way by the people of his home town, Naugatuck, Conn.

Under the direction of George McNamara a program of money-raising has been undertaken which will lead to the establishment of a scholarship fund in General Dalton's name. Mr. McNamara who is the tax collector of the borough of Naugatuck and commander of the Disabled American Veterans Post in Naugatuck, knew General Dalton as a youth and is spearheading the memorial program, and I take this opportunity not only to call my colleagues' attention to this worthy undertaking, but also to commend Mr. McNamara and his associates for their worthy endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I include herewith a story on General Dalton which appeared in the Waterbury Sunday Republican January 23, 1966, and also a letter written by Mr. McNamara and which appeared in the Naugatuck Daily News:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, Jan. 23, 1966]

TODAY'S YOUTH REMINDED OF WORLD WAR II HERO'S COURAGE

(By Bill Leuchars)

NAUGATUCK.—In these days of draft card burnings, peace marches, and other indications of a growing lack of patriotism among members of today's "In" generation, leaders of a number of borough veterans organizations have quietly expressed concern over the safety and future of this Nation.

One veteran of both World War II and the Korean war said there was "apparent apathy—why I don't know. Maybe when we came home from the war we should have done more to instill young people with the greatness of this country and the great works that were done to protect our democratic way of life. Perhaps one fault today is the fact that war in Vietnam is so remote and so few understand what we are fighting for.

"World War II was a cinch—the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and everyone wanted a chance to get into the fight—young men and women, and those really too old to go to war. Korea was a hazy one—there was a real purpose there, but many couldn't see or understand it—just like this thing in Vietnam."

George McNamara, commander of the Disabled American Veterans and a member of both foreign wars and the American Legion contends that "there are probably less than a dozen young people in this town who ever heard of Naugatuck's late Gen. James L. Dalton, although most of them might have heard of the street at Glendale named in his honor.

TYPICAL YOUTH

"I grew up with Jim Dalton—a typical youth, one who loved the outdoor life. But his dedication to his country and his bravery in combat established a record never equaled. I am convinced the youth of Naugatuck should be reminded of the deeds and accomplishments of this great man so that his memory will always be cherished."

McNamara said that he plans to propose that one or more of the borough's veterans organizations develop a scholarship program in memory of General Dalton, believed to have been the highest ranking Army officer in the history of the borough.

A native of New Britain, Dalton and his family came to Naugatuck shortly after his birth, January 20, 1910. He graduated from St. Francis' School and was in the class of 1927 at Naugatuck High School. Young Dalton was nominated for appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and after successfully passing the various tests, won appointment and graduated from the academy in 1933.

His first assignment as a second lieutenant was the Fort Ethan Allen, Burlington, Vt. While stationed there, Dalton an expert rider, qualified for the post polo team.

A clear-cut indication of his bravery was seen at an indoor polo match when his horse bolted and to protect the crowd of spectators, he pulled the horse sharply to the side to knock him down. The horse fell and pinning the young lieutenant causing a severe spinal injury.

As a result of the injury, Lieutenant Dalton was confined to Walter Reed Hospital at Washington for a full 6 months. The injury prohibited his riding (in those days the cavalry used horses, not tanks) and upon leaving the hospital, he was assigned to the infantry.

Shortly after his arrival at Fort Benning, Ga., he was promoted to the rank of first lieutenant and in 1939 he received his first overseas assignment, to the huge U.S. military installation at Hawaii.

Two years later when the Japanese attack was launched at our Pacific stronghold at Pearl Harbor, Captain Dalton had his first taste of combat. As the smoke cleared and the military counted its losses to the savage attack, plans were launched for the long, hard step-by-step campaign across the Pacific to the Japanese home islands.

Because West Pointers were the backbone of the new Army raised to wage the widespread war, promotions came fast for the most capable officers in the Regular Army. By August of 1942 Dalton was promoted to the rank of lieutenant colonel and in command of a unit waging a savage battle to take Guadalcanal. In this campaign, Colonel Dalton won the Silver Star and the respect of his men.

GUADALCANAL

His unit was one of two that finally strangled the Japanese stronghold at the Canal. With Guadalcanal secured, Dalton was again promoted, this time to the rank of full colonel, and a few months later he led his troops into combat again at New Georgia and New Britain.

By August of 1944, Colonel Dalton had been a part of almost every Army combat activity in the Pacific. Worn and tired, he was relieved for 30 days for a rest at home where he for the first time saw his new daughter, Beth, his wife, and their other daughter, Kit. He had been married in 1936 to the former Kate Starbird, one-time poet laureate for the State of Vermont.

By the time Colonel Dalton returned to the Pacific, battle plans for the recapture of the Philippines had been readied and his assignment outlined. In the fall of 1944 he led the force which struck at Luzon and was credited with the capture of San Miguel.

Often he conferred with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, supreme commander of the Pacific theater, and it was in the Philippines that Dalton won his last promotion—that of brigadier general, at the age of 35.

On May 16, 1945, a bullet fired by a Japanese sniper ended the life and brilliant military career of Brig. Gen. James L. Dalton. The general was killed at Balete Pass, on

Luzon, as he moved in with a small group to examine the newly captured headquarters of Colonel Hayashi to try to determine how the headquarters could have withstood the bombings and shellings of U.S. planes and artillery pieces.

McNamara stated that he firmly believes that "in this day and age it is important to the youth of this community to be aware of the deeds and service of a heroic figure such as General Dalton. I hope we can institute a scholarship in his memory, in hope of keeping alive the bravery of his deeds in the defense of this Nation."

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

To the EDITOR:

It was with profound pleasure mingled with sorrow that I read an article lauding the late Gen. James Dalton. To the author of this article I salute you for a job well done. Having known the general well, many a good time we had together in our youth. All I can say is he was a "man amongst men." Down through history from the Magna Carta, Joan of Arc, Nathan Hale, Valley Forge, Thomas Paine, Colin Kelly, no man or woman deserves the title "hero" more than General Dalton. We, the people of Naugatuck, should be very proud of General Datlon, knowing that he is one of our own and yet he does not belong to us alone but to all America, the world, and to generations yet unborn.

General Dalton was once lauded by Gen. Douglas MacAfthur as the "best field general in the Army."

The article suggests that a scholarship be set up honoring General Dalton and to help some students to gain his or her education. I heartily endorse this idea. It is only fitting and proper that we should do this. I would like to see the board of education, all educators, business, labor, all veterans organizations, veterans nonaffiliated with any post or chapter, schoolchildren; in fact, everyone take part in creating said scholarship

At the next meeting of the Disabled Veterans I am going to propose that we start a fund for the above purpose. If we, the people of Naugatuck, can raise enough money for this scholarship we could deposit it in a bank or banks and only use the interest each year and this money will stay intact forever. I look forward to any suggestion or comments on the above subject.

Let us lose no time in honoring a great American, a great hero, and last but not least, "one of our own."

GEORGE MCNAMARA.

More Support for Animal Humane Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter from Mr. George H. Levy, president of the Dog Owners Service Bureau, Inc., of New York, which is one of many I have received in support of my bill, H.R. 9875, and others, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation.

I believe the Members of this body should be apprised of the views of this outstanding organization.

DOG OWNERS SERVICE BUREAU, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 8, 1966.

Hon. LESTER L. WOLFF,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: The Dog Owners Service Bureau, Inc., representing a cross section of dog owners throughout the United States, has been incensed and bitterly critical of the trade in dogs. We are speaking about those dogs purchased from commercial dealers for use by laboratories, research facilities, and other places where dogs are used for research and experimentation purposes.

Legislation appears to be the only way in which protection can be given to dogs and to their owners. Dognaping, having reached wide national proportions, must be curbed immediately, and laws governing this crime must be enacted.

Our full support is hereby given to the recent bill which you introduced, H.R. 9875. It is important for citizens of our country to feel that they, and their dogs (in many, many cases considered a part of the family) are protected by law.

At this time we would like to call your attention to another area—not widely publicized but nonetheless an area of widespread inhumane treatment for dogs. It has been known for some time that dogs traveling with their owners aboard scheduled airline planes have been forced to ride in cold (or hot, as the case may be) baggage compartments. On a rough trip, these animals are thrown around the kennels unmercifully, sustaining, in many cases, internal injuries not readily noticed for sometimes up to several weeks. Our membership implores you to suggest legislation regulating the air travel of pets by stipulating the type of kennels needed (with rubber foam sides to prevent injury). We will be pleased to research the needs relative to such legislation if you will so advise us. This legislation could conceivably be tacked on to H.R. 9875.

Please do not hesitate to call us at any time if we can be of any service.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE H. LEVY,
President.

The Migrant Worker Becomes Visible

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was an invisible and forgotten man in this country, he is the migrant farmworker. For years these hard-working and low-paid people have been exploited with less humanity that we treat our oil and gas and other physical resources. They have been kicked around from State to State and farm to farm, stopping only to help harvest the crops without which we would hardly be an affluent society or a well fed people. Compounding their misery and their exploitation was the feudalistic bracero program, wisely and successfully terminated by Congress last year.

One of the great myths that has existed in some places is that the migrant farmworkers, particularly those of Mexican descent, are especially suited for "stoop" labor; and that they cannot or will not learn the skills that would open up greater job opportunities. The oppressed, disenfranchised, subjugated migrant farmworker still suffers from the damage that has been done through the myth of his inferiority. Racial, religious, and ethnic discrimination take many forms and have historically hidden beneath many falsehoods. The myth of the laziness and the intellectual inferiority of the migrant farmworker falls in this category.

Mr. Speaker, the migrant farmworkers have been literally buried beneath acres of false claims and false assumptions. Fortunately, they are beginning to dig themselves out, with the help of funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity. My purpose today is to inform the Members of this House of the adult migrant education program that is being conducted in San Antonio and several other cities in south Texas.

Some time ago the Office of Economic Opportunity granted $3.3 million for an adult migrant education program in south Texas. Never before had any sustained manpower training program been attempted in this area for migrant workers. The reason given for the neglect of this large group of underprivileged and poverty stricken people by State officials and others amounted to the myth I have outlined. That is, that these people did not want to or could not learn to do anything except migrant farmwork. So the migrant farmworker received no training, and his children received little education. When you are the child of a migrant farmworker you go where the seasonal farmwork is. And seasonal farmwork does not normally coincide with the school year. It is quite typical for the children of migrant farmworkers to leave school before the end of the school year in order to travel across the country in search of farmwork. The effect of all this has been to maintain a large supply of low-skilled labor for the great farms and plantations not only of Texas but of States throughout the Nation.

I am happy to say that even in the short time that the south Texas adult migrant education program has existed so far, the myth of the migrant has been proven false. The 3,000 adult migrant farmworkers that have enrolled in the current training program have amazed everyone with their earnestness, their willingness to learn, their enthusiasm for the program, and their attendance. In some south Texas cities daily attendance has averaged 98 percent. In San Antonio, for example, 80 adult students attend classes from 4 to 9:30 p.m., 5 days a week. Fifty of the students are from 40 to 60 years old. Only two of those who enrolled in the program have dropped out.

Similar programs are being conducted in Laredo, Robstown, MacAllen, Roma, and Rio Grande City. Without exception, these programs have been completely sold out, in terms of applicants for enrollment. In fact, hundreds of migrants have had to be turned down because of the amount of funds and resources available. Numerous requests have already been made to the migrant farmworker section of OEO for an enlarged program next year. I support and fully endorse these requests. Next year's adult migrant education program for south Texas should service a minimum of 25,000 persons. In San Antonio alone, at least 5,000 persons should have the chance for this training and education.

The Sunday, March 6, issue of the San Antonio Light carried a story on the adult migrant education program. The story contains this observation:

> Most of the enrollees are seasonal farmhands and many of them are tired of making the annual trek to out-of-State farmwork.

The story goes on to quote Domingo Villegas, 57, one of the students:

> I want to learn to read and write and learn a trade. I have 19 grandchildren and my sons and daughters have too many mouths to feed.

The south Texas adult migrant education program has demonstrated beyond any doubt that migrant farmworkers want to be better educated and better employed. I believe the Federal Government should help these people with training and educational opportunities. This is a program that should be expanded.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the newspaper story from the San Antonio Light, March 6, 1966, entitled "Migrants Prove Adage":

MIGRANTS PROVE ADAGE

You are never too old to learn.

This old saying can be applied to 80 persons enrolled in the adult migrant education program now being held under the auspices of the Texas Education Agency and the Federal antipoverty program at the South Side High School.

Most of the students are parents of children attending that school during the day.

LONG CLASSES

There are three classes. They start their schooling at 4 p.m. and go home at 9:30 p.m.

There are six teachers and four teacher's aids involved in the program.

They attend classes 5 days a week.

Fifty of the students are men ranging in age from 40 to 60 years old—and all take their schooling seriously.

Each enrollee is paid $30 a week. Only two students have dropped out.

Most of the enrollees are seasonal farmhands and many of them are tired of making the annual trek to out-of-State farmwork.

For the first 3 months, both the men and women will learn the three R's. The last 3 months of their 6-month course will be devoted to learning a trade. The men will be taught welding, plumbing, carpentry, and upholstery.

READ AND WRITE

The women will be taught sewing, cooking, upholstery, and health care.

Supervising the program is Principal Jack Gray. He gathers all the statistics and payrolls from the three classes.

Domingo Villegas, 57, who lives near Bergs Mill and is father of six, said, "I want to learn to read and write and learn a trade. I have 19 grandchildren and my sons and daughters have too many mouths to feed."

Getting a Grasp on a Bright New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration's war on poverty is reaching out into all of the States of the Union and into all of the counties of those States.

The St. Petersburg Times of February 7 contained a very interesting article on the neighborhood multiservice center being conducted on a full-year basis in Palmetto, Fla., in Manatee County. As the writer of this story points out, the little children coming to this neighborhood center do so in threadbare clothes, without shoes, sweaters, or jackets, even on the coldest of days. But they are greeted with kind hearts and willing hands. I commend this article to my colleagues.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Feb. 7, 1966]

GETTING A GRASP ON A BRIGHT, NEW WORLD

(By Nancy Osgood)

Where is the boy who looks after the sheep?—Under the haystack—fast asleep.

The rise and fall of the teacher's voice dramatized the lazy goings-on of Little Boy Blue.

In a semicircle around her, 14 tiny 2-year-olds sat in spellbound silence. Fourteen pairs of huge, bright eyes looked with solemn wonder at the colorful illustrations held up for them to see.

Next door in a bustle of activity, 3-year-olds were getting ready for their midafternoon snack—primly putting away their toys exactly as they had been taught.

In a third room, 4- and 5-year-olds raised piping boy-and-girl voices in a finger-play song.

The record which accompanied them was tuned low. Gentleness—soft music, soft voices—are mandatory in the day nursery at the Neighborhood Multi-Service Center, Palmetto.

Only in such an atmosphere can exist the motivating philosophy, expressed by assistant director, Mr. Lucille Sheehan:

"Come take my hand and I will show you a whole new, exciting, wonderful world. I will be your friend and listen to you. You will know success and have a right to human dignity."

That their children may walk a road less rough than theirs, parents bring their tots to share this promise, while they go out to earn pittances all too inadequate for their families' needs.

Consequently, their little ones come to the center in threadbare clothes—without shoes, sweaters or jackets, even on the coldest days.

But here awaiting them are kind hearts and willing hands; to give them comforting, warm baths; to tuck them at naptime into little cots under soft, warm blankets while quiet music lulls them to sleep; to machine wash what clothes they have and to forage among others' castoffs for additional garments.

No one could better understand the needs of his charges than director Walter Pearcey. He is the eldest of seven children whose parents brought them from Georgia to Florida in 1933. "We were without material possessions of any kind—completely destitute."

A high school graduate at 15, Walter delayed his own higher education to help his brothers and sisters through school. He worked in a Connecticut war plant until old enough for Army service which took him to bases all over the United States, to Korea and Japan for 1 year and to Europe for 3 years.

Today, he and four other members of his family are teachers. The younger two, 13 and 15, also are college bound. "We're a close family, always willing to help each other."

His goal now is to give his 9- and 10-year-old sons "the very best education available," regardless of the sacrifice entailed. Mrs. Pearcey adds to the family income by working as a secretary at Memorial Elementary School.

Pearcey may never return to teaching. "This work is so necesary, I'll be here from now on if I have my way." The director is completely self-sacrificial in his determination "to give more kids a chance in life." Not counting paper work at home, he labored 76 hours the week the center opened. Things have to be right. I'm not satisfied with half-way measures."

Of major concern to this personable young man is the training program which prepares the youngsters for school, and looks to their mental and physical well-being, as well.

But recognizing the importance of proper environment, he has seen that classrooms are bright and clean, and has provided a fenced yard, a paved area for wagons and tricycles and a huge tree-shaded sandbox (60 by 30 feet). Now there are to be plantings and "perhaps even a little fountain" in the open court around which the former school is built. "Everything must be beautiful."

The war on poverty project is shaping up well with the aid of a great team, Pearcey said. The staffers spoke as enthusiastically as their boss:

Mrs. Sheehan: "It's completely soul-satisfying work."

Mrs. Essie Knights, lunchroom manager, responsible for early-bird breakfasts, morning and afternoon snacks, and well-balanced midday meals: "We make the food pretty, so the children go for it, and include everything they need (for nutrition). * * * They eat and eat. Every bit of it. And they're so good."

Miss Mary Alice Simpson, teacher in charge of the 4- and 5-year-olds: "I'm so happy to be able to do this work. It's just great to see the children enjoying things they've never had."

Mrs. Willie Johnson, aid: "This is a very wonderful program. It's a real privilege to work with underprivileged children."

Parents calling for their children—they're released only to those designated in the files—expressed gratitude for the program which is benefiting their offspring while lightening their own burdens.

Mrs. Talma Williams, sole support of three children, leaves her 4-year-old Greg in the nursery while she works in the kitchen.

Mr. and Mrs. Ira Walters, Memorial Hospital employees, no longer need leave their 2-year-old Jerome with a sitter. "It helps us financially and the baby is with companions his own age."

Mrs. Janett Strong (a private maid) and her husband were worried about leaving their Steven Mark, 4, with his aged grandmother. The day nursery solved this problem and is preparing the small boy for school in a way never experienced by 11- and 8-year-old brothers.

Community cooperation is the element most needed now that the day nursery is operating at capacity. Director Pearcey explained:

"We're liberally funded (though a Federal grant), but there are many things not provided for in the program. We are most in need of children's clothing and wheeled toys."

Parents in the poverty pocket served are in no position to supply their youngsters' needs. Nor is this expected of them. "All we want them to send us is the child," Pearcey said.

WHAT MAKES PROJECT TICK

The Neighborhood Multi-Service Center in Palmetto is where 2- to 5-year-old children of the poor find happy, wholesome activities. They are supervised by teachers charged with raising their cultural level and preparing them to enter school on par with their peers.

It is also a project to give adults new hope, a chance to better themselves, an opportunity to secure desperately needed basic education, the ways and means to learn new skills.

The center, at 1315 Second Avenue West, occupies the former Memorial Elementary School whose pupils have been transferred to the new James Tillman Elementary School. It is situated in the heavily populated Negro district it serves—North Palmetto and Washington Park—where incomes are low and much of the housing is poor and inadequate. Some 1,000 families are eligible for this antipoverty program.

Opened January 3 under a $267,605 Federal grant, the center has a capacity attendance of 200 preschool children. To be admitted, the children must come from low income homes where both parents work, or where a working mother is the only parent. A fringe benefit of the program is that older childen no longer need be kept out of school to care for small fry while their elders are away.

The day nursery also welcomes children of migrant workers. Since many speak little, if any, English, they need special help to prepare them for school.

The staff of 55 persons, 5 of them white, is headed by Walter Pearcey, former social studies teacher at Lincoln Memorial High School, Bradenton. The assistant director, who also heads the teaching staff, is Mrs. Lucille Sheehan. In addition to long experience as a teacher and teachers supervisor, Mrs. Sheehan also has been associated with the Head Start program. Teaching at the center is based on the successful Head Start plan.

Former public school teachers working with Mrs. Sheehan are Miss Mary Alice Simpson, Mrs. Olivia Greene, and Mrs. Lillian Alexander.

Remedial reading is in the hands of Mrs. Mary Ann Estes. The guidance counselor for basic education in Manatee County is testing the nursery school children to evaluate the center's progress.

Mrs. Mildred Saunders, R.N., on leave from the Manatee County Health Center, is in charge of the health program. She does some social work as well. Head of the tutoring program is Mrs. Katherine Kuhn, who taught most recently at Central Catholic High School, Fort Pierce.

Guidance Counselor Charles Haskell is charged with helping people—prekindergartners to adults. Retired from the educational book publishing and insurance fields, he trained for his present work in a summer program at Western Reserve University and the Tampa Youth Opportunity Center. He holds a semiprofessional certificate from the Department of Labor.

Mrs. Essie Knights manages the lunchroom with the assistance of Miss Mary Ware and several helpers. The staff is rounded out by aids and part-time Neighborhood Youth Corps workers. Many are residents of the area served, hired for their understanding of the problems involved and their ability to solve them.

The goals of the center's preschool program are the same as those of the Head Start project: To improve the child's health; to expand his ability to think, reason, and speak clearly; to broaden his horizons; to erase patterns of frustration and failure by giving the child frequent chances to succeed; to develop a climate of confidence which will instill in the child a desire to learn.

Investigating the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I joined with a number of my colleagues last week in calling for a congressional inquiry into the military draft and its ramifications across the Nation. The problem of inequities and bottlenecks and inefficiency in the administration of the Selective Service System is no less serious today.

An editorial in the Saturday, March 5, 1966, edition of the Chicago American also expressed concern over the draft situation. The editorial follows:

Investigating the Draft

The House Armed Services Committee Monday opens regular hearings on the Nation's military posture. This time the inquiry will take in, among other things, charges by 30 Republican committee members that Selective Service is being run in a haphazard, inefficient manner and is seriously bogged down in redtape. The charges certainly merit a careful scrutiny.

In a statement issued this week, the Congressmen charged that more than half the men between 19 and 26 now classified 1–A are not available for the draft because "their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline between local draft boards and Army induction centers."

The Republican members also questioned plans to reexamine present deferments, arguing that enough men would be available now to meet induction and enlistment quotas if present procedures were used efficiently.

They pointed to a report by the Controller General's Office which said the Army, Navy, and Air Force were using about 9,000 enlisted personnel to work in officers' clubs, hobby shops, golf courses, and similar jobs, rather than hiring civilians for them. This report, they emphasized, considered only the most flagrant inefficiencies in the use of manpower; there are undoubtedly many more instances. Said the Republican members:

"It is ridiculous for the Department of Defense to insist upon drafting young men to be hurried into combat when it is not making maximum efficient use of the trained personnel it already has."

Presumably Selective Service officials will have some answers to these charges when they testify before the committee. But the charges obviously call for a thorough hearing that is also nonpartisan.

We hope the fact that these charges came from Republican Congressmen doesn't mean the Democrats will feel constrained to belittle them—or that the draft will become the center of a new "hawks versus doves" controversy.

Hawaiian Beef Compares Favorably With Best in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, men in the cattle industry in Hawaii, who have never been known to lack competitive spirit, are embarking on an educational program to convince the public that "Hawaiian beef is just as good as any meat produced anywhere in the United States of America."

The Oahu Cattlemen's Association, under its able president, Mr. Gordon Cran, is currently disseminating information concerning the high quality of U.S. Department of Agriculture graded island beef.

Mr. James A. Napier, assistant secretary-treasurer of the Hawaii Cattlemen's Council, revealed to Betty Boxold of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin in a recent interview that his organization hopes through this intensive educational drive to also dispel some mistaken notions about beef produced in Hawaii. One of the organization's aims is to correct the tendency of some housewives to regard "mainland beef" as being superior to "island beef." Mr. Napier was quick to point out that cattle in Hawaii are fed under the same stringent nutritional standards set by the USDA grading specifications as cattle in the continental United States.

Cattlemen in Hawaii also hope to end the indiscriminate use of the term "island beef" when referring to "cow beef." The term "cow beef" generally describes ungraded meat in Hawaii as well as here on the mainland.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations, I commend Mr. Cran and Mr. Napier and all cattlemen in Hawaii for undertaking this worthwhile educational program.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Betty Boxold's story which appeared in the February 23, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

Hawaii Cattlemen Upgrade Beef Image

(By Betty Boxold)

In 1793 a cow and a longhorn bull were delivered to Kamehameha I by the English navigator, Captain Vancouver. That was the start of Hawaii's cattle industry.

After landing at Kealakekua Bay, these first cattle were driven to the upland slopes of Hualalai where, under royal protection, they multiplied for 30 years.

Today in Hawaii there are more than 400 commercial beef enterprises—with at least 20 head of cattle each.

As the market demand for beef and veal has increased substantially in the past few years, Hawaii's cattlemen have turned increasingly to pen feeding of cattle to improve and increase production.

Extensive pen feeding of cattle really began in 1959 when the Federal grading of beef was started in the islands and cattlemen were eager to comply with the new regulations.

Gordon Cran, president of the Oahu Cattlemen's Association, pointed out that despite the fact that cattle here—to meet the USDA grading specifications—are fed on imported grains from the mainland, housewives still tend to believe that Kansas City beef is better than the local product.

"This, of course, is completely false," said James A. Napier, assistant secretary-treasurer of the Hawaii Cattlemen's Council. (The council has 350 members and is the governing body for the five island associations.)

"Rations and diets have been made up by nutrition experts with chemical firms across the country. So the cattle are fed just as they are on the mainland. They have to be in order to meet the Federal grading and inspection requirements," he added.

Another aggravation to Hawaii's cattlemen is the habit of some local retailers to pass off "cow beef" as island meat. "Cow beef" is a trade term to describe ungraded meat, which can be found in markets all over the country.

"Yet, in Hawaii, it's called island beef and we feel it downgrades the entire industry," council spokesman said.

In seeking to portray the island meat industry as a vital thriving segment of the State's economy, the cattlemen are off to a good start.

They point with pride to the big gains made in pen-fed cattle since the practice was started 7 years ago. At that time, 4,103 head were fed. Then, in 1964, the number had steadily increased and 16,000 head went through the feedlots.

But this year the number is startling. Some 25,000 head are expected to be processed.

As Napier said, "This will provide Hawaii's homemaker with approximately 13,750,000 pounds of the tastiest grain-fed, Government inspected, and USDA graded beef that she could possibly buy and serve her family."

Informational and educational projects recently started by the council include distributing books, pamphlets, and charts to public libraries, and a plan to cooperate with the Honolulu Gas Co.'s cooking classes during April.

Also, Napier said the council is participating more extensively in fairs, trade and food shows by providing informational booths and displays such as a chilled carcass in a case indicating the beef cuts.

And the council is participating in the Kukala, the Honolulu Symphony benefit to be held at pier 10 on March 5. A live steer will be auctioned; a dressed carcass and a year's supply of meat also have been donated.

Napier apparently feels there may be some rough spots ahead for the cattle industry, but the future in general is very bright. A favorite quote of his was made by a mainland meat expert, John Milton, who spoke at the council's annual meeting in December.

Milton, consultant and field supervisor for the American Meat Institute in Chicago, said, "Hawaiian beef is just as good as any meat produced anywhere in the U.S.A."

Let Them Drink Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed; yes, I am much concerned, by the President's proposal to drastically cut the school lunch program, which has done so much for so many schoolchildren at little cost and expense to the taxpayers.

Many of my colleagues are disturbed and concerned, too.

Protests from parents, teachers, and school administrators arrive at my office by the day.

The school lunch is, in many cases, the only nourishing and well-balanced meal that the schoolchild receives each weekday.

Editorial comment is almost all against the drastic cut which has been proposed.

In this connection, an editorial of recent date in the Cleveland, Ohio, Press is most interesting.

The editorial follows:

> Let Them Drink Milk
>
> Every day, in 92,000 schools across America, 16 million children exchange a few pennies for cartons of milk. The pennies are only part of the cost. The rest is paid by taxpayers.
>
> All this has been going on pleasantly for a dozen years until it's as much a part of the school scene as homework. Now President Johnson proposes quite a change.
>
> He wants to cut the program 80 percent and to give what's left only to the needy. How this would happen, in the actuality of school lunch lines, is not explained.
>
> Nor is it explained what happens to the $80 million worth of milk the program represents. Industry sources say the Government would have to buy the milk anyway as a surplus commodity. Then it would be stored expensively, as butter, cheese, or dry milk. If that is the case, no real saving is indicated.
>
> The school milk program has been a relatively small public health investment in children at all economic levels. As long as the Government is in the subsidy business and up to its ears in surplus commodities, it seems better to keep youngsters drinking milk than to put it in storage.
>
> Meanwhile, cutbacks in the school lunch program have already been felt in Cleveland. If the guns for Vietnam are to replace butter, it would seem a poor place to begin it with schoolchildren.

Problems That Plague the Administration of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my endeavor to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the problems that plague the administration of the city of New York.

New York City is known worldwide. It is acknowledged as unique. It is described by any and all adjectives known to man—beautiful, ugly, clean, dirty, overpowering, generous, cold, friendly, complex. The last I admit, made so not only because of its geographic location—at the mouth of a great river leading into the great Atlantic Ocean—but also because it is the second largest city in the world. It is comprised of a diversity of interests—financial, industrial, commercial, social, cultural—made so because it has a heterogeneous population. Thus, the problems and issues affecting the city of New York also affect the people of the States on its borders, because many of the persons in these States are working in or deriving their livelihood in the city of New York.

It is therefore my objective to help explain the fiscal problem of the operation of the city of New York. In order to understand this problem, one must remember that New York City must raise the money for its administration by the means delegated to it by the Legislature of the State of New York. One must remember that, in recent years, the chamber of commerce, tax foundations, and other research groups have been using a figure of slightly more than 13 percent to compute New York State's Federal tax burden. Based on estimated administrative budget receipts of $111 billion for Federal fiscal year 1967, New York State's Federal tax burden would be roughly $14 billion. On a collective basis, New York State's share would be higher.

I also want to recall that New York City's contribution to State tax receipts is roughly 50 percent or $1.9 billion, compared with Federal expenditures in New York State of some $898 million.

To help explain a phase of New York's fiscal problem—the 15-cent subway fare—Senator Samuel Greenberg of the State of New York took the floor of the senate and addressed himself to this matter:

> I assume—and if I am wrong, I would like to be corrected—that we are about to engage in a discussion of these bills, the titles to which at least have been read, the actual bills, however, not having yet been delivered to us but, as I am informed, within the next half hour or so each of us will have a copy of these bills. Naturally, anything that I might say without having seen the bills will be subject to correction if anything in the bills does not exactly jibe with what I assume they are and what is in the bills.
>
> Now we know from the press and from the Governor's message just read to us a few moments ago what these three bills are. One is a bill which appropriates the $20 million which it is expected the State will receive over and above the $60 million that was appropriated last year to the city of New York in connection with the transfer to the city of all collections from the stock transfer tax from July 1, 1965 on.
>
> The second bill, or one of the other bills, is the one which has to do with the tidy little sum of $49 million which has been due to the city of New York at least since 1962 but actually since 1933.
>
> The third bill is the one which has to do with social welfare appropriations; that is, the contributions by the State to the city in connection with social welfare payments which the city makes.
>
> We, in the city of New York, welcome every dollar of this $100 million long overdue. Belonging, as a matter of right, as a matter of law, as a matter of equity, to the city of New York and high time that it was paid.
>
> Now, what disturbs me is the reason for my rising on the floor of this senate tonight. Eight million people of the city of New York and countless other millions suffered for 12 days during the recent transit strike. I am not going to talk about whose fault it was, who was to blame or the politics of the situation, but the fact remains that these millions of people suffered and some suffered irreparably, some will never recoup their

losses and most of them will feel their losses for many, many months to come. Now the Governor comes along with his announcement of this $100 million and uses the language, and I quote, "These funds include the cash necessary for the city to maintain the 15-cent transit fare."

Gentlemen, that was the cruelest cut of all; to try and make the people of the city of New York, the people of the State of New York, believe that any penny out of this $100 million can be used for the purpose of maintaining these 15-cent subway fares is such a distortion of fact, of truth, of the law, that I am completely at a loss for words to describe it and nobody knows it better than the Governor. Why the Governor has seen fit to use the transit strike and this $100 million package, moneys which belong to the city of New York, as a means of buoying up the hopes of the millions of straphangers that their fare is going to be retained at 15 cents, is something which I cannot for the life of me understand.

Now, I know, of course, gentlemen, that the Governor is a candidate for reelection and that is a laudable purpose, a laudable objective on his part and I do not quarrel with him one bit for trying to be reelected, but I do not think it behooves a Governor of the great State of New York, as politically minded as he may be, the least we have a right to expect of a Governor, is that he be absolutely intellectually honest in every statement that he makes to the people. You can be sure, gentlemen, that every word of this message of the Governor, with respect to this $100 million, was read by the people of the city of New York and in the metropolitan area with great interest. The newspaper headlines that the Governor was the savior of the city of New York and the millions of straphangers. He came to their rescue. How? In the first place, the $20 million of stock transfer money rightfully belongs to the city and it was just a question of whether we would get it now or whether we would get it March 31 or April 1 or April 2. But we would have to get it. It is part of the law.

The $31 million of welfare funds—$15 million of this $31 is the monies due the city of New York for the quarter ending December 31. It is known as the settlement payment for that quarter, October, November and December of last year.

Generally speaking, it is paid in March—excuse me, I should say generally speaking it should be paid in March. But the fact is for years it has not been. What they have been paying in March is the March advance payment. An advance payment is made each month so that the city of New York and the other social welfare districts throughout the State should have some of the money which the localities are advancing for welfare payments. So, this $15 million, whether we would have gotten it on April 1, under the plan heretofore adopted, or whether we get it as soon as these bills become law is really not too significant. We are getting what belongs to us, and what the city has actually already paid out. This is the State's share. Sixteen million of this 31 million is really in the nature of an advance payment.

Now, of course, it is the advance for the month of March. With these payments, we, in the State, will be up to date so far as the fiscal year ending March 31 is concerned.

But in any event, just as in the case of the $20 million stock transfer money, this $31 million represents monies that the State, under existing law, State and Federal law, pays to the city of New York on account of the advances which the city makes for welfare payments.

Let us go to the $49 million. Back in 1933—some of you young fellows do not remember that far back, some of us older men do—the State of New York was no different than you or I. Well, I hope you fellows were better off, but the State was not any better than any of us in this country. We were in the midst of a depression and the State was short of money. So the State picked on the cities throughout the State and deferred 25 percent of the annual appropriation for State aid for education. That was never paid, excepting in the case of Rochester and Buffalo—I think it was paid prior to 1962 because they were in bad straits, or whatever the reasons were.

But in any event, along came 1962 and we got a new education formula and we were going to be brought up to date, current, and with the exception of four little cities, Syracuse, Yonkers, Albany, and New York. Everybody became current with the exception of these four cities.

Well, there would have come due from the State to the city of New York, according to the law in existence prior to the change in the formula in 1962, a payment in September 1962 for the school year beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 31, 1961. That fourth installment would have been paid to the city of New York in September and the amount was $49 million.

We did not get the $49 million. Instead of that we became current in the sense that the September payment that was made to the city of New York and the other cities throughout the State was based upon the new formula. But the $49 million, that was hidden under the rug. We hollered. We screamed, but as usual, we got nowhere.

Well, I am not going to ask why the Governor came up with the $49 million now. I am not asking him where the money is coming from. We are so happy and so anxious to get it that I am not asking any questions. But I do want to make it clear, gentlemen, that the payment to the city of New York of this $49 million and the payment to the other three cities, Albany, Syracuse and Yonkers, approximately $3 million, whenever that payment will be made is certainly long past due. It is not new money. It is money which the city of New York, Syracuse, Yonkers, and Albany had a right to expect that this honorable Empire State would make good on its legal obligations.

So fortunately, or unfortunately, as you would look at it, along comes the transit strike, and a great savior of the 20th century—so far as the straphangers in the city of New York are concerned—comes along in the person of his excellency and digs up his plan and we are about to get this $100 million. I hope and trust that every member of this body will vote for each of these three bills. I am sure that the three smaller cities, Albany, Yonkers, and Syracuse, will find good use for this money just the same as the city of New York will.

Before I close, gentlemen, I want to go back to what I said earlier. It was wrong, it was unkind, it was uncalled for, for the Governor to try to indicate or to make the people of our city or our State believe that this was the panacea for their transit fare situation. It is not, it was not and it will not be and the Rockefellers are sufficiently aware of finances with respect to the transit authority in the city of New York to know just as well as I and you do, that this money cannot legally be used to pay one penny of the transit authority's operating expenses, unless we pass some kind of a law with some new gimmick for the city to be subsidizing part of the transit authority's expenses.

We passed a law here, the transit authority. The Republicans did it.

You gentlemen passed a law which says that the fare must be sufficient to maintain the current operating expenses. The only place where the city can use any of its general funds is in connection with capital improvements for the subway system. But to pay the operating expenses, not a penny of this $100 million can be used for that purpose. Governor Rockefeller knew it because he has some mighty good lawyers downstairs on the second floor and they know it.

So, gentlemen, I am both happy that I have been here long enough to see this $49 million paid to the city of New York and the other $3 million to the other three cities. I am sorry that I have been here at a time when the Governor of our State stoops to the level that he did, to fool, to mislead the straphangers in the city of New York.

She Could Collect a Lot—But Mary Has Guts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Daytona Beach, Fla., News-Journal is one of Florida's most enlightened newspapers.

Mrs. Mabel Norris Chesley, the newspaper's associate editor has written a series of articles dealing with aid for dependent children in Volusia County, Fla., and some of the attendant problems of families torn about by poverty, ignorance, and a host of other social ills which sap this Nation's energy.

I commend this series to my colleagues. The first of the series, entitled, "She Could Collect a Lot—But Mary Has Guts."

[From the Daytona Beach (Fla.) News-Journal, Feb. 20, 1966]

SHE COULD COLLECT A LOT—BUT MARY HAS GUTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What is it like to live on the dole that goes under the name of aid for dependent children? That's State and Federal money paid to women who have fatherless children and its status is bound to be an issue in the next legislature. This series deals with a specific case which, while possibly not typical of ADC cases, nonetheless tells a story of struggle, of pride, and of ambition.)

(By Mabel Norris Chesley)

Dear Mr. Taxpayer, if it weren't for the fact that Mary H. has guts, you could be picking up a tab of some $20,000 over the next 18 years for the support of her and her children.

The name here is fictitious because the comfortable majority still, as Mary puts it, thinks people who are hungry should be discreet about it and not make the well fed and well attired uncomfortable. The poor, she says with some bitterness, should remain anonymous.

But the facts of her story are real, and stark.

Mary lives in the Halifax Park housing project, which she merrily dubs the "poverty pocket." She has no idea where her husband, the father of her five children, is, and she doesn't much care. He retired early from military service for medical reasons and took up drinking as a hobby, so a year ago she left him. She could have him found and jailed for nonsupport, but what would that accomplish? she asks.

"I'd rather that he go along as the town drunk than to know that he's locked up in some institution," says Mary.

So, Mary's on welfare in the form of aid for dependent children—ADC. That's where the $20,000 comes in. If Mary were the type just to sit back and accept the situation, ADC could support her and the children until the present 2-year-old is 18, and if the maximum payment of $8 a month remained static, and if she took all the hospital, medical, and free utility costs due her, she figures it would amount to $20,000.

She and the children, under ADC, are entitled to 12 days of hospitalization a year and any emergency dental care they need. She, of course, pays no taxes. As it would stand if Mary accepted things this way, she could be described as a completely nonproductive citizen.

"The way I look at it, the Government would be far better off if it loaned me $15,000 at 6 percent interest for 20 years, on the strict assurance that I would pay it back; everyone would be far better off," says Mary. "In 5 years, I could become a contributing citizen, paying taxes and being of service to society instead of being a leech."

Actually Mary's ADC income is only $78. It's that because she doesn't intend to be a leech forever—she's got a job and takes home $193 a month. So that cuts her ADC allowance.

But, as of this writing, Mary had just $4 in her purse. And payday isn't until February 28.

So, should one of the children say: "Mother, can we go to the movies?" her answer will be: "No, we have just $4." She never equivocates in letting them realize how poor the family is; she thinks it makes their spirit tougher. Incidentally, Mary's children are just about the most obedient you'll find anywhere. They obey her promptly with a "Yes, ma'm," and the 12-year-old daughter looks after the smaller ones as if they were precious dolls.

To continue with Mary's financial predicament: It's going to get worse instead of better. It's going to get worse because Mary is going to get a raise.

It will be something between $25 and $40 a month.

That means that her ADC allowance will be cut proportionately.

Ethiopian Student Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as an original sponsor of the Peace Corps Act, I am pleased to draw attention to the unusual and outstanding work of a Peace Corps volunteer from my own congressional district.

Tom Amos, of Mishawaka, Ind., decided while a junior at Ball State University to join the Peace Corps upon graduation. He served as a volunteer from 1963 to 1965 in Jimma, Ethiopia. In this period, Tom and two other volunteers teaching in a local school gave special attention to three teenage Ethiopian boys who were students there.

Tom Amos has returned to Mishawaka now, teaching history at the high school. But as a result of his experience in Ethiopia, he has launched a singular effort to enable the three boys whom he met in Jimma to come to Mishawaka for a year.

The First Evangelical United Brethren Church of Mishawaka has already pledged $1,000 toward this effort, and a former Peace Corps couple in Detroit has offered another $600. Tom hopes to raise $2,000 more in voluntary contributions for the boys' transportation costs. Once the young Ethiopians are in this country, Tom plans to pay their living costs himself.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that a variety of student exchange programs already exist. But this Ethiopian student project proposed by Tom Amos is unique in at least two important respects.

First, it has been inspired by the personal experience of a man whose work and purposes form a living example of the impact on young Americans of the Peace Corps experience. The three Ethiopian boys have been chosen not through the formal processes of an impersonal organization but through the personal effort of an individual American.

Second, this project would benefit boys with poor backgrounds. One is an orphan and the other two come from farming families in a small village. Their living conditions are in stark contrast to the upper class status typical of many foreign students brought to this country through ordinary exchange programs. The former Peace Corps man correctly identifies the significance in this when he says:

> We need to become acquainted with the common man from these countries.

The Ethiopian student project is a unique and worthwhile endeavor. I am confident that my neighbors in the community of Mishawaka will give Tom Amos their fullest cooperation to guarantee its success.

The story behind the project and its purposes are explained more fully in the following letter I have received from Tom Amos and in several articles from northern Indiana newspapers:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS: After serving as a Peace Corps volunteer in Ethiopia for 2 years, I am launching an Ethiopian student project. I hope to bring to the United States and Mishawaka High School this next school year the three students who lived with me for 2 years. Their names are Solomon, Dagne, and Zewdie. These boys were in such unfortunate circumstances that they would have been forced to discontinue their education unless we had taken them in as members of our family. They came to us with no change of clothing—they came to us sick and weak from their living conditions and lack of nutritious diet—they came to us discouraged and fearful after living in the big city away from their homes—but now—notice the picture (not printed in the RECORD).

They thanked us by ranking in the top 10 percent of their classes. This was a tremendous achievement considering their cultural backgrounds. One of the boys is an orphan while the other two come from small village farming families. One of the reasons for bringing these particular students is their backgrounds. Foreign students in our city in the past have almost always come from wealthy families within their own countries. We need to bring those who cannot come any other way. We need to become acquainted with the common man from these countries.

I propose Solomon, Dagne, and Zewdie because there need be no guessing about their abilities, needs, or desires. I know each of them to be scholastically able to handle our high school work. Besides learning what America is really like (we could not teach them in Ethiopia what an American school is really like, what snow is, what supermarkets are, that we really don't have servants, or that some Americans are poor) these boys need a better basic education to prepare them for high school graduation and their future vocations.

I will be happy and willing to support these boys and have them live with me if the transportation costs of $3,600 can be met. The First Evangelical United Brethren Church of Mishawaka has already pledged $1,000 and a Peace Corps couple in Detroit have guaranteed the return trip for one amounting to $600. The additional $2,000 must be raised by April 1 if the boys are to be given this opportunity.

The advantages of bringing three boys at the same time are many. Cultural transition is easier (I know) if one has a "brother" with which to share the experience. Since these boys will have the chance to view many different Americans, Americans should also be able to know several Ethiopians at the same time rather than basing their knowledge and opinion on a single representative. The boys' different personalities and interests will provide this for our school and community.

These boys know our customs and holidays; they are acquainted with our foods; they know of Americans' frankness and critical attitude. Therefore, I suggest, the cultural transition for these students will be much easier than might otherwise be possible. Living with me, I believe the boys will have someone with whom they would always be able to talk about home. Because I knew each before he arrives, the home atmosphere will be a more relaxing one than might otherwise prove possible. Having lived in their country, I will be able to understand the things which will be new, strange, and amazing.

Many members of our community have had or will have had the opportunity to hear and see about Ethiopia before the students arrive through my speeches and slides. I believe it to be very important that our community learn and know of the country from which any of our foreign students come. If your organization has not seen the colorful and unusual slide show which lasts approximately 1 hour, I will be glad to provide this service at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS L. AMOS.

[From the South Bend, (Ind.) Tribune, Jan. 24, 1966]

MISHAWAKA HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER OPENS DRIVE TO BRING ETHIOPIAN BOYS HERE

Thomas Amos, a teacher at Mishawaka High School and a former member of the Peace Corps, has launched a project which he hopes will bring three Ethiopian boys to Mishawaka for study at the high school during the next year.

The three boys, named Solomon, Dagne, and Zewdie, were students of Amos during his stay in Ethiopia as a Peace Corps man from 1963 to 1965.

The Mishawaka High School teacher has started his private campaign, called the Ethiopian student project, to raise funds to bring the boys to Mishawaka. They would stay for 1 year, live with Amos, and study in much the same manner as foreign exchange students do.

EXPLAINS AIMS

Amos officially launched the project last week with the sending of letters, explaining his aims, to church organizations and service clubs in the area.

Amos spoke at the Evangelical United Brethren Church of Mishawaka Sunday evening and will address a youth banquet at the

First Evangelical United Brethren Church of South Bend next Sunday.

Amos said that he has several other speaking engagements scheduled in coming weeks and added that he is willing to show his slides of his stay in Ethiopia, which takes about 1 hour, upon invitation during the next 2 months.

The Mishawaka teacher estimated that the transportation costs to bring the boys to this country would be about $3,600. The First Evangelical United Brethren Church of Mishawaka has already pledged $1,000 toward the project, however, and a Peace Corps couple in Detroit, Mich., has agreed to donate $600.

SEEKS $2,000

The present drive is to raise the remaining $2,000, Amos said, and he indicated that he would depend on service clubs, civic and private donations to obtain the money.

Amos states that he can be contacted at his home 1206½ East Third Street in Mishawaka and he estimates that the money will be needed by April 1, in order for him to have time to make the necessary traveling arrangements.

Amos explains in his letter that the three boys came to the Peace Corps school 2 years ago "sick and weak from their living conditions and lack of nutritious diet * * * and discouraged and fearful after living in the 'big city' away from their homes."

GOOD STUDENTS

The boys did well at the school, according to Amos, and "thanked us by ranking in the top 10 percent of their classes." This was a tremendous achievement, Amos contends, considering their cultural backgrounds. One of the boys is an orphan while the other two come from small village farming families.

One of the reasons for wanting to bring these particular students to Mishawaka is their backgrounds, Amos states.

"Foreign students to our city in the past have almost always come from wealthy families within their own countries," he adds. "We need to bring those who cannot come any other way. We need to become acquainted with the 'common man' from these countries," the teacher writes.

Amos says he proposes bringing the three Ethiopian boys because there need be no guessing about their abilities, needs, and desires. "I know each of them is able to scholastically handle our high school work," he writes in his letter.

TRANSITION EASIER

Amos further states that "the advantages of bringing three boys at the same time are many. Cultural transition is easier if one has a 'brother' with which to share the experience. Also, since these boys will have the chance to view many different Americans, Americans should also be able to know several Ethopians at the same time rather than basing their knowledge and opinion on a single representative."

The fact that the three boys will be living with Amos should make their stay here an easier one, according to the Mishawaka teacher. "Having lived in their country, I will be able to understand the things which will be new, strange, and amazing to them," he says.

[From the Mishawaka (Ind.) Times, Jan. 19, 1966]

GUESTS FROM ETHIOPIA

Mishawaka High School Teacher Thomas Amos has saddled himself with quite a chore. Amid a number of fund drives going on in the area, he has committed himself to an attempt to raise $2,000 in transportation costs to bring three young Ethiopian men to Mishawaka for a year of study.

Mr. Amos has not started with an empty till. His church already has pledged $1,000 of the necessary $3,600 total, and a Peace Corps couple in Detroit will donate $600 to the cause. That leaves up to those Mishawakans who wish to help to make up the needed $2,000 of the $3,600 total. Mr. Amos will support the boys during their stay here.

Mr. Amos is not attempting to compete with the AFS program that has been carried on successfully in our high schools. He knows the three boys he has in mind. He met and lived with them during a 2-year Peace Corps stint in Ethiopia. He is confident that these boys and Mishawaka could make valuable contributions to each other.

A point made by the Mishawaka teacher is one with which we would have to agree. The AFS program normally brings to the United States the more well-to-do students from foreign shores. Mr. Amos proposes to bring an orphan and two lads from poor Ethiopian farm families. They are boys who have struggled to obtain their educations and who have made it to the top of their class.

We think these three boys would be good for Mishawaka. We hope that Mr. Amos makes a go of it.

[From the Mishawaka (Ind.) Times, Jan. 17, 1966]

TEACHER HOPES TO BRING ETHIOPIANS HERE

Amid all the fund drives that are being conducted these days in the Mishawaka area, a young Mishawaka High School teacher is prepared to launch still another—for a cause in which he wholeheartedly believes.

Thomas Amos, who teaches U.S. history and citizenship at Mishawaka High School, is beginning a one-man crusade to bring to Mishawaka for a year of study three young Ethiopians who were under his tutelage while he was a 2-year member of the Peace Corps.

Although the project is beginning as a "one man" effort, Amos hopes that it will develop into more than that. It must if it is to succeed. The reason is simple. To bring it off, Amos must come up with $2,000.

NOT THAT INEXPENSIVE

The plan is not actually that inexpensive, however. The total transportation cost for the three Ethiopian youths—Solomon, Dagne, and Zewdie—will amuont to $3,600, but the First Evangelical United Brethren Church, of which Amos is a member, has pledged $1,000 and a Detroit Peace Corps couple will donate another $600. That means that the Mishawaka teacher must raise the remaining $2,000. He hopes that he will be able to do so through the generosity of friends and fellow Mishawakans.

Before one jumps to the conclusion that Amos is attempting to get Mishawakans to finance the entire program for him, however, it should be pointed out that he will support the three youths through their 1-year stay here. The money needed is strictly for transportation.

Amos has particular reasons for wishing to get these three particular boys to Mishawaka for a year. While he believes in the AFS program, he points out: "Foreign students in our city in the past have almost always come from wealthy families within their own countries. We need to bring those who cannot come any other way."

One of the youths proposed by Amos is an orphan, while the other two come from small farming village families. All three came to Amos' Peace Corps group with no change of clothing. They were sick and weak from their living conditions and diet, and they were in the "big city" away from their homes (education in Ethiopia is offered only in the larger cities, and those who wish to become students must come on their own).

Despite the adverse conditions of their arrival, Amos points out that the three boys were given help and direction, and wound up in the top 10 percent of their class. He feels that they will be scholastically able to handle work at Mishawaka High School.

CAN OFFER MUCH

Amos believes that the youths will be able to offer much to Mishawaka in return for what they receive here.

Amos is a 1963 graduate of Ball State University, and he went directly into the Peace Corps. He taught several subjects during his tour of duty in Ethiopia, and he returned to Mishawaka only last August.

Amos emphasized that the necessary $2,000 must be raised by April 1 if he is to be able to arrange for the youths to be here next school year.

Amos plans to go to various organizations, using a slide presentation to promote his drive for funds. Other donations, he said, will be accepted through the First Evangelical United Brethren Church, 504 West Mishawaka Avenue or by him at his residence, 1206½ East Third Street.

Save Indiana Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Carl Sandburg has well said:

> The Dunes (Indiana Dunes) are to the Midwest what the Grand Canyon is to Arizona and Yosemite is to California. They constitute a signature of time and eternity: Once lost the loss would be irrevocable.

The recreational areas of our country which still remain in all their natural glory are becoming fewer and fewer. We have a responsibility to our children and generations yet unborn to preserve these so that they may share in measure the natural beauty of our country.

No one has contributed more to the cause of conservation than the senior Senator from Illinois, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS. His valiant and determined fight to save the Indiana Dunes from extinction has won the admiration of conservationists everywhere and the great respect even of those who do not share his views.

A glowing and deserved tribute to the fine efforts of Senator DOUGLAS is contained in an article by Charles Lea entitled "To Save the Indiana Dunes," which appeared in the January 1966 issue of the Gardener, and I am pleased to attach it to my remarks and to bring this cause of conservation to the attention of all Members of the House:

OUR GREAT OPPORTUNITY—TO SAVE INDIANA DUNES

(By Charles Lea, chairman, national projects committee)

These words of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, express the greatest challenge and finest opportunity to the members of the Men's Garden Clubs of America.

This wonderful American heritage nestles in the center of an area of 10 million people within a 100-mile radius. If safeguarded it will be visited by countless millions in the generations to come.

I do not know whether you realize how near you have come to losing this priceless treasurer, this irreplaceable gem. It is not yet out of the hand of those who stood by and watched the homing pigeon fade into oblivion; the buffalo herds that covered the West melt to a few score; the whooping crane, the trumpeter swan, the crested heron, and many other of America's priceless possessions reduced to a pitiful few.

No, it couldn't happen here, we said, but it keeps on happening here, along our coasts, to our areas of beauty; to our clear, fresh rivers; our redwoods, our wilderness, all of which don't belong just to this generation, but to all generations, past, present and future. Each generation is the custodian for the next, and you men, to a great degree, are the custodians for the Indiana Dunes.

Carl Sandburg has said, "The dunes are to the Midwest what the Grand Canyon is to Arizona and Yosemite is to California. They constitute a signature of time and eternity: Once lost the loss would be irrevocable."

The dunes are unique scientifically. They are located in the heart of the Nation's second greatest metropolitan complex. Their values fit every desirable characteristic set forth in the new report of Laurence Rockefeller's Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission. They contain an incomparable fresh water shore and beach line. The widest in America, they are located near a major population center, where they are needed most; they are imminently threatened by adverse usage; and they contain natural phenomena and combinations not duplicated anywhere on the continent.

The importance of the dunes has long been recognized. Stephen Mather, Secretary of the Interior, and the first Director of the National Park Service, recommended in 1916 that 25 to 30 miles of them be incorporated in the National Park System.

Naturalists the world over have found the dunes to be unique in North America for their geological and botanical contents. At the start of this century, the great botanist, Henry C. Cowles, of the University of Chicago, was primarily responsible for the area being called the birthplace of ecology in North America.

Many years ago, Professor Cowles conducted a group of Europe's outstanding natural scientists through the United States. Time permitted a visit to only four of our greatest natural phenomena: Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Yellowstone, and the Indiana Dunes.

"There are few places on our continent," Cowles once said, "where so many species of plants are found in so small a compass * * * within a stone's throw of almost any spot one may find plants of the desert and plants of the rice woodland and plants of the swamps, plants of oak woods and plants of the prairies * * * species of the most diverse natural regions are piled here, together in such abundance as to make the region a natural botanical preserve. Here one may find the prickly pear cactus of the southwestern desert hobnobbing with the bearberry of the Arctic regions."

"Nowhere, perhaps in the entire world of plants," Professor Cowles said, "does the struggle for life take on such dramatic and spectacular phases as in the dunes. In my 20 years of study of the Indiana Dunes, I have many times watched the destruction of forest by sand burial. But the plants do not yield supinely * * * the cottonwood, various willows, wild grape and dogwood display an outstanding resistance growing up as the sand advances over them, and often suceeding in keeping pace with the advance of the sand.

"It is not so well known as it should be that the Indiana Dunes are much the grandest in the entire world."

Time and space will not permit me to describe this jewel, which has been publicized in countless magazines and newspapers of America, yet we are willing to stand by and see our "birthright" sold on the block for a "mess of pottage."

In 1964, at the suggestion of the late President Kennedy, a further study was made by the Bureau of the Budget, which recommended a compromise which permitted the Burns Ditch Harbor, one of the main obstacles in the long fight, to be included with certain economic conditions. An administration bill was prepared by the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service and introduced in the Senate by Senator Henry M. Jackson, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Among the 25 cosponsors were Senator Clinton P. Anderson, senior majority member and former chairman of the Interior Committee; Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Senators Vance Hartke and Birch Bayh, the able Senators from Indiana, and eight members of the Interior Committee.

In the House of Representatives, Representative Morris Udall, of Arizona, a vigorous member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, introduced the administration bill. Several other longstanding House supporters of a Dunes National Lakeshore, including Illinois Representatives Roman Pucinski, Melvin Price, Barratt O'Hara, and Roland Libonati introduced identical bills.

A hearing was promised on S. 2249 for February 1964, by Senator Alan Bible, of Nevada, chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Interior Committee.

The bill was passed by the Senate in the 88th Congress. The House bill was still having difficulties, with Representative Ray Madden, of Indiana, a fighter for the dunes for many years, bearing the brunt of the fighting. The 88th Congress adjourned without a House vote.

New bills had to be introduced in the 89th Congress by both Houses. The Senate bill has been passed, and we are still waiting for the House Members to have the privilege of voting.

On September 23, 1965, word was received from the Save the Dunes Council, which has been the mainstay of the fight to save the dunes for over 10 years, together with Senator Douglas, of Illinois, that a hearing on the House bill 51 would be held in Valparaiso, Ind., on Saturday, October 2, 1965. Someone in Washington didn't believe there were enough people in Indiana who cared whether the dunes were saved or not.

Well, friends, they got the shock of their lives. Saturday morning, Valparaiso University, the place of meeting, looked like a homecoming day with the Chicago University team the underdog. The word we received was "they came in droves and droves, and more droves, from all over the State, there was standing room only, and that was crowded. Prepared badges ran out, substitute badges were used, they ran out, so pieces of white paper were used." As far as we know, here in South Carolina, the committee returned to Washington satisfied that the people who counted, in Indiana, knew of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore bill, and were determined to save the dunes for their children and for generations to come.

It took 10,000 years to form these dunes, and we want America to enjoy them for 10 times 10,000 years.

I hope that every region, every club, and every individual members in the States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, will join in seeing to it that a stream of resolutions, letters, wires, and phone calls goes to every Member of the House of Representatives from their States until the H.R. 51 has been passed. This should be backed up by MGC's in the other 46 States for good measure.

Don't underestimate your enemy. Now is the time to make sure that 1,000 years from now people will still be able to enjoy the beautiful Indiana Dunes.

Unpredictable Government Stockpiling Policies Create Difficulties for Mining Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I have been most interested to hear the testimony before the subcommittee on the stockpiling of mineral resources for future national defense contingencies.

Last Friday, March 4, Mr. James Boyd, president of the Copper Range Co., of New York, on behalf of the American Mining Congress, testified to the difficulties created for the basic mining industry in the country by the unpredictable actions taken by the Government in carrying out its stockpiling policies.

Mr. Boyd called for greater cooperation between the mining industries and the Government in carrying out the intent of the Stockpiling Act of 1946. This cooperation would benefit the whole Nation, and would avoid the capsizing of a whole industry by arbitrary Government action.

Mr. Boyd's statement deserves the widest study and examination, and I am, therefore, placing it in the Congressional Record:

Stockpile Policy

(Statement by James Boyd, president, Copper Range Co., New York, N.Y., on behalf of the American Mining Congress before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, House of Representatives, March 4, 1966)

Mr. Chairman, my name is James Boyd, I am now the president of the Copper Range Co., but I am speaking to you today for the American Mining Congress as a director and member of the Special Committee on Stockpiling.

My basic training was in engineering and economics, followed by more scientific training in geology and geophysics, the engineering phases of which I followed before and while teaching economic geology at the Colorado School of Mines.

My commission in the Corps of Engineers was activated in mid-1941 when I became the chief of the Army and Navy Munitions Board's section on metals. During this time I became deeply involved in the stockpiling program. As the war developed, I became the Army representative on the War Production Board's program adjustment committee which was concerned with the allocation of materials to the claimant agencies in the development of their procurement programs. After a year and one-half as the Director of the Industry Division of the Office of Military Government in Germany, followed by almost a year as dean of the Colorado School of Mines, I returned to the Government at Secretary Krug's request, first as his assistant and chairman of the interdepartmental committee charged with evaluation of the country's resources in the preparation for the Marshall plan. President Truman appointed me to the directorship of the U.S. Bureau of Mines in 1947 and during the Korean war Secretary Chapman concurrently appointed me to the post of Defense Minerals Administrator. I served as the Department of Interior's representative on the interdepartmental stockpiling committee during the period that a large part of the stockpile objectives were planned. Since 1951 I have been engaged in the copper industry, first as vice president of the Kennecott Copper Co. in charge of exploration, and in 1960 I was elected to my present position. In the past 15 years I have served on several advisory committees to the Government involved in mobilization planning and minerals research.

I have, therefore, been close to the complex problems of stockpiling from both the Government and industry points of view for almost 25 years.

Mr. Strauss has presented to you the Mining Congress and therefore the industry's view in this matter. I completely concur with this position. I would like today to relate the Government's activities to the domestic industry both historically and economically.

As a consequence of material shortages in World War I, there was considerable debate on the necessity of a stockpiling program for many years. As the war in Europe developed in the late 1930's, this debate became more insistent. It must be stated that much of the opposition to a stockpiling program came from the mining industry. Many in the industry feared the existence of stockpiles in the Government's hands as a threat to normal markets. This fear has been amply justified in the actions of the Government during the past 2 or 3 years. Nevertheless, the need for strategic stockpiles was so obvious that Public Law 117 was passed by Congress in 1939. This law contained the explicit safeguard that provided for congressional approval of disposals from the stockpiles, except under the conditions for which the stockpiles were created.

Unfortunately, however, the passage of this statute was too late to be of much help in World War II. Where it did help it was dramatic. Without the rapid action taken immediately after the passage of the act in the purchase and accumulation of natural rubber, we would have been in dire straits. Much of the accumulation of strategic materials at this stage was accomplished under the broad powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Had the program been initiated a few years earlier and accumulation of materials begun, the enormous diversion of materials, manpower, and shipping to the creation of mines and the importation of scarce materials would have been materially reduced. For stockpiling is as much a creation of a reserve of manpower, electrical power, and transportation as it is of the materials themselves. Furthermore, the period just before the outbreak of hostilities in Europe was one of economic depression for the domestic minerals industries. A stockpiling program at that stage would have allowed a more orderly buildup of our domestic mining industry. Instead, we had to engage in a massive expansion of our mineral resources facilities superimposed on the war effort. Many costly mistakes were made.

The critical shortages faced throughout almost all of World War II awoke the country to the realization that a strategic reserve of critical materials was a matter of vital importance to our security. This led to the passage of a strengthened Stockpile Act of 1946. With the demand for materials to support reconversion, there was little done to build the stockpiles, for during the immediate postwar period most of our mines were busily engaged in supplying the lifeblood of industry to reconversion. Financing to carry out the stockpile objectives was slow in coming. The Nation began to lose its enthusiasm for stockpiling. Many forgot the lessons of World Wars I and II in the feeling that atomic weapons would make war an unthinkable eventuality.

Then came the military action in Korea and the reestablishment of Government controls. The feeling that the Korean action could escalate into a worldwide conflict became a dominant factor in planning. With military requirements imposed on top of a thriving economy, the need for concurrently building the neglected stockpiles created a nearly hysterical concern. Large appropriations were made for stockpile acquisitions at a time when our mines were running at full capacity to meet military and civilian demands. Government aid under the Defense Production Act was extended in several forms to stimulate expansion of the sources of supply, and stockpiling procurement was prosecuted with vigor. This, naturally, created a requirement for strategic materials far greater than any normal demand that could then be envisioned.

Following the truce in Korea, market prices for strategic materials went to record levels. This was caused by the realization that there would be no immediate escalation to a world conflict, the removal of controls, the satisfaction of the pent-up demand for civilian products, and the continued flow of materials to the stockpiles. But almost overnight in the mid-1950's the minimum stockpile objectives had been largely filled. Civilian demand leveled off, and military procurement dropped with the inevitable result that markets fell short of the artificially expanded production facilities of the mines. By 1958 prices dropped to levels which made many mines uneconomic to operate. Many were forced to close with the resultant depressing effect on the economics of the mining districts.

In an attempt to alleviate some of the devastating pressure, in 1954 the Government reopened some of the stockpiling programs to reach for the maximum rather than the minimum objectives as they had been calculated at that time. This resulted in a further flow of some minerals to the Government stockpiles and gave some relief to the industry at that time.

Despite the size of our modern Government and the apparently vast sums of money flowing in and out of its coffers, it remains only a part of the total civilian economy and such actions as stockpiling activities can have only temporary effect. The growth of the economy is far more important and eventually it would catch up with the artificially created capacity. This it has done to larger or smaller extent in each specific commodity.

The objectives of the strategic stockpiles are creatures of men's minds and imagination based upon their interpretation of the forces facing them at each stage of decision. Conditions change and the men in positions of responsibility change; hence, what one group of men determines to be an objective today will be different from what another group, under another set of circumstances, will decide tomorrow. It is much easier to change these objectives than it is to expand or contract vast industries. The administration of the stockpiling program becomes, therefore, an extremely difficult task requiring vast foresight and a maximum of restraint. Decisions of Government officials in this field have a tremendous direct influence on the lives of many thousands of people and the national security. Wise decisions require great knowledge and close cooperation with those affected by those decisions. Unfortunately, although the Congress provided in the stockpiling act for close Government-industry cooperation—this is contained in section 2, subsection (b), which states: "to the fullest extent practicable the President shall appoint industry advisory committees selected from the industries concerned with materials to be stockpiled * * *" this has too often not been the case. This is probably due to the fact that such cooperation is time consuming and difficult to structure. Such cooperation is, however, vital and despite the difficulties it should be pursued diligently. The objectives of both industry and Government are identical in the assurance of adequate supply in war and peace. There is no room, therefore, for an arm's-length approach.

At this moment in many of the critical materials industries, demand has caught up with supply and in some instances has exceeded it. Industry has been working diligently with the expenditure of vast sums of capital money to anticipate the future needs. The changing face of stockpiling policy, necessary as the concept is, has made industry's task extremely difficult. Uncertainty as to what the Government may do unnecessarily complicates vital decision-making. Wrong answers arrived at under these conditions can be damaging to the entire economy.

Now that the stockpile objectives have been largely met, even though in the minds of some they appear to be too large, in our judgment, they should be left alone. The largest of the present seemingly excess stocks are barely 1 year's supply. Nobody is wise enough to know what will happen in the years ahead in this unsettled world. To dispose of this national treasure achieved through sacrifices far greater than their monetary value could be tragically unwise. Such disposals could face the industry and the country with further disruptions because at some future date it could be decided by a new generation of administrators responding to new circumstances that additions must be made to the stockpiles.

Mr. Chairman, down through the years this committee and its predecessors have supported a sound stockpiling policy. The basic stockpiling concept is sound, for it is an important part of our defense posture. Nevertheless, disruptions to the mining industry in the achievement of stockpiling objectives have been profound. Some of the actions taken by Government in the program have helped to strengthen the industry in the performance of its duty to supply the economy, but many have tended to weaken some parts of it. The present situation has been achieved under some of the most challenging periods in the Nation's economic history. Now that the basic objective in general has been achieved, the administration of it can be carried out with the minimum of tension.

The fears of the industry that disposable stocks overhanging a market are a disrupting influence have proved to be well founded. Certainly the Government should not maintain large surpluses if they can be disposed of with the minimum of influence on the market. On the other hand, the Government must be as sure as it is possible to be that these stocks are indeed surplus to all possible long-range national security needs. Because objectives have varied so greatly in recent years and the administration has not yet determined how much of each material might be required for postatomic attack, this would not seem the time to declare surplus and dispose of materials that currently appear to be accumulated beyond these temporary objectives. It should be remembered that as our economy grows, these stocks annually become a smaller percentage of the total supply and demand.

Short- or long-range disposals, by reducing the pressure on supply, will slow up the industry's expansion plans. This depressant effect on expansion means that in the future we shall again be faced with shortages. It is difficult enough for companies in the industry to decide on the rate of expansion when faced with the variables of normal market conditions. It becomes impossible to plan intelligently when faced with the added complication of unpredictable Government actions.

I have described here in brief and general terms the history of stockpiling and its effect on the mining industry. I have brought with me a chart which shows the timing of Government action in relation to the condition of the markets. The period of maximum influence on the industry is that when obligations for procurement are incurred. The blocks on the chart show what obligations were incurred year by year since 1948. We have also shown the actual expenditures which necessarily lag behind obligations. (The chart referred to will be a part of the final record of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining in its March 4, 1966, hearings.)

The chart shows the events I have described. The health of an industry is usually pretty well indicated by price. We have, therefore, charted the price for copper and zinc, which together with lead are three of the largest of the activities. We did not plot lead as it follows zinc so closely. Each of the many materials has slightly different histories, but to chart them all would be confusing and imposing on your time. In principle, the same correlation would apply to each of these materials.

The 50th Anniversary, Leominster, Mass., Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my remarks in part at the 50th anniversary dinner of the Leominster, Mass., Chamber of Commerce, February 13, 1966, and news accounts of this outstanding event.

The material follows:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN, 50TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET, LEOMINSTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, FEBRUARY 13, 1966

At the 50th anniversary dinner of the Leominster Chamber of Commerce Sunday night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, hailed the local chamber for outstanding service to community, State, and Nation and unsurpassed contribution to the industrial, mercantile, business, and public development and prosperity of this great city.

Since this fine organization was born, said the Congressman, unbelievable changes have occurred in our economic system, our government, our communities and the entire American way of life.

To your everlasting credit, it can be said that this group throughout the years has furnished the splendid leadership, the ideas, the support and the guiding genius required by the fast-moving, rapidly developing changes that have taken place in the city and the country and the end is not yet in sight.

At the present time, you are participating in the tremendous growth and development of our great productive system that is accommodating itself so efficiently to the so-called population explosion and the very speedy advance of science and technology, truly amazing in both its depth and the wide sweep of its impact.

To be sure, the country is growing at an astonishing rate and our economy is moving upward to unprecedented levels.

Not so very long ago we were concerned in our own areas as people were in other places, about depressed condtions, increasing unemployment, and what appeared to be an impending economic lag.

But this is all changed. Our problem now is not one of recession or unemployment, but of doing the best we can to contain the obvious inflationary forces that are appearing in our economic system and must be effectively checked one way or another.

With the exception of Vietnam and the grave international situation, on which I will touch a little later, the country is enjoying unprecedented prosperity and adequacy at almost every level.

Practically all the economic indicators are favorable.

Business is at the highest peak of activity.

Employment is at the highest level ever.

Wages, living conditions and standards, opportunities, general economic well-being, have never been so high, and the same is true generally of earnings and profits.

Our business, economic, and social advance would be most baffling and incredible, were it not an actual reality before our very eyes.

Admittedly, these things are all on the good side, and we can be thankful for them in more ways than one, because they have brought untold benefits across the board, not only to business, labor, and agriculture but to every class and group in the Nation.

Further, these prosperous conditions, unknown in any period of world history, constitute the greatest tribute that could be paid to the greatness, and grandeur, and efficiency of our wonderful, free enterprise system, led by men and women like you, that has given Americans the priceless privilege and opportunity of bringing their initiative, talents, industry, hard work, and spirit of venture and progress, to bear upon the general welfare and the general well-being of the American people.

While we have many great and grave tasks and challenges facing us in these days, one of the most important, I think, we can agree, is the preservation of our free enterprise system that has unquestionably made us and this Nation the greatest, the most prosperous, and strongest, and most powerful Nation in history.

I do not make this statement boastfully, or in any sense of vainglory, but because it is a plain fact, of which every American is entitled to be proud and grateful.

We must, at all costs, not allow the pressures for extreme social change, or the beguiling promises of unsound economic ideologies, to swerve us from our firm purpose to maintain, preserve, develop, and enrich these marvelous free institutions of ours that have brought this Nation and its people to such remarkable levels of achievement, sufficiency, and well-being.

We must have in mind at all times that our national experience proves beyond doubt it is not necessary to scrap, or dangerously distort and alter, this great system in order to achieve desirable social goals commensurate with the needs and demands of the time in which we live.

At the present time, with this economy running along at its fastest pace, pushing up toward a huge, gigantic gross national product figure of something like $750 billion, or three-quarters of a trillion dollars, for this year, it can be readily seen by all those, not blinded by affinity for radical doctrine, that a society capable of this kind of production can, by wise, sound, cooperative, private, and governmental arrangement of its affairs, easily meet the goals of a good, sufficient, adequate, and happy life for everyone living within the confines of this great land, if we but show the will, the courage, and the interest in humanity to do it.

Obviously time enjoins me here from going into many matters that I know are in the forefront of your minds, and the minds of the American people.

Unfortunately, the picture before us is not all favorable. We face grave problems abroad. Whatever the reasons—and we know most of them stem from the Communist conspiracy—much of the world, including a considerable part of our own hemisphere, is in the throes of deep disturbances, upset, and revolution.

Lighted mostly by communism and Communists and their sympathizers, the fires of discontent and rebellion, violence, strife, and warfare against existing institutions are raging in many parts of the world, and the perpetrators are seeking with vigor, ability, and every resource to overthrow freedom and substitute the totalitarian, police state of communism.

Only the great strength and power of this country, standing almost alone these days, is stopping this evil aggressive movement from sweeping over the world.

That is the issue in Latin America. That is the issue in Africa. That is the issue in East Berlin and that is the issue in Vietnam, where gallant American boys are fighting, yes, and dying, to hold back the hordes moving by infiltration and force to trample over small, helpless nations and press their conquest, not only of all of Asia, but ultimately of the rest of the world. To remain supine and unmoved by these events would be for this Nation to invite disaster.

Most Americans deplore and regret the necessity for our current involvement in bloody conflict. But most Americans know what the issues are, they know that freedom, security, safety, and survival is at stake. They know that, if hard-core Communists once learn as the result of our appeasement and lack of purpose that they could successfully conduct aggression against the weak and helpless without opposition, they will run madly throughout the world, just as other despots and tyrants have done in the past, scorching the earth, so to speak, bringing slavery, destruction, and desolation everywhere until they have achieved their aim of conquering and dominating all freedom-loving nations.

If there is a peaceful answer to this present conflict, Lord knows this Government has tried hard enough to find it, because our leaders have worked day and night to secure an honorable peace. They have pleaded with the aggressors to respond to our appeals for peace, but to date these pleas have gone unheeded.

They have ceased bombing and declared moratorium, with all that could mean to the military position of our troops, but this inducement, these fervent pleas from many nations, these acts of sincerity, and good faith have been met with stony silence.

None of us have any way of knowing what the future will bring. We pray it will be peace and understanding, at an early date, even as we contemplate the hard-core apparatus of organized world Communists as they join hands in devious ways, powerful aggression and strong support to test out the strength of our purpose to stand up against their aggressions, designs and moves toward our defeat, and conquest of the world.

For they know, as I think most Americans know, that if we do not stand up firmly, and if we appease and retreat and give way to ruthless violence and oppression of the weak and the lowly, we may well face the greatest dangers of all, and be confronted with escalated wars not only in Asia but in other parts of the world that would threaten and endanger our security and very existence as a free nation.

So I think, my friends, that we do not have much choice in this crucial hour. The way may be hard, but we must choose, if we are compelled to do so, the way this Nation has always chosen in the past, the way that will best protect our liberties, assure our freedoms, guard our security and defend our blessed land, the way of peace through strength and liberty, through our resolute will to protect the spiritual values of this unmatched democratic system and our way of life.

Even as we gather here tonight to honor this great organization, dedicated to free enterprise and the ideals of this free Nation, our Government is striving with spiritual leaders and many other nations for peace in Vietnam. Our objectives are clear and honest, and I hope the Communists will accept this latest offer to negotiate in the same spirit of good faith, sincerity, and conviction for peace in which it is made.

However, come what may, let it be clearly and definitely understood by all—that this Nation is firm in its determination to protect our heritage, in every way this may be required, with all our strength and power in behalf of the freedoms we love and the just peace we seek.

Let me congratulate you upon your 50th birthday and commend you for your lofty public spirit and your magnificent record of accomplishment and your inspiring devotion to the Nation. I wish for you many happy returns of this great day and I trust and pray that in the days ahead we will all stand, as our country has stood before, joined together in an unbreakable unity for freedom, justice, and peace in the Nation and the world.

[From the Leominster (Mass.,) Enterprise, Feb. 14, 1966]

Philbin Says Retreat Would Enlarge Wars

LEOMINSTER.—Appeasement and retreat in Vietnam could lead to "escalated wars, not only in Asia, but in other parts of the world that would threaten and endanger our security and very existence as a nation," Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN stated here Sunday night.

"Only the great strength and power of this country, standing almost alone these days," is stopping Communist aggression in Asia, Africa, East Berlin, and Latin America, Congressman PHILBIN said at the annual chamber of commerce meeting.

"Most Americans deplore and regret the necessity for our current involvement in bloody conflict," but the Communist aggressors have ignored our attempts to "secure an honorable peace."

The administration's efforts to end the Vietnam war, PHILBIN said, have been totally ignored.

The cease-fire and moratorium, "with all that could mean to the military position of our troops, combined with fervent pleas from many nations have been met with stony silence."

"If we do not stand up firmly, and if we appease and retreat * * * we may well face the greatest dangers of all, and be confronted with escalated wars not only in Asia but in other parts of the world that would threaten and endanger our security and very existence as a free nation."

PHILBIN also noted that with the exception of Vietnam and the "grave international situation, the country is enjoying unprecedented prosperity and adequacy at almost every level" with "practically all economic indicators favorable" for continued growth and prosperity."

Congressman PHILBIN's address marked the annual meeting of the chamber of commerce in the Holiday Inn.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, Feb. 14, 1966]

Philbin Hails Leominster Chamber on Anniversary

LEOMINSTER.—At the 50th anniversary dinner of the Leominster Chamber of Commerce last night in the Holiday Inn, U.S. Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN hailed the chamber for "outstanding service to the community, State, and Nation and unsurpassed contribution to the industrial, mercantile, business, and public development and prosperity of the city."

Speaking on the Vietnam situation and the U.S. Government's overtures of peace and settlement, he said, "If there is a peaceful answer to this conflict, Lord knows this Government has tried hard to find it, because our leaders have worked night and day to secure an honorable peace."

The outgoing president of the chamber told members that the chamber had been "successful in attaining most of the goals that it had set for itself." Alphonse Paramini told members that "Leominster is not only a good place to start a business but it is a good place to stay and maintain a business."

The incoming president, Frank Nash, outlined the program the chamber hopes to carry out during this 50th anniversary year. Some of the program includes such things as a drive for 150 new members, support for a city manager form of government, a renewal program for downtown Leominster. (He was quick to ask the crowd not to misinterpret him—he said a renewal program—a right one.)

Those nominated to serve for 3 years as directors are Robert C. Lasert, Edward Carlson, Augustine Fabiani, Donald Fleming, and Robert Doucette.

Headstart Gains Cited by Costello

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Project Headstart has been making progress in the Nation's largest city, according to Deputy Mayor Timothy W. Costello. The New York Times in its February 27 edition contained an article dealing with the progress report. I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 27, 1966]

Headstart Gains Cited by Costello—Report Brings Praise From Private Agency Group

(By Alfred Friendly)

Project Headstart, a Federal program for cultural enrichment of preschool children, is making progress here, Deputy Mayor Timothy W. Costello told a news conference in city hall yesterday.

Eight Headstart Centers run by private agencies are already in operation with 505 children in class, and 17 other private centers for 795 youngsters are scheduled to open this week, Mr. Costello said.

In all, 124 centers sponsored by 47 voluntary agencies and handling a projected total of 5,382 children will go into operation as necessary renovations and staff hiring are completed.

About 100 centers under the supervision of the board of education are functioning already, the deputy mayor said. These are caring for about half of the 7,380 children due to attend classes at 219 public schools.

There had been complaints that a Federal grant of $6,448,845, approved by Governor Rockefeller on January 6, was not being distributed rapidly enough to the privately operated centers. Two weeks ago the 47 volunteer agencies formed the Federation of Independent Headstart Centers to press for coordinated city action on the program.

Their representatives met with the deputy mayor last week. Spokesman for the group expressed a measure of satisfaction yesterday with the progress reported by Dr. Costello.

"They have moved within the last week much more than they had previously, but there's still a lot more to be done," said Maurice Reid, director of the Head Start project at the Brownsville Community Council in Brooklyn.

PROBLEMS DISCUSSED

The deputy mayor received praise from Eugene M. Sklar of the Union Settlement Association in Harlem, who said Dr. Costello should be congratulated for "cutting through the myriad of city agencies responsible for getting the Head Start program going."

Mr. Sklar, a member of the meeting of the steering committee of the federation said, however, that it would be necessary to gain assurances from city hall about long-term plans for Head Start. "If they do not produce, we'll be back, and we'll be ready to fight," Mr. Sklar warned.

At the press conference, Dr. Costello and Martin Kotler, deputy director of the city's economic opportunity committee, detailed some of the problems that had been delaying the Head Start projects.

Many of the privately operated centers, particularly those in the poorest neighborhoods, were unable to meet standards for fire, health, safety, and lighting provisions, the officials said. Moreover, only inadequate funds were available to make necessary renovations.

Last Monday, however, the Office of Economic Opportunity allocated $490,000 to cover the cost of making the private premises suitable for schooling operations. This lifted a previous $250-a-room limit on such renovations.

In addition, the officials said, it has been difficult to recruit all the qualified teachers, assistant teachers, and family assistants needed for the intensive prekindergarten training the Head Start children are supposed to receive.

Critics of the delay have further charged that there is a lack of coordination between the city agencies involved and that the sponsors of private centers have been getting a runaround from departments that should have been expediting their projects.

The progress reported yesterday, Dr. Costello said, "demonstrates how it is possible to bring to bear literally all the forces of the community and government on a particular problem on a crash basis and break through what many people call bureaucratic red tape."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Col. Waldron E. Leonard, Outstanding Friend of the Veteran, Retires After 20 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the retirement of Col. Waldron E. Leonard after 20 years of service as the Director of the Department of Veterans' Affairs of the District of Columbia is regretful. This man has served veterans of this area faithfully, efficiently, and knowledgeable for the last 20 years, but the retirement of Colonel Leonard will leave as much an absence of his personality, as of his good work.

Colonel Leonard was the kind of man who you would pick to be a veterans' representative. He was aware of the veterans' problems, knew the way to solve them, and kept abreast of every happening in the field. The main solace to those of us who worked so long with Colonel Leonard is that, although he supposedly "retired" at the end of last year, he has been just as much a working part of veterans matters this year as he was before his so-called retirement. This is the kind of man he is—a man concerned with other people and a man of energetic spirit that reflects in an ever willingness to help wherever he can.

As a tribute to Colonel Leonard, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Stars and Stripes of Thursday, January 13, 1966, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL'S OUTSTANDING VETERAN RETIRES

It has often been said that the retirement of some outstanding man marks the end of an era in his particular field. Many times this is true. But occasionally an unusual kind of outstanding man, while bringing the unmistakable stamp and character of his personality, style, and uniquely individual qualifications to his job, brings also a far-sighted realization and understanding of the need to build soundly for the future. This would insure the continuance of his work and service and help to meet the challenging demands of an on-going present. This assurance of continuity for the future of the activities he began and carried forward so well is the mark of this kind of unusual outstanding man. His going does not mark an end because he has insured a future.

To his great credit and the continuing benefit of our American veterans in the District of Columbia, Col. Waldron E. Leonard has been this kind of outstanding veterans man for the 20 years he has devotedly and imaginatively served as director, Department of Veterans' Affairs of the District of Columbia government.

To believe that he will not be sincerely missed in his accustomed haunts, that his retirement will go unremarked or will not take some of the individuality, color, interest, and human warmth which his longtime sympathetic and humane qualities brought to every veteran's problem which touched their lives, their interests, and the welfare of their loved ones, would be both unrealistic and untrue.

The range and scope of Colonel Leonard's activities in the Capital City he loves and so faithfully served is a roster of every major civic group. Thirteen District of Columbia patriotic and religious organizations are more effective and colorful by reason of his membership, interest, and unflagging energies. These he will continue to serve. He will be missed as the chairman for many years, of the Constitution Day and Citizenship Day programs and in many other community observances.

For every District, Maryland, and Virginia veteran and his dependent in need of help, comfort, kindness, or information the colonel's office has long been a haven of hope, reassurance, and compassionate human understanding. The recognition and tribute accorded Colonel Leonard through the years have been many, varied, and important, but his 15 years as president of the Metropolitan Area Council of Veterans Organizations representing 22 major veterans' groups of the District, Maryland, and Virginia; his personal representation of the Board of District of Columbia Commissioners in all matters pertaining to veterans and patriotic affairs and his chairmanships of veterans participation in four presidential inaugurals give clearest testimony of his ability and accomplishments.

Dearest to his heart, however, has been his association from its inception, which he has had with the activities of the Washington, D.C., USO and the realization of his dream for a new veterans hospital in the District.

Colonel Leonard's hopes and interest in maintaining the highest quality service to veterans is demonstrated by his desire that those who succeed him be the best qualified men available. He has been insistent that his successor continue present services but be capable of bringing new ideas, renewed dedication, and personal concern to the problems of the veterans of Vietnam and to the continuing mission he has established for the Department of Veterans' Affairs in the District of Columbia.

That Colonel Leonard in his many years of service has established a standard that is hard to match and has lived up to his standard in matchless fashion is best epitomized in the words he once received in Christmas greeting. "To whom can one turn at midnight or 4 a.m. for a veteran in critical distress, as I have done, except to Colonel Leonard and get results. May God bless you."

We of the Stars and Stripes-the National Tribune, can think of no more deserved and meaningful accolade to add to a career of single-minded devotion and service than these words. May you enjoy a long happy and active "retirement" from public office * * * we know you will never "retire" from your interest and service to our Capital City, its civic activities and its veterans. Like the old Roman, Cincinnatus, you will continue in your love of country and your fellow man to work in peace or war for their betterment and welfare.

Comments From Washington by Congressman Clark W. Thompson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. HANSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Congressman CLARK THOMPSON, of Texas, is a very conscientious Representative. His efforts to keep his constituents informed are untiring.

In his recent newsletter, Congressman THOMPSON, an ex-marine, wrote of his visit with marine Gen. Lew Walt at the monthly meeting of the Capitol Hill Marines. The two marine members of my staff, Harry Sullivan and Mark Servoss, who faithfully attend these meetings, also spoke very highly of General Walt and his analysis of the situation in Vietnam.

With the marines at this very moment inflicting extremely high casualties on the Vietcong in their most recent campaign, General Walt's statements are most timely.

For the benefit of my colleagues, therefore, I introduce Congressman THOMPSON's fine newsletter into the RECORD. This particular letter is typical of the quality of the material with which the Congressman keeps his constituents informed:

COMMENTS FROM WASHINGTON BY CONGRESSMAN CLARK W. THOMPSON

DEAR NEIGHBORS: Once a month, former marines who are now Members of Congress or otherwise officially on Capitol Hill get together for breakfast. We invite the Commandant of the Marine Corps and other prominent marines to come and talk to us off the record about the military situation.

The Marine Corps never gets out of your blood once it gets in, and this process of rubbing elbows once a month with the active service keeps us informed and keeps us feeling that we are a part of the old corps.

In keeping with this monthly schedule, this past week we sat down around the table so to speak and listened to Gen. Lew Walt, who is in command of the Marines in Vietnam, tell the story of what is going on and what the future holds. Ordinarily what is said at these meetings is off the record, but this time it was not, and so I violate no confidence whatever in telling you what I learned from the general.

First, he told us something of the underlying troubles in that unhappy Vietnam country. I remember long ago, I guess maybe 15 years, my pastor asked me to occupy his pulpit one memorable Sunday and to talk to the congregation on any subject of my choosing. I chose the Communist menace, which I had been studying carefully and with deep concern. I told how in those days the Communists infiltrated an unsuspecting country—how they first would gain control of small political units such as cities and towns. They would do it by getting control first of the mayor or whoever the ruling magistrate was; then they would seize the police department so that there was no law and order and no justice except that which the Communists chose to mete out; then they would take over schools, eliminating them at first and much later filling them with teachers who would teach only the Communist doctrine. At about the same time, they would destroy all churches.

That has been the pattern for many years, and that is the pattern in South Vietnam today. Human life is expendable. Natives who resist the Communist infiltraters are killed without compunction and are probably better off if it happens quickly rather than after torture. This phase of the Communist operation is carried on by guerillas. They are followed by more formal military units from North Vietnam.

As our troops move into an area, they first of all, after driving the guerillas out, restore the former goverment or set up a new one composed of the non-Communist Vietnamese. Our troops provide the necessary security for a considerable time if necessary until the local people are ready to protect themselves. Meanwhile, we conduct military operations against the North Vietnamese and/or whoever else may be fighting beside them.

Up to now, General Walt told us there is no evidence of any Chinese troops. That is the picture in that unhappy land; and if we are driven out either by force or by the demands of a certain element here in this country, we are going to have to do the same job somewhere else at a later date.

I came away from that breakfast meeting convinced that we are right to fight it out where we are. Incidentally, there was no question in my mind, after listening to him, that General Walt thinks that we are winning and that our progress is good.

Sincerely yours,

Clark W. Thompson.

Alabama TV Station Wins Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a significant honor has been bestowed upon Taft Broadcasting Co., which operates station WBRC–TV in Birmingham, Ala. The company has received a Freedoms Foundation Award for outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life.

I ask unanimous consent that two documents about the award be printed in the Record following my remarks. One is a Taft Broadcasting Co. release dated February 21, 1966. The other is an item from Broadcasting magazine dated February 21, 1966.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TAFT BROADCASTING CO. SERIES WINS MAJOR FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD

Los Angeles, February 21.—The Taft Broadcasting Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, will receive at the patriots' ball tomorrow from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., an encased George Washington Honor Medal for outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life.

The encased medal, one of the highest awards in the general Americana category, is being presented for the five-part television series, "Rights and Responsibilities," conceived by Robert T. Schlinkert, vice president and general manager of WBRC–TV, the Taft television station in Birmingham, Ala.

The award also cites the contributions of Dr. Billy Graham, Bob Considine, Pat Boone, and Art Linkletter, who appeared in the series. The award is the only Freedoms Foundation presentation to be made at the patriots' ball in the Beverly Hilton Hotel here.

It will be received by Lawrence H. Rogers II, president of the Taft firm, and presented by Don Belding, cofounder and chairman of the Freedoms Foundation executive committee.

WBRC–TV is also receiving, for the fifth time, a regional award for its annual Fourth of July celebration television broadcast, a patriotic program aired each Independence Day. This presentation will be made at a later date.

In the "Rights and Responsibilities" series, Dr. Graham discusses freedom of religion; Mr. Boone, background to the first amendment and the rights of assembly and petition; Mr. Considine covers the communications media in freedom of the press; and Mr. Linkletter addresses himself to freedom of speech.

The five programs are based on the first amendment. In addition to being carried on the Taft stations, "Rights and Responsibilities" was made available at no cost to all radio and television stations in the country, both commercial and educational as well as civic, educational, religious, and patriotic organizations.

The Freedoms Foundation awards jury was composed of 36 persons, one-third of them chief justices or associate justices from individual State supreme courts, and national heads of patriotic, veterans, and service organizations.

With Mr. Rogers at the presentation here will be Mr. Schlinkert and Roger B. Read, administrative vice president of Taft Broadcasting, and Charles R. Vanda, Beverly Hills, producer of the series.

Messrs. Boone, Considine, and Linkletter are expected to be present. Dr. Graham is unable to attend.

In addition to Birmingham, the Taft Broadcasting stations are located in Cincinnati, Columbus, Ohio.; Kansas City, Mo.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Lexington, Ky.; and Scranton/Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

[From Broadcasting magazine, Feb. 21, 1966]

TAFT WINS FREEDOMS MEDAL

Top television award in the broad General Americana category of Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa., will go this year to Taft Broadcasting Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, for "outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life." A complete list of the Freedom Foundation awards will be announced this week. For the five-part television series "Rights and Responsibilities," Lawrence H. Rogers II, president of Taft, will receive an encased George Washington Honor Medal at the Patriots Ball in Los Angeles today (Feb. 21). The series was conceived by Robert T. Schlinkert, vice president and general manager of WBRC–TV, Birmingham, Ala.

Publisher Carl Estes of Longview, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include an article that appeared recently in the Dallas News concerning a truly great man and a truly great publisher, Carl Estes of Longview, Tex.

LONGVIEW PUBLISHER HONORED BY MAGAZINE

Longview, Tex.—Newspaper publisher Carl Estes of Longview, who is widely known for his leadership in east Texas industrial development, has been named Man of the Month by East Texas magazine.

The official publication of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, in its February issue, notes that Estes will always be found "where the action is, and if there doesn't seem to be enough action to suit him, he is sure to create some."

His name, the magazine states, is synonymous with east Texas industrial development, and adds that he has been called "Mr. East Texas" by the Dallas News.

Estes spearheaded campaigns that brought to the region R. G. LeTourneau, Inc., LeTourneau Institute, Lone Star Steel, Texas Eastman Co., Bell & Gossett Co., Resistol Hat Co., Pittsburgh Screw & Bolt Corp., Knox Lee Power Plant and Trailmobile, among others, the magazine declared.

"He carried the ball in getting a new $500,000 union station, a new $350,000 post office, a four-lane highway between Longview and Gladewater, a $1 million county hospital, a new highway from Longview to Carthage, as well as a four-lane divided highway between Longview and Hallsville," it pointed out.

Not restricting his efforts to the Longview area alone, it added, he worked for a highway from Hughes Springs to the Lone Star plant, and was spokesman in Washington for 15 towns in the steel plant area in obtaining relaxed curbs on building for the area. This resulted in construction of hundreds of homes for the region.

One of his activities of which he is proud was his work in the Connally Act campaign, which insured orderly production of oil, and which saved the east Texas field and the Texas oil industry from the "hot oil crowd," the publication reports.

Estes, who is publisher of the Longview Daily News and the Longview Morning Journal, has placed his editors in the spotlight when his newspapers received various honors, "and he has been quick to recognize and reward his teammates for a job well done," it states.

Estes is a veteran of two world wars—he was in the Army in World War I and was a naval commander in the Pacific theater during World War II, where he won the bronze star and other citations. He is a member of numerous civic and journalism organizations.

The publisher and his wife, whose maiden name was Margaret Virginia McLeod, live on a ranch south of Longview where they raise Santa Gertrudis cattle.

Demonstration Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House a very penetrating analysis of the administration's "demonstration cities" and other urban development programs. It is an analysis of administration programs put out by Prentiss-Hall Inc., an honored firm of undoubted nonpartisan nature. I believe that the Prentiss-Hall analysis is very enlightening. I wish every Member of this House could read it because it spells out the true intent of administration programs in terms of pure powergrabbing.

I hope that Members from rural constituencies, as yet unworried by the proposed urban "commissars," will read the section shedding light on the power grab on the drawing boards with reference to rural areas. The Johnson administration wants to put commissars in the countryside, too, it would appear.

The American rural yeoman is going to be culturally rehabilitated, or the commissar will have to know why. Perhaps the administration will call the farm commissar "Director of Development District" as those are the units to be involved. He will be a coercing cousin of the "Urban Coordinator."

The Prentis-Hall Lawyers Weekly Report of February 7, 1966, makes these points nicely:

> WHAT'S HAPPENING IN WASHINGTON
>
> THE GREAT SOCIETY IN THE CITIES
>
> President Johnson has announced that his Great Society is really coming to the cities now. In the past, urban programs have been piecemeal approaches to single problems: urban renewal, public housing, slum clearance. But a still-secret task force study recently completed has come up with a truly Johnsonian total plan—designed to bring sweeping changes to urban areas. The business and social implications for everyone are simply staggering.
>
> Insiders tell us all this is only the beginning. They say L.B.J. is so anxious to see his new program work that he has told Federal planners to study carefully just how a city that applies for funds is running itself—and then recommend improvements. In some cases these Great Society agents will ask city governments to change building codes and zoning laws and to provide real estate tax advantages for property owners who rehabilitate their buildings. They may even demand that city administrations reorganize themselves for more efficient operation along lines suggested by Federal representatives.
>
> Some Government aids candidly acknowledged to us that they expect very little resistance from the cities to these demands. They broadly hint that Johnson has set up his plan in such a way that the cities will be competing amongst themselves for the funds, and in the heat of competition will hesitate to complain about Federal demands.
>
> It will be some time before Congress holds hearings on bills embodying Johnson's proposals. But Hill staffers tell us that much of L.B.J.'s plan could be applied right now to current projects without further congressional OK'ing. So watch for increasing Federal pressure in urban programs.
>
> AND IN THE COUNTRY
>
> Johnson's Great Society plan for rural areas, recently described to Congress, is only the first step in a master plan to bring complete economic and social change to rural areas. The implications—as with the program for urban improvement we discussed above—are tremendous. Here's a broad outline of what the President would like to see accomplished.
>
> Basically, his program would divide the country into new Federal community development districts—a sort of new administrative or political unit which will look to the Federal Government rather than the State for guidance. Each district will include several counties and rural communities. Federal planners say they will lay down district lines according to existing trading or commuting patterns where possible.
>
> All of the governmental units within a district—community, county, State agencies—will be requested to cooperate under Federal direction. Federal money will be held out as a reward for such districtwide cooperation. Federal agencies that now operate rural programs have already been told by L.B.J. they'll be working only with the development districts.
>
> Like his program for the cities, Johnson thinks that not only physical but social and cultural rehabilitation must take place. So there will be Federal projects to increase labor skills, industrial capacity, job opportunities, as well as to improve educational and health facilities and other public services.
>
> There has been much talk in recent years of the inability of local governments to cope with the problems of modern society and especially with the demands of the Great Society. This new plan for rural areas, Johnson aids tell us, is the beginning of a move to establish units on the local level that the Federal Government cannot only work with but direct too.

ORT Saluted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute the Rochdale Village, N.Y., chapter of Women's American ORT—Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training—which at this very hour is holding a rally in the Rochdale mall in observance of the 39th anniversary drive of this splendid organization.

As part of that celebration the name of Baisley Boulevard is being changed to ORT Boulevard, with that function being officially performed by John Byrne, of the New York Department of Public Events.

The speakers at the rally include Janet Wolberg, Councilmen Michael Lazar, Donald R. Manes, and former Councilman Seymour Boyers.

I was honored to be invited by Mrs. Adele Ring to be a guest speaker at today's observance but much to my regret I could not be present because my duties in Washington necessitated that I be here. It is with deep pleasure and pride that I partake in those ceremonies by calling to the attention of my colleagues this wonderful event and some of the aims and accomplishments of ORT and applaud the untiring efforts of the Rochdale and all chapters in its behalf over the many years.

ORT Day, which is being observed nationwide today, is sponsored by Women's American ORT. It has become a traditional honored event in all communities throughout the country in which dedicated ORTists work for the rehabilitation of Jews in need everywhere in the free world.

In observance of the day President Johnson has issued a statement directed to ORT chapters everywhere and which said in part:

> Yours is a laudable mission and you have performed it with distinction.

The ORT program of vocational training has served displaced underprivileged people for 86 years. Six hundred ORT vocational training installations in 22 countries offer youths and adults the opportunity to learn the industrial skills which will make them self supporting.

ORT is a program for rebuilding lives through vocational education. The recognized vocational training agency for the Jewish people, ORT's central creed is that man is best aided by being helped to become independent, self supporting and self respecting.

Some of these training units are located in New York. Others are in Europe where more than 12,300 are enrolled and in Israel where 19,000 are enrolled and in Africa.

The standard ORT school is a vocational high school with a 3- to 4-year curriculum in which an academic high school education is given along with technical training in the most advanced industrial trades.

ORT gives training in more than 70 modern industrial skills. The trades taught vary according to the needs of the particular area's economy.

Women's American ORT, the American women's branch of the World ORT Union, is the largest World ORT Union affiliate. It now has 60,000 members in more than 460 chapters in all American cities.

The ORT program is financed by the World ORT Union and affiliates, by the Joint Distributing Committee, a member of the United Jewish Appeal and by government foundations throughout the world.

Again I offer my congratulations to the Rochdale chapter and all chapters of ORT, and wish them continued success in this great endeavor.

Kansans Put Relationship Between Citizen and His Government in Proper Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the famous editorial, "How Much Does It Cost To Educate a Child," evoked an interesting comment from two of my constituents, putting the relationship between a citizen and his government in its proper perspective. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this thoughtful letter from Mr. and Mrs. Carl E. Mehl, of Hiawatha, Kans., in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter follows:

> HIAWATHA, KANS,
> *March 4, 1966.*
>
> Representative CHESTER MIZE,
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: I'm enclosing a copy of an editorial in the Atchison Daily Globe which should be read to your colleagues in Congress to remind them to stop being "yes men" to our spend-thrift President. The spending he is insisting on at the home front doesn't show common sense, and Congress passing on his every whim is not representing the majority of the people. Don't forget that my Government owes me only the

freedoms and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution, and these do not include a living or a guaranteed income. And I owe my Government loyalty, service, defense—I also owe my Government critical analysis and the expression of my convictions with the greatest weapon placed in the hands of men—the ballot.

Very sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. CARL E. MEHL.

Johnson's Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us are wondering what has happened to the President's leadership in the Senate. Perhaps Joseph Alsop, in his column entitled "Johnson's Leadership," published in the Washington Post of March 9, answers some of these questions.

His article follows:

JOHNSON'S LEADERSHIP

(By Joseph Alsop)

Not nearly enough attention has been given the events leading up to the Vietnam vote in the Senate last week. Yet they are very interesting, not least because they suggest that "too clever by half" is the best description of the President's present leadership.

The key event was a meeting of the senatorial dissidents on the Monday afternoon before the final vote, in Senator FULBRIGHT's office. The main question under discussion was what to do about the three supplementary resolution that then seemed to be in prospect in the Senate. These were as follows:

First, Senator MORSE's resolution to revoke the earlier congressional action sustaining the President at the time of the Tonkin Gulf incident.

Second, a resolution by Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, renewing and confirming the powers granted the President at the time of the Tonkin Gulf incident.

Third, a resolution by Senator FULBRIGHT declaring war on North Vietnam, which the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee believed would rally the maximum number of votes against the President.

Like all such senatorial rallies, this was pretty disorganized. Yet it had a kind of drift of its own. A significant episode was the appearance of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, with the news that the administration had agreed to try to persuade Senator RUSSELL to withdraw his pro-Johnson resolution. On this basis, most of the moderate dissidents urged withdrawal of the other two resolutions as well.

With some hesitation, Senator FULBRIGHT went along on dropping his pseudo-declaration of war. Many Senators present begged MORSE to follow suit, on the ground that they could not support his resolution, which would therefore get only a trifling vote. Even MORSE was thought to have agreed at the close.

As might have been expected, of course, the temptation of the headlines proved too much for Senator MORSE. Alone among the three above-listed, the Morse resolution was offered on the floor. It got exactly five votes, including only two surprises, FULBRIGHT and (unkind cut for the Vice President) McCARTHY, of Minnesota. On the main vote, there were only two against.

So the great show in the Senate ended, with many a newspaper story saying that these votes underrepresented the opposition to Johnson. They did indeed, but the question is, how much?

The meeting in FULBRIGHT's office may be considered as the measure of the hard core, and indeed included several men like Senator KENNEDY who are by no means core dissidents. It was attended by only 17 or 18 Senators. To this, in a real pinch one might have to add one or two more Democrats like the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, and two or three Republicans, like Senators COOPER and AIKEN.

In short, the real opposition to the President at this time hardly reaches 20 votes in a Senate of 100 Members. And the important fact to note is not that the vote on the Morse resolution failed to register the full opposition to Johnson. The important fact to note is that with 80 percent of the Senate ready to vote with him, even in a pinch the President now has stronger support than any war President in American history.

That is a remarkable fact. It indicates in turn, that the President as leader is being too clever by half (and that is putting it very mildly), simply because he is always reaching out for the few birds in the bush, and thereby endangering the numerous birds in hand.

On the morning of the Senate vote, for instance, he made another meaningless "peace offer" to Hanoi—an inane gesture supposedly calculated to smooth the feathers of the Senate doves. This was standard image warmaking. There was a lot more image warmaking in Secretary of Defense McNamara's recent statements. And image warmaking is even hampering the efficient conduct of the war.

This image warmaking, this prating of peace is daily more unwise. It is not winning votes. It is sowing confusion in the country. No one can understand what the President is up to, what he really wants, where he is going and how he plans to get there.

It is time, in short, for him to say forthrightly, "We are in a war, and the American way of dealing with wars is to win them." By "running Old Glory up the flagpole" (as one of his frustrated advisers has put it) he would strongly consolidate his support in Congress and the country. Whereas the universal confusion that now prevails constantly threatens to erode that support.

In sum, President Johnson deserves enormous credit for a long series of decisions courageously taken since Pleiku last winter. Maybe he was right at the beginning that they must be taken late and furtively. But surely the time for furtiveness and pretense has now passed.

Legislation To Put Animal Thieves Out of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the need for Federal legislation to halt the growing problem of theft and mistreatment of dogs and cats that are sold for research and experimentation is clearly documented. Accordingly, I am introducing today a bill providing for the licensing of animal dealers and the inspection of their facilities and records.

Under the provisions of my bill, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to promulgate standards governing the handling and transportation of animals to be sold. It also requires that research facilities obtain animals only from licensed dealers. Furthermore, it will make the theft of animals and other violations of the provisions of the bill a Federal offense.

I have received numerous letters, as I am sure many of my colleagues have, deploring the inhumane conditions and treatment that so many animals destined for laboratories—if they survive the mistreatment—have been subjected to. I share the conviction of those compassionate individuals who have written me that we must prevent the needless suffering and abuse of these animals.

Legislation such as we are proposing today should, if enacted, aid significantly in putting unscrupulous animal thieves out of business and putting an end to the cruelty endured by so many helpless animals.

I urge favorable action on this proposal before the end of this session—the sooner the better.

John F. Baldwin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are deeply anguished as we pause to mark the passing of our friend and colleague, JOHN BALDWIN, who stood among us as a tower of integrity and who was the very soul of kindness and concern for the welfare of others.

Among a group of men and women dedicated to the advantage of their respective constituencies, JOHN BALDWIN loomed tall as one who always tempered his exuberance for a given bill by a wholesome respect for the views of others. And even when he appeared before us in support of his political philosophy, he did it in a way that endeared him to his listeners instead of repelling them.

I came to know and appreciate JOHN in our weekly convocation around God's breakfast table in what we are pleased to call the House prayer group. There we could see the true spirit of this good friend as he demonstrated his love for his Maker in an increasing concern for his fellow men. Thus we saw him not as a legislator but as a Christian enlisted in the service of the Eternal.

We are deeply distressed over the irreparable loss that has been visited upon this brother's family, and Mrs. Dague joins me in prayerful petition to Almighty God that He will sustain and strengthen those who have been made desolate as they travel through this dark valley.

Redwoods and Sawmills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, KNXT television station in Los Angeles has offered its views concerning a Redwood National Park in an editorial it presented on March 3 and 4.

Because of the great interest in a Redwood National Park among the Members of Congress and people throughout the Nation, under unanimous consent I insert this excellent statement in the Record so as to give our colleagues access to a fine analysis of the situation pertaining to a Redwood National Park:

Redwoods and Sawmills

(KNXT editorial presented by Robert D. Wood)

Many people all over the State have become involved in a bitter dispute over plans for a Redwood National Park in northern California.

The current argument concerns the size of such a park, its location, and its effect on the economy of California.

President Johnson last week proposed a park totaling 45,000 acres. It would include only a few hundred acres in the Redwood Creek area of Humboldt County. Most of it would be in Del Norte County.

KNXT supports the administration plan, but with some reservations, because it would literally shatter the economy of Del Norte County.

The fight has been pictured as simply a battle between conservationists and lumbermen, but it's much more than that. There are tens of thousands of persons in that area whose very livelihoods depend upon the lumber business. What hurts them will in time hurt all of California.

These people—the loggers and sawmill operators—know the beauty of the redwoods. We believe they are generally agreed that a national redwood park is not only desirable, but inevitable.

The lumber industry also knows that the preservation of redwoods is in their own interest. If they wipe out the redwoods by cutting through the forests without regard for conservation and replanting, they will destroy the economy of the area. So they want to maintain forests, but they want the lumbering industry, too. They must have lumbering, and this is why:

Almost 70 percent of Del Norte County, or an area about the size of Orange County, is a federally controlled national forest. The remainder of the county supports about 17,000 persons, and nearly all of them depend directly upon lumbering for a livelihood. About a third of all jobholders in Humboldt County also are employed in lumbering.

Under the administration proposal, Humboldt County would not suffer greatly. But Del Norte County supervisors say their area would be devastated economically by the proposed park. Jobs would be gone, and so would the major part of the county tax base. That loss would in time prove costly to the entire State.

The administration park bill would include payments to Del Norte County to compensate for the loss to the tax base. But the supervisors say it would take much more money than the bill offers and over a much longer period to make up for the permanent loss in revenue.

We have learned of an alternate national park bill that would include the Del Norte County area, but would let the lumbering operations continue under strict controls. It would save the jobs of the people, and at the same time develop a model lumbering and reforestation program.

State park officials have made similar proposals in the past, and KNXT believes they deserve the most careful consideration by Congress.

KNXT supports a Redwood National Park. We've looked over the area, and its beauty is something that certainly should be preserved. Indeed, many large redwood areas already have been permanently set aside for the public. We'd like to see more of them saved, but we think it would be unrealistic and unfair to ignore the needs of the thousands of families who would be uprooted by the end of lumbering and sawmill operations in that area.

The Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker the death of the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp means not only the loss of an inspiring spiritual leader, but the loss of a valued personal friend to each Member of the House of Representatives, as well as to vast numbers of his former parishioners in Washington, and to the many who had come to know him in other ways. It is difficult to imagine how so simple and unassuming a man could achieve so spectacular a success in his ministry.

Somehow, his earnest sincerity became all the more effective because it was combined with friendly humor, just as his learning and logic became the more effective because they were combined with wit. The words of praise and sorrow spoken on the floor of the House since his death, and entered in the Record, are no mere matter of courteous recognition of Dr. Braskamp's 16 years of devoted service as Chaplain, but a heartfelt tribute of affection from the numerous individuals who had felt the full impact of his personality.

Seeing what great numbers of individuals are deeply and personally affected by Dr. Braskamp's death, I am reminded of the story about the funeral service of another great minister of the Gospel, Father Francis P. Duffy, chaplain of the "Fighting 69th" in World War I. A man is said to have come to the door of New York's great St. Patrick's Cathedral, while the service was going on, and demanded to be admitted because, he said, he had been an intimate friend of Father Duffy's. The policeman with whom he was expostulating waved one hand toward the full cathedral, and the other toward the overflow crowd massed on the sidewalk, and said: "So were all these."

It took little contact with Dr. Braskamp to establish a feeling of intimate friendship. He was one who cared deeply, for the fulfillment of his Christian ministry in the service of God, for his prayerful contribution to the welfare of the country and of the House of Representatives, and for the concerns of each individual who came in any way within the scope of his generous ministry. He was so effective as Chaplain of the House of Representatives because we knew that he was truly concerned, both about each of us as a human individual, and about our problems of political and moral judgment.

He was aware, and he made it his business to keep us aware, that every political problem has its moral aspect—that every proposed measure must be scrutinized from the viewpoint of two inseparable questions: "Will it work?" and "Is it right?" The pragmatist is satisfied with the answer to the first question. The starry-eyed idealist is satisfied with the answer to the second. The Christian politician, as Dr. Braskamp so often and so forcibly reminded us, must seek solutions both practical and just. The Reverend Bernard Braskamp has earned from us, his many sorrowing friends, the noblest epitaph any man could hope for: we feel that we are better men for having known him.

On Sunday, April 18, 1965, Dr. Braskamp was the guest on my special Easter Sunday television and radio broadcast. Because of the reflections of Dr. Braskamp's life and work given in the discussion we had on this occasion, I am particularly pleased to share with my colleagues excerpts from this interview:

Mr. Horton. In keeping with the spirit of this Easter Sunday, I am pleased to have as my guest today the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives. Dr. Braskamp is the first man ever to serve the House of Representatives full time as its Chaplain and he has served the post longer than any other man in history for the past 16 years.

Our Chaplain is a native of Iowa; he graduated from the University of Michigan and received his master's degree from Princeton University. Before coming to the House of Representatives in 1950, Dr. Braskamp served 40 years as pastor of a number of churches in the Washington area. Of Dr. Braskamp, the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn from Texas, said, "To the entire membership of the House of Representatives he is a counselor, friend, and brother."

I am honored to endorse this sentiment and welcome Dr. Braskamp to this Easter Sunday "Report From Washington."

Dr. Braskamp. Frank, that is a very complimentary introduction. I appreciate it.

Mr. Horton. Thank you, Dr. Braskamp. I'm sure that my constituents would be very much interested in what special ministerial duties you find distinguish your work in Congress from the many years you served in individual churches.

Dr. Braskamp. I remember very distinctly when I first ascended the rostrum to offer the prayer 16 years ago. Mr. Taft's campaign manager from Ohio said, "Now, 'Barnie,'" (he always called me "Barnie") "I'll tell you what you want to do—you want to take a good look at the Congressmen, then pray for the country."

I've been doing that ever since.

Mr. Horton. Has the House always had a minister that serves as Chaplain?

Dr. Braskamp. Yes, I think so, from the very beginning of the Continental Congress.

Mr. Horton. I always note that when there is some pressing national concern, some national crisis, you frequently reflect this in your prayers and ask for God's help.

Dr. Braskamp. Naturally, I try to make my prayers appropriate for the occasion and when there is some very pressing crisis, I refer to that.

Mr. Horton. I try, of course, to get over for the opening of each session. Many of our citizens don't realize that we start at 12:00 noon when we are in session. Of course, we do open with a prayer. Do you usually perform that function?

Dr. Braskamp. Yes. According to the ruling made by the Speaker, I am privileged to have one guest Chaplain per week. For awhile, with 435 Members, we had so many requests the Speaker decided to limit the number. So, from that time on we have had only one per week.

Mr. Horton. I notice also that you have the habit of prefacing your opening prayer with a verse of Scripture. Why do you do this and where did this custom come from?

Dr. Braskamp. Well, naturally one evening when I was in my study I picked from my bookshelves a copy of the "Book of Prayers," by Edward Everett Heel, who was Chaplain of the Senate in 1900, and I noticed that he prefaced all his prayers with a verse of Scripture. So, the next morning I told the Speaker that I had made this observation and he suggested I do the same thing. Ever since I have been prefacing all my prayers with a verse of Scripture—from both the Old and New Testaments.

Mr. Horton. Do you find that you get many comments from the Members of the House or from spectators who are in the gallery about the prayer?

Dr. Braskamp. Oh yes, quite frequently at the close of the prayer someone comes to me and says it was a fine prayer or that they appreciate my remembering an event in my prayer.

Mr. Horton. Of course, I realize that many people don't know this, but your work does include more than opening each session with prayer. Tell me a little about some of your other duties.

Dr. Braskamp. As you stated a moment ago, I happen to be the first Chaplain in the history of the Congress who is making it a full-time ministry. Years before all the Chaplains were men with parishes of their own. Naturally, they couldn't spend much time with the Congress after the prayer. But after my prayer I usually sit on both sides and make no distinction between the two parties, and I feel as much at home with the Democrats as I do with the Republicans—the Republicans as much as the Democrats.

Mr. Horton. Do you have many opportunities for private counseling or any requests for private counseling?

Dr. Braskamp. Yes, quite frequently I have, in addition to my duties to offer the opening prayer, requests for counseling. I have an office in the Capitol—a very fine office; it's very beautiful. I frequently have time for counseling with Members of the Congress. They have their own problems, you know, as the folks did in my parish before during those 45 years that I was in the ministry.

Mr. Horton. From my knowledge of the work you do, you really are not only a minister for all the Congressmen in the House of Representatives, but probably your congregation is the largest in the country.

Dr. Braskamp. Well, you take 435 Members and their families and clerks—or anyone who connects in any way with Congress—and all are perfectly free to call on me for any service I can render.

Mr. Horton. I think it is important this Easter season to leave the impression with those who are watching this show and listening to it on the radio that there is a sense of faith in God and a reverence for God here in the Nation's Capital. And, in spite of all the inroads that have been made into prayer in school, the problems dealing with the Supreme Court decision, there is a strong reliance here in the Congress on God.

Dr. Braskamp. I believe, Frank, that during the last 10 years there has been noted evidence on the part of the Members in spiritual things. The first subject of conversation when I visit with a Member of Congress is one of religion.

Mr. Horton. Dr. Braskamp, are there any special events that you have noticed in the last 16 years that stand out in your mind in your duties as Chaplain?

Dr. Braskamp. The day when the Puerto Ricans opened fire, I happened to be on the floor and sat about 50 feet from Kenneth Roberts of Alabama. I called every day on those Members of Congress, especially when men they knew were seriously injured. I had a wonderful opportunity then to find out just what their thoughts were along the line of the spiritual.

Mr. Horton. Another thing I'd like to point out, Dr. Braskamp, is that I hold in my hand a book of prayers that were offered by you. This was published as a public record and I understand that very shortly you are going to have a new book "Book of Prayers" which will set forth some of the prayer messages that you have given in the openings of Congress.

Dr. Braskamp. This one contains all of the prayers that I have offered, not any of the prayers of the guest chaplains. The Speaker thought we might as well include only the prayers of the Chaplain. Now these books are printed every 4 years by resolution of Congress.

Mr. Horton. Dr. Braskamp, in the short time that we have left, perhaps you might say a word by way of an Easter message to my constituency.

Dr. Braskamp. I would be delighted, for after all, you and I, as church members and Christians, believe that the Easter Sunday is the greatest day on the calendar of the church year, emphasizing some of the things we often take for granted. First, it is the outstanding manifestation of the power of God—Son of God raised from the dead by the power of God. And then, the outstanding fact that we're thinking about the resurrection of the Christ. The atheist doesn't, of course, believe in anything of that kind and says it is all a record, this whole business of religion; then the agnostic says, "Who knows, Christ is not with us now." But those who believe in the Christian faith feel that Christ has risen from the dead and is now among us.

Mr. Horton. I think it is appropriate as we close that we recognize that even here in Washington, where there is great bustle and great activity of a capital of a democracy where man is free under God, we pause here to pay honor of God and to recognize that the things we have, the gifts we have, the talents we have are gifts to us from God and that it is important for each of us to use those as best we can to make His kingdom here on earth a little bit better for those that we serve.

Dr. Braskamp, I want to thank you for being here today.

Dr. Braskamp. I'm grateful to you, Frank, and send my greetings to your folks, will you?

A Letter of Mr. Raymond Roger Poston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Congressional Record a letter written by a young man who lived very close to where I live. The article emphasizes the type of firmness and fearlessness that has made America great. I trust each Member of the Congress will read the article.

To the family of this young man I express my sincere sympathy.

The article appeared in the Tyler Morning Telegraph February 3, 1966.

A note penned last December might well be inscribed as an epitaph on the tombstone of a Kilgore youth or any other serviceman killed in the Vietnam action.

The letter of Raymond Roger Poston, a battle casualty last week, was found among his papers by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Waldo Morris.

The 21-year-old Henderson native wrote:

"I would like to say to those people who demonstrate against the U.S. policy in Vietnam; to those who burn their draft cards in order to avoid protecting their country or to protect the loyalty of those who do; to those who cry 'run, retreat, desert, betray'; to those who will to sell out their own country, the entire free world; to the traitors, cowards, the faint of heart, and those of little faith, I wish to say:

"You fill me with an outraged disgust that is unparalleled in my life.

"You fill me with a consciousness of the many sacrifices this country and its people have made since its birth.

"The heart of the United States of America beats as strong as ever.

"We will not run; we will not betray. We will fight. And because we are right, we will win."

Administration of the Central Intelligence Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished journalist, William S. White, has written a very interesting article about the CIA and its Director, Adm. W. F. Raborn, which I feel should be included in the Congressional Record. Appearing in the Washington Post this morning, the article is as follows:

REORGANIZED CIA: MAKING USE OF OUTSIDE SKILLS

(By William S. White)

The highly secret Central Intelligence Agency is broadening its communication with Congress, with private American scientists, and with American industry.

Almost, indeed, it might be said that CIA is for the first time gingerly entering ordinary American life—or as much of that ordinary life as its unavoidably clandestine basic cast can possibly permit.

This, the most sensitive of the instrumentalities of the American Government in the cold war has not, of course, dropped and cannot drop its inherent cloak-and-dagger covering for some operations.

Within the limits of bedrock and unalterable security precautions, however, Adm. W. F. Raborn, its Director, has reorganized its whole inner structure and approach to make a wide use of outside skills and talents—and information—never before so widely available to CIA.

The production of scientific and technical intelligence, in consequence, has been immensely increased. This has been principally through the cooperation of world-famous American men of science who have been brought in as cleared consultants. Some American industrial concerns have made large direct contributions of their own.

That Raborn, a professional admiral yet, has become the chief of the CIA in order to liquidate some of its old passion for extreme apartness is not without its irony. When he took over "the Agency" there was much expressed fear that with a "military mind" at its head it would more and more tend to operate in darker and darker alleys.

The simple truth is that this has not happened. Nor has Raborn put in some GI system requiring endless saluting of the boss. In truth he has gone to the reverse. CIA was never so little a one-man operation as it is now. The admiral has given to the professional operative who is his deputy, Richard Helms, a degree of power never before held by any man other than the Director himself.

Helms, in truth, actually conducts the day-by-day operations of the Agency. He sits as the CIA representative on the U.S. combined Intelligence Board. He, as well as Raborn, briefs Members of Congress. The admiral, in short, cheerfully acknowledges Helms' superior savvy as a career intelligence operative. Raborn's simple purpose has been to merge his own executive managerial experience with the intelligence expertise of Richard Helms.

The intelligence community is a small and at heart a closed community and the introduction into CIA of a seadog outsider undoubtedly did not sit well at first within the ranks. But the best information available now is that professional morale is high and not low. This, at any rate, is the estimate of men not involved in the Agency but with certain supervisory powers over it.

The admiral seems to have found a way of running a taut ship without making it also a martial one—and a ship, moreover, which can take on outside and purely civilian passengers occasionally with no harm to them or to the professional crew.

One other fact is perhaps worth noting: Not once in Raborn's regime has CIA been caught napping in any major outbreak of trouble for us around the world.

One of his creations, a new form of special intelligence task force for "special needs," involving senior operations officers from all arms of American intelligence, is on 24-hour watch in every critical area of the earth. The busiest at the moment is Task Force Vietnam—but Task Force Vietnam is not alone.

These special forces serve with far more coldly objective minds—as does the CIA collectively—than is commonly thought by eager critics. Still, nobody is naive enough to suppose that the best possible work will totally free CIA of the instinctive skepticism and sometimes outright hostility of a public which has a healthy suspicion of secret establishments and an immense appetite for melodramatic spy fiction.

One of Raborn's central efforts is to reduce this skepticism, this hostility, by what in CIA language would be called the optimum possible.

Poverty Sickness of Body Politic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in the Long Island Press of Long Island, N.Y., on February 13, appeared an interesting letter to the editor entitled "Poverty Sickness of Body Politic." The writer is disturbed about the argument which I heard quite often last year from critics of the war on poverty program—that we will always have the poor with us, so why bother about them.

In just a few words, the writer of this letter to the editor explodes this myth quite well. I commend it to both critics and friends of the war on poverty.

[From the Long Island Press, Feb. 16, 1966]

POVERTY SICKNESS OF BODY POLITIC

When Mr. Clements says in his letter of February 9 that in the history of the world there have always been poor people and, consequently, always will be, he doesn't know history.

There are no poor people, as we know them, among primitive races; the American Indians, the Eskimos, or the inhabitants of the many Pacific islands have no poor. But even if, as Mr. Clements claims, there had always been poor it is foolish to say they have to be with us forever; one might as well say cancer or smallpox has always been with us therefore must remain with us forever. Poverty is as much a sickness of the body politic as cancer is of the physical body. This is not a question of a soft heart but plain common horsesense. And nobody guarantees anybody an annual income of $3,000.

CHARLES ROSNER.

BELLPORT.

Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien Honoring Congressman Paul J. Krebs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night more than 900 persons gathered to pay tribute to our good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, PAUL J. KREBS.

PAUL KREBS is held in such high esteem that Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien took time out from his busy schedule to deliver the main address. At this point I include in the RECORD the text of the Postmaster General's speech.

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT DINNER FOR CONGRESSMAN PAUL KREBS, ROBERT TREAT HOTEL, NEWARK, N.J., MARCH 6, 1966

A little over 2 weeks ago I spoke in this same hall, on this same platform. I have come back tonight because I want to personally tell you how highly I think of PAUL KREBS and to bring you the greetings of President Johnson.

The President believes that the Congressmen elected in 1964 have given more to America, more to their constitutents, and more to make this a Great Society, than any equivalent group in history, and the President knows that PAUL KREBS is outstanding, even among this unusually talented and productive group.

Though a lifelong Democrat, PAUL KREBS received many votes of thoughtful Republicans in 1964, who were bored with tired old slogans rather than creative action. The voters of this district wanted a Congressman who would be working for them full time in Washington and who would have the courage to make independent judgments on the many important issues facing the Congress.

And that's precisely what your Congressman has been doing. He hasn't missed a singel rollcall vote, and he hasn't missed a session of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This committee involves little glamour and lots of hard, detailed work, the kind of work that produces good laws and good government.

Among experienced legislators, PAUL's record has already marked him as a man of growing influence—a real professional, and a man who is making the needs of the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey well known to the Congress.

When last here, I had the honor of speaking at the victory celebration that marked the reelection of your great Governor and, for the first time since Woodrow Wilson's victory in 1912, the election of Democratic majorities in both houses of the legislature.

On that occasion, I spoke of how this election signaled recognition by citizens of the Garden State that they were facing serious problems—and more important, that they had the will to solve those problems.

This evening, I want to discuss an issue of great concern to all Americans, no matter where they live, no matter how they vote: the search for a secure and lasting peace in Vietnam.

During the 5 years that I worked closely with President Kennedy and President Johnson in the White House I saw this problem grow and become more intense. I saw it become ever more menacing. I saw it claim a large portion of President Kennedy's daily attention—as it is now claiming President Johnson's.

Today we live in a complex world, where the search for simple answers is almost always fruitless and frustrating; where seemingly easy solutions may end up producing even more difficult problems. We live in a world that is neither at peace nor totally at war.

We live in a world of ballistic missiles and there are no safe or secure enclaves left on this planet. Our task is difficult and delicate. It is at the same time a search for peace and a demonstration that we are committed both to peace and to honor.

The military commitment of the United States in Vietnam has been measured in terms of responding to outside aggression.

Our bombing of North Vietnam, overwhelmingly supported on August 7, 1964, in both Houses of Congress—support overwhelmingly reiterated by Congress just a few days ago—has been limited to military targets. We have not used the full power of our arsenal.

We do not seek to invade North Vietnam. We have increased our troops only to the degree needed to achieve our stated objective of defending South Vietnam. We have underlined our pursuit of peace by the nature of our military response.

We have actively sought peace in every possible diplomatic area. We have sought to enlist others, both Communist and non-Communist, in that peace effort. We have tracked down every rumor of a peace feeler. We have responded to the efforts of the Pope. We have sent our diplomats to world capitals. We have placed the search for peace in the hands of the United Nations.

As the Secretary of State has said, our peace emissaries have met with "an overwhelmingly favorable response" to U.S. efforts for negotiations "except from those who could in fact sit down and make peace."

President Johnson has made it clear that our aims in Vietnam pose no threat to Hanoi. We seek no territory. We need no bases in Vietnam. We are committed to free elections. We hope that violence will cease and that the forces that have murdered thousands of innocent civilians—schoolteachers, local officials, and others—will return to peaceful pursuits. And we have sent our Vice President and Secretary of Agriculture to Vietnam to help the Government in Saigon move more effectively toward achievement of true social and economic progress.

Further, we have three times paused in our military response as a signal of our interest in peace. We called a 5-day halt to our bombing missions in May 1965; we told our forces to cease-fire for 30 hours during Christmas; we again halted, this time for 37 days, our raids against military targets in the north.

As the President said before the AFL–CIO Convention in Los Angeles: "Our efforts * * * to talk about peace were met with silence from some, shrill propaganda from others." So, too, our cease-fire efforts have been ignored.

I know that there are many representatives of organized labor here this evening. I want to tell you that the President deeply appreciates the support he has consistently received from organized labor on his Vietnam policy.

Though we will continue to use whatever force is necessary to convince Hanoi and Peiping that they will not achieve their will through violence, the doors to peace remain open. Our efforts to find a political, peaceful solution will continue. The President has asked me to affirm to you tonight that we will never pause in this quest.

I can assure you that the President will continue to pursue the difficult path that lies between destruction and dishonor.

The President will follow that path because it is the right path, because he sees, as did Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, that freedom is indivisible. "Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettos of our own cities," President Johnson has said, "the struggle is the same. That struggle is to end the violence against the human mind and body—so that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom may be won."

Yes, my friends, the struggle for peace is indivisible. We cannot see freedom sliding beneath the stagnant waters of communism abroad without being contaminated here at home. For have no doubt that Americans fighting and dying in Vietnam are serving to protect freedom here in Newark—and in the Nation and throughout the free world.

Certainly your great Gov. Richard Hughes stated the issue clearly when 2 weeks ago he termed the Vietnamese conflict "a struggle between freedom and totalitarianism, a murderous fight between the democratic idea of man and the authoritarian idea of man. If we, who exemplify freedom and democracy, do not defend those beliefs, then who will?"

Yes, if we do not, who will? And who—friend or foe—will trust our word or our resolve when next we are tested, as tested we will surely be if we fail in Vietnam?

My friends, I have seen our President grappling with enormous problems involving the very survival of our Nation. And today, the difficulties abroad are more complex and potentially more dangerous than at any time in our history.

In his difficult task, lend him your support, show him the measure of your understanding, give him your prayers.

Soil Conservation Districts Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, nowhere are the pressures on natural resources greater than in California. The State's booming population puts unprecedented demands on the area's supply of land and water. In our haste to meet these demands, we often do more harm than good. By misusing our irreplaceable agricultural land to meet nonagricultural needs, we are, in effect, foreclosing on one of the richest sources of economic wealth in this Nation.

Fortunately there are groups that take resource planning and management work seriously. I am speaking of the soil conservation districts that provide a valuable service to landowners and communities throughout the Nation.

The six soil conservation districts organized in my congressional district in Ventura, and Santa Barbara Counties, Calif., have played a major role in keeping agriculture an important segment of the local economy. Income from agriculture in my congressional district exceeds $198 million annually.

Soil conservation district programs benefit urban as well as rural areas. For example, the Santa Ynez flood prevention project not only protects agricultural land but also urban land at Lompoc, Calif. In addition, it provides flood protection to the Vandenburg Air Force Base and the Point Arguello Naval Missile Testing Base.

Local soil conservation districts are governed by locally elected directors who serve faithfully year after year with no pay. I commend these men and their organizations for their valuable services and efforts in developing land and water resources for all the people.

United States-French Rift Should Be Investigated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which would authorize and direct the Committee on Foreign Affairs to "conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the differences and difficulties between France and the United States in regard to the Atlantic Alliance with special reference to arrangements covering the operation of U.S. Armed Forces in France."

A congressional investigation is urgently needed in order to clarify facts, clear away misconceptions, improve mutual understanding and find a basis for improved teamwork within the Atlantic Alliance.

The French-American rift demands top priority attention for these reasons:

First. France is enormously important to the United States. NATO without France is almost unthinkable, and a glance at the world map shows why. The containment of communism would be much more difficult if France becomes separate from the alliance.

Second. For years France has expressed dissatisfaction—not with the alliance—but with its military structure. Our only apparent response has been to make plans for France's withdrawal.

Third. The opposing positions of the two Governments in regard to NATO and the future of U.S. Forces on French soil has recently hardened to an alarming degree. Each apparently has taken an unyielding position.

Fourth. This mounting crisis has not had the attention it merits. The Vietnam war has virtually monopolized the attention of the President, the Congress, and the public generally—almost to the exclusion of this grave and fundamental development in NATO.

Fifth. A substantial and friendly effort on the part of the United States toward understanding and conciliation is urgently needed in order to avert a major setback to free-world interests. The congressional investigation and study is proposed as a part of that effort.

Hopefuly the investigation and study would answer questions like these:

Are American complaints that De Gaulle wants alliance protection without French participation justified?

Are French complaints of U.S. domination of NATO justified? Has the United States encouraged full discussions of this question?

Has the United States done everything possible to meet these complaints?

In view of our long record of bilateral talks with NATO allies, why did President Johnson reject President de Gaulle's proposal of United States-French talks on the future of American Forces in France?

Why have the French and United States Presidents not conferred with each other for almost 5 eventful years, although each has conferred with most other allied heads of state?

President Johnson has repeatedly proposed unconditional discussions with the Communist enemy. Why not with the resolute President of an allied Republic?

Has the United States encouraged the North Atlantic Council to discuss French objections?

To what extent do other NATO allies share French objections?

Is the U.S. policy of actively discouraging the development of French nuclear forces in the best interests of NATO?

Is the U.S. attitude apt to encourage a French-Soviet alliance?

Has the United States foreclosed the possibility of a separate alliance with France if it should withdraw from NATO?

That Notion of a Lottery Keeps Looking Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read an article in the Los Angeles Times of February 25, 1966, indicating that commonsense attitudes toward the lottery concept are moving west. The article in question, written by Caspar Weinberger, a former California State GOP chairman, indicates that California may well follow in the footsteps of New York by adopting the idea of a State-run lottery.

Like Mr. Weinberger, I feel that the lottery device is just starting to build up momentum in the United States. I hope that the lottery trend, as evinced by the growing sentiments for State lotteries, will soon culminate in a national lottery. A national lottery is just the painless revenue device America needs.

THAT NOTION OF A LOTTERY KEEPS LOOKING BETTER

(By Caspar W. Weinberger)

Srtangely enough, there has been no talk yet of a State lottery by any of those charged with the responsibility for raising and spending the money for California's increasingly expensive government.

When such expedients as finding new labels for tax increases and changing bookkeeping methods to show cash in the treasury that is not there are utilized, one would think a simple cash-producing scheme that taxes only those who volunteer to be taxed would be favorably received.

This seems particularly true when it is remembered that New Hampshire, one of the Nation's most fiscally conservative States, has had a modest success with their lottery, and that New York's Legislature, for the second straight year, approved a lottery proposal 2 weeks ago that will go on the ballot this November.

The New York proposal, which was overwhelmingly passed by both legislative houses, seeks voter approval of a State constitutional amendment authorizing a State lottery with all net proceeds earmarked for additional State aid to the New York public school system.

If the voters approve, then the 1967 legislature will decide whether to have a straight drawing, or to tie the lottery to a horseracing sweepstakes such as is the practice in New Hampshaire, England, and many other areas. New York lottery sponsors estimate that as much as $400 million would be earned for their schools if the measure passes.

State lotteries as a means of raising governmental revenues are of course nothing new. Some of the first buildings for Harvard College were built with proceeds of Massachusetts lotteries, and it was the proud boast of England's Prime Minister, Henry Addington, in 1802 that his budget contained proposals for "overwhelming the lottery so that it yielded 20 percent more revenue and offered less opportunities for cheating." England, Ireland, and other countries build and maintain modern hospital systems with the proceeds of their lotteries."

American experiences with the lottery following the Civil War, particularly in Louisiana and other Southern States, were so unhappy that by 1900 enough people said "Never again" so that there were no more lotteries until New Hampshire's sweepstakes began 2 years ago. The difficulty was primarily dishonest private operators who were given contracts to run State drawings, coupled with wholly inadequate State supervision.

The absurd California initiative scheme of 1964, with its proposal to give a private group the sole right to run a lottery for an enormous profit, undoubtedly contributed also to the widespread public feeling that there is bound to be something dishonest, if not positively encouraging to criminal elements, in a lottery.

However, New Hampshire has not had this experience. While their sweepstakes is not bringing in as much revenue as expected, it has produced a substantial addition to their education funds, and, thus far at least, there has been neither dishonesty nor any increase in crime generally in the Granite State.

A lottery is much like other governmental activity: it can be run honestly, or it can be a source for graft, depending on the people in charge, and the care and skill of those responsible for watching the managers.

As a revenue-producing instrument, it has some unique features. Some call it "taxation for the foolish"; others say it is "the only form of voluntary taxation." The fact that it offers the State the opportunity to gather in a substantial amount of additional revenue for schools, or other governmental activities, from only those voters who wish to contribute, makes it certain that our representatives will be watching the New York election results this fall with great interest.

If New York's voters adopt their lottery proposal, it seems safe to predict that the next California legislative session will have before it numerous bills asking us to follow suit.

Valiant Stand of the Green Berets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as we came to the Chamber of this House today, many of us had in mind, I am sure, the news, both inspiring and saddening, of the stand of an Army special forces unit—the men of the Green Berets—and their mountain tribe allies, the Montagnards, in a remote sector of the Vietnam war.

My information, I should emphasize, is based completely on press and radio accounts emanating from Vietnam, but it seems evident that fewer than 20 Americans, including a basic special forces team, and several hundred of the mountain men they were assigned to advise and assist, fought off for 2 days or more a regular unit of the Army of North Vietnam approaching regimental strength.

The efforts of our own forces to relieve this beleleaguered camp apparently were hampered by unfavorable weather, and the evacuation operations were characterized, according to news reports, by a dramatic rescue of the pilot of a downed aircraft through the resourcefulness and courage of the pilot of an accompanying plane.

It seems evident that special forces personnel, as well as their allies—mountain tribesmen who may not have an understanding of sophisticated democratic government but who have shown that they know the basic meaning of freedom—were willing and ready to fight to the death against overwhelming odds.

While we mourn today the fates of all but the few who survived as the evacuated wounded in this operation, and share of the grief of their dependents, we can take pride in the determination and capacity of American fighting men to give their best—men who understand, in almost all cases, why they are engaged, despite the efforts of some individuals here at home to denigrate our national commitment and the value of the individual sacrifices being made daily by the men of all of our Armed Forces, who are performing in the best traditions of our military history.

Slavs Early Pioneers of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, Maryland, as the cradle of the religious liberty of our great country, is continuously surprising us with many discoveries from its past history, which is replete with contributions from many nations.

An interesting article about the Slavs as pioneers of Maryland appeared in the February 1966 issue of Children's Friend—Priatel Dietok—official organ of the youth members of the Slovak Catholic Sokol of America, and I will have it printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SLAVS EARLY PIONEERS OF MARYLAND

(By John C. Sciranka)

In my article on the successors of SS. Cyril and Methodius, who brought the Christian heritage of these two apostles to America, published by Congressman DERWINSKI in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have mentioned some Slav pioneers who labored in Maryland. Among them was Father Farar, one of the first Jesuit professors there.

In order to gather the data for my articles on the Slovaks and the Slavs in Maryland, which is known as a cradle of religious liberty in the United States, the writer had an unexpected plasure to visit Waldorf, Md., during the weekend of October 25, 1957, and I learned a great deal about the rich history of Charles County, which celebrated its 300th anniversary in 1958. Waldorf is situated only 20 miles south of Washington, D.C. I learned about the glory of Port Tobacco. No area in the Nation is richer historically or more interesting and picturesque than this, one of the oldest permanent settlements in North America as an English-speaking town.

Its history dates from a few years after the founding of Maryland in 1634. More and more of the English settlers came to the Port Tobacco region, and they soon founded a town. At first they called it Chandlerstown, after the first settler, Job Chandler. Later its name was changed to Port Tobacco on account, as some think, of tobacco being its chief product and an important commodity, since Charles County was established in 1658. In spite of the fact that tobacco is linked with the history of the county, the historians claim that Port Tobacco does not owe its name to the magic weed. Their claim is that the name is an anglicized version of the Indian word "Pertafacco," "Potopaco," or "Potobac" commonly descriptive of the town's location "between the hills." Historians claim that Port Tobacco's history goes back even more than 300 years. The Indian village of Potobac occupied the site in 1608 when Capt. John Smith visited there. Others claim that the Spanish explorers, a century before, probably sailed their ships up Port Tobacco River because they were known to be in that vicinity then.

CONVERSION OF INDIAN QUEEN BY FATHER WHITE

There is so much interesting history here that one would have to write a series of articles. For instance Maryland's first historian, Father Andrew White, S.J., made his home among the Potopac Indians for several years. In 1639 he converted the Indian Queen and 130 of her subjects to Christianity. It was here that Father White compiled the first catechism, dictionary, and grammar in the Indian language. Incidentally, in 1958 also marked the 350th anniversary of the arrival of four Polish and two Slovak craftsmen on the *Godspeed,* September 25, 1608, to help Capt. John Smith establish the first permanent English settlement in Jamestown, Va.

Maryland also has a Bohemian Manor, founded by Augustine Herman, first Czech in America, who arrived here in 1630 and was a close friend of famous Peter Stuyvesant, Governor of New Amsterdam, now New York. Herman was delegated to make a map of Maryland and Virginia, which he successfully compiled and as a reward received 20,000 acres of land, on which he established the Bohemian Manor. He was honored in 1956 when a portion of Maryland highway in Cecil County was named for him.

Some 60 years ago an American Slovak journalist, Joseph Joscak, established a farming colony in St. Mary's County, Md., for colonizing namely the members of the National Slovak Society. Many Slovak families still reside there and the famous American Jesuit, Father John LaFarge, S.J., noted lecturer and author, served these Slovaks for several years on account of his knowledge of Slavic languages. Father LaFarge described the early years of this Maryland Slovak settlements in his autobiography, "The Manner is Ordinary," published in 1953.

St. Mary's County is known as "Mother County of Maryland."

FIRST CONVENT IN 13 ORIGINAL UNITED STATES

Now let us concentrate on the 300th anniversary of Charles County. Its rich history thrilled me. However, I shall describe presently the place known as "Mount Carmel" a religious shrine, where on October 15, 1790, the first convent in the 13 Original United States was founded. Its founders were four Carmelite nuns, three of them members of the well-known Matthews family of this historic Charles County.

"Mount Carmel" was known to the people of Charles County as "The Monastery" for almost 170 years. It is situated on a rolling hillside near Port Tobacco on Maryland Route 327. It has become the scene of pilgrimages from southern Maryland, Washington, Baltimore, and other American cities.

The Carmelite community, which eventually grew to 40 nuns, occupied the place until 1831. They sold the property and moved to Baltimore for they were unable to operate the convent farm, which was their principal means of support. "Mount Carmel" as the historians put it, "slowly slipped into oblivion for a century." However, in 1933 the late Mrs. Benjamin E. Talbott and her daughter, Mrs. John J. Haggerty, created a movement to restore the historical site, which also contains an old Catholic cemetery with graves of many well-known residents of the Port Tobacco area. In 1935 the Society for the Restoration of Mount Carmel was formed. The society restored the main buildings and the chapel. This historical landmark, through the generosity of its members, will no doubt be permanently maintained as a priceless relic of Colonial religious life.

The original convent buildings and 14 outdoor stations of the cross and the large crucifix have been erected on the historical site.

TWO OLDEST CHURCHES

The histories of two of the oldest churches, one Catholic and the other Protestant Episcopal, are closely linked with the past of Port Tobacco, Md. St. Ignatius Catholic Parish at Chapel Point, where Port Tobacco River ties into the Potomac, has had a resident pastor since 1662, which is believed to be a record in the United States.

Christ Church, located now at LaPlata, Md., was created in 1692 as Port Tobacco Parish. Until 1904 the Protestant Episcopal Church was situated in Port Tobacco for 212 years.

The above mentioned Father Andrew White, S.J., who accompanied the first settlers to Maryland in 1634 built a small chapel at Chapel Point in 1642 while he was a missionary for the Indians in that area. This was the first house of worship in Charles County, but has long since disappeared.

And in 1662 another chapel was built by a successor and became the chapel of St. Thomas Manor. The present manor house was built in 1741 as the priest's residence. The present St. Ignatius Catholic Church was built in 1798. Its chapel of 1662 became a sacristy, joining the church and the house. St. Thomas Manor is now one of the oldest Jesuit institutions in North America. During various periods of Colonial times it was the headquarters for the Jesuit Fathers serving Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New York.

And now that the famous Father LaFarge was chosen by "The Tablet" of Brooklyn, N.Y., as the Catholic Book Week patron, we are happy to inform our Slovak Catholic Sokol youth that this outstanding American Catholic scholar and author, knew the Slovak language well and served our pioneers in Maryland, which was also visited by Count Maurice Benovsky during the American Revolutionary War. Benovsky was a Slovak nobleman, born in Vrbove, Nitra Country, Slovakia and died as a king of the Island of Madagascar.

Voices to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the legislation I have introduced to authorize the transmittal of voice recordings under the free mailing privileges for servicemen, I was interested in reading a newspaper article from the Hampden, Conn., Chronicle, which was reprinted in the Christian Monitor on Saturday, March 5, calling attention to a project, "Voices to Vietnam." The success of this project is further proof of the popularity of "living letters" between the servicemen and the members of his family.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

FAMILIES TAKE PART IN VOICES

HAMPDEN, CONN.—Soon Sp4c. Richard E. Schenk, Jr., of 195 Dorrance Street, will come into camp from the jungles of South Vietnam after long hours of guard duty. He will be wet, tired, hungry, and homesick. But in a few more minutes he and some 300 other boys in similar situations will forget about the discomforts of combat duty and be quickly transferred back to their wives, sweethearts and parents via a project called "Voices to Vietnam."

The project, sponsored by the Greater New Haven Junior Chamber of Commerce in conjunction with the New England Area USO in Boston, took place February 11–12. Radio stations WELI, WAVZ, WNHC, and WDEE supplied the tape-recording facilities, the Jaycees manned the tapes, the USO supplied the tapes, and loved ones supplied the voices.

"'Voices to Vietnam' was a great success," said Lt. George Singleton, cochairman of the project along with Lyall Scholz. "We had a great response and the families that took part were extremely grateful," he told newsmen.

"This was the first time such a project was tried in this area," said David Opton, vice president of the Jaycees. Hope is that the entire Nation will catch on and sponsor similar projects, said Singleton.

Salute to Conservation District Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Vermont's soil and water conservation district leaders for their unselfish devotion and dedication to the cause of natural resource development.

These leaders, who are elected locally and serve voluntarily, are deeply involved in the development and use of natural resources for the purpose of improving the economic and social life of rural areas.

Soil conservation districts were originally organized to help farm owners and operators plan and apply conservation practices. This is still a most important function. But the districts have broadened their program of assistance over the years. Today districts offer technical help to nonfarm landowners and town and area planning groups, they sponsor community resource development projects, and promote beautification of the countryside.

Recent accomplishments include help to rural landowners in the conversion of land from crop production to income-producing recreational uses, an endeavor that is having a very favorable effect on Vermont's economy.

The people of Vermont were quick to recognize the value of the district program. By 1947 the entire State was blanketed with districts. Today the 13 soil and water conservation districts in Vermont are cooperating with more than 11,500 landowners and operators in the development and application of conservation plans. Districts in Vermont have sponsored three small water shed projects that are in the planning stage and a fourth one on which construction will begin this year. In addition, the White River District is a sponsor of the White River resource conservation and development project, one of the original 10 such projects authorized in the Nation.

Soil and water conservation districts in Vermont and the men who govern them can well be proud of their record of accomplishments. I salute them for their work and wish them Godspeed in the days ahead.

Reserves Could Have Speeded War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, for some time many of us have wondered why the Defense Department sent 200,000 servicemen into South Vietnam without proper logistic preparation to supply them. Perhaps the attached article by Richard Fryklund entitled "Reserves Could Have Speeded War," published in the Evening Star of March 8, furnishes that needed information wherein it is stated that the Chief of Staff of the Army recommended to the Defense Secretary, Mr. McNamara, that he call the Reserve unit specializing in logistics and troop support early in the Vietnam affair but the recommendation was not heeded.

Mr. Fryklund's article follows:

Reserves Could Have Speeded War

(By Richard Fryklund)

When the American buildup in Vietnam was just starting last year, the Chief of Staff of the Army told Defense Secretary McNamara that he needed to call Reserve units that specialize in logistics and troop support.

The Reserves were never called, of course, and his "verbal request," as Gen. Harold K. Johnson has described it to congressional committees in still-secret testimony, was almost lost to history.

But many Army officers believe that if the request had been honored, the war in Vietnam would be in much better shape today.

A larger American force would be on the scene, or the present force would have arrived sooner. Either way, the allied side would be fighting more effectively.

General Johnson did not protest the decision, but in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee recently made public, he made it clear that he still believed as late as January of this year that some Reserves should be called.

Army officers assume that the decision against calling specialized Reserve units was made by the President on broad reasons of national policy. Even within the Army there are arguments both for and against a callup.

But there is general agreement on the result.

Here is why:

The Regular Army has always lacked certain support units which are needed in wartime but which would have nothing to do in time of peace. The various contingency war plans specify that these units will be supplied by the Reserve components, and the Reserves do keep them available.

For instance, Reserve "port terminal battalions" are organized in major port cities of the United States. Men who work the ports as civilians join the Reserve and stand ready to do the same kind of work for the Army.

A port terminal battalion might be commanded by a man who directs a port. Under him will be Reserve officers and men who can do just about every job needed from paperwork behind a desk to loading and unloading ships.

The greatest bottleneck in the Vietnam buildup has been the jam-up at the ports. With a limited Reserve callup, the jam could have been broken more quickly by professionals.

Without the callup, the Army had to train men in port jobs and shift specialists from Army port units—who, of course, are still needed in wartime.

Military engineers, similarly, are stockpiled by the Army in Reserve units because relatively few are needed in peacetime—and those are kept busy, on the whole, building civilian structures, like dams.

Vietnam required fast construction of bases. Experienced and willing Reserve engineers were available but they were not called. The most important job now in Vietnam, according to military leaders, is "pacification"—the organization of civilian services behind the military shield. American soldiers do this work as secondary duty. They call it "civic action."

But the Army has "civil affairs" units in the Reserves made up largely of local government workers who have much-needed experience in organizing schools, police forces, sewerage systems, and village councils.

The Army war plans were contingent also on the callup of other kinds of Reserve support units.

There is little use for field hospitals in time of peace, for instance, but a heavy demand in time of war. Some Reserve units are complete hospitals—staff, equipment, tents, everything but perishables—which could be called and sent to South Vietnam.

Regular Army doctors and volunteer reservists were used instead.

The Army wanted also to use Reserve communications, maintenance, and quartermaster specialists but it had to do without.

Army officers say that the buildup was limited in speed by the logistics and support structure. That is, combat troops could be sent only as fast as their supplies could be delivered and their bases built.

With reservists, they say, the buildup would have gone faster or been larger, at the option of the President.

American forces might now be carrying out the large-scale sustained attacks against enemy base areas that are now expected to start later this spring.

Solid Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I quote:

> The world now knows beyond the slightest doubt that U.S. forces are backed by full home support.

This is the editorial opinion of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which states that recent congressional action rallies the country behind its Armed Forces carrying the brunt of the Vietnam battle.

The paper adds:

> The next sensible step would be to the conference table. President Johnson's offer of unconditional discussions still stands, but with the added and unmistakable notice to the foe that there is no alternative.

The commonsense summary will be of interest to others, and with this in mind I herewith make the editorial available for the Record.

Reemphasizing the Peace Drive

Congress debated the Vietnam issue for 2 weeks but it required less than 2 hours for both Houses to give President Johnson a solid vote of confidence that must still be echoing off the walls of Hanoi and Peiping.

Ninety-three Senators and 392 Representatives voted the President the means to continue to direct the American battle against aggression in southeast Asia. Only two Senators and four Members of the House dissented. Senator Wayne Morse's attempt to revoke a resolution supporting the President's authority drew only five supporters.

The congressional action rallies the country behind its Armed Forces carrying the brunt of the Vietnam battle. The action is an impressive display of unity that belies accusations of deep and damaging division.

Differences remain and, this being a democracy, they will continue to be expressed. But on the fundamental question of resisting Red terrorism the enemy and the world has been notified by overwhelming agreement that the United States intends to honor its commitments to oppressed people abroad.

The vote must have been one of the most satisfying experiences the President has had since taking office.

Challenged and criticized relentlessly, he has patiently waited out his opposition and invariably has been gratified to find that when their positions have been analyzed and clarified they are seldom in conflict with his essential aims. Now he has solid evidence of nearly unanimous congressional support.

The voting of the $4.8 billion war spending bill and reaffirmation of the President's authority to take all necessary measures in the defense of Asian freedom are going to be denounced as warmongering in some areas of the world. This must be expected as part of the Red propaganda war.

The two actions are specific warnings to the Vietcong-Hanoi-Peiping axis that the United States will back up its antiaggression policy with all the assets at its command.

If there were forlorn hopes among the enemy forces that by continuing to fight they could eventually force an American withdrawal those hopes are ended.

The world now knows beyond the slightest doubt that U.S. forces are backed by full home support.

The next sensible step should be to the conference table. President Johnson's offer of unconditional discussions still stands, but with the added and unmistakable notice to the foe that there is no alternative.

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen Publishes Debate Manual as Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I was recently presented a copy of a debate manual titled "The Pros and Cons of Compulsory Arbitration."

This manual was prepared by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen as a public service for high school debaters who have compulsory arbitration as their major topic this year.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, as we all know so well, was recently involved in the work-rules dispute with the railroads which ended in the passage of Public Law 88-108, the first peacetime compulsory arbitration law in our history.

As you know, we struggled long and hard with this law and at the end referred only the manning issues to compulsory arbitration. The other issues were returned to the parties for collective bargaining. They were finally settled in the White House under the capable direction and with the good help of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Knowing this background, we can see the publication as a progressive step in the field of public relations.

In this manual, the union has presented the background material for both sides of the debate question. It has also published the results of a survey which its president, Charles Luna, took on the subject of compulsory arbitration. The survey was made just after we had passed the law in Congress. The brotherhood is to be complimented for publishing this survey and all the phases of opinion it contained. Those who favor compulsory arbitration are represented in the brotherhood publication, as well as those who oppose it.

As we all know, the brotherhood is sharply opposed to compulsory arbitration, even to the point of calling it a threat to the survival of organized labor.

We also know that a high school student debating the subject must explore all sides. Whatever his personal opinion may be, the requirements of modern debate are such that he must investigate all facets of his subject.

Realizing the terms of reference in which the manual will be used, the brotherhood took a most commendable step and presented material for research, and material which it hopes will stimulate research on the part of these high school students. I can only praise this action as mature and statesmanlike.

The presentation of the brotherhood manual has some very important contributions to make in the field of labor. The book is designed around compulsory arbitration, but to give the proper background and provide stimulation for research a general discussion and introduction is presented on conflict and conflict resolution in the labor movement. The book goes on to discuss the historical and legal background of the labor movement, and devotes a section to collective bargaining process, problems and effects. A similar section is devoted to compulsory arbitration, and makes a comparison of the two.

Another section is devoted to the work-rules dispute which occupied so much of our time recently. This is supported by an appendix which is a chronology of the railroad work-rules dispute, and in itself is a notable contribution to the literature of labor.

It is encouraging to see a major union stake so much in the way of effort, time, and money as the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen did in presenting this book for that very purpose of encouraging young minds to think for themselves.

Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 512th anniversary of the birth of Amerigo Vespucci, the man for whom North and South America were named. In recent months there have been several theories advanced that it was not Columbus, or Vespucci who discovered America but another party—depending upon which paper you have been reading. Even the Russians have been advancing claims that it was one of their men that first trod American soil. It will probably follow that Pravda in short order will claim that the Americans were put where they are by the Russians. It would not be the first time they have tried to play God.

Infrequently do we hear of Vespucci and then seldom correctly. Some textbooks claim that America was so named because an ancient mapmaker confused Columbus and Vespucci. In actuality, Vespucci was a brilliant navigator who devised a system of celestial navigation which led him to calculations so accurate that they even today astound scientists. It is said, for instance, that he was able to calculate the length of the equator within 50 miles of its actual length—an amazing feat considering the knowledge available at that time. His charting of the South American coast proved, to those willing to see, that Columbus had not reached the Indies but had in fact discovered a new continent. It was this fact which led a mapmaker in Torraine in 1507 to call the new continent America—the name later being extended to North America as well.

Americans of Italian birth or descent take great pride in Vespucci—explorer, navigator, and man of letters. They take pride, too, in the many other Italians who have contributed so much to this land of ours, as well they should. I think it fitting, too, Mr. Speaker that the countries that make up the two great continents in this hemisphere take note of Amerigo Vespucci and use the anniversary of his birth as a date to be set aside for rededication to the spirit of freedom that binds all of our countries together.

This country owes a great deal to its 22 million Americans of Italian descent and one need only to look around this body to find prime examples of how Americans of Italian blood are fulfilling their role in the affairs of the country. Seventy-nine years ago in 1887, the first American of Italian descent was sent to this body as a Representative of the people of Brooklyn. Italian Americans in Brooklyn particularly can look upon the memory of Francis B. Spinola with a great deal of pride. Congressman Spinola was a lawyer in Brooklyn who held several local and State offices before attending the fateful Democratic National Convention in Charleston, S.C., in 1860. Two years later he was to be a brigadier general in the Union Army in charge of four regiments which he personally raised and then led into action. He was twice wounded in combat.

But even while paying honor where honor is due, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to single out any class of Americans and say they did the most for the country. It is for the country to say rather that without all of them—the Italians, Irish, Spanish, French, Germans, Poles, Scandinavians, Greeks—people from the world over—this country could not be what it is today.

Fortunately for our country, this immigration has not stopped. It was slowed for a long period by unfortunate legislation produced from fear. But our new immigration law signed into being by President Johnson on December 3 at the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor—a long stone's throw from Ellis Island where so many of our parents and relatives had their first contact with America—has changed all that. Once again, our country has opened its doors to all people, without discrimination. I am proud to have contributed to the passing of that law, as I am equally proud to be the son of immigrant Irish parents. Our country can only prosper from this new blood—as it always has in the past.

Freedom Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Kiwanis International is sponsoring a "Freedom Leadership" program throughout the Nation. They have chosen a most appropriate time to undertake this project, as the riots and demonstrations of the past year indicate.

This project will benefit every citizen by giving them a chance to stop and contemplate the true meaning of freedom as it exists for each individual in our country.

I insert at this point in the RECORD, the March 6, 1966, editorial of the Johnson City Press-Chronicle, Johnson City, Tenn., which congratulates the Kiwanis for taking this action, and I would like to add my own commendations and to wish the venture every success.

FREEDOM LEADERSHIP

Is the Bill of Rights as familiar as it ought to be to Americans?

Does the public understand that ours is a nation of laws, and is there due respect for these laws?

Are our young people developing an appreciation for the national heritage?

These are some of the questions to which members of Kiwanis clubs throughout the Nation are addressing themselves. They are uniting behind a "Freedom Leadership" program sponsored by Kiwanis International.

It is an effort to dramatize individual freedom as guaranteed by the Constitution.

It is encouraging to find an organization like Kiwanis undertaking a program of such scope. We hope there will be widespread support both inside and outside the club ranks. With freedom threatened on all sides, all Americans need to examine their country's history and rededicate themselves to the principles and documents which brought it into being and made it great.

Containing Communism Asian Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, all through its history, America's word has been its bond.

It has been a bond that we have honored over and over again when the freedom of men has been threatened.

Business Week magazine, in a recent editorial, called attention to that fact.

It notes most vividly that this country long ago chose to make a stand against a war of national liberation in Vietnam. The magazine stated:

> If we now withdraw—or abandon most of the country to the Vietcong by retiring to enclaves—we would cast doubt on the firmness of our defense commitments around the world, most of them directed against Communist aggression.

Furthermore, it believes—and outlines why it believes—that we can halt Communist expansion in Vietnam if we do not abandon the fight.

The Business Week editorial makes a number of very logical points, and I would like for my colleagues to have the benefit of them. I therefore include the article in the Appendix of the Record:

CONTAINING COMMUNISM ASIAN STYLE

Gradually the situation in Vietnam looks more hopeful for the United States. But no early end of the war is in sight, and critics of our commitment are asking evermore loudly why we are fighting—and whether it is worth the sacrifices.

The United States is in Vietnam for two basic and related reasons: first, to thwart a Communist war of national liberation, and thus to discourage similar attempts at Communist takeover in other countries, and second, to contain the expansion of Communist China's power and influence.

Vietnam is a major test of the technique of guerrilla fighting and political organization in rural areas that was perfected by Mao Tse-tung in China. It is clear that success in Vietnam would encourage similar guerrilla wars elsewhere, just as the Cuban revolution stirred a series of revolutionary attempts and widespread political unrest in Latin America.

It is not necessary to subscribe to the "domino theory"—the notion that the fall of Vietnam would be followed by Communist takeovers in quick succession in other southeast Asian countries—to understand that the United States has a vital interest in halting wars of this kind. Though the United States is not directly threatened in Vietnam, it is obvious that U.S. security is diminished by any expansion of the Communist bloc.

This is not to say that we must intervene in any and all upheavals led or supported by Communists around the world. But we have chosen to make a stand against a war of national liberation in Vietnam. If we now withdrew—or abandoned most of the country to the Vietcong by retiring to enclaves—we would cast doubt on the firmness of our defense commitments around the world, most of them directed against Communist aggression.

HOLDING CHINA IN LINE

The war in Vietnam is also part of a long-term effort to contain the expansion of Communist China, dating back to the Korean war. Peiping is supporting North Vietnam and the Vietcong guerrillas as part of its announced campaign to foment wars of liberation throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America. If it succeeds in Vietnam, governments in southeast Asia that face the threat of similar wars would feel that they have little alternative but to come to terms with Communist China.

Containment of Chinese aggression is the only possible basis for establishing peace and stability in Asia. As long as Peiping is able to continue expanding its power and influence by aggression, it will have no reason for seeking a peaceful accommodation with its neighbors. The same was true in Europe, where the United States successfully followed a policy of containment in dealing with the Soviet Union. The peace in Europe today, and whatever prospects there are for a detente between the United States and the Soviets, are the fruits of that effort.

To be sure, Asia is not Europe. In Vietnam, we must help to build a viable government and society at the same time that we help to fight a guerrilla war. But our basic goal of containing Communist expansion is the same.

THE WAR HAS ITS LIMITS

There are risks in this policy, of course. It has been argued that the conflict in Vietnam is an open-ended war, with no visible limits to its scale or duration. Actually, limitations are imposed on the Vietnamese war by the nature of the fighting and the terrain. The ability of the North Vietnamese to aid the Vietcong guerrillas is limited by their capacity to infiltrate men and move supplies over long, rugged trails.

Hanoi could expand the war by launching a conventional attack on South Vietnam with its army of 250,000 men. But it is unlikely to take this course, since overt aggression of this kind would expose its cities and industries to retaliatory bombing.

Even more remote is the risk of open, Chinese intervention. As the Korean war demonsrtated, the Chinese might intervene if the United States threatened to destroy the North Vietnamese regime. President Johnson has repeatedly ruled out any such intention. Despite Peiping's violent language, there is no sign that China will attack as long as the fighting is confined to the south. They would have a great deal to lose by intervening. And it is doubtful that they could count on Soviet support.

Thus the Vietnamese conflict is not the kind of land war in Asia that U.S. military men have long warned against. We are not fighting hordes of Asian troops. The masses of troops, in fact, are on our side: some 575,000 South Vietnamese, 200,000 Americans, 20,000 South Koreans, and more coming, against a Communist strength of about 90,000 regular troops and 110,000 guerrillas.

At some point, Hanoi and the Vietcong will have to recognize that they cannot win. It is impossible to predict whether they will then decide to negotiate, or whether they will continue to fight on a diminishing scale, perhaps for years. But there is every reason to believe that we can halt Communist expansion in Vietnam if we do not abandon the fight.

Message Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, an article in the New York Times of March 3 indicates that President Johnson's proposals on transportation might solve one of the American merchant marine's basic problems—its inability to compete effectively with foreign shipping.

The article by Werner Bamberger states:

> Maritime industry sources envisioned immediate and much more rapid progress as a result of the President's directive to the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a three-part study of advanced vessel concepts.

The informative article is of importance, and with this in mind I am offering it for publication in the Appendix of the Record:

JOHNSON MESSAGE PLEASES SHIP MEN

(By Werner Bamberger)

President Johnson's message to Congress yesterday on transportation appears to promise a concerted application of modern technology to one of the American merchant marine's basic problems—its inability, because of higher operating costs, to compete effectively with foreign shipping.

Maritime industry sources envisioned immediate and much more rapid progress as a result of the President's directive to the Sectary of Commerce to conduct a three-part study of advanced vessel concepts.

The study will include:

Research, development, and planning of high-speed, large-capacity ships, devoted primarily to transporting preloaded containers.

Research on an ocean-going air-cushion vessel capable of skimming over the water at speeds of more than 100 knots.

Continued exploration of the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant ships.

The Secretary of Commerce, President Johnson said, will be joined in this study by the Secretary of Defense, the President's scientific adviser, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

PENTAGON PROGRAM CITED

Their work, in part, Mr. Johnson said, is to be guided by the example set recently by the Department of Defense in its fast deployment logistics ship program. Mr. Johnson noted that "this concept introduces to the maritime field the same systems approach that has proved so successful in other defense and aerospace programs."

The fast deployment logistics ship program calls for an initial procurement of 15 vessels. They would essentially be cargo ships with facilities for the handling of roll-on and rolloff cargo and cargo in containers. Another feature of the vessels, of which as many as 40 may be ordered, is a helicopter landing platform. The helicopters could be used to load or unload cargo containers.

Industry observers noted that the three areas of study outlined by President Johnson were not virgin territory. They said considerable work in these areas had already been done by private industry and the Federal Government.

REPLACEMENT PROGRAMS

They noted that the building of fast, large container-carrying ships, either conventionally powered or nuclear-powered, figured prominently in the fleet replacement programs of some subsidized American steamship lines.

They also recalled that the Maritime Administration several years ago had undertaken a feasibility study of an ocean-going cargo-carrying surface effects ship—a vessel that rides on an air cushion. That study showed that such a craft showed sufficient promise to warrant further research.

Only one sentence in the merchant marine portion of the President's transportation message appeared to mystify the industry, the statement that "after years of U.S. leadership, maritime technology in other countries has caught up with and, in some instances, surpassed our own."

SIZE OF CREWS

The general feeling of the maritime industry was that American shipping technology compared most favorably with that of other nations. But one source suggested that perhaps in one practical application of ship automation—reduction in crew sizes—more rapid progress had been made abroad.

This interpretation was based in part on another shipping reference in the President's message:

"It is not good enough when public and private investors pour $15 million into a large, high-speed ship—only to watch it remain idle in port for days before it is loaded."

This, in the view of the maritime industry, was a reference to the new and highly automated $12 million cargo ship *Elizabeth Lykes*. The vessel has been idle since January 22 at New Orleans in a dispute between her owners, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., and the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association.

The company contends the vessel can be operated with five engineer officers. The union is insisting on six.

President Johnson also declared that he would submit legislation to improve measures and guarantees of financial responsibility on the part of owners and operators of passenger-carrying vessels sailing from U.S. ports.

Rhodesian Press Fights for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, with the rise of dictatorships, large and small, in our troubled world it has been axiomatic that the free press is among the first institutions to come under stern government control. We are today witnessing this familiar drama in Rhodesia where a militantly free press is making a valiant fight for its very existence. An excellent editorial in the February 26, 1966, Sacramento (Calif.) Bee describes some of the battle. The editorial follows:

RHODESIA MAKES IDEA INTO A SAVAGE ANIMAL

Rhodesia under the insurrectionist white government of Ian Smith is blazing proof that inequality leads swiftly to the whole apparatus of totalitarianism abuses.

The Smith government has undertaken to impose the wishes of about 250,000 whites on some 2 million disfranchised blacks. Could press censorship follow far behind? It could not, because the freedom of the press invariably is one of the first casualties of undemocratic government.

Rhodesia has many savage beasts and insects, most notably the leopard, lion, and white ant. Another has been added. It is truth.

Smith's government did not waste much time in moving censors into newspaper offices and the cruel, regressive word, "censored", killed story after story.

A press created in the tradition of freedom did not surrender easily, if at all. Its first reprisal was to leave white the space which would have been filled by the censored story so all the readers would know they were reading a captive press, albeit a press which was fighting back.

Now the Rhodesian Government has ordered that the white spaces be filled in by the newspaper itself. It was goaded to this action in no small part by the weekly magazine, the Central African Examiner. This periodical in the spirit of satire and scorn offered prizes to its readers to fill the empty columns.

John Parker, news editor of the Sunday Mail in Rhodesia, has been in and out of prison for his steadfast refusal to divulge sources of a story the Government disliked. The Rhodesian Guild of Journalists has maintained a continuing struggle for its lost liberties in the tradition of their nation's militantly free press.

It all sounds like the most primitive of setbacks in man's march to freedom. The Smith government seeks to justify its policy on the ground some articles would incite bloodshed since they would not be fully comprehended by the colored people.

The Rhodesian blacks understand only too well whât is happening and censorship only confirms this understanding. What is important for the world to comprehend is that no nation and no society can break with democracy without opening the doors to all the ugly elements of dictatorship.

VFW Award for Outstanding Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, at the Veterans of Foreign Wars dinner on March 8, the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen, minority leader of the U.S. Senate, received the VFW Award for Outstanding Public Service. As is usual his address in accepting this award was in keeping with the highest traditions of American statesmanship. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include his address:

REMARKS OF HON. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, MINORITY LEADER, U.S. SENATE, ACCEPTING THE VFW AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE

I am honored to be your guest. I am doubly honored with your award for outstanding public service. I can only hope that in modest measures, I merit this expression of esteem and confidence on the part of a great, farflung, patriotic organization.

The character and activities of the VFW give this award special significance and meaning to me. I am a member of the VFW post in my native city in Illinois. But over a third of a century of service in the Nation's Capital, there has been ample opportunity to observe the work of your organization. Year by year, I become increasingly impressed with your unselfish and patriotic service to the Nation.

Fidelity to him who has born the battle and to his widow and orphan has been your foremost concern. Always, you have valiantly championed the cause of those who served and sacrificed—so many of whom will all their days carry the ineffaceable marks of conflict.

Year in and year out, you have counseled that this Nation remain strong for only strength compels respect and generates prestige.

With rare diligence, you have been in the forefront in supporting policies designed to resist and stay the forces of godless communism.

Old fashioned and amusing as it may seem to the cynics and scoffers of our time, you have steadfastly asserted the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the freedoms established by the Constitution, knowing that therein lies the last best hope for preserving those ideals and principles.

Reverently have you taken to heart the kinship of the uniform and the sanctity of that fellowship, with those who wore it, with those who wear it now, and those who may be called upon to wear it in some future day.

Who then, great human segment of America that you are, more richly merits the right to a strong voice in finding solutions for the baffling problems which beset our land and especially those which affect our national security? Who can bring to these problems a greater competence and understanding than you who have served your country abroad and have been ever mindful of the Nation's future in a world that is aglow with fever and turbulence?

These are troubled times. These are days for prayerful concern for the cause of freedom and representative government. These are days when superficial thinking, polite nonsense, misguided views, and unfounded hopes can divert us from the business at hand.

That business is grim and undramatic. When it was proposed that Theodore Roosevelt be permitted to lead a division in World War I, it was President Wilson who vetoed the idea with this laconic observation. He said, "The business in hand is undramatic." And so it was. And so it is today.

Men write and speak so glibly of hawks and doves in assessing the present scene. How quaint in a world beset with ugly fevers and terrors in which young Americans, who in the language of Colonel McRae in the conflict in which I served, "lived, felt dawn, saw sunset flow," and now stand on freedom's frontier in far-off jungles should speak of doves? How odd, that men should so glibly write and speak of these as hawks because they seek to assert our prestige, carry out our solemn pledges, fulfill our treaty responsibilities, and give heed to the Macedonian cry of a weak and defenseless people.

But where is the American eagle in this strange lore of doves and hawks—that majestic bird who so truly symbolizes our hopes, our will, our strength, our purpose, and who knows the grandeur of freedom.

Consider for a moment just why young Americans fight and die in the tropic heat, the malaria-laden jungles and the monsoon mud, thousands of miles from home.

They serve to keep our word and redeem our pledges. They serve to give meaning to our treaty obligations. They serve freedom in a shrunken world, knowing that freedom is an indivisible boon to mankind. They serve to stay the ugly force of aggression.

Foggy and inconclusive thinking can always generate strange, unsound, and disastrous courses of action for the Nation to follow.

They speak of withdrawal and of retreat. They but sound the uncertain trumpet which leads to disaster.

They speak of the wrong war in the wrong place. I know of no better evidence that we neither initiated the struggle nor selected the place. They speak of having picked the wrong battlefield. Perhaps the enemy inadvertently forgot to consult us on that point before aggression began and the assault on the freedom and independence of Vietnam got underway.

Where freedom is involved, the issue will not be solved by withdrawal. Where aggression is involved, it will not be solved by retreat. Where an implacable foe is involved, any confession of weakness or show of disunity will command no respect at the conference table. No one knows better than the veterans of our foreign wars that victory and survival depend not on running but on winning.

If the history of warfare teaches anything, it is that the decisive battles which have affected the very course of history were not fought on some carefully selected battlefield agreed on in advance by the adversaries as being mutually advantageous.

On a small plain in ancient Greece, brave and badly outnumbered men fought and died to help save what is known as Western civilization. That was the Battle of Marathon.

The hope of the Founding Fathers in their struggle for independence and in fact their very personal destiny rested on a small but savage frontier at a place called Saratoga.

The decline of the powerful Spanish empire and the rise of this Nation as a world power was signaled by the naval battle at Manila Bay.

In World War II, the open door to Japanese expansion was slammed shut with a resounding bang at a little place scarcely known but now long and everlastingly remembered. That was at Guadalcanal.

Inchon in Korea was but a spot on the map and virtually unknown to any of our people. But it was there that General MacArthur smashed the Communist invasion of South Korea with one of the truly bold and brilliant amphibious operations in all history.

Many other illustrations could be offered to prove the point. And the point is simply this. Men and nations must expect a rendezvous with destiny at unexpected places and at unexpected moments.

Today, the scene is South Vietnam. If it were not there, it would be in some other place. But wherever it might be in the intense and unremitting struggle for freedom, there would be some to say in loud and emphatic tones: "It's the wrong place and the wrong time."

There is, of course, a way to make it the wrong place and the wrong time and that is for us to lose heart and a sense of mission, to follow the counsels of despair, and above all else to do the wrong thing.

And speaking of wrong things, could there be anything more wrong than inviting into a coalition government the very same savage terrorists who our young men are fighting and dying to keep out?

I, for one, believe that we are in a strategically sound position in Vietnam. True, it is far from home and the logistic problem becomes something of a burden.

Basically, it is a peninsular war. That makes it a maritime war. In World War II and again in Korea, we demonstrated beyond all doubt how our superiority of sea gave us strategic advantages which were envied by the enemy. We have the equipment, the material, and we know how to use it. We can fight this kind of a war and we can win. What's more, it is far better to meet the enemy on the frontiers of freedom than in the citadel of freedom itself.

Tonight, as we the old soldiers of another generation salute the young soldiers in Vietnam who carry on for us in the cause of freedom, peace, and self-determination, let us not forget that we have an obligation to them until the job is done and the issue honorably disposed. Simply stated, that means that we must avoid placing any unnecessary burdens or handicaps upon them.

If the classical concept of winning a victory by force of arms is still valid; namely, to break the will and the resistance of the enemy, it must be achieved not merely by superior firepower and adequate manpower but also by interdicting the enemy source of supply of food, weapons, equipment and all other items necessary to the prosecution of a conflict.

I refer particularly to the unending procession of vessels, flying the flag of free world nations and Communist countries alike, who ply their trade in and out of the ports of North Vietnam.

A single cargo is one too many when we are engaged in a bloody and costly struggle with a relentless enemy. If that needs amplification, I need only point out that our problem is not merely the freedom and independence of a small country but the life and death of our own troops as well. Any exception to shutting off enemy supplies if it can be achieved is a clear departure from every concept of winning a victory.

For this we have fresh precedent. When the Cuban situation became critical, we imposed a "Kennedy-type quarantine" and readied our massive sea and air power. Is there any valid reason why a similar tactic cannot now be employed to bring Hanoi to the conference table?

A few weeks ago, I traveled the wards of the U.S. naval hospital at Great Lakes, Ill., and sat with the young soldiers so recently returned from Vietnam for medical attention. It was an unforgettable experience. I could only hope that their sense of mission, their dedication to a cause, and their determination might be matched by an overwhelming devotion on the home front. I am certain that you, the old soldiers of another generation who served abroad, share that spirit and conviction. There came back to me an old couplet from long ago as these young soldiers at Great Lakes, wounded in body but not in spirit, spoke of freedom's cause.

"No man escapes when freedom fails
The best men rot in filthy jails.
And those who cry, 'Appease! Appease!'
Are hanged by those they tried to please."

Bicentennial of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to note the recognition President Johnson has given, in his message to Congress, of the current 200th anniversary of the period of the American Revolution.

The Commission proposed by the President to commemorate the great events of the formative period of our Nation is along the lines of resolutions I have had pending in this Congress and the preceding one, and I am happy to support this effort to direct public attention to the genesis of our national heritage.

Historians generally agree that the period of the American Revolution began many years before the firing at Concord Bridge and the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

As a matter of fact, we passed last year, with little notice, the 200th anniversaries of two major events in the movement of American independence—the adoption of the Virginia Resolves and the meeting of the Stamp Act Congress at New York.

I am not so much interested in pageants and parades as I am in an intensified effort to acquaint our oncoming generations of young people with the sacrifices which were made by their ancestors to acquire and insure the tradition of freedom which, too often, is taken for granted today.

It is an unfortunate fact that many young people on other nations are better versed in our history of individual liberty than are our own students.

I hope legislation embracing the President's proposals will have full and free committee consideration as to the most appropriate means of commemorating the bicentennial of our Nation, with particular emphasis on the basic concepts for which Virginia leaders, and their counterparts throughout the Colonies, risked their lives and fortunes, 200 years ago, in what proved to be one of the most magnificent endeavors of freemen.

Pine Ridge Job Corps Conservation Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Pine Ridge Job Corps Conservation Camp near Chadron, Nebr., is enjoying a great record of progress.

I would commend to my colleagues an article which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on February 20. It tells of this progress and the brains, muscle, and pride which today thrive at this camp. As is true in so many of the Job Corps training camps, the young men at the Pine Ridge Job Corps Conservation Camp are learning that indeed someone really cares what happens to them. This feeling of belonging and being appreciated are great fringe benefits from the war on poverty. Factors such as this I believe will surely tip the scales in favor of success in the war on poverty. I commend this article to my colleageus.

BRAINS, MUSCLE, AND PRIDE THRIVE AT CHADRON CAMP

(By Tom Allan)

CHADRON, NEBR.—In the subzero gray predawn, an hour before reveille, shadowy figures could be seen flitting from the dark dormitories and bounding over the snowbanks to a maintenance shop down the hill.

Long before the first lights began to gleam on the hill the sounds from the shop echoed through the pines:

"Tut, tuh, three, foah. Column, left, Come on boy, get in step."

An Army camp? What GI ever got up before reveille to practice close order drill?

But some 20 boys do here at the Pine Ridge Job Corps Conservation Camp operated by the U.S. Forest Service in the Pine Ridge district of the Nebraska National Forest. The camp is 2 miles south of Chadron State Park.

ON THEIR OWN

"The boys are doing this strictly on their own," Supt. Walter J. Fillmore said. "This is the only time they have in the schedule."

"Yes, I was surprised until I talked to them. These are young men who couldn't pass the literacy tests to get into the armed services. They are getting reading, writing, and mathematics in our classrooms and all hope to pass the tests to get into service. They decided to practice close order drill to get ready. A Navy recruiter is scheduled here this week to look some of them over."

Superintendent Fillmore, a genial Minnesota native, former South Dakota State forester, and longtime Forest Service employee, as well as a World War II Navy officer on a combat-scarred South Pacific destroyer, added:

"I could hardly believe it either when I found out what these kids were doing on their own at that time of the morning.

"They are real proud of it. They have a special table in the messhall. They won't let anybody sit there unless he's one of them."

EIGHTY-TWO YOUTHS

This was but one of the surprises during a visit to this hilltop camp among the pines. It is one of two Job Corps camps in Nebraska. The other is run by the Bureau of Reclamation at the old bomber base 8 miles northwest of McCook.

But there were other revelations here where currently 82 youths from 30 States are working as well as studying for what some say is their last chance to make something of their lives.

The classroom work is shared with on-the-job training in such crafts as welding, woodworking, auto mechanics, heavy equipment operation and real muscle-and-sweat work in the surrounding forests.

Despite foot-deep snow and bitter cold, crews last week were clearing trees preparatory to turning the Spotted Tail area into a spectacular tourist camp site, 4 miles south of town.

A welding class is turning out fireplace grills and a carpentry class is preparing signs and picnic tables.

"As soon as the weather breaks we are starting forest firefighting training and we'll be sending crews down to Halsey to help in replanting the area damaged from last year's fire," Superintendent Fillmore said.

ESPRIT DE CORPS

There is an esprit de corps here—especially among the members who have been here since the camp opened December 8.

Degree of enthusiasm is in direct proportion to their length of stay.

A newcomer from Oklahoma, still with a bewildered look on his face and covering it up with a defiant attitude, snapped:

"I ain't never gonna be any good for nothing. All I'm good at is failures and getting in accidents."

But he's sticking it out and trying.

So far there have been 13 dropouts. Trainees may resign at any time. There has been but one incident. Two arrivals balked at the first sight of the isolated camp and wanted to go home. Counselor talks and bull sessions with the older boys were in vain. When they discovered it would take a day to arrange for their transportation home, they crept out of camp and started hitchhiking. Freezing in the sub-zero cold, they stole a car from a ranch and were apprehended.

HOMESICKNESS

"Our big problem with newcomers is homesickness," the superintendent said. "Maybe it's like the song, 'Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home.' Some of the boys who dropped out because of homesickness came from the poorest or broken homes."

Many of the corpsmen I talked to last week were angry at the two boys who "bugged out" and were arrested for two reasons.

They were afraid the incident might ruin the excellent relations the camp has with the town and Chadron State College and "make us ashamed to go to town."

The culprits had also taken Red, the Irish setter and camp mascot, with them.

"We knew there are some boys we might not reach," Superintendent Fillmore said. "But we are all surprised here at the large number we do and the remarkable progress most of these youths are making.

"I think in addition to preparing them for gainful occupations once they leave, probably our main goal is motivation, giving them an incentive. Some of these boys never worked a day in their life before they came. In a forestry camp that's one thing we can guarantee."

The incentive, some ignited by the staff and counselors, some by the competition of communal living and in some boys, just knowing for the first time in their lives that somebody cares, is much in evidence among those who have been here a month or two.

AMAZED US

Raymond Givens, 20, of Omaha, is learning to be an auto mechanic—and how to read and write for the first time. Proudly he read a sentence from a primer book haltingly:

"The plant is green."

"I read pretty good, don't I?" he beamed. "I went to school to the fourth grade but I think I passed there because of my age. I don't know. It just seemed teaching went in one ear and out the other. It's easier learning now. I know I have to. It's my last chance."

Roosevelt "Politician" Smith, 19, was graduated from a high school in Little Rock, Ark., but he could only find a job washing pots and pans in a hospital. He came to camp dejected and defeated.

"Since he's been here he's amazed us all," Superintendent Fillmore said. "He's developed into a first-rate clerk and an office machine technician. After a couple of lessons he made perfect spots in welding.

"He was shy at first until we discovered he is a natural public speaker. He wowed 'em with a speech—the first he ever made in his life—at the Western Nebraska Inter-Cultural Association conference and he's going to give another at the Rotary Club. After the association speech a woman praised him and said he talked better than a politician. That's where he got that nickname."

Roosevelt, a quiet, intent, studious youth, beamed at the mention of his nickname.

"Public speaking has given me a feeling of responsibility," he said. "Maybe it's also a responsibility to myself to make a success of my life. I want more education. I want to develop new skills. This is my chance."

Iroquois Wrestlers Reach High Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, February 8, 1966, was indeed a red-letter day for the wrestling team of Iroquois Central High School in Elma, N.Y. On that day the Iroquois wrestling team broke the national record for consecutive victories. Beating the old record of 140 victories, the Iroquois wrestling team reached the 143 consecutive victories mark.

Both Coach Duane Patterson and his predecessor, Norm Foster, greatly contributed to leading the team to their outstanding accomplishment. Aiding both coaches was Assistant Coach Robert Steislinger.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these outstanding athletes and their coaches should be highly commended for their achievements. They are a fine example for all competitive athletic groups and their leaders to seek and reach high goals. I believe these boys are a credit to the youth of America.

The New GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the day the President signed the new GI bill into law, I advised the people and organizations of my district of that fact. Since then, I have received many inquiries about details of this bill.

I can well understand the great interest of the people and of the 16 veterans' organizations in my district in this bill. There are 9,200 veterans who are potentially eligible for benefits under this bill in the 13th Congressional District in New York, which I have the honor to represent. The many inquiries I have received on the matter and the great interest in general that the bill has engendered, prompted me to make this statement explaining its provisions in greater detail.

The new GI bill provides education and training programs that generally are similar to the GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict.

I have always supported these programs. In the last Congress, I introduced a bill for this purpose on June 9, 1963, and in this Congress, I again introduced a similar bill (H.R. 1128) on January 4, 1965. When the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs was considering this legislation in August 1965, I said in a statement that I submitted in its support:

> There are those who object to this legislation because its benefits are not related to need. I will support any measure that would raise our country's educational level. There is not yet any legislation on the books to provide educational benefits for all our younger people. I believe my bill would encourage more volunteers to serve their country in return for their education. I think the quid is well worth the quo. My bill will tell our youth that service to our country is a two-way street and that they are not its forgotten citizens.
>
> This bill affirms our faith in our youth.

To ascertain the impact this bill will have upon those in my district, I have obtained significant statistics from the Veterans' Administration. In the first year alone, I anticipate that 1,180 veterans will take advantage of the educational benefits and that $742,000 in direct benefits will be provided to them. Because the educational provisions are effective June 1, 1966, the veteran will have ample time to plan his schooling program.

Some 60 veterans will obtain VA guaranteed loans totaling $951,000 in that same first year. About 1,500 patient-days at a cost of $37,600 will be made available to the veterans of my district.

To be eligible for educational and guaranteed home loan benefits, a veteran must have been on active duty more than 180 days after January 31, 1955, and honorably discharged or he may have been honorably discharged with less than 180 days service because of a service-incurred disability.

Monthly payments for full-time training under the education and training sections of the bill are $100 for veterans without dependents, $125 for veterans with one dependent, and $150 for veterans with more than one dependent.

A veteran can receive up to 36 months of schooling or training on the basis of 1 month for each month spent in uniform, but he must complete his educational program within 8 years after discharge.

The home loan provisions of the bill will increase building and real estate activity throughout our country. The eligibility formula for veteran participation in this program is the same as that already in existence. The veteran has 10 years from the date of his discharge plus 1 year for each 3 months served by him in which to avail himself of this program. He is not entitled to benefits after 20 years nor may they expire within 10 years from the date of his discharge.

Guaranteed or insured loan ceilings will remain at $7,500.

The bill makes medical and hospital care available to him on the same basis as for wartime veterans. Burial benefits, employment assistance and veterans' preference in Federal employment are also provided.

The Congress and the President are to be commended for the expeditious manner and spirit of cooperation in which they acted on this urgent matter.

REA-Financed Systems Seek Equal Opportunity for Rural People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the report of Administrator Norman M. Clapp of the Rural Electrflication Administration for fiscal 1965 shows that the REA rural electric and telephone systems enjoyed another successful year.

Administrator Clapp says in the report, and I agree with him wholeheartedly, that the demands on these systems will be great in the ensuing years. He outlines three approaches which are important and necessary in meeting these future needs. He says:

> In meeting these future needs, three approaches are necessary. First, there must be maximum utilization of the total resources of the program, both those of REA and those of its borrowers. Next, there must be continued strengthening of the borrowers themselves through the development of the basic equalizers—territorial protection, lower cost wholesale electric power, rural areas development, and constantly improving management. Finally, it will be necessary to develop a method of supplemental financing which will provide for an orderly advance of REA borrowers from the present basic 2-percent loan program of the Federal Government to ultimate access to private financing consistent with the special needs of the rural systems and the public interest in accomplishing the objectives of the REA program.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the Record the full text of the introduction of Mr. Clapp's report, entitled "Toward Equal Opportunity for Rural People." It is an excellent summary of the background, handicaps, objectives, accomplishments, and the needs of these two great programs.

The text of the introductions follows:

TOWARD EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR RURAL PEOPLE

In a national broadcast to the American people in 1935, Morris L. Cooke, the first Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, called for "a general improvement in the levels of (rural) living to the end that the gap which now exists between urban and country life may be closed."

On a truly prophetic note, he added that "in any such planning for the economic and cultural betterment of life in rural America, electrification must play an increasingly important part."

Since Mr. Cooke's day, another great program—the rural telephone loan program—has been added by the Congress to the responsibilities of the REA, and today the objective of the REA programs continues to be to help rural people to obtain electric and telephone service of a kind and under rates and conditions comparable to that enjoyed by people in urban areas.

GAP STILL EXISTS

More than 7 million rural electric consumers and telephone subscribers—more than 20 million rural people—already have moved closer to an equality of opportunity with urban people because of the benefits of the REA programs. This is the number of people served by REA's electric and telephone borrowers in fiscal year 1965.

But the objective of social and economic parity of country with city still has not been achieved. An important factor is the cost of electric service. Rural consumers on the systems financed by REA still must pay 10 percent more, on the average, for 500 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month than do consumers in adjacent towns and cities. And some 20 percent of America's farms still are without any kind of telephone service. The gap described by Morris Cooke 30 years ago still has not been closed.

It has not been closed because of the enormous handicaps faced by the rural systems in trying to bring modern electric and telephone service to rural areas. One handicap is low consumer density. There are fewer people to pay for each mile of line in the country. Despite three decades of progress in rural electrification, today there are only 3.5 consumers per mile of line on REA-financed electric systems, compared with an average of 33.2 consumers per mile on the lines of class A and B commercial power companies. The urban-based power companies, furthermore, receive 15 times as much revenue per mile as do the rural systems financed by REA.

There are other handicaps, such as a lack of those large industrial loads which mean so much to the revenues of urban-based utilities and a lack of off-peak, or nighttime, loads. There are pockets of chronic rural poverty, where rural people use little electricity, and there are systems which are isolated, by distance or conditions of terrain, from sources of low-cost power. It is because of these handicaps that rural people generally still have to pay more for their electricity than city people do. And the handicaps of wide open spaces and fewer people have presented similar obstacles to the development of modern, economical telephone service in rural areas.

HANDICAPS BEING OVERCOME

It is the REA program which has provided important and effective equalizers to overcome these handicaps, and in fiscal year 1965 its borrowers continued to move closer to the goal of parity of rural service with city service for their 7 million consumers and subscribers. In doing so they were helping to lift the whole level of rural living, not only through the utility services they provided directly, but also by supplying leadership and technical assistance in developing needed community facilities, better farm methods, and new nonfarm jobs in rural commerce and industry.

Two of these equalizers are supplied by REA itself in the form of long-term, low-interest electrification and telephone loans and technical assistance to borrowers in the fields of engineering, accounting, and management methods. Other equalizers, basic to the eventual achievement of parity of rates and service for rural electric systems, must be developed primarily by the borrowers themselves, through their own resources and those of their State, regional and national associations.

These are (1) lower wholesale power costs; (2) territorial protection, to asure them of the right to continue to serve in the areas they have pioneered; (3) constant improvement of management and operations, and (4) rural area development to improve the economic level of their service areas and, as a result, to build a firmer economic base for their operations. Through their contribution to the development of these four basic equalizers, REA and its borrowers all across the Nation made an outstanding contribution during fiscal year 1965 in the struggle for equality of rural opportunity.

CAPITAL NEEDS ARE GROWING

The 20 million rural people who depend on the REA-financed systems for essential utility services have a vital stake in the future growth and development of these systems. The rural cooperatives and companies which serve them cannot afford to stand still and say, "Our job is done." They must grow as the needs of rural Americans for more power and higher quality telephone service grow. Between 1950 and 1965, the average monthly kilowatt-hour consumption per residential consumer on REA-financed electric lines rose from 147 to 481. Annual sales of power to REA borrowers in the same period rose from 7 billion kilowatt-hours to 41 billion kilowatt-hours. And since the REA telephone prorgam began in 1949, the proportion of U.S. farms with telephones has risen from 36.4 percent, most of it obsolete magneto service, to 80 percent, most of it dial.

This kind of record, this volume of demand, requires capital in large amounts. The American electric power industry is a dynamic industry, one which is expanding its plant at the rate of more than 6 percent a year to meet the needs of a growing economy. The rural segment of this great industry, as represented by REA's 1,000 electric borrowers, is growing at about the same rate. In 1955, total investment in electric plant of the rural systems was $2.7 billion. By 1964, the total had reached $4.7 billion. By 1980, REA conservatively estimates that plant investment will reach $11.9 billion.

In telephone service, the industry is setting a rapid pace which also will require accelerating amounts of capital if the rural systems financed by REA are to keep up. Bell System companies expect to have 87 percent of their subscribers on single-party service by 1975, with the complete elimination of multiparty service the ultimate objective. On the lines of REA borrowers, 23 percent of the subscribers were taking single-party service in fiscal year 1965, and REA expects that figure to rise to 52 percent by 1975. Total value of REA-financed telephone plant, which was $1.1 billion in calendar year 1964, is estimated to rise to $1.7 billion in 1970 and to $3.6 billion in 1980.

In the REA electric program the rural systems will not only need much larger amounts of capital, but they will need greater flexibility in the use of that capital to enable them to achieve the greatest possible economies in the generation, transmission and distribution of power. They will have to increase the capacity of their distribution systems to meet the rising demand of present consumers and the needs of new consumers. They will need freedom to acquire and exchange existing facilities in the adjustment and strengthening of service territories. They will have to build generating plants of larger capacity than ever before, they will be forced to construct higher voltage transmission lines which will interconnect with the facilities of neighboring systems. They must be able to participate as equal partners in pooling arrangements with other suppliers—cooperative, commercial, and public—for the benefit of their own rural consumers.

In meeting these future needs, three approaches are necessary. First, there must be maximum utilization of the total resources of the program, both those of REA and those of its borrowers. Next, there must be continued strengthening of the borrowers themselves through the development of the basic equalizers—territorial protection, lower cost wholesale electric power, rural areas development, and constantly improving management. Finally, it will be necessary to develop a method of supplemental financing which will provide for an orderly advance of REA borrowers from the present basic 2-percent loan program of the Federal Government to ultimate access to private financing consistent with the special needs of the rural systems and the public interest in accomplishing the objectives of the REA program.

Texas Sisters of Providence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, with the ever-increasing need for thoroughly educating the youth of our Nation, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent work in education which has been done in Texas now for 100 years by the Sisters of Divine Providence.

The Sisters of Divine Providence is an order which was founded 200 years ago by Father John Martin Moye, who early in his priesthood saw the tremendous need to educate the neglected French peasants of the mid-18th century which he served through a congregation of women "who would be willing to go alone and without a regular salary to evangelize the neglected countryside by teaching catechism and secular subjects to the children." Now, Father Moye's dreams in France of educating the young have been expanded through the teaching order the world over including the countries of Belgium, China, France, French Indochina, Italy, Madagascar, Mexico, South America, Spain, Switzerland, and the United States.

In Texas, the beginning of this teaching order's work began after the Reverend Claude Dubuis, bishop of the Catholic Church in Texas, visited the convent of St. Jean de Bassel of the Sisters of Providence in Lorraine, France, in hopes of securing teachers for his parish school system some hundred years ago.

Within 2 years after he had staffed the first school in Austin, Tex., Bishop Dubuis sent three sisters to establish a second in Castroville, Tex. As vocations increased, from the mother house in Castroville, more schools were opened. By 1872 they totaled 8; by 1879, 13. Among these was St. Joseph's in San Antonio which is my home district. By 1903 the Sisters of Divine Providence had undertaken 47 schools in Texas.

Since Castroville was without railroad facilities, transportation difficulties had led to the move of the mother house to San Antonio in 1896. Here under Rev. Mother Florence had begun the establishment which became Our Lady of the Lake. In 1962, the Generalate was moved to the Scenic Loop, Helotes, Tex., where Rev. Mother M. Amata and some of the council members reside and carry on the administration of the congregation.

At first an accredited high school, Our Lady of the Lake College came into being in 1911. During the next 14 years, the college gained membership in the Texas Association of Colleges, the Southern Association of Colleges, the Association of American Colleges, and the American Council on Education. By 1927 Our Lady of the Lake was placed on the approved list of the Association of American Universities.

Under the leadership of Rev. Mother Philothea Thiry and later that of Rev. Mother Angelique Ayres, the college continued to expand.

Today, OLL's student body numbers 1,352. Joining San Antonians, students come from 23 States and 11 foreign countries. Degrees granted by OLL include bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of music, bachelor of music education, with a master in education; master in arts in education, in English, or in speech pathology; and a master in social work.

Here, each summer, meet the 730 Sisters who carry on Father Moye's work in a social service center, a children's home, a school of religion, 2 clinics, 3 aspirancies, 4 hospitals, and 67 schools in 5 States. Here, too, the Missionary Cathechists of Divine Providence, numbering 81, are prepared to staff their house of formation in San Antonio, and their 19 missions in Texas.

This Saturday, March 12, I have the honor of speaking at ground-breaking ceremonies for a new gymnasium for the Providence High School of San Antonio. This high school was founded by the Sisters of Divine Providence in 1951.

In the high school's first year it received accreditation in the Southern Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges. An excellent rating in the respective departments was reported after a 3-day evaluation by the association's representative committees.

It was reported in the Southern Messenger that the comments of the committee included:

> The building, the library program and the physical facilities were rated "almost perfect."
>
> The spirit of cooperation between the administration and the staff was declared to be evidently as nearly perfect as can be desired.
>
> That the students are developing high ideals, wholesome attitudes and good habits, is quite evident.

Today the enrollment at this excellent school for girls is 605 with a waiting list of over a hundred.

I am pleased to salute the Superior of Providence High School, Sister Adrienne Marie, and the other members of her order for the steadfast and excellent work they are doing. They have a wonderful heritage and one which makes it possible for work like theirs to be ever expanding.

The Snook Bluejays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the country seeks young people of the best physical condition to assume the strenuous responsibilities that are a part of our complex society, it is most rewarding to find an entire community dedicated to the principles of physical fitness.

As a striking example of a successful program of physical training, I would like to single out for special recognition the community of Snook in Burleson County, Tex., which is in the district I have the honor to represent.

For the second consecutive year, the Snook Bluejays have won the State high-school basketball championship in the class B division.

The game that wrapped up their second title in as many years also provided the team's 78th consecutive victory. The last time that the Bluejays were defeated on the basketball court was in December of 1964, and since that time they have given everybody in the country a licking.

The team's record this season is an impressive 52 wins and no defeats. During the past 4 years, the Bluejays posted an equally-impressive 181 to 14 win-loss record. That record, no doubt, would be a source of envy to many colleges and universities in this Nation.

Farm boys who work hard on ranches or in the fields are a little harder than the so-called city boys, reports the Bluejays' mentor, Coach James G. Horn.

Among the 79 students in Snook High School there are 30 boys, and those who participate in the school's basketball program are capable of withstanding 3-hour practice sessions without a single complaint.

There are about 200 persons in the friendly and delightful Snook community and a couple dozen stores and shops, but the smallness of the community is certainly no reflection on the community's ideas about physical fitness.

I ask that you join me in honoring a small town that has proved itself to be very much a big town by the manner in which they have provided an extensive physical fitness program for the youngsters of the community.

The Snook Bluejays' basketball record is, in my opinion, a conspicuous monument to physical fitness.

Educational Assistance Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House in 1965, I derived great satisfaction from participating in the various processes which resulted in the largest and most significant body of educational legislation ever enacted by a single Congress. It is a source of pride for me that my first Congress exhibited a deep and earnest concern for the state of the American schools, and that it made that concern tangible by earmarking a considerable portion of the Nation's vast fiscal resources for the support and betterment of those schools.

OPPOSES PROPOSALS

Now, only a year later, I am compelled to rise in opposition to proposals which, if accepted, would belie our continuing concern. I refer to the recommended cutbacks in the program of assistance to schools in federally affected areas, first presented to us skeletally in the budget for fiscal 1967, and now more fully in the provisions of H.R. 13160 and H.R. 13161.

Mr. Speaker, the current program of aid to federally impacted schools has been in operation under Public Law 815 and 874 for only 15 years, but the circumstances which led to the enactment of the program are of much longer standing. Those circumstances relate to the historic doctrine of intergovernmental immunities, one tenet of which holds that property of the Federal Government is not subject to taxation by local or State governments in whose territory such property lies.

LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS

As a result of this doctrine, local school boards have often been hesitant in accepting for enrollment children who live on Federal property. This was an unfortunate situation, but I think, an understandable one. The local school boards probably reasoned thus: "Our task is to provide public education for the children of our area. To finance this education, we draw mostly on taxes collected on the property in the district. The Federal Government pays no taxes on the property it owns—property which would be taxable if it were privately owned. Therefore, we are in no way bound to educate the children who live on Federal property. Moreover, should we attempt to school those extra children, we would actually fall down in our primary duty—that to the local children—since we would be spending the same amount of money while trying to educate a larger number of children."

TUITION SOMETIMES REQUIRED

This line of reasoning is not merely understandable; it has also been upheld judicially in a number of instances going back to a Massachusetts decision in 1841. From that time forward, the federally connected child was left in a sort of educational limbo. At one post, he might be accepted into local schools with no trouble. Transferring to another base, his parents might be required to pay tuition to get him in the local schools. At another post, he might have to enroll in a private school; and at another, the base authority itself might run schools for the children of Government workers.

In the late 1930's, with the great buildup in defense forces under way, the Federal Government realized the necessity for more systematic action in this long-neglected area. In 1940, Congress responded by enacting the Lanham Act, which provided Federal financing for housing and community facilities in areas with concentrations of Federal military and defense-connected families. Under this emergency legislation and its subsequent amendments, the Federal Government attempted to ease the Federal burden on local schools by providing funds for construction and operation. The Lanham Act was always looked upon as temporary in nature, however, and plans were made to discontinue assistance under it as soon as the war ended. Congress recognized the continuing burden on local schools by extending assistance through fiscal 1949, but it was obvious that a more unified, more permanent approach to the problem was still needed.

PRESENT LAW ENACTED

In 1950, the President called for new legislation dealing with the problem, and the outbreak of the Korean conflict and its resultant defense-military buildup made the need even more pressing. Finally, in September of that year, Public Laws 815 and 874 were enacted. For the first time, the Federal Government stood ready to compensate systematically all local schools for the continuing burden of federally connected children it was placing on them.

Public Law 874, authorizing assistance for the operation and maintenance of federally affected schools, was originally enacted for a 4-year period. Public Law 815, the companion measure providing school construction funds, was set to expire after 3 years. Yet today, a decade and a half later, both laws are still in effect. The very longevity of the laws bespeaks their need. It speaks of the continuing nature of the Federal burden, and it speaks of the effectiveness of the laws in dealing with that burden.

Since 1950, each of the laws has been extended on eight separate occasions. On each of those occasions, congressional support for the laws has been overwhelming and support from the Nation's schoolmen has been all but unanimous.

MORE THAN $87 MILLION TO COLORADO

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues in this body are aware of the splendid record of achievement associated with the operation of these two laws over the past 15 years, but I must touch for a moment on some of the figures. My State, like many of the Western States, has a considerable Federal burden, and the program of assistance under Public Law 815 and 874 has been of the greatest importance to our educational system. In 15 years, Public Law 874 has contributed nearly $62 million for the operation of Colorado schools in which federally connected children are enrolled. Under Public Law 815, $25.4 million has been used to build 1,100 new classrooms serving over 32,000 pupils.

But, in this same light let us look at what the situation would be in a couple of instances if this assistance had not been forthcoming.

In the academic year 1957–58, School District No. 20 in Colorado Springs enrolled about 70 federally connected children. Then, in the fall of 1958, the U.S. Air Force Academy moved from its temporary location at Lowry AFB in Denver to its permanent site at Colorado Springs. As a direct result of this move, nearly 600 new federally connected students were enrolled in the schools of district No. 20 in a single year. Now it is true that many of the families connected with the Academy lived in private homes and paid property taxes. But it is also true that the Academy itself, the biggest industry in the area, paid no taxes. It is quite obvious that, in the absence of Public Law 874–815 aid, School District No. 20 would have been powerless to cope with the sudden influx of new pupils.

STARTLING ENROLLMENT INCREASES

Or another instance, even more startling. In 1955, the Widefield-Security School District No. 3, also near Colorado Springs, was small and rural in nature. It operated 10 rooms for 24 students. But in the current academic year, that same district has an enrollment of 6,000 students, nearly 60 percent of which is federally connected. This staggering increase has stemmed partly from the opening of the Air Force Academy, but also from increased activity at other Federal bases in the area, such as Ent Air Force Base, Fort Carson, and Peterson Field.

School District No. 3 has not merely waited on the Federal Government to ease the burden. It has received substantial help under Public Law 815 and 874, but it has also passed 11 bond issues in the last 10 years and is now at the limit of indebtedness. Where, though, would the district stand if there had been no assistance for federally affected areas? And where will it stand if that assistance is cut back to the very bone?

REDUCTIONS UNWISE

Such a cut, of course, has been proposed, in the budget and now in the form of legislation. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I have examined the legislative proposal, and I have looked at the study on which the proposal is based. I am still convinced that the proposed reductions would be neither equitable nor wise, and I must in good conscience oppose them.

In terms of hard dollars, the suggested cutback in the program is radical indeed. For the current fiscal year, Public Law 874 assistance will amount to about $327 million—which sum, incidentally, may be only 80 to 85 percent of the amount needed to pay all entitlements in full. For fiscal year 1967, the Office of Education estimated that about $416 million would be needed to support the program as it now stands. But the budget calls for appropriations of only $183 million—$233 million less than the estimated requirement.

CONSTRUCTION SLASHED TOO

The vital program of construction assistance under Public Law 815 would also be slashed. Over the past several years, Public Law 815 has been funded at an annual level of from $50 to $60 million. For fiscal year 1966, the level will be right at the lower figure. But for next year, we are being asked to appropriate only $23 million.

These drastic reductions would result from proposed changes in the two basic laws as follows:

Three major amendments have been offered to Public Law 874. First, Federal property which is leased to private corporations would no longer be used as a basis for determining the Federal connection of children who live on such property. The second change also affects the determination of eligibility. At present, if at least 3 percent of a school district's enrollment is federally connected, the district may receive payment for all federally connected pupils. But under the proposed amendment, the school district would be required to absorb a certain percentage of its Federal pupils—that is, to pay for their education from its own resources—and payment would be made only for those pupils in excess of the absorption factor. For category A children—those whose parents live and work on Federal property—the absorption factor would be set at 3 percent. For catogery B children—those whose parents either work on or reside on Federal property—the district would have to absorb the first 6 percent.

And finally, the method of computing the amount of payment for eligible pupils would be changed. The payment would be equal to the average per-pupil spending in comparable districts in the State. The district could no longer opt, as it may now, to be paid one-half the State average per-pupil spending or one-half the national average if those figures are larger than the average per-pupil spending in comparable districts.

The proposed changes in Public Law 815 are simpler, but no less drastic. At present, that part of the Public Law 815 program dealing with children whose parents both live on and work on Federal property is permanent. The program of payment for children whose parents either live or work on Federal property, but not both, is temporary, and it is scheduled to expire in June of this year. The proposed cutback in financing would be achieved by allowing the temporary provisions of the law to expire.

So much for the mechanics of the reductions. But what of justification? What reasons are set forth in support of the proposed changes?

To deal with the simplest first, we might look at the justification for allowing a good part of the Public Law 815 program to expire. I say simplest, for I am yet to encounter any justification for this proposal. Could it be that there is no longer any need for school construction assistance? Hardly, when it is noted that 10.3 million American pupils—nearly 30 percent of all our schoolchildren—must try to learn in schools jammed with over 30 children per classroom. Is it that a sufficient amount of construction assistance will be available under the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act we passed last year? Not according to our able colleague from Kentucky, who was instrumental in the formulation and enactment of that legislation, and who has said that:

> The funds provided under that act (Public Law 89-10) * * * are inadequate to enable the construction of new classroom and other educational facilities in the school attendance areas in which these programs will operate.[1]

Or did the study of Public Laws 815 and 874 carried out for Congress by the Stanford Research Institute indicate that the program under Public Law 815 should be cut back? To the contrary: the Stanford group found the program too small already and suggested changes which would call for an additional $10 million annual spending thereunder.

Since there seems to be no valid justification for allowing the temporary portions of Public Law 815 to terminate, I am of the opinion that they should be extended, and that we should finance the program at least at the level of recent years.

And what of justification for the cutbacks in assistance under Public Law 874?

On this head, the budget states that the proposed cutbacks are based on:

> (1) Recent studies made at the request of Congress, and (2) the impact of the large new Federal programs which meet many of the same needs.

These recent studies, I assume, are the ones carried out by the Stanford Research Institute, to which I have already referred. Several points seem pertinent to me in this connection. For one thing, the very size of the Public Law 874 program is such that the study could deal in detailed fashion with only a very small portion of the eligible school districts—54 out of an estimated 4,100.

Again, the study concluded that the payment to some districts was more than enough to meet the Federal burden; but also that in some districts, it was far short of the amount necessary to offset the burden. Assuming this to be the case, we should certainly alter the law so that the payment to every district meets the burden. In my opinion, however, the proposed amendments would not achieve this end. Under them, approximately 1,050 districts would lose all eligibility, and virtually all of the remaining districts would have their entitlements substantially reduced. The amendments would certainly put a stop to overpayment, but they would also push underpayments even further under. Admitting that adjustments are necessary, I do not think we should make them in a hasty manner, which smacks distinctly of throwing the baby out with the bath.

Then there is the matter of the proposed absorption requirement. The Stanford report points out that if the enrollment of a district is exactly 3 percent federally connected, then the district is paid for all federally connected children; but that if a district has a federally connected enrollment of 2.9 percent, it receives no payment. This is undoubtedly inequitable. Under the proposed amendments, as we have seen, every district would have to absorb set percentages of federally connected children, for whom no payment would be made. This arrangement would indeed be equitable, in that it would apply to all school districts alike. But, in my opinion, it would violate the basic purpose of the program by requiring the local districts to foot a good portion of what is admittedly a federally imposed burden. I cannot generate much feeling for an arrangement which would remove a minor inequity by replacing it with a major one.

Finally, I would comment on the second justification propounded for the retrenchment in the Public Law 874 program—that the newly enacted Federal assistance programs will help fill the needs previously met by Public Law 874. Indeed, the budget goes even further and asserts that:

> This special form of assistance (i.e., the impacted areas program) should be periodically adjusted to reflect the growth in assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Now my understanding of the programs in question will not admit of that reasoning. Essentially, Public Laws 815 and 874 are concerned with one thing only: the burden placed on local schools by activities of the Federal Government.

---

[1] School construction, 1965. Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, on H.R. 9948, etc. July–August 1965. Statement of Mr. Perkins, p. 1.

The two laws do not deal with rich areas or poor areas, but with federally affected areas. Public Law 89-10, on the other hand, has nothing to do with federally affected areas. Its touchstone is the general quality of education, especially in economically depressed sections. Consequently, the statement I have quoted from the budget seems to me to be founded on reasoning which is, at best, tenuous.

PROGRAMS DIFFER

Even if the programs had the same purpose, which I do not believe to be the case, would the proposed amendments to Public Law 874 really reflect the growth in Public Law 89-10 assistance? Certainly not, in many instances. For example, I would cite El Paso County in my district in Colorado. Under the present provisions of Public Law 874, the school districts of that county would qualify for an estimated $4 million in assistance in fiscal 1967. If, however, the suggested amendments are enacted, the total entitlement for El Paso County would be reduced by $1.45 million.

Under title I of Public Law 89-10, the maximum basic grant to El Paso in fiscal 1966 would be about $575,000. Should this grant be increased to $1 million for fiscal 1967—and there is no reason to believe it will be—El Paso County schools would still be out nearly one-half million dollars. That is not my conception of an increase in one program being reflected by a decrease in another.

URGES PROGRAM CONTINUE

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the proposed changes in the federally affected areas program. In spite of the various justifications offered for the suggested changes, it would seem that the real reason behind the proposals is purely fiscal. There is certainly a need to limit Federal spending, but, as this body demonstrated last year, there is a greater need to see that American education is made as strong as the Nation can make it. Retrenchment in the program of assistance to schools in federally affected areas would certainly impair that strength. Therefore, I sincerely hope that efforts toward such retrenchment will fail.

I thank you.

Checking System Allows Children To Learn Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the budget and its all-powerful Bureau dominates most of the action of the Congress.

The Federal Government is constantly striving for a balanced budget, as are large corporations, small businesses, and families. Most parents of teenage youngsters find their children unfamiliar with budget procedures and the elements of banking, however.

A well-known newspaper columnist in Memphis, Mr. Lydel Sims, has come up with a kit intended to remedy this problem. His idea came about through his personal experience with his own children.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article about his Check-A-Lowance system:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Feb. 27, 1966]

Checking System Allows Children To Learn Budget

Parents who worry about their children growing up without knowing the rudiments of finance now have a painless way to remedy the situation.

Lydel Sims (assignment, Memphis), columnist of this newspaper, is marketing a kit intended to teach children from 8 to 15 some elements of banking at home. The kit includes deposit slips, checks, cash vouchers, an accounts book, and statements of account.

The system is called Check-A-Lowance. A parent acts as adviser and banker, the child draws up an allowance budget for the year, and collects the allowance through cash vouchers.

Mr. Sims said he became aware of the problem some young persons have in keeping accounts when he sent his older daughter, to the State University of Iowa. She had trouble keeping her accounts straight.

"I have another daughter, Pat, who was 10 at that time," Mr. Sims said.

"I decided then that children shouldn't get out of high school without being able to keep accounts, so I started with Pat in January 1963. The present forms are the result of a lot of trial and error."

The child confers with the family banker and tries to think of all the expenses which might arise for the year.

The items are then listed on the budget, and the budget is then entered in the accounts book.

The week's allowance is collected in the form of a voucher which is filled out by the family banker and endorsed back to him for deposit. The child writes checks against his account. Once a week he balances his books, using check stubs and the accounts book. At the end of each month the banker gathers deposit slips and canceled checks and prepares the bank statement. The child then checks his records to see that his books balance.

The Check-A-Lowance system has illustrated directions and forms. It is sold by mail and is available for $5 from Check-A-Lowance, Post Office Box 531, Memphis, Tenn.

Post Office Department Needs the Trains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, the Post Office Department is busily continuing a hard-nosed practice of removing U.S. mail from our trains. Experts have already testified that this is not only leading to poorer mail service, but also to the elimination of many trains. This comes at a time when we are trying to promote high-speed rail transportation.

I think it is interesting to note an editorial which recently appeared in the "Conductor and Brakeman." It seems the Post Office Department had to put mail back on trains in order that the public could receive the holiday mail on time.

Queer Post Office Tactics

An unwelcome Christmas present was given the C. & O.-B. & O. by the U.S. Government in the form of a notice that certain mail being handled to and from Detroit by rail was to be turned over to other modes of transportation, principally trucks.

This shocking pronouncement from the Post Office Department came at a time when the executive branch of the Government was taking active interest in passenger transportation by rail.

The net effect of the Post Office Department's cancellation of mail in this one instance alone will mean a loss in rail revenue to the C. & O.-B. & O. of $1 million, according to reliable sources. Of course the net result of this action will be to seriously jeopardize the continued operation of this passenger service.

Word now comes that the Post Office, which had taken much mail off trains in favor of trucks earlier in 1965, asked the C. & O.-B. & O. to take most of that mail back during the holiday season.

The railroad had asked the Post Office, when the mail was taken away from trains earlier in the year, whether the railroad was expected to provide standby service during rush periods. It is reported that the Post Office Department advised they did not expect the carriers to be prepared to provide such standby service.

As you may have guessed, the inevitable happened. During the holiday rush the Post Office went to the railroad and asked to have the mail taken back on the trains so that John Q. Public could receive his Christmas mail in time for the holidays. While the carrier was under no obligation to provide that service, it did cooperate as a service to the public.

To top off this strange story, the Post Office Department has now sent letters of commendation to the C. & O.-B. & O. for their service in handling the mail, particularly in Washington, Cumberland, and Chicago. Special trains operated over the main line, carrying Christmas mail between Cincinnati and Detroit during the peak rush period.

Paul H. Reistrup, C. & O.-B. & O. director of passenger service is quoted as saying, "The Post Office figured trucks could handle holiday mail when they took it away from us originally, but it turned out they needed our services. But with the continued policy of mail diversion from trains, what's going to happen the next time they need us and the trains are no longer in service?"

Statement of G. L. Weissenburger on Behalf of the Vanadium Corp. of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives is holding hearings on Government stockpiling of strategic minerals. I commend to my colleagues the statement before the committee of G. L. Weissenburger, chairman and president of Vanadium Corp. of America on March 4, 1966:

Statement of G. L. Weissenburger on Behalf of Vanadium Corp. of America, Before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, March 4, 1966

My name is G. L. Weissenburger. I am chairman and president of Vanadium Corp. of America, a major producer of ferroalloys in the United States, and in conjunction with the production of two of our major ferroalloys we are heavily involved in the mining and milling of uranium/vanadium ores on the Colorado Plateau and the mining of high grade chrome ores in Rhodesia. Mining operations are conducted by our company in New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Colorado, and we have milling and production facilities in the States of Washington, New Mexico, Iowa, Ohio, and West Virginia.

The Government's policy with respect to its stockpiled materials is of vital interest to our company, not only as a miner but also as a producer of ferroalloys, dependent on mined products. The ferroalloys produced by our company and other members of our industry are vitally essential to many segments of our national economy and security. Among the major industries involved are the steel industry, the gray and ductile iron industries, the aluminum industry, the titanium industry, and several important segments of the chemical industry.

In recent years there has been an increasing effort to revise or reinterpret the purposes and intent of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act as originally adopted in July of 1946. It is our firm opinion that the Government stockpiles are a valuable national asset, essential to the Nation's defense, and to the extent they can be utilized to protect vital industries, including the mining industry, without jeopardizing their use for purely defense purposes, they should be so used. Such use, however, should be under continued congressional control to avoid any possibility of dissipation for purposes other than protecting our defense posture or our domestic industries, which past experience has proven to be a major factor in our national defense.

Since most commodities now in the stockpile are produced under different circumstances and sold in distinctly separate markets, proper disposal or use of each commodity should involve individual analysis. It is our belief that disposal of the stockpiles by the General Services Administration, subject to approval by the Office of Emergency Planning, is sound and proper, under the guidance and specific authority of Congress.

The history of two world wars and the Korean emergency definitely demonstrated the hazard of relying on foreign sources of supply during a period of national emergency. It also demonstrated the tremendous increase in demand for some products over and above normal peacetime requirements. Since the Government stockpiles are a national assets, paid for by taxes, we believe that in any program for disposal or use, three basic interrelated objectives should be given consideration, to the extent that this can be done without detracting in any way from the original objective of national defense. These are:

1. Obtaining maximum benefits to the domestic economy and its growth through the creation of more domestic jobs, payrolls and tax sources;

2. Avoiding disruption of our normal free market economy by disposals which have either a deflationary or inflationary impact; and

3. Improving our Government's position with reference to the balance of payments problem.

Because of recent developments, both political and economic, with respect to vanadium and chromium, and current programs for disposal of vanadium oxide and chrome ore or ferrochrome from Government stockpiles, I would like to discuss these particular items in more detail.

In recent years the United States has been the major producer of vanadium oxide, which has come mainly from vanadium/uranium mining operations on the Colorado Plateau and from slags resulting from the production of elemental phosphorus. The rest of the free world has obtained its oxide from the lead vanadates of southwest Africa, the vanadium-bearing magnetite ores of South Africa and Finland and by exports from the United States. The vanadium oxide produced from these sources is the base raw material for vanadium alloys and chemicals. As a result of the technological advances in the fields of metallurgy and chemistry, the growth in the use of vanadium has sharply accelerated within the last year. Forecasts of total use in the early 1970's made only 2 years ago may well be exceeded this year if sufficient raw material in the form of vanadium oxide can be made available. While total tonnage of steel in 1965 increased 8 percent over 1964, consumption of vanadium increased 33 percent, and in some of the vital areas of newer grades of steel the increase was 43 percent. If our domestic steel, lightweight metals and chemical industries are to achieve the progress they are capable of, additional vanadium oxide must be made available promptly, and the only current source of additional vanadium to fill this vacuum is material determined to be excess in the Government stockpile. This sudden imbalance between supply and demand was brought about by the unexpectedly rapid expansion in use, while at the same time the primary source of vanadium pentoxide in the United States has been substantially reduced by the policy decision of the Atomic Energy Commission to reduce the production of uranium, which as a side effect has reduced the production of vanadium pentoxide from combination uranium/vanadium ores. We have no quarrel with this decision of the AEC but do wish to point out that a major contributing factor to the present shortage of vanadium is a direct result of a Government policy decision.

Although demand and supply for vanadium oxide were approximately in balance early in 1965, this was made possible only because major producers were drawing heavily on reserves of oxide from uranium/vanadium mill tailings on the Colorado Plateau, but rapid inroads on this source have resulted in a near-term supply problem, which is becoming increasingly acute. Various producers, recognizing the impending shortage, have stepped up their search for alternate sources of supply and research on and expansion of controlled sources previously considered marginally economic. However, this additional production cannot be expected to catch up with the escalating demand until late 1968 or early 1969.

In view of the fact that the current vanadium shortage should be of an interim nature and that the major raw material sources are located in the United States, we feel that the use of the vanadium oxide determined excess in the stockpile to relieve this shortage can be fully justified. The $64 question is how to do this within the limits of the objectives outlined earlier. The GSA, in disposing of roughly 8,600,000 pounds of vanadium pentoxide, available to them from the AEC, starting with an initial offering in August of 1965, consulted with industry, producers, consumers, and brokers in setting up a program. However, despite the almost unanimous recommendation of industrial representatives of both the vanadium industry and the consumers of vanadium products consulted, the initial disposals lacked adequate safeguards to avoid some of the objectionable side effects foreseen by the majority of this industrial group. These adverse side effects were:

1. The inflationary impact resulting from inadequate conditions of bidding, which encouraged speculative bidding; and

2. The lack of control over material which could be exported to the detriment of domestic consumers and also to our Government's position relative to the balance-of-payments problem. By this I mean that the value of vanadium so exported would be tremendously exceeded by the value of foreign products made from this material and reexported to the United States to take over the market which domestic producers were unable to supply.

Subsequent offerings of vanadium oxide by the GSA have approached the original recommendations, and there is some indication that if congressional authority is obtained for further disposals, the disposals can be made within the outlines of the basic objectives previously referred to.

The importance of setting prices on material sold from the stockpile at levels reasonably related to market prices, to avoid either inflationary or deflationary impact, cannot be over emphasized. The sale of material at prices which are too low cannot but tend to discourage the mining and production of vanadium oxide and the development of new sources for this essential material. Whereas on the other hand, prices which are too high can react adversely on the continued growth of the use of vanadium and, in effect, to a degree, price it out of the market.

With reference to disposal of either chrome ore or ferrochromium, this is an entirely different situation, in that the United States relies almost entirely on chrome ore produced in foreign countries. A review of our experience in World War II and the Korean emergency demonstrates that the demand for chrome alloys rose between 200 and 250 percent above peacetime requirements in the year immediately preceding each of these emergencies. On this basis, we believe there is considerable question as to whether any broad scale disposal of either chrome alloys or chrome ore can be justified. If as a result of the current political situation in Rhodesia the supply of Rhodesian chorme ore is shut off for any extended period, there would certainly be justification for making available to producers deprived of this ore, equivalent tonnages. In view of the fact that Rhodesia has historically supplied approximately 40 percent of U.S. requirements of metallurgical chorme ore and that over the last few years between 25 and 35 percent of metallurgical chrome ore consumed in the United States has been imported from Soviet Russia, which could at any time discontinue shipments, it is to pe hoped that a solution to the Rhodesian problem will be found very shortly. In supporting the British Government in their sanctions on chrome ore exports from Rhodesia, the United States is jeopardizing, as we pointed out, 40 percent of its metallurgical chrome ore supply, on which stainless and alloy steels are directly dependent, while at this same time the United Kingdom is reliably reported to have received a full year's supply of Rhodesian chrome ore during the first 2 months of this year.

As I and other representatives of our industry have repeatedly pointed out to the Office of Emergency Planning, the Tariff Commission, the Commerce Department and other Government agencies and departments, the ferroalloy industry, including its mining operations, is not only vitally important from a standpoint of national defense, but is also an essential element of a profitable and healthy domestic economy. Because of this vital role, it should not be subjected to any unnecessary handicaps such as disposal of chromium alloy in any amount, or chrome ores in anything more than modest quantities, unless larger quantities are made necessary by the current Rhodesian situation.

The interest that this committee has shown in the use of the Government stockpiles and its impact, not only on the domestic mining and metals industries but on the entire domestic economy, is extremely encouraging to me and, I am sure, to other members of our industry, and I very much appreciate this great interest on your part and the opportunity to present my views on this very important subject.

Days of Difficult Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, Norman Clapp, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, addressed the 24th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Las Vegas, Nev., on February 15. It was my privilege to hear Mr. Clapp's thought-provoking speech on the decisions facing the rural electric cooperative leaders. These decisions take on added importance as the need for electricity to farms increase as we embark on an expanded worldwide war on hunger.

I have long been aware of the wonderful contributions of the rural electrification program to the progress of rural America and am very proud that its Administrator, Norman Clapp, is from Wisconsin. Among Wisconsin's many fine rural electric cooperatives is the Rock County Electric Cooperative with its headquarters in Janesville in the western part of the First District. This cooperative, with 609 miles of line, serves more than 2,000 consumer-members.

Mr. Clapp's speech entitled, "Days of Difficult Decisions," follows:

DAYS OF DIFFICULT DECISIONS

(Remarks of Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, before 24th annual meeting of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, February 15, 1966, Las Vegas, Nev.)

We meet again.

To me this occasion is always an inspiring experience. To witness and be a part of this vast assembly, to share your sense of common purpose, to feel your dedication to public service—all this is an annual reassurance that rural electrification is in good hands. It is a mighty testimonial that powerful forces are at work in the progress of rural America and laying firm foundations for the Nation's future.

These are not easy times in which we meet. These are days of difficult decisions. As a nation we face the hard choices involved in meeting both our commitments to freedom abroad and progress at home.

And in his state of the Union message last month, President Johnson made it clear that we are determined to meet both commitments. "This Nation is mighty enough," he said, "its society is healthy enough, its people are strong enough, to pursue our goals in the rest of the world while still building a Great Society here at home."

Do this we can; do it we will. But make no mistake about it; this is no easy assignment. It leaves no room for waste or extravagance in the allocation of the Nation's resources. It permits no shirking, no idling, no lagging behind. It will call for the best efforts of everyone individually and maximum efficiency in our total effort together.

In the rural electrification program we are already facing the hard realities of the task to which we are committed as a nation. We are facing them in the problems of REA financing. They involve no denial or equivocation on the basic and far-reaching values of rural electrification as a social force for better living or as an essential factor in the balanced economic development of the Nation. They imply no retreat or compromise on the objectives of rural electrification.

They do require, however, finding the ways and means of meeting not only present but the multiplying future needs of the program without incurring unnecessary expense or indulging in extravagence, and without placing unnecessary burdens on the Federal budget. They require too a more effective total mobilization of the program's resources, the resources of the rural electric systems themselves as well as the resources provided by the Federal Government.

It is a high tribute to your sense of public responsibility that you have understood all this and in fact anticipated the difficult decisions we now face in the field of financing. Two years ago you directed your national association to undertake a study of possibilities for developing supplemental financing through the private money market. Out of this study has come a proposal for a Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems to supplement the present basic 2-percent REA financing.

This proposal for future supplemental financing outside the Federal budget is the major topic of this annual meeting.

I am sure the decision you face is not an easy one, but I know you will meet this issue realistically, unselfishly, and in the public interest as responsible leaders, as conscientious Americans. You have proved this in the past; this is your tradition. You have never shrunk from the tough issues of the past, and there have been many of them. You are accustomed to breaking new ground; you have pioneered in this program from its very inception. And throughout it all, as cooperative leaders, you have shown a deep and abiding sensitivity to your public responsibilities in working with your Government through REA.

Financing is a fancy name for money, and I have heard that families quarrel more over money than anything else. So, I suppose, there is always some risk in talking about financing, even here in this family circle. In fact there has been a little family fussing about money just in recent weeks.

But financing is so important to the future of this rural electrification program and your own rural systems I want to talk with you about it, whatever the risk may be. This is a problem we must face together—you as officers, directors and managers of rural electric systems and we who represent REA and this administration.

First of all let me clear the air of any misunderstanding.

This administration stands for a great society which has as one of its basic cornerstones a prosperous, vital, and beautiful rural America.

This administration stands for a growing rural America, one in which both farm income and nonfarm income will continue to increase, one in which there will be more employment and greater parity of opportunity with each passing year.

This administration stands firmly for a rural electrification program and a rural telephone program capable of serving the expanded needs this growth will bring and, capable too, of serving them at costs and in kind comparable to service in our towns and cities.

The record of our past work together speaks for itself. This administration has provided well for the needs of rural electrification. In the 5 years since January of 1961, first under President Kennedy and now under President Johnson it has provided nearly $1.6 billion in rural electrification loans. That is over $400 million more financing than was provided in the last 5 years of the previous administration.

We have moved with firmness and determination in a broader-scale effort than ever before attempted to improve the wholesale power supply of your systems, through better contracts and more muscle in the generation and transmission program. We have moved to protect your security and effectiveness from the threats of hostile power suppliers.

At the same time, we have helped and encouraged you in developing constructive, cooperative relationships with other friendly power suppliers, private as well as public, to move you into the mainstream of the electric industry where you can share fully in the benefits of coordinated operations and advancing technology.

We have encouraged and actively assisted your efforts to develop the economic base of your rural areas and win protection for your continued right to serve the areas you have built your systems to serve.

We have placed increasing emphasis on the need to develop the internal strength of your organizations through constantly widening cooperation, better member service, and more effective management.

Now we are prepared to move forward with you in meeting the problems of the present and in preparing for the needs of the future.

Let us talk about the present and future of REA financing.

It is both our problem and our purpose in the rural electrification program to provide adequately for your essential needs. At the same time, we must be as frugal and efficient as humanly possible in the light of all the other demands upon the Federal budget. Sound and careful economy in the management of the rural electrification program will strengthen—not weaken—the whole program. No sound purpose will suffer, no essential need will be neglected, but in sternly avoiding waste and unnecessary use of the Government's assistance, you will preserve and retain the support and understanding of an appreciative public.

This necessarily involves a rigorous and constant process of testing and proving program levels—a careful study and weighing of each loan application—to make sure that we are not committing ourselves to some requests which, while desirable and justifiable under less stringent circumstances, are not at this time completely necessary.

As you know, the electrification loan program level for this current fiscal year was originally set at $270 million, and we have been working with you to determine to what extent this amount could be made to meet the essential needs of this year. We hope that, with the understanding and cooperation of each of you in this critical time, the projected loan level will suffice. But, to the extent it does not, there is still time and there is still authority to adjust the figure.

One misunderstanding which, I know, deeply concerned you, has been corrected. The $37 million contingency fund balance which was released at the very close of the last fiscal year by President Johnson's direction was initially charged against the $270 million loan level projected for this fiscal year. This was not in accord with the President's intentions, and Secretary Freeman has asked me to report to you that at a very recent conference on departmental matters the President made it clear that the 1965 contingency balance had been provided, and was not to be taken away.

If the loans made from this 1965 balance in the first few days of this fiscal year are to be counted as part of the projected loan level for this fiscal year, this means we really have at this time now a projected loan level of $307 million instead of $270 million as announced.

Now let us turn our attention to fiscal year 1967. The electrification program level of 2 percent loans for the next fiscal year, which begins on July 1 has been projected at $270 million. This level, however, is based on the expectation that these basic 2 percent REA loans to be provided in the budget will be only a part of the total financing available to the electric program next year. It is based on the expectation that there will be, in addition, a new supplemental financing program to meet the balance of your needs.

This administration is prepared to move with you in developing a new supplemental financing program along the general lines of the proposal you have been studying for the past 2 years and are considering here at this annual meeting.

Such a plan must, first of all, provide a new source of financing outside the Federal budget for meeting the growing needs of rural electrification; secondly, it must offer borrowers interest rates which are low enough to make the loans usable; and, finally, it must provide greater flexibility in the sound business use of loan capital—greater than is possible with the basic 2 percent loan funds.

If we are successful in securing the enactment of such a supplemental financing program at this session of Congress, we can then look forward to total lending resources in the electric program during fiscal year 1967 of substantially more than the $270 million to be available at 2 percent. With such a supplemental program we could expect a total loan availability of well over $400 million. How much more than $400 million would be available would depend primarily on the extent to which the more fortunately situated rural electric systems could qualify for—and profitably use—full-market rate, nonarmortized loans which a new band for rural electric systems could make available on a scale well beyond any conceivable needs of the program.

There has been a growing recognition of the fact that while the total capital needs of the rural electric systems are increasing and will increase still more, an increasing share of these needs could be met with loans bearing a higher rate of interest than 2 percent, if they were available, without sacrificing the objectives of the rural electrification program.

We have recognized this, and more and more of you have recognized it too as your systems have matured and gained strength.

Many of you have been understandably reluctant, however, to initiate any change in the Rural Electrification Act lest it result in the complete elimination of 2 percent REA financing. I can sympathize with your caution, for certainly it is obvious to all who know this program that 2 percent financing still is necessary to enable the majority of rural systems to accomplish the basic objective of the rural electrification program.

That objective, today as in 1935, is to provide electric service to rural consumers at costs and of a kind comparable to the service available to town and city people.

This administration accepts and concurs in your fundamental contention that adoption of a plan for supplemental financing must not involve any change in the present basic 2 percent program.

The new plan must be what the name implies—a supplemental program, not a substitute for 2 percent financing where it takes 2 percent financing to get the job done.

An acceptable supplemental financing program ought also to meet the following requirements:

First, it must provide a source of funds outside the Federal budget to help meet the growing needs of rural electrification. It would be necessary, of course, to utilize Federal participation in the capital structure of a bank for rural electric systems during the bank's early years. It also would be necessary for the Federal Government to back up the bank's debentures. But with this type of financial support from the Government, the bank would be in a position to seek out and channel increasing amounts of private capital into the rural electrification program.

Second, a workable supplemental plan must offer borrowers interest rates which are low enough to make the loans usable. Many systems will have to accumulate additional net worth before they can qualify for the conventional type of nonamortized financing. Such systems need to have access to an intermediate-rate, amortized type of loan which will enable them to continue to build net worth without pushing debt service commitments to unrealistic and restrictive levels.

Third, to be most effective a supplemental plan must provide greater flexibility in the use of funds than is possible with the basic 2 percent loan funds. It must permit borrowers to utilize supplemental loans, where necessary, to acquire and exchange facilities in adjusting and strengthening service territories. It must be usable for larger, more economical, more efficient generating units and transmission lines. It must permit rural systems to carry their proper share of the load in new power pools and transmission grids. In short, it must permit and assist the rural-based systems to move forward with the rest of the power industry.

Your deliberations here this week have great significance in the history of this program. You have an historic decision to make. If you take this step to seek a broadened financial base and greater freedom of operation and development than is possible under the limitations of 2 percent financing, you may well be shaping a new bill of rights for rural electrification.

You will indeed be laying a necessary and firm foundation for the future.

There is, of course, more to the financing problem than simply finding new sources of loan funds. We need also to look to the development of the internal resources of the rural electric cooperatives themselves. Building stronger rural electric systems is the best and surest road to sound and constructive economy in the REA program.

This depends in large measure upon further advances in the field of rural areas development, territorial protection, and management improvement. These are the basic equalizers which in time will materially offset the present handicaps of providing both electric and telephone service in rural America.

In looking to the total needs of this great program, we also need to develop efficient division of labor. We need to find ways to make the most efficient possible use of the total resources of this great program.

And the total resources of rural electrification are more than lending authority and unadvanced funds, more than poles and substations and headquarters buildings, more than generating plants and transmission systems, dramatic and impressive as these things are.

Your most important program resources are people: your board of directors and trustees; your trained co-op personnel; your new member services committees; your great State, regional, and national associations; and, of course, your rank-and-file membership.

If to all this we can add the final spark of unity, the future of rural electrification is bright and secure. One thousand rural electric systems, the 20 million people they serve, all their officers and representatives—working together and pulling together can work miracles. And I am convinced you will.

In conclusion let me read some moving and prophetic words spoken to you from this very platform 3 years ago.

"If governments are to be prudent, they must follow their hearts without losing their heads. We living today must recognize that it is our special responsibility in the history of America and in the history of the human race—to be privileged to put in place the foundations on which man's enjoyment of freedom and hope for peace will stand for centuries to come. A part of that foundation is and will always be the stability, the success, and the prosperity of agriculture and of life in the rural areas. We shall need to continue in this country to concern ourselves with that foundation of stability, success, and prosperity for rural America—and that means we must continue our support of the rural electrification program as a vital part of the foundations of our Nation's future."

These words were spoken to you by an old friend, Lyndon Johnson. He was then Vice President of the United States. Today he bears the awesome burden of the Presidency of this great Nation.

He has not forgotten you, nor has he forgotten the needs of rural electrification. His concern about the folks out in the country is as keen today as it ever was when he was leading the struggle for electricity on the Pedernales 30 years ago.

He is looking to your future and the future of the Nation. If there are foundations for that future which must be laid now, he is ready.

Are you?

Rural Electrification and the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stalbaum], delivered an excellent and thought-provoking speech to the 9,000 rural electric cooperative leaders who attended the 24th annual meeting of their national organization, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. In his speech, Mr. Stalbaum detailed the need for the rural electric systems to obtain access to a source of supplemental capital above and beyond the annual congressional authorization for the rural electrification program.

With power loads in rural areas doubling every 7 years, the more than 1,000 rural electric systems of the Nation are requiring increasing amounts of capital in order to meet this rising demand for electricity. As Mr. Stalbaum pointed out, the Congress is not going to abandon the very worthwhile rural electrification program, which has done so much to improve the working and living standards of our farmers and other rural residents. However, the Congress must also consider the needs of many other meritorious programs.

> Ours is, therefore, not the assignment of granting all the funds asked for in every meritorious case but rather to allocate funds among all of them—

He said.

Mr. Stalbaum indicated that the Congress will probably continue to authorize funds for the rural electrification program at approximately the levels which have been authorized in the past 10 years. However, he noted that this figure would be less than one-half of the estimated capital need for the rural electric cooperatives in the next 15 years.

Based on his firsthand knowledge of the operations of the Bank for Cooperatives, Mr. Stalbaum recommended that the rural electrics seek supplemental financing through the proposed Bank for Rural Electric Systems which, like the Bank for Cooperatives, would be ultimately owned and controlled by its co-op stockholders. The NERCA delegates subsequently approved, by an overwhelming margin, a resolution urging the Congress and the administration to continue the present 2-percent, 35-year REA loan program with adequate finding for those systems requiring such loans to meet program objectives, and to establish a Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems as a supplemental source of the capital required by the rural electric cooperatives to meet the growing power needs of the rural areas they serve.

I recommend the entire remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin to you for your information and consideration:

Rural Electrification and the Congress

(Speech of Representative Lynn E. Stalbaum, First District, Wisconsin, given on February 16, 1966, at special session on supplemental financing at NRECA annual meeting).

First let me extend my greetings to you who are so active in the rural electric cooperatives.

Your activities and those who hold similar capacities and those who have preceded you in the development of the rural electric cooperatives are not new to me. As has been indicated to you in the introduction, I am a Wisconsin farm boy, but must hasten to add that I grew up on the farm without the benefiits of electricity. It was not until 1937 that electricity reached our farmstead, one-fourth mile off the main road.

It would be pleasant for me to stand here today and tell you that the ultimate source of power was through an REA-financed cooperative, but such is not the case. It was by a private utility. The fact remains that until REA came onto the scene and threatened to move into farm areas such as the one where I grew up in southeastern Wisconsin, the private power companies had done absolutely nothing to encourage electrical development in the rural areas.

If memory serves me correctly, and 30 years or more is a long time to remember, the original bill which they wanted to submit to us to run power to our place back in the early 1930's was $1,300. Bear in mind this was just for the powerlines to bring the electricity to our farm. It did not in any way cover the cost of the wiring and fixture installation nor the monthly charge for electrical service. And those of you who have grown up and have lived through the depression days of the 1930's, I am sure, will realize that $1,300 was about 1 year's gross income from the average Wisconsin dairy herd during those days.

And so I say today in this first opportunity to appear before a national meeting of rural electric cooperatives, a belated "thank you" some 30 years late, for getting the wheels in motion to bring electricity to us.

I have shown my appreciation of this fact in later days. Prior to entering the Congress of the United States, I was a member of the Wisconsin State Senate for 10 years and, as was true in so many States during the past few years, the battle of territorial integrity entered the legislative scene.

You know, there is an old saying that one must take the bitter with the sweet, but it always strikes me as I observe the electric utilities, that when it comes to servicing sparsely settled areas with low revenue potential, the private power companies are perfectly content to let rural electrics have this business. This is the part I call the bitter part of the business. But suddenly if this bitter, by some strange alchemy, through the development of a municipality or the expansion of its borders becomes sweet business, then immediately there are efforts by the private power companies to say that the rural electrics must give up this business now that it has become sweet. And so instead of having the bitter with the sweet, it has long appeared to me that the private power utilities are perfectly willing to leave the bitter to the rural electrics and take the sweet unto themselves, even if it means taking over territories formerly served in the buildup days by the rural electrics.

When one realizes that rural electrics average slightly over 3 consumers to the mile compared with 33 consumers to the mile for private utilities and that in this mile there are $450 of revenue on the average for the rural electrics compared with over $7,000 for the utilities, one can see the contrast that exists. And this in spite of the fact that the rural electrics have had to build over half of all the pole miles of distribution line in the country on this limited revenue potential.

So, when the efforts were made to take away from the rural electrics the right to operate in areas in which they had always operated, simply because these areas had now become built up, or in a little more complex case where they had been annexed to a community which had a municipal powerplant, I felt that the rural electrics were entitled to this little bit of sweetening to the otherwise bitter business and vigorously supported in my own State the rural electric co-ops' efforts to retain their right to those areas in which they had always operated. I am pleased to say that we won that round of the battle, although I suppose this is a war which is never completely over.

Today, however, the topic assigned to me is that of the financing of the expansion of the rural electric co-ops. I state that I have read the material which has been prepared on this subject and found this concept not too difficult because the pattern of it is so similar to that found in the Bank for Cooperatives. As indicated earlier to you, I was the secretary-treasurer-manager of a dairy cooperative in Wisconsin for 14 years. During that time, we had opportunity and need to borrow from the Bank for Cooperatives over a rather long period of time. Primarily, we borrowed for the relending of money to our patrons for the purchase of bulk milk tanks.

It was during this period that the Bank of Cooperatives moved from being a Government-owned bank to becoming, if you please, a cooperative bank for cooperatives. When I start reading about A type stock and B type stock and C type stock, these, too, are all terms with which I am familiar. And so a little later I want to show you what happened in our own St. Paul Bank for Cooperatives.

But before we do that, let's take a quick look, a look by an outsider, an interested outsider, at the financing both present and potential of the rural electrics. As I look at this, I look through the eyes of a politician. I say this in all candor because I am not scared by the word politics or the term politician. It is an honorable profession.

Someone once used the definition that "politics is the art of the practical." This, I guess, is the reason that I am proud of the title, because we are the practical men who make the views held by the extremes work. We are the ones who modify them and refine them and come up with programs which are acceptable, perhaps neither as far to one side as the proponents would like, nor as far to the other side as the opponents would like, but somewhere in that practical middle area where a result can be obtained.

And so we must look at the 2-percent REA loan rates that now exist in the light of the recently increased Federal interest rates. It is my view that we will be able to make 2-percent money available as long as your organization can present a strong case for its needs, but we will not be able to substantially expand these funds.

I know there are those among you who maintain that an outstanding case can be made for federally supplied 2-percent money for all of your capital needs. To those who hold that belief, I am not today arguing the logic or the merit of your case.

Realistically, however, as a Representative in Government, it must be pointed out that the same type of strong case is made by virtually every group who comes before us. The educator, the conservationist, the health research people, to mention only a few, can make just as strong a case as you. Ours is, therefore, not the assignment of granting all the funds asked for in every meritorious case but rather to allocate funds among all of them.

I mention this in order to warn you against deluding yourself into thinking the Congress would of necessity feel that yours was a uniquely meritorious argument to be considered ahead of all others. And especially should you consider this in the context of the recent increase in interest rates.

Everyone, it seems, would like to be the author of a natural law. I suppose the most known author of recent times is Parkinson with maybe two or three different Parkinson's laws, primarily on bureaucracy. But today I am going to give you what I call Stalbaum's natural law on low interest rates for rural electrics. My natural law is simply this: "The ability of rural electrics to retain 2 percent loan rates becomes more difficult in geometric proportions to the increase in other interest rates."

As the cost of money to the Government and to everyone else increases, the fight by the rural electric co-ops at the national level and by its fine Administrator, Norman Clapp, an old Wisconsin friend of mine, becomes more and more a problem. Realistically, we have to recognize that under these conditions it would be most difficult to expand this lending power, and it becomes more difficult than formerly even to hold it. I do believe, however, that we can hold it at approximately the levels which have existed in the past.

This to me is not the most serious problem, and I regret that some of the argument on whether or not a new financing system should be developed has enmeshed itself in the political ability of rural electric supporters to continue to get money at the 2-percent rate.

To me the most critical problem is on financial need, the financial need of your organizations. For the past 10 years, the amount of money available for 2-percent loans per year is as follows (and let me run through these figures quickly to show you both the pattern of the availability of money as well as their erratic tendencies):

	Million
1957	$414
1958	159
1959	317
1960	136
1961	170
1962	245
1963	325
1964	275
1965	365
1966	270

What does this average out to? An average of about $270 million per year, $268 million, to be exact.

Those who have looked to this source of money for capital financing should pause to consider what happened in the President's budget message presented to the Congress 3 weeks ago.

The $305 million in regular authorization which the Congress had approved for 1966 was cut to $270 million. The balance of the 1965 contingency fund which had already been released and which amounted to $37 million was impounded. The 1966 contingency fund of $60 million, not yet released, was completely deleted from the budget. In so doing, the President recommended use of some of these funds in fiscal 1967 and some in fiscal 1968.

The amount of loan funds programed for 1967 would be $270 million, the same as is now proposed for 1966. By 1968, if present budgeting procedures continue, only $242 million would be available.

Briefly, the stepdown in funds shows as follows:

Year 1966 congressional authority: $305 million plus $60 million in contingency reserve.

President's 1966 program figure: $270 million.

President's proposed 1967 program figure: $270 million.

Year 1968 projected figure: $242 million.

As one considers your future capital needs, this trend should put you on notice that it is evident that this source of funds is going down while the need for such funds is going up.

Now, what are the needs for the future? Here we have two estimates. REA has estimated that all the electric systems of America will require $140 billion in new capital for expanded plant facilities by 1980. They estimate, and this is interesting, that between now and 1980, during the next 15 years, rural electrics will need slightly over $8 billion.

Well, I smiled when I saw that figure in contrast with the next one. In all of my years in Government, I have come to expect that the party making the estimate, who is justifying the position, will have the high figure, and those who are supposed to be the conservative impartial neutral observers have the low figures. Not so in your case. Kuhn, Loeb, in their appraisal, estimate that the rural electrics will need $9½ billion during the same 15-year period. And so it is gratifying that an outside independent source estimates the needs of your organizations at a $1½ billion more than REA has estimated.

Now let's turn back to the history of the figures I have given you. The 10-year average I pointed out was $268 million. Multiply this by 15 years, and you have a little over $4 billion. Or if you prefer, take the last 5 years, with an average of a little under $300 million per year. Multiply that by 15 years, and you come up with a figure of about $4½ billion. One need not argue which figure is the more nearly correct as a projection—the plain fact remains that either figure is less than half—less than half—of the estimated need as projected by an independent observer.

I, as an outsider, looking at this whole picture, am impressed with the point that electricity provides 20 percent of the basic energy of the United States now, and that by 1980 it is expected to supply 30 percent. This projection is reasonable and may be conservative especially when we look back at the increase in percentage of the basic energy provided by electrical sources in the past 15 and the past 30 years. And so, as one who is interested in seeing America continue to grow, as one who strongly believes that we want to develop, if you please, a Great Society in America, my most basic concern is on the ability of rural electric cooperatives to get the money to play their part.

I cannot believe, based on the historical pattern of the past 2 years, that the Congress of the United States is going to greatly expand the moneys it makes available for this purpose. Certainly they are not likely to expand it if the interest gap continues at its present level or were it to widen. I do not want Government limitations on funds to be the inhibiter of the development of capital electrical facilities throughout rural America. This, to me, is the main area of concern which confronts you and which should be of interest to those who want to see America grow.

There are many prominent leaders who strongly believe that we must now turn toward the rural parts of our Nation for future development. "Why continue to encourage more growth in the larger urban centers and in so doing only aggravate their already existing problems?" these spokesmen asked. If these ideas toward the development of the smaller communities and the rural areas were to become a national trend, then it could well be that the present projections for rural electrics' needs for capital investment during the next 15 years are being drastically understated.

Putting it more simply, the question basically is this: Without the establishment of a Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems, could the individual rural electric cooperatives obtain their money? And if they could obtain it, could they obtain it as cheaply as through their own bank? The answer to both parts of the question is probably yes, and probably no. Some of the larger units, in areas where money is not as tight as in others, might, and I only say might, be able to obtain it for about the same rates. Others would not be able to obtain it, and others would have to obtain it at much higher rates. Isn't it far more sensible to pool your efforts, to cooperatively work together to obtain your own credit in effect from a bank which you will ultimately own?

How effectively could you borrow your money on an individual basis when your average equity is between 20 and 30 percent? Certainly, I contend that the present restrictions which we have imposed upon your types of organizations within the Congress on the development of generation and transmission facilities should be modified if you are going to seek your own money. But certainly it would seem evident that you would be far more able to handle your needs and to obtain your money at a lower cost through the mass sale of debentures than through the individual efforts of each of your organizations.

Granted that the debentures from such a bank would have to be sold on the money markets, but won't the collective sale of these debentures permit you to get your money at a lower cost than if each of you have to go out looking for it through local bankers or other sources? I think so.

Earlier in my remarks, I made reference to the Bank for Cooperatives and the change which was made in this organization during the time I was manager of the Racine, Wis., Milk Producers Cooperative. It would be of interest to you, I am sure, to see what has happened in a financial organization similar to the one you are considering. I, therefore, called the president of the St. Paul, Minn., Bank for Cooperatives, Mr. Ullyot, in order to refresh my own memory on what had happened in this particular operation and to bring my records current. I asked him when the start had been made to change the Bank for Cooperatives from a Government-owned activity to one cooperatively owned by the patrons and was informed that this was on January 1, 1956, so the report and illustration I am about to give you cover a 10-year span of time. During that time, the Government capital in the St. Paul bank was reduced from $11.4 to $3.8 million. Therefore, in less than 10 years, two-thirds of the Government capital had been paid off. As is proposed in your own case, they, too, have A stock, B stock, and C stock.

At the time the changeover was made, each cooperative was required to buy class C stock based on the amount of outstanding loans as of that date. In my own cooperative's case, because our loan volume was low, we were required to buy $800 of the stock which has continued to pay a 3-percent dividend.

For the balance of their financing, there was a 25 percent override on the interest payments from 1956 to 1960. It was then reduced to 15 percent. In 1966 it has been reduced to 10 percent. In the early days, if the interest rate was 4 percent, we had to pay 5 percent but the extra 1 percent was an actual investment in the Bank for Cooperatives stock subject to ultimate redemption.

The Bank for Co-ops offers its own debentures on the money market. From 1960 until 1965, they were able to obtain their money at rates which permitted them to loan at 4½ percent on loans under 1 year, 4¾ percent on loans from 1 to 3 years, and 5 percent on loans for over 3 years. Bear in mind that some of these were operating loans, not specifically related to capital development as would be true in your case.

However (and this is the significant part), each year we receive from the bank a patronage dividend which was based on the volume of business done. Part of the allocation is paid in cash, this being 25 percent of their total allocated surplus. The balance is paid in B stock. This is done after the franchise tax is paid, after the original cash patronage dividend is made, and after the 3-percent dividend is paid on the original (class C) stock, the remaining amount is paid as a patronage dividend in stock.

In 1965, the total allocations (that is the patronage dividend) amounted to 28 percent of the interest paid in by a cooperative. I point out to you that on loans of over 3 years, that while the interest charge is 5 percent, if the 28 percent allocation is charged against it, it reduces the interest rate to about 3.6 percent. And, of course, there are corresponding reductions on the other loan rate values.

This allocation in 1965 was not unique. I recall in my own report to my board of directors that I usually considered the allocation to be about equal to 1 percent interest rate on the cost of the money we got from the bank.

I don't think the St. Paul Bank for Cooperatives had any magic formula that gave them this return that you would not have. In fact, the proposals you have involving larger sums, involving debentures backed primarily by capital equipment loans could well do two things. First of all, it could encourage money at a rate lower than that which applied on Bank for Cooperative debentures where part of it went for operating funds, and second, the larger volume might well warrant an even larger allocation at the end of the year to each participating electric cooperative.

So, I speak to you as one who has been through this and has found this a very effective way of obtaining money.

I want to thank you for this opportunity of presenting my views to you today. I again point out that in my opinion the big issue for your organization is not on whether or not you can continue to obtain government money at a 2-percent interest rate. I believe you can at about the present level. More important is whether you can obtain the necessary expansion capital which will be needed by your organizations in the next 15 years, if you are to grow apace with the private utilities here in America. As I have indicated, all of my projections fail to show adequate funding potential for you at the 2-percent rate. You alone must know whether or not a supplementary method of obtaining financing is needed beyond having each individual electric association apply for its own expansion funds at some local level. If the experience of other cooperatives is a criteria, then it would be well for you to join together in the formation of the Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems.

H.R. 13177—Freedom Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, profoundly dynamic ideas underlie our governmental and economic system. Our forefathers recognized what individuals could and would accomplish when they were afforded the opportunity in a society freed from governmental shackles. The essence of our federal system is the subordination of governmental power to that of the individual. Giving the individual the opportunity and the responsibility for his own development released the creative capacities of men to an extent hitherto undreamed of.

Realizing the potential of our economic system and democratic form of Government, we rightly wonder why so many of the newly independent nations of the world seem to look to communism and state socialism as the fastest routes to material abundance and fulfillment of their national aspirations. The answer is obviously threefold: First, the very aggressive methods used by Communists to further communism; second, the failure of the free world to present its beliefs in a manner readily understood and applied; third, the failure of everyone to recognize the danger posed by the Communist philosophy.

Despite the increasing loss of men and countries to Communist dictatorship, it appears that few Americans, even in high governmental positions, are sufficiently aware of the stated goal of communism—world domination—and the methods designed to achieve this goal. How many persons know what is meant by dialectical materialism? How many realize that words to Communists have meanings completely different from our meanings?

Too many people hate communism—almost a kneejerk reaction to the word—without knowing or understanding communism.

Communism is repugnant to everything I hold dear, my family, my church, my country, the individual human being, the free enterprise system of doing business, free representative government. But I cannot oppose it intelligently or fight it effectively if I do not fully understand it.

Just as we cannot fight a disease if we do not thoroughly understand it, we cannot defend ourselves or our institutions against communism if we do not understand its history, objectives, language, mechanics, techniques, and methods.

Nowhere at present is there a repository of research materials on communism and the insidious subversive tactics its proponents and followers have developed. Nowhere can a private citizen who is moving to an overseas post take a course to equip himself to perceive Communist activity or to tell the story of free enterprise and democracy. No present institution can educate government policymakers and employees in Communist theory and practices. Qualified teachers are in short supply. We actually do not have enough competent teachers of Communist techniques and tactics to teach the teachers.

This crying inadequacy has placed the United States far behind the Communists in the race between freedom and communism. The tale of the hare and the tortoise is somewhat analogous except that many persons in this country do not even realize that we are in such a race. Conversely, too many of our citizens believe that we can retreat into our shell and be protected from Communist aggression and subversion. This attitude should convince even the most dubious that the free world must shake itself free from a lethargy which could lull it into oblivion.

Mr. Speaker, an extensive Communist program for training agents is well documented. The State Department has supplied the Congress with information verifying the operation of seven schools of political warfare in the Soviet Union, nine in East Germany, nine in Cuba, four in Czechoslovakia, three in Hungary, and two in Bulgaria. Meanwhile, Red China has specialized in training Latin American and African Communists. I am not aware of any published statistics on the Chinese-sponsored schools. However, the present leadership in Ghana announced the closing of a Communist school for subversives which had the blessing of former Premier Nkrumah. Even when faced with the fact of these schools which turn out thousands of operatives trained in mob violence, subversion, destruction, and terrorism too many of us want to carry on "business as usual."

The need to understand this godless philosophy is so great and urgent that we should immediately embark on a crash program to systematize our knowledge of it and then convert this knowledge into the most effective media for instructing all Americans of all ages about this menace.

Secondly, we must develop counter-Communist methods. The most creative minds available should be set to work on this challenge. Our Foreign Service personnel, employees of American businesses abroad, and even tourists could profit from training in countercommunism.

Many believe that the Voice of America should be sufficient for telling the world about America and its beliefs. While no objective tests can measure the effectiveness of the Voice, the advance of communism since World War II suggests that we need many more and better weapons.

Mr. Speaker, we will lose the struggle with communism by default unless we awaken to the danger, arouse our citizenry, and arm ourselves. The major battlefields will be in the minds of men. The most effective weapons will be ideological, buttressed by better methods of presentation.

For many years, some dedicated Americans have been working for the establishment of a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy. Its purposes are the attainment of a thorough and complete understanding of communism; the development of methods to learn about and combat the effective tactics of the Communists; the dissemination of technical information on the true character of communism—both at home and abroad; and the education and training of governmental and private individuals in the new science of countercommunism.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 13177, which contains some revisions agreed to by framers of earlier legislation and some revisions of my own. I trust my bill will serve as a springboard to a final version which will be enacted. The bill admittedly needs perfection.

My bill would establish a Freedom Commission to collect and assemble current information and knowledge on communism and its methods and to devise effective means for countering communism.

My bill also authorizes the Commission to establish a Freedom Academy, similar in some respects to our service academies, to educate and train persons in the newly developed science of countercommunism. I anticipate that the Academy would be a specialized graduate institution.

The Academy would be a technical research and training institution. It would not be a counterinsurgency agency or an arm of the military or State Department.

I have introduced this bill partly to give meaning and purpose to the outstanding and dedicated work of a group of Salinas, Calif., Jaycees who have become concerned about the inadequate research materials, knowledge, and understanding of communism and the methods and tactics of Communist promotion. The Salinas and California Jaycees have resolved to support the Freedom Academy concept. I applaud their interest and initiative.

I urge interested Members and persons to scrutinize my proposal and make helpful suggestions which will strengthen it.

Employees Separated After June 30, 1965, To Receive Severance Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would provide a retroactive effective date of July 1, 1965, for the severance pay provisions of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965. Under the present law, only those Federal employees who are involuntarily separated from their employment on or after October 29, 1965, the effective date of the act, are entitled to the benefits of severance pay. Upon closer observation this humane law, noble in purpose, turns out to exclude from its protection many of those whom it was intended to benefit. I am sure that the Congress never intended it that way and it would seem that a change in the law is in order to give it the intended effect.

Several instances of injustice under the severance pay provisions of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965 recently came to my attention. I am told that there are many other Federal employees who are similarly affected adversely by the present law. In one case, a 23-year employee of the New York Naval Shipyard was separated from his employment on October 1, 1965, and in another case an 18-year employee of the shipyard was separated from his employment on October 10, 1965. Both were separated because of a reduction in force resulting from an order of base closure. Neither of these employees is eligible for severance pay benefits under the present law, while other separated employees with substantially less years of service to their credit are eligible for severance pay because they happen to have been separated subsequent to October 29, 1965, the effective date of the law. This is neither fair nor is it reasonable, and I am sure the Congress never intended the law to operate in that manner.

Under my bill, all Federal employees who are otherwise eligible for severance pay benefits would be entitled to them if they were separated from their employment on or after July 1, 1965. My bill would establish the same effective date for severance pay benefits as is provided in the same act for relocation expense benefits to postal employees.

Under present law, postal employees who are transferred or relocated from one official station to another are entitled to relocation expense benefits. These relocation benefits are available to all eligible postal employees who were relocated or transferred on or after July 1, 1965. There seems to be no valid reason why the same July 1, 1965, date should not also be the effective date for severance pay benefits. The same reasons that compel a July 1, 1965, effective date for relocation benefits to postal employees operate with equal cogency in the case of severance pay benefits for Federal employees.

Fair play demands that we amend present law to extend severance pay benefits to all eligible Federal employees who were separated from their employment on or after July 1, 1965. My bill does not enlarge the basis for determining whether or not an employee is eligible for these benefits. This determination remains the same.

They Fight Battles, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 8, 1966.

The editorial staff of the Herald Tribune is this particular editorial points up one of the most significant aspects of the escalation in this combat area. The escalation which has been blamed on the United States should be blamed on the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong. The fact that battalion regimental size units have engaged American troops in the field certainly points out this is not just a guerrilla operation.

The editorial follows:

THEY FIGHT BATTLES, TOO

Much of the reporting of the Vietnamese war has tended to emphasize the little skirmish, the role of the individual soldier or the platoon. Many of the headlines have been preempted by air raids over North Vietnam. Opponents of the American role in southeast Asia talk as if that role consisted of killing women and children while showering napalm on peaceful villages. But they fight battles in Vietnam, too.

This was illustrated by the account of the success achieved by the Marines and the South Vietnamese troops against a North Vietnamese regiment near Quang Nai. Apparently, half the regiment were casualties and the rest, in the words of a Marine officer, "just survivors." And General Westmoreland confirmed the picture of real battles and real victories when, almost casually, he referred to four regular Vietcong battalions destroyed in the last few days.

This is an impressive toll. It has been customary to state Vietcong losses in terms of "body count"—a grisly method which was necessitated in part by the guerrilla nature of much of the fighting—enemy units dissolving into the jungle to reform—and in part by public skepticism over communiques might tell of routed enemies but were far from precise about what the rout actually meant.

But in plain fact, it is possible to win victories, even over guerrillas, and fairly crushing ones at that. No matter how loose a military organization may be, no matter to what extent it normally lives off the country, once it gets past the snipe-and-run stage, it must have bases, it must have assembly areas, it must have some kind of command and supply organization. The Vietcong are mustered into units, and those units can be smashed, uprooted from their usual sources of supply, cut off from the higher command. When that happens, although there may be many survivors, they are not effective—until they can regroup, be brought up to strength and given new leadership. And if they are hustled enough, such a reorganization may not be possible.

It is this kind of defeat that the Vietcong seems to have been suffering, at an accelerating rate, in the past few months. And it is this kind of defeat that can enable the vital political and social role of pacification to be undertaken with a chance of success. Victories can be won in Vietnam—and they are being won now, Senator FULBRIGHT to the contrary notwithstanding.

Timely Safety Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial, the Pittsburgh Press notes the need for a broad Federal program on highway safety. Commenting on the President's transportation message the editorial said "the President got down to brass tacks. He wants Federal standards in driver education and licensing. Better traffic control techniques. Cars designed and engineered to be safer. Better tires, safer highways."

All of us are concerned with a traffic death toll which averages a thousand lives a week.

Under leave to extend my remarks I ask that the Press editorial of March 5, 1966 be included at this point in the RECORD.

TIMELY SAFETY PROPOSAL

President Johnson's message to Congress on transportation was really two separate and extensive proposals which only happened to fall together.

One was a long-range plan for bringing together in one new cabinet department all Government agencies dealing with transportation—by highway, air, rail, and water. The President has some justification for his request; as he says, our transportation system is the web of our Union and it has grown without coordination.

Today the Federal Government spends about $6 billion a year on transport matters and 100,000 Federal employees work at it, scattered in numerous agencies.

Probably greater efficiency would follow a consolidation of this effort into one department, but there will be good arguments on both sides of its creation and the question is not likely to be quickly resolved.

But as to the second part of Mr. Johnson's message, there should be little argument as to the need and urgency. That is for a broad Federal program on highway safety.

No other necessity of modern life, said the President, has brought more convenience to the American people—or more tragedy—than the auto. More Americans have died in auto accidents than have been killed in all our wars.

The President got down to brass tacks. He wants Federal standards in driver education and licensing. Better traffic control techniques. Cars designed and engineered to be safer. Better tires. Safer highways.

To a Nation heartsick over a traffic death toll averaging 1,000 lives a week, the President's strong words are welcome. He proposes improvement in drivers, vehicles and roads; and there no doubt are shortcomings in all these areas. This would be a new responsibility for the Federal Government, but scarcely anyone could say it is an unnecessary one.

The Nashville Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for decades Nashville, Tenn., has been known as the Athens of the South, the home of Presidents, a leading educational center, and one of the South's finest medical centers.

Today, more and more, Nashville is also being recognized as one of the world's largest and most important music centers.

The story of the growth and development of the music industry in Nashville is a fascinating one. This story was recently told in Grit magazine, which I insert in the RECORD at this point and commend it for the consideration of my colleagues:

THE NASHVILLE SOUND: MORE MUSIC POURS OUT OF TENNESSEE'S CAPITAL THAN ELSEWHERE IN UNITED STATES

(By Bob Shelton)

Nashville, the capital of Tennessee, is known as an educational, medical, and publishing center and as the place that sent Andrew Jackson and James Polk to the White House.

Less well-known about Nashville is that it is the home of a $100 million international music industry. It has become the hub of a recording, publishing, broadcasting, and personal-appearance network that spreads around the world.

Although many people still think that the popular-music industry is centered in Hollywood, Manhattan's Tin Pan Alley, or, more recently, in Liverpool rock 'n' roll clubs, Nashville is probably the center of more musical activity than are any of these other metropolises.

The statistical evidence is impressive: There are probably more than 25 million country-music fans in the world. To serve their tastes, Nashville is the center of a personal-appearance empire that sends out performers for a total of nearly 15,000 performances annually. Nearly one out of every two popular-music recordings made in the United States is made in Nashville. Some 500 songwriters live in or near Music City, U.S.A., and more than two dozen recording studios are in operation there.

Last year marked many events and anniversaries of consequence to Nashville. Forty-one years ago, the radio show "Grand Ole Opry," which was to be the chief reason for the development of the Nashville industry, began to broadcast. Twenty-one years ago, the first commercial recording was made in the Tennessee city.

To show that the Nashville story is not just one of a past glory but rather one of a continuing spiral of growth, 1965 also marked the opening of two new studios by recording companies.

All of which adds up to a portrait of the Tennessee capital as a sort of show-business boom town. The spirit of the musicians and officials who staff the Nashville industry is not the least of the city's subjects of pride. For there is a certain sense of pride in the "underdog" music that helped to make Nashville the thriving music center it is today.

Although the city's industry was built upon country music, the last 15 years have seen another phenomenon there. The relaxed atmosphere of the town, the availability of able accompanists and sidemen, the resources of excellent recording studios have made many pop music stars gravitate to Nashville.

One recording director has described the town as a "Mayo clinic" for perfomers whose careers are lagging; they go to Nashville to change their luck, to start off on a new rise to stardom.

But Nashville is not only a haven for singers in trouble. Burl Ives, Perry Como, Rosemary Clooney are a few of the successful ones who have recorded there. Interestingly enough, two European singing stars, Rita Pavone and Sylvie Vartan, recently came to the United States and journeyed to Music City for recording sessions.

The origin and the exact definition of "The Nashville Sound" cannot be established. More than anything, it seems to connote a quality of ease and relaxation, an unhurried, unpressured atmosphere that the southern center offers to performers, and that they, in turn, pass on to their fans.

Long before the phrase "Nashville Sound" entered the language of the music business, the town started on its destiny as a music center. November 28, 1925, the first Barn Dance program was presented on the newly established radio station WSM. The announcer-host was a former newspaperman named George D. Hay, who had earlier helped radio station WLS in Chicago start its Barn Dance program.

The performers on that first show were an 80-year-old bearded fiddler named Uncle Jimmy Thompson and his niece, Eva Thompson Jones, who played piano and sang. Uncle Jimmy scraped out an hour's worth of old jigs, reels, and sentimental parlor and country songs.

After only a few minutes, requests began to pour into the station from listeners by wire and telephone. It was a hit.

Two years later, George Hay, known by his nickname, "The Solemn Old Judge," renamed the show "Grand Ole Opry," and it has become the grand old dinosaur of American radio.

Having missed air time during a few of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Fireside Chats," the "Grand Ole Opry" is the oldest continuous broadcast in radio. Either directly on its clear-channel station or through subsidiary syndicated shows, the country music on the "Opry" reaches some 10 million persons each week.

When the "Opry" started, country music was also in its infancy. It was then just a rural folk music, instrumentally and vocally, that was finding an outlet over the young media of disk recording and radio. (The first country recording of consequence was Fiddling John Carson's Atlanta session of 1923.)

Thus, it was two electronic media, recording and radio, that were to transform a regional folk music into an international industry.

The "Opry" today and the music recorded in Nashville reflect how comprehensive the term "country music" has become. It includes ballads, heart songs, Bluegrass, Western songs, train songs, breakdowns, fiddle and guitar tunes, and hoedowns.

Country music embraces a wide range from the strictly traditional folk-oriented to the bright, urbane love ballads or novelty or sacred tunes that have a distinctly modern flavor. As in jazz and pop music, there are a variety of styles and approaches to country music, and the fans will often debate the merits of one over another with considerable passion.

Today, the "Opry," held in a former tabernacle called Ryman Auditorium, has grown to a 4½-hour marathon. As many as 5,000 persons will turn out on a Saturday night to watch the colorful performance.

The "Opry" is a tourist attraction in its own right, having already drawn more than 7,500,000 visitors. Among its stars have been Hank Snow, Ernest Tubb, Cousin Minnie Pearl, Roy Acuff, Webb Pierce, Eddy Arnold, the Carter Family, Bill Monroe, Flatt and Scruggs, Pete Drake, and a host of others.

The 40-year history of country music has seen a long and distinguished roster of performers who have helped to set fashions and styles. Among these are Jimmie Rodgers, Hank Williams, and Jim Reeves.

Recording in Nashville began some time in the spring of 1945, when Paul Cohen ran a session with Red Foley, one of the stars of the Second World War era. The recording companies, during the 1920's and 1930's, had made disks in such places as Atlanta, Fort Worth, Chicago, and, of course, New York City.

But it was becoming apparent that each Saturday's Opry broadcast was bringing the stars through Nashville, and it would be only natural to record them there. By the early 1950's, every major label and many minor labels had their officials on the job in Nashville.

Record Row in Nashville today is a gleaming street of publishing companies, recording studios, talent agencies, and similar enterprises.

The euphoria that Nashville's steadily spiraling music industry seems to engender has now established itself overseas. The trend began in the Second World War. Just as many a city-bred American first became aware of songs like "The Wabash Cannonball" and "Tennessee Waltz" in an Army barracks. So did many listeners overseas.

Broadcasts of country music on Armed Forces Network stations in Europe and Asia greatly helped to spread the Nashville sound to foreign listeners.

As a consequence, Tokyo now boasts its own "Grand Ole Opry" show plus many country bands and singers. The recordings of Jim Reeves, who died in a tragic air crash in the summer of 1964, have been consistently strong sellers in such places as Great Britain and Scandinavia.

In Canada and Australia, the variants of the music from Nashville are so widely known that many fans there, if asked for the name of a top American singer, might name Hank Snow rather than Frank Sinatra.

Elements of country music have so thoroughly entered the mainstream of American pop music that it is often difficult to say where country leaves off and pop begins. The major revolution in pop music in recent years was, after all, started by a country singer from Tupelo, Miss., named Elvis Presley.

The distinctive style of songwriting from Nashville has been a source of endless fascination to music students. They can discern many characteristics in the content and form of the country song—a closeness to reality, a willingness to face life's problems head on, less fantasy, and more basic coping with such subjects as poverty, infidelity, death, and rejection.

Interestingly enough, the urban folk-music revival of the last 8 years has also spurred the popularity of much of Nashville's music among collegians and city youth. The whole trend toward country music can be properly assessed as a change in values in which the sophisticated life of the alienated city dweller has found a sense of loss, a sense of loneliness that the down-to-earth values of country life and country music can assuage.

It is, indeed, a reflection of the values of American life that some people find reflected in country music, and that is what is conceivably making it "the folk music of tomorrow."

For many sophisticated city listeners, Nashville music is an acquired taste. The nasal sounds, the twang, the simplicity, the lack of subtlety are at first forbidding. Later, they can become the very source of the charm and appeal of country music.

In Bluegrass—the sprightly, jazzlike string-band music—many city dwellers have found an exciting element of movement and interplay. In the event or saga songs ("Battle of New Orleans"), they have found Americana brought back to life. In some country ballads ("Saginaw, Michigan" or "Big Bad John"), they have found the delights of tall tales or legends set to catchy music.

Not the least that can be said in favor of the music streaming out of Nashville on to some 1,500 radio stations in the United States is that the ironclad grip of cultural centralization has been broken. America has at least two popular musics now, and Nashville is the steadily growing center of one of them. It has a vast audience around the Nation and around the world.

Country music has put Nashville on the map, and today Nashville is putting a vital form of popular culture into the ears and hearts of countless millions of listeners.

Japanese Heritage in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions, I have had the privilege and pleasure of extolling the accomplishments of Japanese-Americans. Our citizens of Japanese heritage are living and working throughout the country in various geographic areas and in numerous occupations. All of these wonderful Japanese-Americans are contributing in their way to an ever-growing America.

All of us recall the loyalty of these people during World War II when working together as a group in the 442d Regimental Combat Team, they established an illustrious record of military service. The valor of these troops has become a legend in the historic annals of our Nation, and we can all be proud of this contribution, too.

Recently, the Oakland Tribune in Oakland, Calif., had a special article entitled "Japanese Heritage in the United States." Because I so greatly admire those of Japanese ancestry who are doing so much for our country today, I am very pleased to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe it illustrates so graphically what 110,000 Japanese-Americans on the west coast are doing to realize a better way of life for themselves and to assist in providing a better America for all of us.

The article follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Feb. 6, 1966]

JAPANESE HERITAGE IN THE UNITED STATES—GENERATIONS SEPARATED BUT UNITED

(By Bill Strobel)

Keyuri Shibata and Ellen Yamamoto are separated by two generations and two cultures, yet they share many things other than their Japanese ancestry.

Both have a flair for the arts and they possess the delicate grace that makes Japanese women among the most charming in the world.

Mrs. Shibata, 70, is an Issei—a first generation Japanese-American. She came to the United States in 1914, a kimono-clad bride, schooled in the ancient ways and the traditional graces of a Japanese lady.

THIRD GENERATION

Miss Yamamoto, 18, is a Sansei—a third generation Japanese-American. She is a college coed training for a career as a dental hygienist and she lives on a Castro Valley hilltop with her parents, Dr. and Mrs. George Yamamoto, and her Beatle-fan sister, Julie.

Mrs. Shibata, whose first name translates to "Small Lily," is a poet, an artist, and a practioner of the graceful hospitality of old Japan. Her home has become a gathering place for visiting Japanese students, diplomats, businessmen, and even members of the Imperial family.

Miss Yamamoto is an accomplished pianist who sings with the First Presbyterian Church choir, and she is a member of the California State College tennis team.

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

At Castro Valley High School, she sang in student productions of "South Pacific" and "Damn Yankees," reigned as basketball queen, headed the rally committee and directed the gathering of Chritmas baskets for the needy.

And while neither Mrs. Shibata nor Miss Yamamoto can be considered typical, they do represent the past and future of the Japanese-American in our society.

Certainly Mrs. Shibata was not typical of the majority of Japanese women who migrated to the United States as "picture postcard brides."

She was the daughter of a Buddhist priest, reared to be a lady of refinement, versed in the traditional arts.

A MAVERICK

But among the nine children in the family, she was a maverick. When other in her station were learning the tea ceremony, she liked to climb trees.

And she had a spirit of adventure and dreams that led her to question the fuedal ideas that were no concern of well-bred young ladies.

When she became of marriagable age there were many suitors for her hand, all of whom ceremoniously followed the custom of contacting a marriage broker, who in turn made the arrangements with her father.

AN ADVENTURER

Among them was Jenjuro Shibata, the son of a prosperous Japanese businessman who shared her spirit of adventure and had his own questions about the feudal ways of Japan.

He had left his homeland to seek work in the United States and to learn the American way. He also managed to build a prosperous floral business in Oakland.

When he returned to Japan, the girl who liked to climb trees prayed that she would be favored.

TRIED FARMING

Her prayers were answered. The wedding ceremony lasted for 3 days and the guests consumed nine 100-pound sacks of rice.

When Shibata returned to the United States with his bride, he sold his Elmhurst nursery and moved to Mount Eden to try his hand at farming.

And the hands of "Small Lily," skilled in the graceful art of flower arrangements, picked weeds and pushed garlic seeds into the muddy soil of Mount Eden.

She was adept at creating a Japanese landscape on a piece of rice paper with the few strokes of a brush, but she knew nothing about painting a greenhouse.

"I got many blisters," she recalls, "but I learned."

As her husband labored to build the huge cut-flower business which the family continues to operate, she raised their four sons and a daughter, poured tea for visitors, and found time to write poetry.

She also made plans to convert a barren Mount Eden field into a traditional garden of old Japan.

It must contain fish, she decided. So she ordered 10,000 carp and 10,000 goldfish from Japan.

"We were concerned with getting the business to prosper," she said, "and were not prepared for the arrival of the fish."

When the fish arrived, the family took time out from the business to build an earthen dam. Mrs. Shibata couldn't delay her dream garden.

"She started it with a fortune in fish and $20 worth of rocks," her son recalled.

The garden and the home, which blended ancient Japan with modern America, became a showplace and a gathering place for international visitors.

The dream, which had become a reality, ended abruptly on December 7, 1941.

The Shibataas along with 110,000 other Japanese-Americans on the west coast, were ordered to dispose of their property and move to a relocation center.

They were given 2 weeks. They packed a few belongings, leased their property and nursery business for $500 a year, and moved out.

NO BITTERNESS

Mrs. Shibata looks back on the war years with sadness but no bitterness. She is amused by the fact that one of her sons, who served in the U.S. Army, had trouble getting into the camp for a visit.

"We are on earth for such a short time," she said. "It seems so useless to spoil the precious days by destroying each other."

When the family returned to Mount Eden, they found their home virtually wrecked, the garden choked with weeds, and less than half the fish remaining in the slushy ponds.

REBUILDING JOB

They set about the task of rebuilding the dream, and Mrs. Shibata still found time to write poetry and welcome visitors. She also enrolled in night school to learn English and earn citizenship.

Today the gardens are restored, the business is flourishing, and Mrs. Shibata continues to dispense the gracious hospitality of old Japan.

Once when she was clad in dungarees, digging in her garden, a fleet of long black cars pulled into the nursery, and members of the Japanese royal family stepped out, unannounced.

"Mom really flipped her cork," a son recalls. "She gave the Japanese consul hell in two languages for his breach of etiquette in not giving her warning."

Throughout the years, good and bad, Mrs. Shibata has reminded her family of their cultural heritage, and she has kept it a living thing in her home.

"But let's face it," her son says, "we are Americans. We went to Japanese school, and we know something of our heritage, but the United States is our country. And our children are bound to be less conscious of their Japanese heritage than we are."

He recalled that in the years following World War II that the gardens were visited by a group of Japanese naval officers and cadets.

"I hope you guys aren't planning another Pearl Harbor," one of the sons told the guests.

While Mrs. Shibata regrets that her children have not learned more of the finer points of Japanese culture, she has no regrets.

"This is a land of freedom and opportunity," the daughter of the Buddhist priest says. "It is a fine country. It has been good to us."

And Ellen Yamamoto, the third-generation Japanese-American who does not speak the language of her ancestors, agrees.

She sat in the oriental-modern living room in the hilltop home of her parents, and pondered for a moment.

"I don't think our heritage will be lost," she said. "I think it is strong enough to blend with our heritage as Americans."

WAR YANKED NISEI OUT INTO WORLD

The history of the Japanese-American is one of paradoxes.

And the Nisei (second-generation) are responsible for the greatest paradox of all.

When you talk with them, they will say they were caught in limbo between two cultures. Yet when the chips were down they drew strength from the heritage of their ancestors and their own heritage as native-born Americans to sustain themselves through a difficult and trying time.

Pearl Harbor

That time came on December 7, 1941, when Japan attacked the United States.

As Ken Fujii, a Hayward nurseryman, puts it: "There is nothing in the U.S. Constitution that says any race has to prove itself. But we did."

And that too was a paradox for there are few ethnic groups that managed to come as close to the popular conception of ideal citizens as the Japanese.

They had a reputation as industrious, honorable people. Their children had respect for the family and for the free system of education.

And it was seldom that a Japanese name appeared in a police matter or a divorce case.

Policed our own

"We policed our own. If anybody got into financial trouble, the community lent a hand. If anybody got out of line, he was told to shape up or ship out," a Nisei recalls.

But when the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor, the Japanese-Americans were an enigma and the Federal Government ordered their removal from the west coast.

"It was a tortured time," a Nisei woman recalls. "It could also have been a very dangerous time. As Americans we knew it was our heritage to fight for our land as Americans have always done."

And from their limbo between the two cultures, the Nisei sought the guidance of their elders, whose memories of Japan were of a life that no longer existed, and the Japanese-American Citizens' League, which had been organized to protect their rights as Americans and to encourage their participation in the life of the Nation.

Leave it to time

The elders to whom patience was its own reward, drew upon their reserve of pride and dignity and advised them to comply with the law. "Time tells," they cautioned.

And the citizens' league agreed. "Now is the time," they told them, "to prove yourself."

The Nisei have conflicting memories of the camps. Some are bitter, some are happy, but most of them will agree that relocation changed the life of the Japanese-American for all time.

Mrs. Chiyeko Tahira of Walnut Creek says "it got us out of our tomato patches and into the world."

Other insights

It also gave the Nisei new insights into the world of their elders, which many of them admit they never were able to fully comprehend.

"The majority of the Japanese who came to the United States were peasants. They were unschooled and they never had the time to learn. They worked hard and long to give their kids the breaks," Fujii explained.

Yet, with time on their hands, the elders blossomed. They demonstrated their inborn artistry with woodwork and floral arrangement.

Most Nisei believe that the camps led to a breakdown of the strict family system, but at the same time it engendered a respect for the culture of elders and their ancesters.

Natural to them

"Art and beauty are just natural with these people," Fujii recalls. "I couldn't help but be amazed at the things they were able to create with their work-hardened hands."

For many of the second generation the task of proving themselves came during the war years. For some it came by hard labor in areas removed from the coasts.

For others it came on the battlefields where Nisei troops wrote new chapters of valor for the annals of the American Army.

But for many, the proving came after the war.

As one of them put it: "We didn't scream for acceptance. We didn't picket. We may have been angry, but we kept it inside and just worked harder."

And while he would deny it, Frank Nakasako, a Newark high school teacher, was one who helped to prove his race.

Further changes

When he was in teachers college, he expressed an interest in a secondary credential and was told to forget it, that no Nisei would be hired as a high school teacher.

That was 10 years ago. Today the Nisei high school teacher has ceased to be a novelty.

There have been other changes. The Nisei and his family are welcomed into neighborhoods that barred their parents. And Japanese names appear on political action groups and service club rosters.

And the Japanese-American Citizens League, which worked for years to get its members to take part in community affairs is developing programs to renew their interest in the ancient culture of Japan.

Some members express the fear that within a couple of generations all of the cultural ties may be lost.

There has been a revival of the Japanese schools and members of the league assist in promoting classes in floral arrangement and traditional dances.

"Unfortunately more Caucasians seem to be on a Japanese culture kick than our own kids," one Nisei reported.

Recently a Buddhist Church in southern Alameda County presented a blossom festival that brought out the traditional costumes and the attendance was 80 percent Caucasian.

The citizens league and its members are also disturbed by the fact that Japanese names are beginning to appear on police blotters and in divorce actions.

Part of the price

But this, like third and fourth generations who speak no Japanese and prefer pizza to tempura are part of the price of participation.

And not all the Japanese-Americans are bothered by it.

Mrs. Tahira, whose home and way of life could be cited as an example of the best that can come from a blend of East and West and the old and the new, expressed as well as anyone in her generation.

"I think, perhaps, that you might consider us like a little delicacy on a plate of meat and potatoes."

Obstacles Just Seem To Strengthen Her Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues attention the second in a series of articles by Mrs. Mabel Norris Chesley, associate editor of the Daytona Beach, Fla., News-Journal dealing with poverty and its effects upon families drawing aid for dependent children.

The article follows:

[From the Daytona Beach (Fla.) News-Journal, Feb. 21, 1966]

OBSTACLES JUST SEEM TO STRENGTHEN HER WILL

(NOTE.—What is it like to live on the dole that goes under the name of aid for dependent children? That's State and Federal money paid to women who have fatherless children and its status is bound to be an issue in the next legislature. This series deals with a specific case which, while possibly not typical of ADC cases, nonetheless tells a story of struggle, of pride, and of ambition.)

(By Mabel Norris Chesley)

Mary H., slender, dark haired and pretty, sprawled in the cheap chair of her poverty pocket living room and with her rich sense of humor continued to discuss what it's like to be dependent on aid for dependent children.

She's in this predicament because she married soon after graduation from a local high school—married a soldier and looked forward to a happy life of military wandering. Thirteen years later, she was back in Daytona Beach with her five children, having left an incompatible husband.

Mary told how she happens now to be a dollars for scholars student.

Last summer, she was taking a stenographic course in an adult education class when she suddenly felt a deep yearning to get a more complete education. She decided she wanted to become a teacher.

She then was working as a waitress—mighty slim support for her and her five children. She desperately wanted to climb upwards.

But she did not have the $42 for the enrollment fee at the junior college.

Mary discussed her plight with the welfare department, arguing: "Look, if I were pregnant, the State would turn itself inside out to give me help. But I want to become a good citizen. Why can't the State help me to do that?"

But the State laws make no provisions for such logic. They merely allow for dispensing an average of $58.89 to each ADC family (the national average is $140.96; only Mississippi and Alabama have a lower average allowance than Florida; here, the maximum is $85).

But Mary found sympathetic ears at welfare; one of its workers is a dollars for scholars graduate. The worker got together with Dr. Merlin Cox at the junior college, who is a dollars board member. Together, they convinced the board that Mary would be a worthy recipient of a scholarship.

The scholarship didn't make provisions for the nearly $40 in books that Mary needed for the two courses she is taking this semester. Had she not succeeded in finding access to some used books and borrowing others, her drive to succeed still would have been checked.

Now, Mary has crossed fingers. If the Dollars board decides not to renew her scholarship for the second term, her dreams will have to be thrust into the trash can after all.

Chances, however, are pretty much in her favor—she's a straight-A student. She may wind up the year with a 4.0 average.

So, assuming she does complete her studies at the junior college, then what? How could she possibly expect to go out of town to a university to get that teaching degree—Mary, the mother of five children ranging in age from 2 to 12?

One needs to get to know this young woman to sense the steel that is in her will.

"I figure I can get a National Defense (Act) loan of $1,000," she explains. "And I am pretty sure I can get a Florida teachers (law) loan of $500. And, since I wouldn't be working full time, I would get full ADC allowance which would be about another $1,000. And I know someone connected with the cafeteria at Stetson (the DeLand university) and I think I could get on as a table hop."

Then her humor bubbles up: "I'd stuff myself at noontime so I could eat lightly at home, and maybe I could use doggy bags to bring things home to the children too.

"If this doesn't work, I can always rob a bank of course. That's pretty drastic thinking and I never could be dishonest enough to do it—but I am going to find some legitimate way to get that degree. And, after that, a master's."

But emergencies do have a habit of making the struggle very hard for Mary.

CORRECTION

The maximum ADC monthly payment allowed to a single family is $85. A typographical error in Sunday's opening article of this series said the family of Mary H. was receiving $8.—Editor.

Neighborhood Youth Corps Plans Begun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM GIBBONS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty is gaining ground and springing to life in all corners of the United States. Everywhere you look, community groups are organizing to get antipoverty projects into high gear. Out in Great Falls, Mont., plans for a new neighborhood youth corps program are in the works. I commend to my colleagues an article which appeared in the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune of February 18, entitled "Neighborhood Youth Corps Plans Begun:"

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PLANS BEGUN

Francis Mitchell of Opportunities, Inc., said Thursday his office is drawing up plans for a new neighborhood youth corps.

Mitchell said the idea was to find useful work for disadvantaged youths. He said they would be utilized in work that otherwise would not be done.

He noted that public agencies, city, county, and Federal would probably provide much of the job opportunity.

At present, a survey is being made to determine how many youths would be available, and how many jobs would be open for them to fill. He expects a plan to be drawn up by about March 1.

Work on beautification projects that could not be done with present work forces is a possibility, he said.

Mitchell has been asked by the Great Falls Park Board to meet with them at the regular meeting in March to discuss the plan.

The President's Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RODNEY M. LOVE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, since my son-in-law is now serving in Vietnam, Mr. Merriman Smith's article which appeared in the Columbus Dispatch and other papers was of interest to me because Mr. Smith, himself, lost a son in the war.

As a result of the situation in Vietnam, Members of Congress, their staffs, and most everyone connected with the U.S. Government is subjected to more pressure and longer working hours. The President, in particular, has this burden to carry but, in addition to this, he has the decisionmaking responsibility.

While Mr. Johnson and his staff pay close attention to the letters he receives from servicemen and their dependents by answering as many as possible, much of the time it is a heart-rending task.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert Mr. Smith's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I think it might be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Mar. 1, 1966]

LETTERS COME FROM GI'S, TOO—PRESIDENT GETS PLENTY OF ADVICE ON HOW TO CONDUCT WAR

(By Merriman Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Vietnam policy hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee bring to mind the vast amount of unsolicited advice President Johnson receives daily on how to run the war.

Members of the Armed Forces here and abroad are free to communicate with him freely and they do, as many as 80 to 100 letters a week. Johnson tries to read and answer many of these, but at times, it is a heartrending job.

Letters from servicemen in Vietnam are for the most part supportive of U.S. policy there, but occasionally GI Joe has a gripe or a master plan for ending the war successfully. If the gripes seem at all reasonable, they are looked into promptly.

Commanding officers in the field may not be happy at all times by the thought of men under their direction being able to communicate directly with the Commander in Chief, but this has been an American way of life for many years. A soldier might write something utterly irresponsible from Vietnam and if he knows about it, his commanding officer might try to talk him out of it. But woe betide, an officer who tries to stop such a letter and Washington finds out about it.

Johnson wants his staff to pay particular attention to letters from dependents of servicemen. Some of these are so moving that the Chief Executive on occasion becomes quite emotional about them. When a son, sweetheart or husband has been hurt or killed in Southeast Asia, his womenfolks at times write rather poignant letters to the White House.

Letters of this type come from service families of other countries involved in Vietnam, almost as if the writers feared no one would know about their sad contributions to the war.

The President recently received a bitter letter from the family of a soldier who died under another flag in Vietnam. The letter was long and denunciatory, and instead of taking issue, the President sent back a low-key message of sympathy and understanding. Somewhat surprised, Johnson received another letter from the same family, saying that while they were still saddened by their loss, they now felt they understood the situation better and wished the President well.

War letters to the President, however, are not always of this nature. As might be expected, he hears frequently from Members of Congress and many others in places of high authority. This sort of communication is studied and answered promptly.

One of the more prominent Washington columnists regards himself as much more than an avocational expert on the southeast Asian conflict. On occasion, this journalist delivers to the White House somewhat elaborate blueprints for strategy and tactics which he urges be followed in Vietnam—and promptly, too.

The White House acknowledges the receipt of these master plans as politely as possible, but when the President somehow neglects to follow the recommended strategy, the author has been known to become quite critical in print.

Televising Sessions of the House and Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow on the Baltimore television show, "One Man's Opinion," Mr. Alan Friedman will discuss television in the Congress, and in particular my resolution to allow broadcasting sessions of the House of Representatives. His proposed comments are excellent. They follow:

TELEVISING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

The recent hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations have pointed out the desirability of using television to bring into millions of American homes the vital issue of the war in Vietnam. The amount of mail received by the members of that committee indicates the vast audience that these hearings drew. I feel that the use of television in Congress should be expanded from the present Senate committees only status to include televising important sessions of the House and Senate. *I feel the American people could* only profit from watching their Senators and Representatives debate such issues as foreign aid, taxes, and civil rights, in addition to the Vietnam war.

On January 12, Congressman ROBERT ELLSWORTH, of Kansas, introduced House Resolution 641, to provide for the broadcasting of sessions of the House under guidelines set up by the Committee on Rules and under the supervision of the Speaker and minority leader. No editorial comment of any kind could accompany the telecast, and no telecast could be used for political or campaign purposes. A similar measure, to allow televising of sessions of the Senate, should be introduced in that body. House Resolution 641 should be reported out of committee and acted upon by the House without delay.

The people of America have a right to know, direct from the Chambers of Congress, the positions of their elected officials on the many important issues which face our Nation. It seems a pity that we can see, live from an aircraft carrier far out in the ocean, the return of our astronauts from space, but we cannot see our lawmakers debate issues which can, and do, affect our daily lives. That's one man's opinion; what's yours?

Poverty's Grip Growing Tighter on Delta Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times of February 23 ran an article by Jack Nelson of its staff dealing with poverty in the Mississippi Delta region. It speaks for itself. I hope my colleagues will read it:

IN MISSISSIPPI: POVERTY'S GRIP GROWING TIGHTER ON DELTA NEGRO

(By Jack Nelson)

ROLLING FORK, MISS.—Willie James Sanders is 54, but he's the youngest man living in a row of 30 dilapidated shacks on a cotton plantation here.

"If the Army don't take 'em, they leave the State for a job somewhere," Sanders says.

And throughout most of Mississippi the story is the same: young Negro men in large numbers leaving behind ill-fed, ill-clothed children and aged relatives. This adds another dimension to the picture of widespread, abject poverty in the State.

TECHNOLOGY ADDS TO PROBLEM

Sanders and thousands of other Negro cottonfield workers in Mississippi, including many women and children, have always lived on marginal subsistence. But their meager incomes have been reduced in recent years by farm mechanization and use of chemicals to control weeds.

"It wasn't no worse during the depression," say Sanders, "and it don't look it's gonna get no better."

In fact, it is getting worse, and Federal officials fear major civil rights demonstrations may rock the State this summer unless there is widespread relief.

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the almost equally militant Delta Ministry, an arm of the National Council of Churches, have been laying plans for farmworkers' strikes and otherwise agitating for economic and social change.

The civil rights movement has been increasingly critical of the Federal Government for failing to provide for Negroes displaced by the farm revolution and others evicted because of civil rights activities.

CRITICAL POINT NEAR

A critical point may be reached before summer. By April 1, cotton farmers must decide whether to reduce their allotted acreage under the 1965 Federal Food and Agricultural Act by 12.5, 25, or 35 percent.

Most of the farmers are expected to reduce by the maximum amount, which would mean considerably less work, especially for those who need the income most—the women and children who do seasonal work in the fields.

William Seaborn, assistant to Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, calls the problem urgent.

After a tour from Memphis, Tenn., to Greenville, Miss., last week, he said:

"I was struck with the abject poverty I saw, the conditions of futility. The unskilled people without adequate food, shelter and medical care. There was great human suffering."

U.S. ACTION SPURRED

The plight of poverty-stricken Negroes in the 18-county delta area, which produces two-thirds of the State's cotton, was dramatized January 30 by a group of Negroes who left their shacks and briefly took over an abandoned Air Force base at Greenville. The action stirred Federal agencies to begin implementing several planned poverty programs.

Mississippi's poverty is not confined to the delta, an alluvial plain that stretches in an arc from the intersection of the Mississippi River and the Tennessee State line to Vicksburg, 200 miles down river. Nor is it confined to the Negro population.

As recently as 1959 in Mississippi more than 80 percent of the Negro families and 34 percent of the white families existed on less than $3,000 family income—the basic income level the Federal Government considers the dividing line for the war on poverty.

Official income statistics since 1959 are not available, but State economists say the picture has changed little since then. In fact, some of the State's economic and welfare problems have worsened, particularly in the delta.

FAMILY BREAKS DOWN

The continuing farm revolution has left thousands of Negroes without employment and many others with only seasonal jobs. The breakdown in the Negro family has left an increasing welfare problem in a State which readily acknowledges its poverty and inability to pay adequate benefits.

To help, the Department of Agriculture last week announced implementation of a $25.6 million food-surplus program to feed between 600,000 and 800,000 needy Mississippians during the next 6 months.

In an age of modern medicine, the health problems of poor Negroes are anachronistic. Since 1946, for example, the infant mortality rate among Mississippi Negroes has gone up almost steadily.

The string of shacks in Rolling Fork where Willie James Sanders lives seems a microcosmic picture of the abysmal poverty and the deterioration of the Negro family in the delta.

MEN IN MINORITY

Not only is Sanders the youngest man living here, he is one of the few men of any age. Most of the residents are women and children.

The shacks are unpainted. Rags and cardboard are stuffed into broken windowpanes. There is no indoor plumbing.

Sanders drives a tractor for $6.50 a day when there is work. He has worked only 4 days since Christmas.

"Us just is makin' it, that's all," Sanders said. "How many is us?

"Twelve, and we got two sick young-uns and can't get what we need for 'em."

WORK CHANCES SLIM

Three shacks down Mrs. Mamie Madison, 66, stood on a crumbling front porch, wearing men's shoes with the tops cut off, a tattered man's shirt and a dirty scarf knotted around her head.

"We don't chop and we don't pick now," she said. "Ever since they started puttin' down that no-hoe stuff (weedkilling chemicals), they ain't much work for none of us."

When the fieldhands have worked in recent years, hoeing and picking cotton, they have been paid an average of $3.50 for a 12- to 14-hour day.

Living with Mrs. Madison are a 48-year-old daughter and three grandchildren. "If it wasn't for my social security ($44 a month), I'd been dead long ago," she said.

WELFARE CUT OFF

She used to draw $33 per month welfare check. "The welfare woman cut me off after I got the social security," Mrs. Madison said. "She said it's too much for a 'nigger' woman to draw two checks."

Mrs. Madison has two sons. "One's workin' at a soup factory in Chicago and the other's in Liberty, Mo.," she said. "They took the first wheels that came along and got out of here."

Mrs. Madison pointed at another shack. "They ain't nuthin' but one woman and 11 kids there," she said.

Postal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, last October, for the second time in as many years, I took the floor of the House to discuss in some detail the deplorable situation existing in the United States with regard to our postal service. At that time, I stated:

> There is no segment of our country, there is no individual or corporation or school or union or institution which does not rely on mail service for communication.

I further stated, and will say again now: We not only need a modern, efficient, dependable system of communication through the mails; we virtually must have it, and there is no excuse for not having it.

Mr. Speaker, I—and many million Americans—were heartened in January of this year when our President indicated that he, too, recognized this problem and was about to take steps to raise the level of mail service and restore our confidence in what was once one of our finest institutions. Various space-age methods were proposed, increased automation, accelerated delivery, bigger and better ZIP codes, and a new Postmaster General. Somewhere in all this I found myself hoping that we would indeed move our mail overnight again, that we could trace lost bank deposits and insured parcels, that we could count on having our mail delivered to our front doors every day *but Sunday, hopefully even before 4 or* 5 o'clock in the evening.

Unfortunately, there is very little progress to report. My mail does not indicate that the situation has improved, or that we are even aiming for it. In fact, the mail which reaches me, and apparently not all of it does, brings repeated complaints, protests, pleas concerning postal services, from delivery or lack of it right up to post office facilities themselves.

And, always, the blame is somewhere else. The excuses are numerous: facilities are unavailable, money is unavailable, personnel are unavailable, postmaster appointments are political footballs, and still, we are told of great technological strides within the Post Office Department itself. Administrative actions, administrative studies, but where are the administrative solutions?

In recent years, as post office employee pay raise bills and postal rate increase bills came before Congress, much was said to place the blame for deteriorating service on the man who carries the mail, the postman, by indicating that salaries were too low to attract qualified men or to keep them as career service employees, that they, in many cases, held two jobs in order to make ends meet.

Congress has taken steps to solve this problem by increasing pay, by increasing uniform allowances, by increased appropriations for the Department so that it could automate mailhandling and recordkeeping—and now that we have attacked the problem as it was presented to Congress, the service is poorer than it has ever been. This situation cannot be blamed on the individual postmen. Certainly, the vast majority are doing an excellent job, and the numerous complaints I have received, do not reflect for the most part, on the service provided by these dedicated men and women.

Possibly, one aspect of the problem is a lack of incentive within the service for ultimate competitive achievement. I know that some steps are being taken along this line. However, in my testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress last year, I stated my belief that postmaster appointments should be removed from political interference. I am still of that opinion, and I am today introducing a bill to accomplish this end.

In my last speech on postal matters, I cited numerous problems and complaints reported by residents of the 13th Congressional District. Some are being solved. By way of giving credit where credit is due, I am pleased to report that the village of Schaumburg, Ill., has recently received postal identification through a branch post office which opened on March 1. Our effort to secure this facility dates back to 1957 and the efforts of my predecessor in Congress—and, as late as last September, despite my continued efforts, I was told by the Post Office Department that such an installation "would not be economical."

In February the Department changed its mind, and this community of over 6,000 is now enjoying the right—not the privilege—of a local post office. We have been doubly fortunate. On February 28, the Post Office Department also announced the location of a branch post office in Streamwood, Ill., to be opened in June of this year. I have worked to achieve this improved postal service for several years, and I am heartened by the action of the Post Office Department.

Regrettably, however, many more complaints have been received. Perhaps the most illustrative and telling plea which I have received is one from Elk Grove Village which brought to my attention the fact that the Post Office Department had decided that in order "to provide the best service to new residential areas," residents must erect curbside mailboxes, which would be serviced by a postman in a 3-wheel truck. Mr. Speaker, I thought those days had gone in heavily populated metropolitan areas. Following are excerpts from letters relating to this matter:

First, from the village of Elk Grove came:

> As you are aware, the Postmaster General issued an order about mid-December that all future delivery routes would have to be serviced by mounted carrier to curb mailboxes, and in our instance and instances throughout your district, this is going to work a considerable hardship and make the Federal Government look rather ridiculous. For example, on some streets one house will have mounted delivery and the house next door will have foot delivery. One side of the street will have carrier delivery and the opposite side will have mounted delivery.
>
> Your good offices are sought to consult with the Postmaster General and see if his order cannot be modified to allow a subdivision which is partially occupied to continue to be served by carrier and have the order apply to subsequent subdivisions.

Needless to say, I protested to the Post Office Department. In their response, they said:

> Mail delivery to newly qualifying areas will be by extension of mounted (vehicle) service where practicable. This applies to all extension of delivery areas and is not selectively applicable to Elk Grove Village and Palatine, Ill.
>
> Two disturbing misconceptions have caused unfortunate reactions in a few areas. The first misconception is that mounted delivery is a rural-type delivery. The second misconception is that this type of service is a new program without advantage except to the Post Office Department. Mounted delivery to curbside boxes has existed for many years. It is very urban in approach, with mechanization to provide fast and efficient service with modern equipment. The postal patron receives both letters and parcels at the same time, and the taxpayer receives added value for his dollar.

The latest word on this subject from the village of Elk Grove reads as follows:

> You may be interested to know that our good people here in Elk Grove Village have erected curbside mailboxes and the delivery is being made by mail carriers walking the streets, rather than by mounted delivery, as the program was outlined and proposed. As you can realize and appreciate, this gives us all a good chuckle, but still it reflects very poorly on the Post Office and on the Federal Government.

If this chain of events were not so burdensome on the residents of Elk Grove Village, it might be humorous. One cannot help but wonder if the Post Office Department might next eliminate individual residential delivery altogether, since, using their logic, anyone could determine that they might conclude that mail would be available to the recipient sooner if he went directly to the post office and picked it up there.

It is going to take a good deal of effort to get the postal service back on track and assure the American people of prompt, reliable mail service. There is no sign that an effort is being made. In fact, the Postmaster General continues to hold two jobs in Government and is not even devoting his full time to the problems in his Department. Clearly, as the population continues to grow and population shifts continue to take place, postal service will continue to deteriorate unless the President and the Postmaster General resolve to execute their responsibilities. There can be utterly no excuse for the United States to have a second- or third-rate postal service. This is what we have. The authority is with President Johnson. The responsibility rests with President Johnson. And, appropriately, the blame is with President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is also introducing a resolution to remove postmaster appointments from the area of politics and place them on a merit basis.

America United

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the Wyoming Eagle of Cheyenne points out in a March 3 editorial the fact:

> Congress has said—and emphatically—that the United States is united in its effort and determination in southeast Asia.

Its editor, Bernie Horton, adds:

> It should be clear to the Communists that victory for them is beyond expectation—that the only sensible approach left for them is the conference table.

Because of my continued support of our President on this matter of concern to us all, and further because I believe the Eagle editorial represents the mainstream of Wyoming thought, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to submit this editorial for the RECORD.

AMERICA UNITED

The Senate and House, with a combined total of only six dissenting votes, has passed President Johnson's $4.8 billion Vietnam military authorization bill.

The action should bring the so-called great debate over our Vietnam policy to an end—at least temporarily.

Following Tuesday's Senate and House votes on the measure, the White House issued a statement praising the action and taking note of congressional concern about the war.

"The President will continue to act responsibly as Commander in Chief," the statement said. "As he said in New York last week, 'our measured use of force must be continued but this is prudent firmness under careful control.'"

The Senate wound up nearly 2 weeks of debate by passing the bill, 93 to 2, after first crushing an attempt by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, to have Congress repeal the 1964 Tonkin Gulf resolution. The Morse proposal was rejected, 92-5.

MORSE, arch-critic of the administration's policy in Vietnam, insisted on introducing his amendment which would have repealed the Tonkin Gulf resolution, which supported the President's use of military force to fight Communist aggression in southeast Asia. The resolution had been passed, overwhelmingly, after North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks on U.S. destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin.

By insisting on a showdown on his amendment to rescind the resolution, Senator Morse invited the crushing defeat he suffered.

The bill, which won House approval by an overwhelming vote of 392 to 4, provides authorization for the purchase of military equipment to be used by U.S. forces in Vietnam and for the construction of bases.

But the overwhelming passage of the measure had much wider significance.

As House Speaker John McCormack observed, if Hitler's aggression had been stopped in its early stages, World War II could have been avoided.

The lop-sided votes, following the so-called "great debate," should help to remove one of the few hopes the Communists still had in Vietnam—the hope that an America, divided over Vietnam policy, soon would grow tired of it all and pull out.

According to all reports, the tide of the war in Vietnam definitely has turned in our favor. The Vietcong and North Vietnamese soldiers are losing battle after battle. More and more Communists are deserting. And there are growing signs of stability in South Vietnam.

Now our Congress has said—and emphatically—that the United States, despite all the recent talk, is united in its effort and determination in southeast Asia.

It should be clear to the Communists that victory for them is beyond expectation—that the only sensible approach left for them is the conference table.

Amerigo Vespucci Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Governor of New York, the mayor of New York City, and the Bronx Borough president, have proclaimed March 9, 1966, as Amerigo Vespucci Day. It is fitting that we pay tribute to this great Italian-born navigator for whom the New World was named.

I commend Mr. Orlando Oliva, venable, and members of the Amerigo Vespucci Lodge No. 2159 of my 22d Congressional District, Bronx, N.Y., for sponsoring and obtaining these proclamations.

The proclamations are similar, and I am inserting one in the Congressional Record, as follows:

PROCLAMATION—AMERIGO VESPUCCI DAY, MARCH 9, 1966

One of the great names in the history of exploration and discovery is that of Amerigo Vespucci.

It is for this, great Florentine navigator that the continent on which we live is named. He is credited with having been one of the first to sight and begin exploration of the mainland of the Western Hemisphere. Amerigo Vespucci was one of the great Italian mariners whose exploits illuminated the golden age of discovery. But those exploits were more than pioneering achievements in navigation and geography. They opened a new world and raised the curtain on a new era of freedom.

In these days when new challenges confront us, the spirit of Amerigo Vespucci and his peers has a special appeal to us. Americans of the same origin as Vespucci are proud of him, but they are not alone in their pride. All of us share that pride.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim March 9, 1966, as Amerigo Vespucci Day in New York State.

Judd Argues for Cutting Communist Supplies in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding and well recognized experts in Asian affairs is former Minnesota Congressman Walter Judd. Dr. Judd served as a missionary and surgeon in North China and lived under the Chinese Communists for 8 years. This brilliant statesman knows and understands the Asians and the Communists. His expert views are certainly worthy of reprint in the Congressional Record and I ask that the following report of a speech he made in Fort Lauderdale recently, which appeared in the Sun-Sentinel, be placed in the Record at this point:

CUT SUPPLIES IN VIET—JUDD

(By Joan Bucks)

The same kind of power struggle that has been going on since the dawn of history is being waged in Vietnam, but the United States is acting as if it had never even read a book on how to wage a war, former Minnesota Congressman Walter Judd said in Fort Lauderdale Wednesday.

"The purpose of war is political," said Judd. "It is not to see how many people you can kill. It is to change your adversaries' will without killing any more people than you have to. Until your adversaries' leader is in danger himself, his will cannot be changed."

The Republican veteran of 20 years in the U.S. Congress, who served as a missionary and surgeon in North China, told the Metropolitan Dinner Club at the Governors' Club Hotel that he lived for 8 years under the Chinese Communists and they are not going to risk losing what they fought 45 years to gain by fighting for Vietnam.

"Fight for Vietnam and lose China?" Judd exclaimed.

Judd recalled India's Prime Minister Nehru saying to him, "You can't understand the Chinese because you aren't Asian."

"He didn't understand the situation," said Judd. "He was interested in his own people and he thought Mao Tsetung was interested in his. He was wrong. The Chinese leaders don't act like Asians. They are agents of an international revolution. Nehru supported China and China invaded his country and broke him.

"Afterward I spoke with him again and he said of China's behavior, 'It is very curious.' A month later he died."

Judd said too many people are deceived by the Russo-Chinese split.

"This is not a split between nations. It is a split between factions. They're arguing about how to conquer the world not whether."

But, Judd added, Russia is a greater danger than China.

He warned that Russia's apparent mellowing over the years is only a deception.

"If she were really seeking peaceful coexistence she could show it by deeds—take down the Berlin wall, stop trying to subvert Latin America, accept disarmament with inspection.

"But there is no change in her objectives. Not one deed to indicate the slightest change," said Judd.

Judd said China represents the palm of a hand in the center of Asia, with the other Asian countries spread out around her like 15 fingers.

He compared China to Germany which is in a powerful geographic center of Europe.

"China is a deficit nation. She needs raw materials from the other Asian countries and she needs the industrial might of Japan. At a conference in Manila of 16 Asian countries, Japan's spokesman said Japan has had atomic bombs dropped on her cities. Now China has a bomb and Japan is close enough to be a target. The United States must be able to guarantee that China won't use it, or Japan will go over to Peiping," Judd warned.

"That's what the war in Vietnam is about. Power, not democracy. And we are the real target of the enemy. We opened up Laos and the Ho Chi Minh Trail to the enemy. We opened up the line of supply that is bringing war materiel that is killing our kids.

"We owe it to our kids in Vietnam to stop the line of supplies that is killing them. We must recognize that we are at war and make a national decision that we have got to prevail there."

Major Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New York Journal-American is one of many newspapers which has lauded the proposal to create a Department of Transportation.

It points out:

> With our immense development in transportation by land, air, and water, the complexities have become numerous and varied. Integration is essential to dissolve the major problems and bring method and system to transportation. It is a national interest of highest priority.

Because this editorial is so typical of many that I have read, I offer it to the Record, where it may be read in its entirety:

A MAJOR MOVE

President Johnson has taken progressive and logical action in urging Congress to create a Department of Transportation to unify and coordinate the many agencies, activities, and problems associated with the movement of persons and goods. Travel by horseback and stagecoach no longer is the mode. We have become the most mobile country in history.

With our immense development in transportation by land, air, and water, the complexities have become numerous and varied. Integration is essential to dissolve the major problems and bring method and system to transportation. It is a national interest of highest priority.

This is the intent of President Johnson's dramatic and forward-looking proposals. They embrace virtually all types of travel and shipment. And they seek to tie together many Federal organizations that now operate independently of one another though all are concerned with transportation.

Special stress is placed by the President on safety. He is particularly concerned about highway carnage. The Hearst Newspapers, long and continuously active in furthering efforts of reduction of the terrible traffic toll, are glad the President has given heavy emphasis to the need for a determined program toward the significant decrease of this harsh problem.

Mr. Johnson asks $700 million for a 6-year Federal start in this field. He should get it. He gives industry an opportunity for further development of safety devices. In the event its efforts seem, after 2 years, to be inadequate, Federal standardization would be imposed.

There now exists a confusion of nonstandardization in highway facilities of even such simplicities as signs as one drives from State to State. This item alone illustrates the current lack of and need for coordination.

The emphasis on highway safety is strikingly important at a time when the Nation has been agonized by a death toll of 49,000 in 1 year.

Vietnam: The United States Digs in Hard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, more than most conflicts, the struggle in Vietnam is one which has many ramifications—political, military, and economic.

This fact is borne out in an article I read recently in Business Week. It makes it clear that—

> The Saigon government has recognized that in the long run it can win (against the Vietcong) only by offering the South Vietnamese people an alternative political goal.

It adds:

> Rural construction is one way of building such a political alternative.

The article concludes that stability may take a while to establish, but that there are reasons for hope, including signs that political initiative is taking root and that the Vietcong may be weakening.

Since the article deals with an issue of utmost concern, I include it in the RECORD:

[From Business Week, Mar. 5, 1966]

VIETNAM: THE UNITED STATES DIGS IN HARD

Committed to a complex war that is difficult to win, the United States pours in manpower, materiel, and technicians to keep Vietnam viable.

Limited war may be what the United States officially is waging in the jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. But it is a large, limited war: 200,000 soldiers committed to battle, 1,600 helicopters as support, an 8,000-mile pipeline of supplies arriving daily form the United States, $12 billion to be spent this year for all of these—and more.

The war has been a long, slow story of escalation, both diplomatically and militarily. Over a decade ago, President Eisenhower proffered aid to the fledging Government of South Vietnam. Then came the military advisers and special forces sent by President Kennedy. Last year, under President Johnson, the war of guerrilla attacks became a war of open combat, with the full power of the United States—from GI to industrial technician—deployed in a country where it is hard to win a war.

Where does the United States stand today in Vietnam? In a far better position than it did a year ago—but also far from anything called victory.

U.S. troops and their Vietnamese allies hold the initiative from the Mekong Delta to the 17th parallel.

The war is unlikely to expand much beyond its present scope. Constant U.S. bombing is limiting North Vietnamese penetration of the southern highlands.

Both the Government and economy of Vietnam are in more workable shape today than at any time since the assassination of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

At Vung Tau, a onetime French resort on the coast below Saigon, vines with little white flowers run up to the barracks windows. Capt. Le Xuan Mai, director of the training camp for rural construction cadres, stands in the hot sun outside the huge messhall and tells of his work. Like his students, he has taken a vow of poverty; he wears cheap, black, cotton pajamas, and his eyes burn in a taut face.

"We talk to the students at night," he says. "We teach them legends of their ancestors and explain to them what they mean in terms of the present struggle. The most important thing is to teach them to love the people, to protect them. The cadres must be as dedicated as the Vietcong."

During the day, the trainees learn other things they will need to know when they move into rural villages in 59-man pacification teams: how to handle a Thompson submachinegun, how to root out Vietcong agents among the villagers, how to enlist peasants in civic activities.

ALTERNATIVE

The Vung Tau camp reflects a central fact about the struggle in Vietnam: More than most wars, this is a political war. The South Vietnamese are fighting not only against local guerrillas and North Vietnamese regular troops, but also against a political program for uniting all of Vietnam under Communist rule. The Saigon government has recognized that in the long run it can win only by offering the South Vietnamese people an alternative political goal. "Rural construction" is one way of building such a political alternative.

However, whether rural construction will fare any better than previous village pacification attempts—such as the strategic hamlets of President Ngo Dinh Diem and the "people's action teams" of later governments—remains to be seen. Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale, adviser to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge on pacification, concedes the limitations of the effort.

"Neither military action nor pacification campaigns will win this one by themselves," he says. "You need a believable and strong political underfooting which we just don't have yet."

WAIT AND SEE

At the moment, though, the political outlook in South Vietnam seems more promising than at any time since the bloody end of Diem's regime in October 1963. The ruling directorate of 10 generals, with Air Vice-Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky as executive, has lasted a record 9 months.

The Buddhists and Catholics, who have brought down governments in the past, currently are weakened by factionalism and seem less able to challenge the government with street demonstrations. Barring unforeseen changes—such as outbursts of popular protest against inflation—both the bonzes of Hue and the priests of Saigon appear to be waiting to see whether the directorate keeps its promise to hold national elections next year.

Long term, the outlook is still cloudy. A few shoots of new political life are appearing, in Saigon and in the provinces, above the surface of general apathy. But as yet there are no convincing signs of political support for the kind of profound social reform that most observers think South Vietnam needs in order to survive.

There are some signs, though, that the political grip of the Vietcong is weakening under the blows of U.S. military power. More Vietcong troops are defecting, and a stream of refugees is fleeing the Communist reign of terror.

I. HOW MUCH ADVICE?

In this mildly encouraging situation, an argument is developing in U.S. official ranks in Saigon as to whether the United States is giving the South Vietnamese too much advice, or not enough, on how they should run their political affairs.

At last month's Honolulu conference, President Johnson pressed Marshal Ky to hold elections and to start some social reforms. Skeptics in Saigon say the elections will never be held—and they point to the fact that Ky has not named the "Democracy Building Consultative Council" that he promised to set up after the new year to draft a constitution and an electoral law.

Passing the buck

Many American officials feel that the United States should press the Saigon government to honor its election pledge. And they would push for other reforms: more aid for the 1 million refugees from the provinces, better treatment of Vietcong defectors to encourage desertions from the Communists, more encouragement for South Vietnam's anti-Communist labor movement.

On the other side of the argument though, some U.S. officials see a danger of killing Vietnamese initiative with too much advice. One such is Lloyd Clyburn, veteran agriculture adviser in the I Corps region in the north. Says Clyburn: "We shouldn't keep a man in the same post out here for more than a couple of years. With the best will in the world, he accumulates too much power. The Vietnamese come to depend on him, to duck the tough decisions."

II. NEW FACES

Meantime, a few stirrings of political initiative here and there offer some encouragement for the future. At least half a dozen of the provincial councils elected last May are asserting some political independence despite their strictly advisory roles.

For example, Phan Quang Dan, chairman of the council for the province of Gia Dinh surrounding Saigon, is pushing land and rezoning reforms. He feels that the 79,000 votes he attracted give him some sort of mandate—and he may have a political future.

Challenge

Another budding political leader is Vo Long Trieu, a French-educated official of the Ministry of Agriculture. Trieu headed a band of indignant students who went to the palace to protest when Ky and the generals toppled the civilian regime last June. Ky invited him in, argued all night about whether and how democracy should be brought to Vietnam. Trieu finally got Ky to let him and about 50 of his student friends take charge of Saigon's Eight Arrondissement, a teeming slum infiltrated by the Vietcong.

Trieu fired those arrondissement officials who were unwilling to forgo traditional payoffs, set up sanitation and health services, launched a cleanup campaign, built new classrooms. Now conditions have improved enough so that the homegrown peace corpsemen are gradually turning the arrondissement back to appointed officials.

Says Trieu, who looks even younger than his 26 years: "We felt we had to do something when challenged by Ky."

Best hope

Then there's Tran Quoc Buu, president of the Vietnamese Conferedation of Labor, which he founded in 1952. The CVT was virtually crushed by the Diem regime, but now has 300,000 members. In Da Nang, the fishermen's and deck workers' unions have provided a steady stream of intelligence that has kept the Vietcong out of the city.

Some U.S. officials see Buu's labor movement as the best hope of leading the social revolution they feel is needed to save the country from communism. Says Buu, a soft-voiced man who looks a little like Mao Tse-tung: "The Government still has done nothing for the workers. We will do what we can."

Conceivably, the Buddhists could eventually provide the political direction and the sense of national purpose that South Vietnam needs. They have an effective grassroots organization in some parts of the country, and a group of ambitious leaders among the bonzes of Hue. But some U.S. officials look to the military as the likeliest unifying force. Throughout Vietnam's troubled history, the army has helped hold the country together. At present, the military directorate and the regional corps commanders are divided among themselves, and Ky has had to operate by balancing off rivalries. But he is accumulating power, and it is possible that he may yet emerge as a strong national leader.

III. SNAPPING POINT

Against the prospect for relative political stability and the still modest signs of indigenous political vitality must be stacked the corruption that reaches into high levels of the military regime.

Generals build villas at a time of desperate cement shortage. The wife of one highly placed general is the person to see if you want black market cement. An incompetent and venal Province chief can't be fired because he has got the goods on the region's corps commander.

Premier Ky is considered almost prudishly honest. He has acknowledged the extent of private and public corruption, has threatened to have the culprits shot, and recently set up special courts to try cases of corruption. But he hasn't made much headway.

Apathy

As serious as corruption in high places is the inefficiency of the Government. This is due partly to low pay and lack of incentives for civil servants, partly to the administrative inexperience of the ruling generals. But at bottom, the Government's inefficiency stems from the same apathy that pervades the mass of the Vietnamese people. This, in turn, is at least partly a result of a rigid social structure that makes it difficult for the poor to rise, or the rich to fall.

Both American and Vietnamese officials worry about the political impact of the massive U.S. presence. On balance, though, American soldiers appear to be more welcomed than resented by the Vietnamese.

How near?

In all this, what gives some encouragement to both American and Vietnamese officials is not so much a political improvement on the Saigon government's side as an apparent weakening on the other side. Vietcong defections have been running well over 1,000 a month for the past 6 months—more than twice the average of a year ago. More important than their numbers is the story they are telling.

One in four of the defectors now say they are coming over because of their conviction that the Vietcong is losing. A year ago, virtually none expressed this kind of defeatism. Nearly all the defectors confess to terror of U.S. air power, artillery, and armor. They all complain of hunger and fatigue, disease, increasing brutality by Vietcong officers toward their own men and toward civilians. Many are shocked by brutal Vietcong recruiting tactics and crushing taxation of civilians.

One U.S. intelligence officer engaged in interrogating defectors and prisoners of war puts it this way: "These people may be getting close to the snapping point. We're driving them hard. Once they snap they could unravel fast."

Pittsburgh Institute To Focus on Urban Transit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee and Banking and Currency is now finishing its second of 3 weeks of hearings on the demonstration cities bill. In addition to its slum and social renewal features, it would also extend the mass transit program enacted 2 years ago. Congressmen THOMAS L. ASHLEY, HENRY S. REUSS, and I are proposing, as an amendment to the pending bill, an expedited program for research, development and demonstration of new systems of urban transport. This amendment looks toward a breakthrough in this field within 5 years.

On Thursday, March 17, Dr. James P. Romualdi, director of the newly established Transportation Research Institute at Carnegie Tech in Pittsburgh, and his associate director, Dr. Thomas E. Stelson, will testify before the Housing subcommittee. It is our hope that the transportation research institute will become truly national in scope and will be able to make its findings available to all the great urban centers which have such great need for facilities to move people rapidly and safely within urban areas.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert a recent KDKA radio and television editorial on the institute at this point in the record, along with biographies of Dr. Romualdi and Dr. Stelson.

[KDKA editorial]

NEW SCHOOL OF THOUGHT

An important step has been taken to give Pittsburgh the leadership of the transit industry in the United States. A transit institute, something we advocated several months ago, is being established at Carnegie Institute of Technology. This should pay big dividends for our city far into the future.

The new facility will be called the Transportation Research Institute. Dr. H. Guyford Stever, president of Carnegie Tech, made the announcement at the close of the First International Conference on Urban Transportation, which was held here in Pittsburgh. Dr. Stever says the institute is being established with the help of a $300,000 grant from financier Richard K. Mellon. It will be headed by Dr. James P. Romualdi, professor of civil engineering at Tech. Dr. Thomas E. Stelson, head of civil engineering, and Dr. Milton Shaw, head of mechanical engineering, will be associate directors.

As explained by Dr. Stever, the institute will have four purposes. First, to carry out transportation research for Government and industry. Second, to organize conferences and seminars in which industry leaders can exchange ideas and information. Third, to develop an education program in transportation at the graduate level at Tech. And fourth, to advance education and contribute to scientific knowledge in the field of transportation.

Dr. Stever says the immediate concern of the institute will be rapid transit and high-speed rail transportation between cities. Within 5 years, he expects the institute to be working with a $1 million yearly budget.

A research and education institute of this kind has been badly needed in the transportation industry, and it is to Pittsburgh's great credit that it will be located here. You can be sure that the institute will be working closely with the many Pittsburgh companies that are involved in the fast-growing rapid transit industry.

Together, they can develop a pool of scientific knowledge and technical skill that can give this city a commanding position in the transit industry. This leadership is certain to pay off with more jobs, and a more stable economy, in the years to come.

BIOGRAPHY OF DR. JAMES P. ROMUALDI

Dr. James P. Romualdi, director of the newly established transportation research institute at Carnegie Tech, is a professor in the department of civil engineering.

He served as a contributor on the special transportation task group at Tech which prepared the keystone corridor transportation study for the Department of Commerce of Pennsylvania.

His additional interests are in the fields of fracture mechanics, applied mechanics and structural engineering.

Dr. Romualdi's research on the use of closely spaced lengths of wire mixed with concrete may lead to radical changes in the future applications and shapes of concrete structures.

Concrete mixed with particles of wire eliminates the need for iron reinforcing rods and could be used in the construction of roads and buildings and even for sculptured pieces.

The particle-mixed-concrete was recently used by Dr. Romualdi in collaboration with Prof. Kent Bloomer, another Tech faculty member in creating a sculptured bas-relief. The concrete, in combination with styrofoam and fiberglas, cut down on the weight of the design. The use of the mixture in an art form has created interest among architects and engineers.

Dr. Romualdi has written numerous articles and has presented several papers abroad. He has been engaged in private consulting work and has done research for the Navy. All of his degrees were earned at Tech.

BIOGRAPHY OF DR. THOMAS E. STELSON

Dr. Thomas E. Stelson, associate director of the newly established transportation research institute at Carnegie Tech, is also ALCOA professor and head of the department of civil engineering.

He served as a codirector of the keystone corridor transportation study prepared for the Department of Commerce of Pennsylvania by a special transportation task group at Tech.

Dr. Stelson is author of "Comments on the Evolving Metropolis and New Technology," planning the urban community published in 1960. His article "Education for Oblivion," written in 1961, was a searing condemnation of engineers who allow themselves to become obsolete. The article has since been widely reprinted and quoted.

His approach to civil engineering encompasses the study of blood flow and foam which is expected to contribute to such diverse enterprises as pipeline transportation of coal, the treatment of circulatory diseases and the pumping of foodstuffs along assembly lines and into jars.

Shortly after Professor Stelson became head of his department at age 30, Dr. J. C. Warner, then the president of Carnegie Tech, said he was "one of the most brilliant young engineering scientists we've seen in a long while."

Dr. Stelson earned all of his degrees at Tech. He is a member of numerous scientific and professional societies. His major areas of interest are in the fields of fluid mechanics, hydraulics, foundation engineering, soil mechanics, and solid mechanics.

The Seventh Anniversary of the Passage of Legislation in the House of Representatives Bringing Statehood to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a joyous occasion for celebration. Seven years ago today the U.S. House of Representatives passed legislation that gave statehood to Hawaii. We in the House of Representatives recall that historic event with true pride. Congress gave not only Hawaii statehood, but to the valiant people of Hawaii the full rights of U.S. citizenship in perpetuity.

The other 49 States, which were in existence at that time, gained immeasurably by the admission of Hawaii into our Union. During these ensuing 7 years a closer relationship has grown between us, and the prosperity, security, and happiness that was sought by this legislation have become a reality.

The State of Hawaii has lived up to the expectations that she would do her part to make this Union stronger. She has added scenic beauty to our boundaries, and her people have been more than enthusiastic in demonstrating true patriotism.

By making Hawaii a State, Congress advanced three steps in our U.S. national progress. These three steps are:

First, we have bolstered Hawaii's and our U.S. defense, by Hawaii being a full sister State, instead of a U.S. territory or possession in the Pacific.

Second, Congress has made Hawaii a center where the people of the Pacific could study and learn our best American traditions. Hawaii by its wonderful progress, has been a showcase of American democracy in the Pacific. This is a fine encouragement for the future for all Pacific peoples, and all colonial peoples everywhere.

Third. Congress and the State of Hawaii have demonstrated dramatically that the United States both cherishes and practices the democratic ideal that her citizens stand equal before the law regardless of color and creed or national origin.

The example of the State of Hawaii shines in the Pacific for half the world's people to see and to compare with the empty promises of equality held out by totalitarian states.

In peace and in war, Hawaii's citizens have proved the worth of their patriotism and Americanism. Hawaii has an experienced and intelligent electorate. It has responsible citizens devoted to their government as an average of more than 85 percent of the registered voters exercise their right to vote.

Since 1840 Hawaii has had a functioning, orderly government patterned on a constitutional form. Its State constitution, ratified in 1950, has been ample evidence of Hawaii's political maturity and capacity to conduct its affairs as an American State.

A public school system was established in Hawaii as early as 1840 and many of the children of western pioneers were sent there for their education. A congressional committee in 1951 found that—

> The public school system of Hawaii is generally recognized as among the best in the United States.

The sparkling sunshine and wholesome outdoor life that are the prime attractions of Hawaii's semitropical living help the State achieve a notable health record.

Fortunately, Hawaii wanted statehood. In 1954 its citizens presented a dramatic testimonial. In a historic petition to Congress from Hawaii's citizens, they asked for statehood. Approximately 116,000 signatures had been affixed within a few days. The giant roll was 6 feet wide, about a mile long, and was one of the largest petitions received in the history of the U.S. Congress. It transmitted the determination and desire of Hawaii's citizens to be granted the statehood status they had earned. For over half a century, the residents of Hawaii had lived as Americans, worked as Americans, and fought and died as Americans.

With the passage of statehood legislation the people of Hawaii are now given the true dignity of American citizenship, with all accompanying rights and privileges, one of the most valued possessions in the world today.

Never was a U.S. territory more ready for statehood. Never have people been more willing and able to assume all the rights and responsibilities of a State in our Union.

We rejoice today that Hawaii is such a success story that it more than fulfills the predictions of those of us who supported and worked for Hawaii statehood. We supporters look back with pride on the action that was taken in this House 7 years ago.

To the people of Hawaii we extend our continued loyal friendship and continuing hearty welcome. We give our heartfelt thanks for their cooperation, friendship, and willingness to stand with the united citizens of our good United States, for progress and the security of all of us.

Local Law Enforcement: Neglected and Forgotten by This Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John J. Mirich, chairman of the Department of Law Enforcement of Treasure Valley Community College is known for his work in the field of improving the quality of local law enforcement agencies.

I would like to insert Dr. Mirich's latest article on the subject:

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT: NEGLECTED AND FORGOTTEN BY THIS SOCIETY

(By Dr. John J. Mirich, chairman, Department of Law Enforcement, Treasure Valley Community College, Ontario, Oreg.)

Probably one of the most important, and most neglected, vocations in need of professional education, training, and professional status in this social order is local law enforcement: that is, our city, county, and State police.

For too long local law enforcement has been forced to recruit its manpower from the ranks of the professionally uneducated and untrained due in part to public disinterest and neglect. For too many years the local police officer has been negatively stereotyped in this society. This stereotyping has served to discourage our educated and otherwise qualified young men from seeking police careers; it has tended to encourage law officers to develop the theory that they "hang together or hang separately" against most public criticism and police reforms; it has solidified the belief in the average citizen's mind that law enforcement officers seek police positions when they are vocationally unfit for anything else; and most seriously, this stereotyping is one of the basic reasons that law enforcement is lagging professionally at least 25 years behind its sister social agencies of law interpretation, parole, probation, and others.

The typical policeman has been presented as a large, paunchy-giant who is flat-footed, uncouth, and uneducated. He is thought to become quite violent when someone violates one of "his laws" in "his town". He has been portrayed as a combination of a physical Samson, an intellectual midget, and an emotional cripple. Small wonder then that this negative sterotype has stabilized in the average citizen's mind the belief that the policeman is to be either tolerated, disregarded, or even avoided in that he occupies a social position somewhere between the law abiding and the criminal elements of the order.

The total blame for local law enforcement's position far behind the acceptable professions cannot be said to rest entirely with the public, however. Local law enforcement agencies themselves are also at fault. Most local police agencies nationally have not seen fit to inform the public of the duties and responsibilities of the local officer; the vast majority of them have not carried on intensive public-police public relations on a National, State, or local level to inform the public of the citizen's duties and obligations in regards to the law; and most important of all, local enforcement nationally, has also fallen into the shallow reasoning that law enforcement is a semiskilled vocation instead of a profession. In addition, too many police administrative officials still hold to the wornout theory that "experience is the best teacher," and that police science education and training is not nearly as important as police experience. True, some States, notably California and Oregon, have instituted police science degree programs in their junior colleges and colleges, but they are in minority in regards to the national scene. Experience cannot teach an officer all the State, local, and Federal laws he is required to know and enforce. Experience cannot teach him entirely the complex innovations in criminalistics (microscopic and spectographic evidence, fingerprinting, handwriting, firearms, etc.,) which are so important in the detection and the apprehension of modern criminals who, studies indicate, show every indication of being as proficient, if not more so, in their illicit vocations than is the local officer in the legal profession he represents. And most of all, experience cannot teach the officer criminology, psychology, and sociology which are so important in the understanding of human behavior. A person with a BS degree in police science, coupled with a few years of police experience, can replace two or more uneducated and untrained officers, and in so doing he would do a far more effective job than they. Law enforcement is so complicated that if we insist on staffing it with unqualified applicants, much criminal behavior will remain undetected, and the civil rights of us all unprotected, by policemen who do not even understand many of these rights themselves.

Thanks to the distinguished FBI, and its eminent director, John E. Hoover, local law enforcement has improved considerably over the police corruption it knew during the heyday of the gangsterism of the 1920's and 1930's. The many periodic police seminars nationally, and the FBI Academy (at no charge), have kept local officers abreast of modern innovations in crime detection and prevention.

While some State and local police nationally are well qualified, they are in the extreme minority. Less than 2 percent of the police agencies nationally require a college degree in police science and in fact the vast majority have no educational or training requirements. This is quite apparent when one observes many of those who hold local police positions. Some retain their positions during the pleasure of the mayor or sheriff and others due to some sort of examination. One wonders, however, if the typical police examination does any screening at all when he observes many mediocre officers who pass them, or in fact who even receive high evaluations on them.

It is interesting to note that the Mafia and other professional criminals are afraid of the apprehension and conviction abilities of Federal officers and "steer clear" of Federal violations, however, they have no qualms in violating State laws; even murder. Sometimes they ice-pick their victims to death, sometimes they encase them in cement and drop them into waters, on occasions they shoot them in public places or even in the victim's own home, and on other occasions they dynamite them to death in cars, but seldom are these killers even apprehended, let alone convicted. The underworld is so aware of the efficiency of Federal officers that it deals most harshly with its members who violate Federal laws for personal benefit. Murder in most cases is a State law violation. When local enforcement becomes a profession, the professional criminal will then fear and respect the local officer as he now does the Federal, and the whole Nation will benefit as a result. Furthermore, the frightening rise in delinquency, which is increasing about 8 percent per capita faster than the population growth, will be more controlled than it is today. Of course, we know that even if local officers were as well qualified as the FBI, we would still have much criminality until those social problems which create criminality are solved.

Recent State and Federal court rulings, which have turned loose proven guilty murderers, etc., indicate that local officers must become proficient and trained, and this training must come soon. In almost all of these cases, the accused person's individual rights were violated by the officer, either because these rights were disregarded, or even unkown to him. In either case, the courts will not allow policemen to obtain their evidence in illegal manners in the future. Rather than weakening law enforcement by these decisions, the author sincerely believes that instead these rulings demand that local enforcement become a profession, staffed by highly skilled technicians who know more about the laws they enforce than do the citizens they arrest. This is not necessarily true today.

While this society has seen fit that lawyers be thoroughly trained and educated in the law, it has naively believed that anyone was competent enough to enforce the law without extensive professional training or education. Whereas, the district attorney (who is always a lawyer) may have hours, days, weeks, or even months to ponder over his interpretation of a given law violation, the typical policeman is many times forced to make his decision on a split second at the scene of a crime. How many innocent persons have had their reputations ruined by a false charge, and how many petty violators have been charged with more serious violations than they deserved, can never be determined, but they must have been legion since the average officer of the law in the Nation is not professionally competent. Due to, again, a negative sterotype we hold toward law enforcement, qualified young men do not seek enforcement careers, however, those who seek psychological enhancement do not have these same qualms. Too many police applicants (many of whom fortunately are denied police positions) seek the power and prestige of the badge. To some unstable personalities the badge makes up for all their real or imagined shortcomings. They may have been denied normal associations with others, but with the badge they know they will become the center of attraction. They may have had a mediocre education, but the badge will make them as important and respected as those who have graduated from the prestige university. While we may have some officers in enforcement today who sought police work as a personality crutch, they are in minority nationally among our dedicated local officers. Law enforcement is too important in a democracy for it to become a "catchall" for social misfits who seek self-realization through police authority.

It is interesting to note that it is not only the typical citizen who thinks that law enforcement exists only for the punishment of criminals, but this is also believed by the average local police officer. Law enforcement is designed not only for the detection and repression of criminal behavior, but for the protection of the individual rights of citizens as well. This is another reason why it is so extremely important for the officer to receive education as well as training. Civil liberties are so important in a democratic social order that we cannot allow this crucial profession to further wallow in a maze of community indifference. The lawyer is thoroughly trained and educated before he begins to practice law. Therefore, it stands to reason that the police officer should be trained and educated before he enforces the law. Since the officer is expected to be a first aid expert, father confessor, social scientists, and even a judge, it appears to this author that we are expecting "boys to perform men's jobs" if we further disregard local law enforcement, and the plight of the local law officer.

Some theorists maintain that we cannot afford to pay attractive salaries which will attract educated, interested, and otherwise qualified applicants. This certainly is shallow reasoning. Since the enforcement of laws exists for the repression of crime and the protection of the innocent, as well as the maintenance of law and order, we are qutie ambiguous when we guarantee individual rights in this democracy, and then employ nonqualified persons in law enforcement to assure the citizenry that these rights will be safeguarded. Since over 90 percent of all the scientists the world has ever known are living today, and they have discovered more new scientific innovations in 20 years than have been invented in the previous 2,000 years, we can expect a highly educated and technically advanced social order in the next few decades.

Can nonprofessional persons enforce laws in a highly complex, technical social order? A qualified police officer will deter more crime, detect more criminals, better understand civil liberties, and better protect innocent citizens than the present untrained officer, and he will pay his own way in many ways. When we are in need of the services of a lawyer, we seek a lawyer who is known for his skill and abilities in the complex area of laws and their interpretations. It is odd that we do not place as much emphasis on law enforcement which is every bit as complex, and certainly just as important as law interpretation. Comment was earlier made concerning the American belief that physical size was the most important qualification for law officers. In fact, the ability to defeat others in physical combat, or extreme athletic ability, for too long have been the only standards of measurement for police applicants in far too many local and State police agencies. Certain height and weight requirements may be desirable in some police positions, but complete dependence upon huge physical size certainly is a poor manner of determining the competency of law officers. One sometimes wonders how many brilliant and otherwise qualified young men were denied law enforcement careers because they were 1 inch or thereabout too short. True, physical standards are important, especially sound physical health, but there are other qualifications which are just as important if one is to enforce laws adequately and fairly.

Some critics maintain that academic standards will not assure that local enforcement will reach professional status, and that, again, police work is practical in nature and must be learned through "practice." We do not allow lawyers to practice on the public until after they receive their professional education, and we should not allow law officers to receive all their training in this manner. Too many individual rights are trampled upon by police officers who have been employed for many years and who have received all their "education" through "police experience."

For several years the author has written national articles for police and criminology journals setting down what he thought were minimum standards if local enforcement was to become a profession. He briefly presents them in this article, hoping for comment and action from SR readers.

Certified police administrators: State police heads, chiefs of police, sheriffs, and others.

1. Five years of police science education.
2. Police experience as the profession would deem necessary.

3. Certified by the profession.

Certified police specialists: Juvenile officers, investigators in morals, homicide, probation, parole, burglary, special services, and others.

1. Five years of police science education in the officer's specialty.

2. Patrolman, or other police experience, as the profession would require.

3. Certified by the profession.

Certified patrolman: Foot patrol, officers, cruiser car officers, and others who deal with citizens on a face-to-face relationship.

1. Four-year B.S. degree in police science.

2. Certified by the profession.

Noncertified police personnel: Parking meter maids and others, guards in jails, etc., where the officer is not required to arrest persons on a face-to-face relationship.

1. Two years of police education in the specialty.

2. Certification by the profession.

Insofar as police administrators are concerned, the profession may decide to break down cities and counties according to population and classify them as class A, B, or C, whereas a certified patrolman might serve as an administrator in a small class C community, but it is suggested that one not be allowed to enforce laws on a face-to-face relationship if he is not at least a certified patrolman. Even these standards will probably have to be raised in the future, but this seems to be at least a starting point.

With the above academic standards, soon will come police State licensing, as is true with other professions, where competent officers will be able to move from one State to another if they so desire. Eventually the politically elected and appointed officers will either become professionally trained, or the public will demand that these positions be staffed with certified personnel by examination or other similar means.

It is suggested that while professional status is necessary, and in fact imperative, that local law enforcement officers never become unionized. The police officer owes his allegiance to his local, State, and Federal Government, and to the citizens he represents, and no professional or other organization should have control over his duties, responsibilities, or loyalties. We must guard against police strikes and walkouts, and against personal political use of police agencies. This is one of the basic reasons some social scientists refuse to do research in police standards. They fear a national police organization. This certainly is blind reasoning. We cannot close our eyes to the plight of the local enforcement in dread of it becoming overly organized and too powerful. While we are marking time and debating what not to do, local enforcement is falling further and further behind the rising crime rate. While it is true that even the most qualified and competent police in the world could not completely erase the frightening crime problem in this society, a much better job of law enforcement can be done by trained police officers than is being done today by nonprofessional officers.

As soon as certification of police is discussed, immediately one hears that this is impossible due to the fact that over 95 percent of present-day officers could not certify. How, they ask, can we solve this crucial problem? This problem is probably not as knotty as some, especially presently employed officers, would have us believe. Those who hold tenure in law enforcement agencies when certification becomes a reality, should be required to attend police science schools, in-service training programs, and the various FBI seminars periodically to remain employed, and thusly would receive blanket certification. To ascertain that police science programs would be available to those young men and women who seek a career in law enforcement, and those who must attend to retain employment, police science curriculums should be instituted in every tax-supported junior college, college and university in the land. The expense of these schools would be greatly offset by each State receiving far better law enforcement, and the birth of a profession called law enforcement. While the above general description of a police certification system may not be all inclusive, it may encourage the readers to suggest others. Other systems may be more effective and practical, but to deny that some type of certification is not necessary to attempt to bring local enforcement up to a professional status is naive indeed in the face of evidence that this forgotten and neglected discipline is quite out of step with the modern times. It simply cannot compete if it must depend on nonprofessional manpower assigned to professional duties and responsibilities.

The extremists on the political right maintain that social scientists who investigate police competence intend to destroy the agencies of law so that enemy governments may take over this Nation. The ultraliberals on the left blatantly attack criminologists concerned with police efficiency, and the police, as being Gestapo instruments of a totalitarian government. They serve to frighten away dedicated social science investigators, and further, serve to confuse the public. As a result, local enforcement slips further and further behind the accepted professions, lost in a sea of misunderstanding and confusion, while crime continues to rise and the citizen continues to lose more confidence in the police system.

To sum up: The time most certainly has come for this society to face up to the problem of an inadequately educated and trained local law enforcement system. California's emphasis on police science education should become a national emphasis, and some system of police certification and licensing is almost imperative. Safeguards against police unionization should be instituted, and city, county, and State citizens in every city and hamlet in this Nation should become interested in assisting local law enforcement to reach a high level of professional status. Local enforcement is helpless to reach this hoped for height itself without the aid of every public-minded citizen in the land. Certainly the road to police professionalization is a long journey, but we must begin this journey a step at a time whether we care to or not, or certainly social chaos will result in this society in the next few decades.

Rules of Warfare in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, firepower and mobility are the chief advantages over the enemy in Vietnam.

Business Week magazine said recently:

> Backed by great firepower U.S. military officials believe the strategy they have devised eventually will cause the Vietcong and North Vietnam to give up the fight. Administration officials proclaim the tide has turned in our favor, and statistics—kill ratios, offensive actions initiated, enemy defections, and other back their claims.

This informative article will interest my colleagues who may have missed seeing it and, with permission given, I place it in its entirety in the RECORD at this point:

VIETNAM: CHANGING THE RULES OF GUERRILLA WAR

(NOTE.—Using massive firepower, total control of the air, and instant mobility of ground forces, Americans are confounding Communist theories—and conserving United States and allied lives.)

Substituting materiel for manpower wherever possible the United States is fighting the Vietcong with massive firepower—on the ground and from the air. For example:

U.S. forces are using up small arms ammunition at an annual rate of 1 billion rounds, bombs at a rate of 1.8 million, and 2.75-inch rockets, fired mostly by helicopters, at the rate of 4.8 million.

Helicopter sorties are being flown at the rate of 125,000 a month—up from 60,000 in the middle of 1965 and 19,000 in 1964.

Tactical aircraft attacks in South Vietnam jumped to a monthly average of almost 13,000 last December, from 1,200 in 1964.

B-52 bombers have been dropping about 6,000 tons of bombs a month on enemy targets since last July.

This use of firepower has raised the cost of killing an enemy soldier to unprecedented heights. But it is saving American and South Vietnamese lives.

GETTING AROUND

Coupled with firepower, the other chief American advantage over the enemy is mobility. The United States has 1,600 helicopters in Vietnam, many armed with machine guns, rockets, and grenade launchers.

In the rice-rich Mekong Delta, you can see how this added mobility—as well as additional men—has changed the war in the last year. General Quang, who has been putting his IV Corps on the offensive for the past 2 months, says: "I have no more men now, four battalions per regiment. I have the choppers. Now I can lift a division from Vinh Binh to An Xuyen to trap a Vietcong force and still be sure that I can get back to defend Vinh Binh if it's attacked."

Since the battles of Pleime and the Iadrang Valley in November, the enemy has tended to avoid large-scale offensives. By contrast, United States and South Vietnamese troops have been moving with increasingly boldness into enemy strongholds never before attacked from the ground.

Yet the size of the Vietcong force continues to grow, and infiltration from the north has stepped up, North Vietnamese regulars have employed a 120-mm. mortar, indicating a buildup of heavier weapons.

I. GUERRILLA PLAN

The enemy still appears to be holding to phase 2 of the classical guerrilla-warfare scenario laid down by Chinese leader Mao Tse-tung: fighting in widely scattered areas in an attempt to force the opponent to divide up his forces and thus create a stalemate. Thus, at the old city of Hue in the north, a Vietcong company attacked on January 20 for the first time in 10 years. Eight houses were knocked out, two children killed, and eight civilians wounded. The number of Vietcong main force battalions in the Province has doubled since last September—and there's now a North Vietnamese regiment.

Meanwhile, the Communists are regaining the capability of testing for phase 3 operations—a general offensive. In Saigon, there's some expectation enemy forces might concentrate their forces in an attempt to overrun a major city near the 17th parallel, or try again to cut the country in two and then sue for peace in hopes of moving their frontier one jump closer to the coveted delta region and Saigon.

The odds lengthen

But successful guerrilla forces of the past never had to cope with the firepower, mobility, and mechanical killing power made possible by modern technology introduced by the United States.

Air power—once ridiculed as unsuited to guerrilla-type warfare—has had a major impact on the war. A cardinal tenet of guerrillas is not to fight at unfavorable odds; air power stacks the odds against them. It also increases the difficulty for guerrilla units, which hide out in dispersed groups, to concentrate for a major attack.

From all indications the B-52 raids, which rain enormous tonnages of bombs down in pattern strikes on jungle redoubts day and night, deprive guerrillas of sanctuary and have severely damaged their morale. Each B-52 carries more than 50 750-pound bombs.

II. TESTING GROUND

In terms of weaponry, Vietnam is putting to test a broad range of jet-age equipment never before used in a shooting war—but not all of it is working as well as hoped. Defoliating agents are being used to kill vegetation and expose jungle trails, and to destroy rice crops in enemy territory. But they have been found to have only limited capability against the double-canopied jungle growth common in Vietnam.

A number of supersonic jets—including the McDonnell F-4, the Grumman A-6, and the Douglas A-4—are getting their first workouts under fire. American planes have come up against Russian-built surface-to-air missiles in North Vietnam and only 11 have been knocked down since the air strikes began a year ago. U.S. pilots have found they can avoid them by flying in low to escape radar detection.

Out of mothballs

At the same time, the war has shown that conventional antiaircraft fire can be effective against high-speed jets, particularly if the guns are radar directed. U.S. jets carry little armor plating and are so crammed with electronic gear that even a partial hit can be severely damaging. The U.S. has lost 275 tactical planes to conventional enemy ground fire—a low rate considering the large number of sorties.

But the impact has been great enough to cause the U.S. Army, which had ditched the antiaircraft gun in favor of air defense missiles, to decide to bring guns back. It is breaking out old 40-mm. guns from stockpiles and converting the General Electric 20-mm. Vulcan rotating barrel gun used on attack planes to an antiaircraft role.

Helicopter losses have been phenomenally low—one for every 13,000 flights. But of the 177 choppers lost last year only 76 were from hostile action, indicating a high rate of accidents and mechanical failures. And the low loss to enemy action must be weighed against the fact that the enemy has no air power to challenge the helicopter fleet.

New and old

Heavy jungle cover also has lessened the impact of napalm and explosive bombs in killing enemy troops. Now the Air Force is shifting to the "Hays Bomblet," which does not arm itself until after it penetrates upper levels of jungle growth and then spreads shrapnel.

In some cases, the military has turned the clock backward to get effective weapons. A fleet of C-47s, some of the oldest planes still flying, has been armed with machine guns that spew out 7.62-millimeter rounds at the rate of 18,000 a minute to provide an aerial firing platform that can remain airborne far longer than any fighter to support ground troops.

The Navy, suddenly faced with the necessity of fighting on rivers and in swampy areas, is buying and arming small plastic boats originally designed for pleasure use. It is considering purchasing air boats similar to those used in the Florida Everglades.

Winners and losers

Two developments have proved highly successful in Vietnam. They are helicopter-borne grenade launchers that can hurl 200 fragmentation grenades a minute at the enemy, and interlocking aluminum blocks that can be laid quickly to provide an "instant airfield" capable of accommodating jet attack planes.

But there have been some other disappointments. The Bullpup air-to-ground missile has not been as effective as hoped in blasting bridges in North Vietnam, although the B model now in use is an improvement.

Backed by great firepower, U.S. military officials believe the strategy they have devised eventually will cause the Vietcong and North Vietnam to give up the flight. Administration officials proclaim "the tide has turned in our favor," and statistics—kill ratios, offensive actions initiated, enemy defections, and other—back their claims.

The Face of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the ambiguities and confusing aspects of the war in Vietnam have made it difficult for the American people to form sound judgments as to the U.S. goals and policies in southeast Asia. The confusion which accompanies the war has been lessened to some extent, however, by the high degree of reporting, of sometimes unpleasant facts, by the U.S. broadcast media, as well as the print media.

The following remarks published in the March 1966, edition of the Quill, published by the professional journalistic society, Sigma Delta Chi, and written by Columbia Broadcasting System President Frank Stanton, outline the role that the broadcast media is playing in Vietnam and some of the difficulties it faces.

THE FACE OF WAR

(By Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.)

(NOTE.—Abridged from remarks made by the CBS president at a meeting in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City, Jan. 28, 1966.)

The past four decades have seen broadcast journalism grow in competence and thoroughness until today the majority of Americans look first to radio and television for their information. Those same four decades have seen the Nation's bleakest depression, the world's most devastating war, and mankind's most dramatic scientific progress.

All these put a tough challenge, first to radio and then to television, to report and interpret them accurately, vividly, and in such a way that the American people were significantly aided in carrying out effectively their decisionmaking duties as citizens. As dramatic a part of history now as the events themselves are the role that radio played in the political life of the thirties, the sobering and yet reassuring effect of Ed Murrow's "This Is London" during the darkest days of World War II, and the soaring sight on 50 million television sets of our first manshoots in 1962.

But the responsibility of broadcasting in gathering and reporting the news has never been more pressing and more difficult than it is now. The overriding fact of our national life today is the war in Vietnam. It is our duty in broadcasting to bring the face of this war—the human face on the battlefield and the issues behind it—to all the people so that they can witness it and understand it. This is turning out to be a rough job, full of perplexing and persistent problems. The forthright reporting of unpleasant facts has inspired adverse reactions both from the public and from Washington. Unjust and senseless charges of unpatriotic conduct have been made against correspondents for doing their jobs under the most difficult conditions imaginable.

I am not talking here about censorship or matters involving military security. I am not talking even about "managed news." I am talking about facts and issues that our people have to know in order to carry out their decisionmaking responsibilities as citizens.

Much of this ambiguity about the proper role of reporting in this war is due, without doubt, to the frustrating character of the Vietnamese war. Vietnam is like no other war in our history and against an enemy like no other we have fought. Progress toward a resolution is sporadic and defies measurement in terms easily determined or simply reported or readily understood.

Besides its baffling intrinsic nature, the Vietnam war has also been a baffling one for our newsmen, our reporters, and our cameramen. Operating on their own in a war of no fixed positions, they have had to use ingenuity, persistence, and sheer guts to bring the harsh reality of this agonizing war home to us here in the United States. They have to provide for themselves and work in isolation from their colleagues. For their pains—and I use the word literally—they have been attacked more often than they have been praised.

There is an ancient proverb about the low regard in which the bearer of ill-tidings is held. "None love the messenger who brings bads news," wrote Sophocles. Unhappily, much of the news in any war is bad news, and this one is far from an exception. As a result, the men who risk their lives to get the sounds and sights of the embattled, and the men who stay up all night to get the material ready for the air, are treated in many cases as if they invented the events and conditions they are reporting.

There are those, too, including some in our Government, who would like only the good news reported. Threats of reprisal, of making a difficult job all but impossible, have not been unknown. But failures and mistakes are an essential part of the story. If they are to be avoided or corrected, it will not be by hiding them but only by bringing them fully out into the open where the people have a chance to examine them and then to make their opinion felt. For as Sophocles also wrote, "Truth is always the strongest argument."

On the other hand, in the absence of formal censorship, we scrupulously follow the three general principles put to the news media by the Pentagon for voluntary adoption: We will report casualty statistics on a daily basis only in general terms, we will report troop movements only when the enemy already know them, and we will refrain from giving the names and numbers of specific units engaged in individual battles. We also do everything we can to avoid revealing the identities of individual casualties before next of kin have been notified. All these are sensible restrictions with the sole purpose of limiting information reaching the enemy. But in other respects—in common with all conscientious journalists—we are not subscribing to any theory of news by handout, telling the American people only what somebody arbitrarily decides that they should know and concealing the rest.

The policy does not make for unanimous popularity, although we are convinced that in the long run it is the only sound one.

And not all our letters are fan letters. We receive some very vigorous letters protesting that we are bringing the horrors of war too vividly into American homes, that we are reporting facts too unpleasant for the public to know, that we are showing too much of the fighting, that we are not showing enough of the fighting and too much of the draft-card burning, that we are propagandists for the war, and that we are propagandists against it.

Much of this, I suppose, is understandable. The human face of war is never pleasant to look upon, and its stark reality is far more jolting in the quiet living room on Elm Street than it is on the battleground. But the fact of the matter is that Elm Street is no less involved in this conflict because of its distance from the combat area and because fighting is delegated to a comparative few of the young. Decisions made in Washington and culminating on a steaming, tortured peninsula 10,000 miles away begin in the living room and end there. To ignore this is to deny our birthright and our responsibility as a free people.

It seems to me highly fortunate that this, the most difficult of all wars to report and understand, is the first war also which we have been able to report with the immediacy, the speed, and the thoroughness of modern-day electronic journalism. The reality of the Civil War was brought home forcefully to the people by the searching and ubiquitous eye of Brady's camera, but his pictures were not seen by most people for months and even years after the events pictured. The choppy films of World War I were mute and fragmented and seen only in brief unrelated sequences in the nickelodeons of the time. Even the intrepid microphone and the dogged motion picture camera of World War II for the most part kept sound and sight apart.

It seems to me that there is no more important responsibility of broadcasting today than to report those events fully, accurately, and forthrightly, and to analyze their meaning candidly and decisively.

Work Right Held Basic as Vote Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1966, in Phoenix, the Arizona Republic published an article on section 14(b) of our National Labor Relations Act, the Taft-Hartley Act. The discussion of this controversial subject was written by Mr. William D. Pardridge, an economist. I consider the article to be worthy of being read by my colleagues. The article follows:

WORK RIGHT HELD BASIC AS VOTE RIGHT—SECTION 14(b) DISCUSSED IN ECONOMIC INEQUITIES SERIES

(By William D. Pardridge)

It is a natural right to worship, it is a natural right to vote, and it is a natural right to work—eat, that is.

The assertion of the right to life in the American Declaration of Independence is an important milestone in the long historical development of these three natural rights of mankind.

Economic inequities sometimes are confused with political inequities.

A case in point is Section 14(b) of the old Taft-Hartley Act and of our present National Labor Relations Act. This Federal law legalizes the right of industry to sign labor contracts permitting the hiring of nonunion workers in those States that expressly allow it.

God without an entrance fee or particular street address, the vote without a payment, and a job without a continuing commission fee are the basic natural rights of all men.

Now, it follows that retention of the poll tax is a twin sister to repeal of the States' right-to-work laws. The one charges a fee to vote, and the other charges a fee to work.

Think it over.

Congress is churning to repeal section 14(b) so that big labor may charge a fee of anybody who wants to work for a living. The reason for wanting this, of course, is a mixture of political power and institutional ego.

Nineteen States have these right-to-work laws that make it unlawful to charge a labor poll tax against industry's will as a fee to get a worker off the dole.

What manner of man says you can vote for free but cannot work for free? What kind of person can wave the flag but not the pork chop? A crafty politician can walk this tightrope, and a greedy labor leader can scheme for more and more organized power.

The national union shop or the closed shop is political ownership of an economic activity—man's own labor.

Big labor and big business are steadily bumbling their ways into the functional economy or corporate economic state.

Utopian declarations of big government are followed by expedient measures, and both are followed by inflation. And the functional economy can and will pick up the pieces.

The corporate state cannot operate without national labor unification of all industrial workers. One tragedy of the American labor movement is that it does not see that repeal of 14(b) is another step toward the gallows for free enterprise business and for right-to-strike labor.

There's one for you; how about a law abolishing the right to strike? If one makes sense, so does the other. Even the simple thought of this logical parallelism makes big labor livid with anger.

Apologists point to the Union Starch & Refining court decision where one problem is avoided by dues payment without union participation. They overlook the fact that this is still a labor poll tax without a formal union label.

These dilettantes say the Union Starch solution preserves the individual's freedom of organizational likes and dislikes. But the economic worker is still forced to help finance a political action movement.

And we all know big labor is big politics.

The Starch argument confuses the real issue, which is that an industrial worker in the free market has to pay a fee to a private agency in order to earn a living.

There can be no closed doors in an open economy, but there must be closed doors in a functional economy. Does big labor see this far into the boomerang consequences of its own power ambitions? No, it doesn't.

The much harsher question is: Does either business or labor see the differences between initial Government expediencies and subsequent Government policies? Again, no.

It is today politically expedient for Government to placate labor by repealing section 14(b), thus making the union or closed shop the law of the entire land.

This clearly amounts to enacting a national labor tax, just as much a tax as the poll tax.

At the same time, it is politically expedient for Government to placate civil rights minorities by abolishing some States' voting poll tax.

A real national policy would support or reject both the voting and working fees by leaving both up to the various States or prohibiting both to all States.

Compulsory union membership with or out the enforced payment of dues is in flat opposition to American individual freedom.

And national enforcement of big labor's agency fees with or without union membership is no different than a poll tax to vote in a free election.

Artificial mapping of the movement of labor and goods, wages and prices—or votes—constricts the natural expansion of any healthy economy or, remember, any democracy.

Thomas M. Mulry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, March 10 marks the 50th anniversary of the death of Thomas M. Mulry, and I think it appropriate that recognition be made of this anniversary since Mr. Mulry was one of the outstanding citizens of our country.

Born in New York City of a mother whose forebears went back to the earliest colonial days and a father who had come from Ireland as a boy, Thomas Mulry grew to eminence in his chosen field of business—banking, but he also became one of the foremost figures in the field of American charity—and this at a time when government had not assumed the all-encompassing position in support and guidance which it fills today.

Although he rose to the position of president of the Emigrant Savings Bank—one of the great savings institutions of New York City, Mr. Mulry's lasting devotion was to organizations serving the poor and afflicted. Much of his effort was devoted to the fostering and nurturing of Catholic charitable units and so great was his contribution that he was described by one eminent authority as "generally acknowledged to have been the greatest single person in the history of American Catholic charities."

He worked all his life for the Society of St. Vincent de Paul and in his later years served as president of its superior council.

So great was the knowledge of his tireless and energetic labors that President Theodore Roosevelt appointed him in 1909 as Vice Chairman of the White House Conference on Children which he did much to stimulate and which continues its work to this day.

It was his work in sponsoring and effecting increased cooperation between charitable organizations that was Mr. Mulry's most valuable contribution to the social development of our country and in these ecumenical times his pioneering efforts take on new significance.

In the 1880's when he began his work, private charities were either entirely Protestant or militantly Catholic. Proselytizing was carried on without any great subtlety. The idea of cooperation was unconsidered. In the face of this unpromising situation Mr. Mulry began his efforts to poin the activities of groups of different faiths since he realized that a continuation of antagonistic efforts would injure the cause of each group and hurt the objects of their bounty.

He began with his affiliation with the Charity Organization Society—a purportedly nonsectarian group which sought to coordinate the charitable activities of the community. Because of their suspicion of the proselytizing activities in the past, Mr. Mulry was allowed by church authorities to affiliate as an individual, but not to commit the Society of St. Vincent de Paul which he headed.

Convinced that objectionable non-Catholic activities of existing organizations were due to ignorance as much as to bigotry, Mr. Mulry next sought a national platform to proclaim his convictions and he spoke in 1884 on this theme to the National Conference of Charities and Correction with encouraging results.

Thereafter he consistently advocated participation and cooperation with other social welfare organizations where the object was the assistance of fellow citizens regardless of nationality or creed. His efforts aroused the opposition of die-hards, but their complaint to Archbishop Corrigan resulted in a ringing support of Mr. Mulry's efforts by that prelate.

With a continuation of his activities on a national as well as a local level, the religious antipathies that had been prevalent gradually gave way to a cooperation that grew and spread and created a feeling of mutual esteem and resulted in the greater service of the community.

Mr. Mulry summed up his conclusions in later years by saying:

> I feel, therefore, strongly in favor of close cooperation without any surrender of our principles. But I am convinced that the great majority of those outside of the field of Catholic relief work are fair minded. I have found even in relatively large meetings that there are very few bigots and that the great majority are in favor of fair play. Hence, I believe frankly in cooperation without any surrender of principle.

Mr. Mulry served on State and local committees concerned with social problems. He was a Knight of St. Gregory and the winner of the noted Laetare Medal of Notre Dame University. He and the former Miss Mary E. Gallagher were the parents of 13 children. His sons, Rt. Rev. Vincent de Paul Mulry of Rosendale, N.Y., and James A. Mulry, of New York City, and his daughter Miss Mary Mulry, also of New York City, survive.

In 1920, New York City dedicated a square at Greenwich Avenue and Perry Street, Mulry Square, in his honor.

In a time when private charity had the main responsibility in social life, Thomas M. Mulry made a vital national contribution whose results have survived to this time. In a time of passion and suspicion, he introduced a note of reason and cooperation that anticipated today's interfaith.

On this 50th anniversary of his death Americans should know of the work of this great American.

International Cooperation: Why?—How?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of my young constituents, Miss Cordelia Dobyns, of 4171 West Fourth Street, Los Angeles, has just been declared the winner of an essay contest on the subject of "International Cooperation: Why?—How?" sponsored by another of my constituents, the Wilshire Bar Association, comprised of lawyers in our 30th Congressional District.

This essay contest was held in response to President Johnson's appeal following the recent International Cooperation Year White House Conference on World Peace Through Law. The President called on bar associations across the country, as well as other voluntary organizations to join in promoting the cause of international cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to include Miss Dobyns' prize-winning essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, not only because of its most significant and thought-provoking content, but also in the hope that its publication will in this way reach many others, to show them what is being done in one congressional district to further international cooperation, and to encourage them in organizing similar activities in their own areas.

I believe the Wilshire Bar Association has provided outstanding leadership in making the goal of world peace through law a major project of its participation in International Cooperation Year.

In addition, this progressive legal group has continued its highly successful program of extending its hospitality to foreign dignitaries visiting in Los Angeles under the auspices of the U.S. State Department.

As a further commendation to the Wilshire Bar Association for its exemplary leadership, and as a sign of my own personal congratulations to Miss Dobyns on her prize-winning essay, I would like to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the text of the essay, "International Cooperation: Why?—How?"

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION: WHY?—HOW?

(By Cordelia Dobyns)

An answer to the why and how of international cooperation can be found in the dictionary.

The dictionary defines "international" as "common to or affecting two or more nations." "Cooperation" is defined as "acting jointly with another or others."

The most common objective affecting all nations today is indubitably the universal quest for international peace and order. It, therefore, follows that acting jointly with others, in pursuance of the common goal affecting nations, is essential to peaceful relations between men and states. One universally shared interest is indeed survival.

It is precisely this common ground which makes for the reality of international cooperation. It embraces thinking and acting globally, igniting ideas on an international basis, spotlighting common ideals and minimizing differences.

This common ground translates itself into a commitment which all governments and all people can make to the maintenance of peace and order, and toward the development of mankind's most practical hope for peace, world peace through law.

It illustrates the famous definition of St. Thomas Aquinas, that the law is "an ordinance of reason for the common good."

Certainly, there is no good reason why world peace through law should not, and cannot, be achieved. This century has been characterized as the era of internationalism.

World law can result only from international cooperation and agreement by nations. Individual cooperation will help make possible a breakthrough in the growth and development of world law, parallel to those in science.

Thus, order can prevail over chaos, through international cooperation.

Steve Vacendak, MVP, Leads Duke to Crown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of the Members of Congress would agree that there is something most unusual for a Congressman from the city of Scranton to address this body on a subject so removed as a basketball player from Duke University in Durham, N.C. I believe you will agree with me, though, that it is proper when I point with pride to a young man on that basketball team who is from my own congressional district. As a matter of fact, he is from my own backyard, and graduated from Scranton Preparatory School, which is my own alma mater.

Steve Vacendak is the captain of Duke this year. In the recent tournament to select the team to represent the Atlantic Coast Conference in the NCAA championship playoffs, Steve was the outstanding leader of his team in the two crucial games that placed Duke in the NCAA tournament. He was voted the most valuable player in the Atlantic Coast Conference playoffs.

But more than his excellence as a basketball player is at issue here. He is from one of the finest families in the city of Scranton. His parents are a credit to the community, and they have raised a son who is now a matter of great pride to all of us. He is more than a basketball leader. He is a fine gentleman, an educated young man, and I know his future will be as bright as his past. It is a privilege for me to pay my own personal tribute to Steve Vacendak, a fine athlete, a fine student, a distinguished young man of character, and a true gentleman.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will insert here in the RECORD the story from the Scrantonian of last Sunday, March 6, 1966:

STEVE VACENDAK, MVP, LEADS DUKE TO CROWN

RALEIGH.—Duke, the all-season Atlantic Coast Conference champion, also won the postseason tournament honors Saturday night with a 71 to 66 conquest of North Carolina State and the man who made it possible, Capt. Steve Vacendak, was a unanimous choice of the eight coaches as the most valuable player in the 3-day affair. Vacendak donated 18 points to the cause, tops for Duke as he again costarred with Sophomore Mike Lewis.

The MVP concession to Vacendak, who brought the Blue Devils back from two huge deficits, was a beautiful consolation prize for the tireless senior from Scranton, Pa., who had been bypassed by all-star selectors in both the ACA and for other honors.

The slight to Vacendak has been a headline story in the Carolina newspapers and his spectacular effort vindicated those who criticized the Duke leader's mistreatment.

Just as Vacendak ignored the apparent favoritism for others, so was his sportsmanship paramount after his MVP award. At his insistence two of Vacendak's fellow seniors were invited to midcourt to share in his glory. One was Jack Marin, Duke's all-American candidate.

The triumph, which moved Duke into the NCAA eastern playoffs with Syracuse here and against the winner of Monday's Providence-St. Joseph's game, was hard earned due to a cold start which found Vic Bubas' pupils trailing 6 to 0 in the earliest minutes.

The Devils were slow coming back, and 2 of Vacendak's 8 baskets in 16 shots restored them to contention. These came with the Wolfpack still ahead by 6, and were registered within 42 seconds, to reduce NCS's edge at the half to 28 to 26.

North Carolina boosted it to 9 again when Vacendak coupled with Lewis to turn the tide. They accounted for 8 between them in less than 3 minutes, and Vacendak furnished 6. Far-ranging set shots were Vacendak's big weapon while Lewis assisted his cucumber-cool captain with a tip-in under a crowded backcourt.

The feat inspired the total comeback by Duke which had Sophomore Bob Verga in foul trouble and desperately needed an encouraging performance such as came from Captain Steve. The usually free scorers, Verga and Marin had been held to 4 each in the first half as Lewis who had 8 and finished with 10, matched Vacendak's output up to this stage.

The fantastic performance rocked the arena and apparently settled any doubt among the coaches regarding Vacendak's value. Especially atop Friday night's low-scoring contest with North Carolina U where his six points were high for Duke. The Devils avenged one of their three regular season losses by eliminating Wake Forest in the opener of the tourney.

Even happier than Bubas by Vacendak's choice was Clemson Coach Bobby Roberts who had chastened those responsible for bypassing Vacendak in the all-star balloting. Roberts had attracted headlines by asking "How in the world could anybody pick an all-conference team and leave off Steve Vacendak? As far as I'm concerned he's the best boy in the league. He's the heart and soul of the Duke team."

Saturday everyone agreed with Roberts.

However, had State won, the MVP prize would probably have gone to Eddie Biedenbach its star ball hawk who alone outscored Vacendak with 22.

Elmer Winter Describes the Total Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an article by one of the Nation's leading business executives, Mr. Elmer Winter of Manpower, Inc., appeared in the Advanced Management Journal's special issue on small business management. Because I believe that Mr. Winter's thoughtful analysis of the qualities needed by today's business executive will be of interest to my colleagues, I include the article herewith:

TOWARD THE TOTAL EXECUTIVE

(By Elmer L. Winter)

In the most recent two decades, great emphasis has been placed on developing management as a profession—one with its own distinct philosophy and technology. While this concept has not thoroughly taken hold, it has had a profound effect on upgrading the role that the manager is expected to assume in the operation of a business.

As we approach the second half of the sixties, it is my opinion that the ideal of professional management can come closer to realization only if we stretch the capacity of the manager's mind to its outer limits in nearly all directions. Applying the pressure of a probing mind, each manager must become his own "developer." While the growth toward the ultimate of a "total executive" will differ with each particular situation—the type of company, the size of the community, position in a company, and so forth, the executive of tomorrow will essentially require an omni-directional growth. Let us first take one important direction:

The total executive must recognize that we are in an all-out battle to protect not only our existing markets abroad, but we must have the vision, the energy, and the drive to open up new markets throughout the world. We must adjust our sights and look through broader-rimmed spectacles as we face the increasing competition from abroad.

One vital attribute of the total executive, whether he goes abroad or not, must be a thorough grounding in the world situation, an almost explosive stretching of his economic and political horizons of understanding. One reason for the low ratio of America's export volume to its gross national product (4 percent—the lowest of any industrialized nation) is the preoccupation of American businessmen with their own domestic market and lack of knowledge of, or interest in, the vast, rising markets of the rest of the world. If this situation continues, we will find, to our sorrow, that our economic isolation will be complete.

Today, we find that the underdeveloped world alone represents a market of 1.9 billion people. Instead of waiting for their incomes to rise, some astute businessmen are developing low-cost products that fit the pocketbooks of emerging nations. Today, the businessman is—with respect to the satisfying of potential world markets—just about where Henry Ford was when the domestic American mass market lay wide open before the business community of the Nation.

As recently as 8 years ago, the author was as provincial in his thinking as any American businessman could be, but a determined effort to expand our company's operations outside the United States brought an exposure to opportunities that are profitable and endless. As a result, our foreign expansion has continued and now extends to five continents. Seemingly impossible problems of local know-how, financing, and nationalistic sentiment were surmounted in most areas through the franchising method.

Once international operations have gotten underway, it becomes a compelling drive, and, in the process the manager himself finds that his horizons have become global, and he becomes sensitized to everything going on around the world, weighing how it affects his business—and every other business.

This brings us to the second dimension in which the total executive of tomorrow must grow—in the direction of becoming increasingly sensitized to all kinds of people and what they want.

While international mindedness requires a macrocosmic expansion of one's interests out beyond one's normal physical confines, the sensitizing process requires an "inner expansion," a growing awareness of the large microcosm one discovers when he first begins to explore the inner space of men's minds and feelings.

It is in this area that much professional management training has been lacking. There is no substitute for empathy as a prime requisite of the total executive. In the vernacular, it might be said that he needs "miles and miles of heart," which, far from having a softening effect on his strength as a profit-minded manager can make him more sensitive than ever to those factors that motivate men to turn out more and better work, to create the kind of advertising appeals that sell products, and to design the kind of products people will want and will use with satisfaction.

The need for empathy is boundless, and the task of developing it in one's self is a constant challenge, requiring a continuous process of projection; that is, a constant effort to step into other people's shoes. One improves with practice. In so doing, however, he must not lose his own shoes, but must be able to step back into them before making his final decisions.

In short, the total executive will be one who is tremendously sensitive to the hidden thoughts and desires of those around him, and also with insight into his own true motivations. Thus equipped, he will be better prepared to retain and strengthen his leadership.

There is yet a third direction in which the executive needs to grow if he is to understand and manage the constant and restless change that characterizes our world today: He should keep a sharp ear tuned to messages coming to him from below.

Many a top manager or president becomes a prisoner of his own "palace guard," who tell him only what they themselves know or understand and who try to do all his detail work for him so as to make themselves very useful (and indispensable) to him.

Actually, he will never know the true state of affairs unless he leaves his office and finds reasons for mingling with people of all levels throughout the establishment, and not necessarily in the presence of his own vice presidents or general managers. This is not to cast aspersions on vice presidents or general managers. They are indispensable; but so is direct information gathering by the top corporate decisionmaker.

The healthiest thing for any organization, VP's included, is for the president to see for himself what is going on in every department of the enterprise. Only then does he gain a true "feel" for the problems at every level. For example, he may think that quality control is something he can leave to the discretion of a manager three levels below his, a man who reports to his factory manager. Upon walking into the plant and seeing what quality control contributes to the make-or-break of company profit, what it does to back up the warranty on the company's products, how incomplete it is unless it also gets into vendor certification, he may decide that it requires an independent status, reporting to a vice president. This is not intended as a plea for the elevation of any particular discipline to a higher status, but rather a caution as to the need for direct communication between top management and a representative sampling of company personnel from all departments and all levels.

Direct communication is a prime requisite of the "total executive." He cannot sit atop a pyramid like a pharoah of old and utter orders to be carried out through the chain of command. His role is more that of a nerve center, which must receive impulses from the farthest finger as well as from the nearest neuron of the brain.

A fourth characteristic of the total executive must be a strange sort of quality I choose to call restlessness. This is not the same as dissatisfaction, but it is at least a quality akin to unsatisfaction—the opposite of smugness. Restlessness implies the opposite of rest, and it is rest that is to be avoided, except for very brief periods of stocktaking, since it is the enemy of momentum—and enterprises are built and their growth sustained by momentum.

Lose this momentum and we have lost precious past hours all designed to accelerate progress toward our goals. But how can top management maintain a restless forward-moving attitude without seeming to exploit or whiplash the people on whom it depends to get the work done? The only way is to (1) be the type of person one seeks to develop, (2) inspire others with a confidence-building approach to all problems, and (3) actually be able to teach others how to do things in their own spheres of competence. Sound impossible? Not at all. Time and again, one sees sensitive managers talk with men below them who have greater skill competence and point out to them areas in which they have not performed fully.

Top management cannot set arbitrary goals and then force support-management to meet these goals without a certain amount of "show-how." The way to do it is to realize that anyone with reasonable intelligence can come in fresh from the outside and find something that those in the field have not done, because they are too close to the forest to see the trees. One does not find the failures by looking, but by asking questions, until finally it is often the man himself who realizes what he has overlooked or done wrong.

The total executive is above all an asker of questions: Why do we keep on advertising in X magazine? Do the results justify the cost? What is our procedure for handling customer complaints? Why do we have to have a 1650 computer; wouldn't a 1080 do the job?

Do we have any way of knowing when this machine goes out of control? Why shouldn't we try to make a model for the lower priced market? Does anybody know the total monetary value of all our fringe benefits? Shouldn't we tell employees about this? And so on—all of these questions illustrating that restlessness, the constant forward movement that makes change work for us, rather than against us.

In rereading one company president's "Charge to the Light Brigade" at his managers' annual conference, it became apparent that not once, but 12 times, the phrase "I am not satisfied" was used to begin a paragraph. Here are some examples:

"I am not satisfied that we can continue to limit ourselves to the services that we are offering today.

"I am not satisfied that we are utilizing the full brain power of the people who work for us in the branch offices. They have a tremendous amount of experience that must be more readily made available.

"I am not satisfied that we are truly an international organization.

"I am not satisfied that each of us has a full awareness of the changes that are taking place in business today. We bandy around such terms as 'automation,' 'machines talking to machines,' and so forth, but what does this all mean to you? * * *"

There were more paragraphs beginning in this vein, all of them intended to stir the imagination and point management thinking in new directions.

What this means, in the long run, is that the total executive will soon wear himself out unless he is capable of making total executives out of those he manages, as well. One man cannot gallop on toward limitless horizons while others plod ahead with blinders on both sides of their eyes.

There is still only too prevalent the idea that the business executive should not spend too much time in planning. It is my contention that one of the methods to be employed in developing managers who have the "total" viewpoint is inculcating in them the idea of forward planning—for periods of at least 5 years. There will be strong resistance to this from those who think of themselves as doers, and who think that time spent in planning is at the expense of doing.

The reverse is true. Up to a point of diminishing returns, which we must learn to recognize, planning actually reduces the time necessary for doing by cutting down the long periods of trial and error. It also keeps executives from doing what so many of them do—getting "the little things out of the way before tackling the bigger things"—an occupational disease that keeps us from really ploughing into the most important problems. With a plan to work from we can hew to the line and avoid the distraction of smaller matters.

Planning for profit—the ultimate in planning—makes us focus our spotlight on the areas of least profitability, on developing much needed work measurements in the office, applying the profit yardstick to areas hitherto regarded as "overhead," and tempering sales quotas with the never-ending question: Can we afford to make this sale?

There is still, however, a fifth and very important aspect to the portrait of the total executive. With all his restlessness, his worldwide horizons, his human sensitivity, and his direct contact, he himself needs a balance-wheel that takes him just as far from his business as it can. Yet, in the process of using this balance wheel, he will not only help himself but also his business and the total community.

I am referring to such seemingly remote activities as becoming a patron of the arts, or taking a leadership role in some vital community activity such as the achieving of full employment or enlisting new support for the drive for fair employment in the interests of minority groups.

We tend to think of these community activities as a sort of "noblesse oblige," or as a form of image building. Actually, a businessman's obligation to his community is just another aspect of his being a total executive. Through it, he develops a sensitivity to what is going on around him and what is being thought by others in his immediate community. This is of inestimable value in guiding his own business decisions. It is, in fact, part of the empathy proces.

In the process of working on committees to study the impact of automation, or to seek new solutions to the problems of unemployed youth or minorities, a business executive becomes a complete person who will be ready for social change long before it takes place. It will not be forced upon him.

Such an experience with other Milwaukee executives recently led to the formation of what may turn out to be a substantial contribution to the problem of unemployed youth—a nonprofit employment agency run by and for teenagers to help jobseeking young people obtain employment for the summer. We call it Youthpower, but it is entirely separate from our own company.

Becoming involved as a patron of the arts led to the formation of a program known as "From the Executive's Easel," a collection of paintings done by leading business and professional men, that has toured the world and has brought a new concept of American executives to the public, both here and abroad, as a total executive interested in the arts and the other finer things of life—not only in corporate profits.

No matter how far one casts such bread upon the waters, it cannot help but return; and even if it did not—even if it temporarily created new problems for his business, it would be well worth the while in helping the executive balance himself and his business by building a better community. As he patronizes the arts, for example, he knows that he is raising the cultural level of the people around him, and hence their ability to appreciate the contribution of business to their daily lives. Only the aggrieved or deprived provide grist for the mills of the extremists.

As he works for equal opportunity for minorities, he knows that he is building safety valves that will avert a destructive sociological explosion. In the process, however, he gets far away from his own immediate problems—and this is good. He acquires distant vision to supplement medium and close vision.

The total executive is one who has multiple vision. Mere trifocals are not enough. His vision must be infinitely flexible and able to handle problems at close or distant range. Without this he is lost in a world as full of change as we have today. Like the fast-moving motorist on an expressway, he must be geared not only to read his own gas gage and speedometer but also the moving fenders of neighboring automobiles, and the far away but fast coming up roadway signs. And in the midst of all this, he must learn to achieve a relaxation in motion that comes from a balanced concern for all elements in his total environment.

Job Corps Men: A Future Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the waste of human resources in the United States is probably our greatest tragedy. For today, we live in the age of specialization. There are no jobs for those without the know-how, and the skills needed by a space-age industry and economy.

Much of the ugliness and despair we see in the dark hopeless areas of our cities come from those a thriving society has passed by. But, we are a great nation. With a great compassion. Our President has challenged us to achieve the Great Society. Responding to this challenge, this Nation acts to help bring hope and opportunity where before there was only hopelessness and frustration.

Through the Job Corps under the war on poverty, we are attacking the social dynamite of our slums. The Job Corps is taking unwanted young people off the streets and putting them into an environment of hope and purpose. It is helping them to become equipped to take their place in society. The press has reported some of the growing pains connected with the Job Corps. I am pleased to see a growing number of stories dealing with the success side of the program. As time goes on, and antipoverty programs such as the Job Corps have a fair opportunity to prove their merit, I believe we will see an ever increasing number of such stories.

As a case in point, I commend an article entitled, "Job Corpsmen: A Future Now," which appeared in the January 2, 1966 edition of the Rochester, N.Y., Democrat and Chronicle to my colleagues. Under unanimous consent I place it in the RECORD:

JOB CORPS MEN: A FUTURE NOW—THEY'RE HOME FOR HOLIDAY

(By Earl Caldwell)

In the lobby at Montgomery Neighborhood Center yesterday, sprawled out on the plush chairs, the boyish-looking Negro youths were like college students wasting an afternoon of vacation time.

They wore bright-colored sweaters and white shirts and blazers and they had a lot to talk about.

But they never saw the inside of a college.

In fact, they seem amused at referring to themselves as a bunch of retired hoods, teenaged youths who don't even own high school diplomas.

It figured that they would be together. It's always been that way. It was like that when they called themselves the Ambassadors and later when they were known as the Undertakers.

That wasn't too long ago—about a year. Then, these same fellows made it in the streets—fighting and stealing, lying and running.

Yesterday, as they sat in the Montgomery Center, the past seemed pretty far behind because these youths have a future now.

They don't have to "make it in the streets" any more and they don't hang out in a gang. In fact, they now operate in places like San Marcos, Tex., and Battle Creek, Mich., and Los Pinos, Calif.

THEY'RE FINDING THEIR PLACE THROUGH THE JOB CORPS

In these faraway places these teenaged youths—most of whom were booted out of Rochester's public schools—are finding their place in life through the Job Corps.

Last week, for the first time, they came home.

There was Sam Scott, a slender, good-looking youth of 18, who never made it past the 11th grade at Madison High School. A year ago he was the big man with the Undertakers, the president.

Wesley Graham, a stocky 19-year-old wears black horn-rimmed glasses and is so good with his fists that he's been given the opportunity to fight in the Golden Gloves championships.

And Alcenius Harden, Tony Prescott and Mack Davis.

In a teenage gang there's one firm rule. You follow your leader.

Sam Scott led the Undertakers.

HEADED FOR THE CORPS BUT DIDN'T KNOW IT

So not too long after he was asked to leave school and got tired of the streets, he didn't know it but he was headed for the Job Corps.

The first step was when one of Montgomery Center's Outreach youth workers began to make contact with the Undertakers and brought the group in to Montgomery Center.

The clincher was when Sam met Mrs. Dorothy Capling, a senior employment interviewer with the State employment service, attached to Montgomery Center.

Mrs. Capling, realizing the problems of finding employment for unskilled youths, gave Sam the Job Corps pitch. Mack Davis picked up some information on the corps during a trip uptown. Mack went for the corps and talked Sam into the idea. The rest of the undertakers went along.

That was nearly a year ago.

Sam Scott waved goodbye to friends and relatives 5½ months ago and boarded a plane for California and the Los Pinos Urban Job Corps Camp.

California is a long way from 54 Reynolds Street, Sam's home, but the distance, he says, "doesn't bother me."

HE'S LEARNING TRADE, MAKING MONEY, TOO

At Los Pinos, he's learning to become a heavy equipment operator and at the same time he's earning some money. In 2 years he'll be ready for the world of work he'll have to face.

The Job Corps has presented no problems for Sam and he's happy he made the decision to go. He already has his high school equivalency diploma.

The only problem he's encountered out West is one all the corpsmen at Los Pinos faced. "When we get a leave to go into town," he explained. "They think we're prisoners or something."

That isn't bothering Sam. "You can bet," he says, "that I'll stay the full shot."

Wesley Graham, who lives at 20 Jefferson Terrace, is stationed at the Job Corps' Camp Aterbury in Edinburg, Ind.

He's learning to become an auto mechanic and figures to be at Aterbury about 2 years, the average stay in the corps.

Wesley, who was expelled from Madison High School in the ninth grade, is certain his decision to enroll in the Job Corps was a good one.

He likes the corps enough to remark, "I was ready to go back a few days after I got home." Wesley says he particularly likes the way the teachers in the camp handle the corpsmen.

"They talk to you," he explained, "the same way you talk to them and they let you work at your own speed."

The food offered in the Job Corps has, in the past, been criticized by some enrollees but it's okay with Wesley. "It's better," he says, "than some of these guys got at home."

Alcenius Harden, a husky 20-year-old with a smooth, dark complexion, left his home at 65 Prospect Street 6 months ago for Camp Gary, a Job Corps center in San Marcos, Tex.

HE GAVE UP SCHOOL AFTER THE 10TH GRADE

He became a school dropout after the 10th grade and the best job he could get before entering the corps was as a dishwasher at St. John's Home for the Aging.

At Camp Gary, Harden has completed a remarkable about face.

A year ago he was roaming the streets with the undertakers. Today, he's not only an enrollee in the corps and pursuing a career as an auto mechanic but he's becoming a leader.

Because of his good record at the camp, he's been chosen assistant dorm leader and that gets him an extra $23 a month. Harden's regular pay comes to $15 every 2 weeks but that's all he needs because room and board and clothing are all free.

Harden is a young northern Negro in a camp in Texas but he says there are no racial problems. However, he added that most of the corpsmen at San Marcos have problems off base—"with the Air Force guys," he explained.

TAKE IT FROM HARDEN: "JOB CORPS PRETTY STRAIGHT"

On the whole though, Harden says the Job Corps is "pretty straight."

Like most other Undertakers, Tony Prescott, a thin, talkative 18-year-old with a toothy smile didn't make it through high school.

He got the boot in the ninth grade.

Now, he's stationed at the Camp Custer Job Corps Center in Battle Creek, Mich., a good jump from his home at 792 Jefferson Avenue. Tony comes from a family of six and just before he enlisted in the Corps he decided to go back to school.

"They didn't want me," he said. "So I joined the Corps and it's nice * * * except for one thing."

What's that?

"Well," he explains, "when we got here they told us this would be our home away from home. You know, after awhile you get to be pretty good friends with the fellows you room with. But what do you think happened? One day they come around with something about racial imbalance and they make us split up. Well, that's not like home * * * that's not right."

BOY 16, CAN'T HIDE HIS DISAPPOINTMENT

Mack Davis, a muscular 16-year-old, sat in Montgomery Center, chatted and laughed with his buddies but he couldn't mask his disappointment.

He couldn't because he was the first of the Undertakers to go for the Job Corps. It was last March when he signed up with Mrs. Capling.

He's still in Rochester.

"They just haven't called me yet," he said. "I don't know what the problem is. Mrs. Capling doesn't either. But Mack does know one thing: "If they don't call me next month," he vowed, "I'm going to join the Marines."

The delay for Mack isn't unusual. A few days ago Mrs. Capling threw a little party for her Job Corps kids. Other youths interested in the Corps and some who have signed up also attended. Many of those who have enlisted and been accepted said they have been waiting to be assigned to a camp for as long as 6 and 8 months.

The Undertakers "used to be scufflers." But got themselves on the right track. Now, it's bugging a lot of people that Federal redtape is threatening to gum up something these youths feel is "pretty straight" and may prompt them to return to the street.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Unwanted Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two more examples of unwanted assistance from the National Government:

[From Berwyn (Ill.) Life, Jan. 14, 1966]

GOVERNMENT SAYS 518 SOUTH BERWYN PUPILS NEED HELP—PLAN SUMMER CENTERS OFFERING EDUCATIONAL, CULTURAL BETTERMENT

It may be news to a lot of people but there are 518 economically deprived children living in south Berwyn. And to alleviate this dismal situation the Federal Government through the State superintendent's office is giving the district $94,962.91 to provide greater educational opportunities for these economically deprived youngsters.

The total of 518 economically deprived children constitutes more than one-fifth of the total south Berwyn public school district population of 2,571.

During a meeting of the south Berwyn grade school district board of education Wednesday night, Robert Gentry, superintendent, said he had only early that day "received official confirmation of a total grant under title 1 of Public Law 89–10 in the amount of $94,962.91."

Gentry said the amount was determined by the office of the State superintendent of public instruction on the basis of the number of children from families in economic need.

Said Gentry: "I heard we were to get some money last week and I called the office of the superintendent of public instruction to find out how much we'd get. I wanted to know whether to figure on $2,000 or $25,000 and was amazed to learn that we were in for a windfall of almost $95,000.

"I've been staying up to 2 a.m. trying to figure how to spend it," the superintendent laughed.

Gentry said he called about six people in the Cook County Department of Public Welfare to find out where all these families were in south Berwyn who were either on relief or on aid to dependent children programs and was unable to turn up more than a few dozen children within the entire district including those in parochial and private schools.

"From the best information I can gather," he said, "the figure is arrived at on the basis of the 1960 census which contained the number of families here who have a yearly income of less than $2,000.

"Apparently the Government took this number and total number of children in the district to arrive at the figure."

At this point in the meeting numerous board members chortled about the retired old couples who own their own homes, have "40 pounds of money" stashed in the savings and loan and then report an income of less than $2,000 a year.

But regardless of how the amount was arrived at, the superintendent told the board he has devised a program to spend it.

It will be used, said Gentry, in the provision this summer of a 6-week program offered in three centers within the district. Each center is to be staffed by a social worker, a psychologist, and it may well call into use almost half the regular teaching staff to provide remedial programs in social studies, arithmetic, composition, and reading.

"We'll locate the centers in places convenient to where these 518 economically deprived children live * * * what we have to do now is find them."

"But what I want to know," said Board Member Warren Jahnke, "is how can we be sure we'll get all 518 children to attend the summer program. We'll have to hire these people before the start of the program and pay them and if the children don't show up * * * do we pay them anyway?"

"Why certainly," said William G. Jaros, "that's not our fault."

The board members all agreed that the summer program must be voluntary.

The summer program would, of course, be open to all children residing within the district regardless of whether they normally attend a public school, parochial school, or private institution.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 11, 1966]

UNWANTED ASSISTANCE

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

I am a member of a local suburban school board in Cook County that recently received a letter from the Cook County commissioner's office advising us that we had been awarded something over $5,000 under the poverty program to help in some manner or other "28 underprivileged children in your village."

Neither the superintendent nor any of the board members know who these children are or might be, nor were we so advised, nor were we told how the sum was arrived at. Suffice it to say that we will turn down the "assistance."

If we had the money, we would not know what to do with it, for we feel our curriculum is geared for all of our children.

E. A. HOBLER.

CHICAGO.

Resolution in Memory of Kenneth G. Whitaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the members and officers of the Kentucky Motor Transport Association, Inc. In memory of Kenneth G. Whitaker.

Kenneth Whitaker, who was a resident of Somerset, Ky., which is my home, died on January 14, 1966. As the resolution states, he was a pioneer in the Kentucky trucking industry and had built his own company from a one-truck business to one of the largest and most successful in the State of Kentucky.

During his life, although he was an outstanding businessman and devoted to the interests of his own enterprises, he took a leading part in all civic affairs. He served as president of the Somerset Chamber of Commerce, and as a director of the Somerset Industrial Board. He did not consider them as official positions only, but as positions affording opportunities to advance the economic, social, and industrial interests of his city and county. He was interested in every movement to uplift the educational, charitable, and cultural interests of his community, and gave freely of his time and means in support of them.

He was a very modest man, and although he had received one of the Nation's highest military awards as a member of the Air Force in World War II, he never talked of his own achievements and success.

The Kentucky Motor Transport Association has not only honored Kenneth Whitaker by this resolution of its members, it has also attested to the high qualities of its own membership. Kenneth Whitaker has left to his wife and children and friends the fine memorial of his life and achievements

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN MEMORY OF KENNETH G. WHITAKER

Whereas the Kentucky Motor Transport Association, Inc., by and through its board of directors, recognizes and mourns the loss of one of its outstanding members and officers, the late Kenneth G. Whitaker of Somerset, Ky., who diligently and faithfully served this association for many years, and whose untimely death on January 14, 1966, came as a great loss to his many friends and associates; and,

Whereas Kenneth G. Whitaker was a pioneer in the Kentucky trucking industry, as well as a guiding force in the progress of this association, having served as chairman of the board, president, a member of the board of directors, and at the time of his death, the American Trucking Association vice president; and,

Whereas Kenneth G. Whitaker, in addition to his efforts for the advancement of the trucking industry, was a leader in his community, having served as president of the Somerset, Ky., Chamber of Commerce, and a director of the Somerset Industrial Board; and,

Whereas Kenneth G. Whitaker faithfully and honorably served his country in World War II, having received one of the Nation's highest military awards, the Distinguished Flying Cross: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the board of directors of the Kentucky Motor Transport Association, Inc., That this resolution in memory of Kenneth G. Whitaker and his faithful service to this association be spread upon the minute book of this association, and that the president is hereby directed to present this resolution on behalf of the association to his bereaved widow and children.

Given under our hand this the 26th day of January, 1966, at Louisville, Ky.

G. Edgar Straeffer, *President*.

Attest:

C. C. Dance, Jr., *Secretary*.

Shamrock, Tex., Marks St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each year on St. Patrick's Day the city of Shamrock, Tex., in the eastern Texas Panhandle, marks the celebrated holiday with a parade and other events attracting thousands of visitors. The Shamrock celebration of St. Patrick's Day is not quite as large as that held in such cities as New York, but it is certainly as spirited. There is no finer hospitality to be found anywhere.

I took note of the Shamrock celebration in my newsletter going to constituents this week, and I wanted to share it with you and our colleagues and other Americans for whom there is something very special about St. Patrick's Day:

An Emerald Isle in the United States

Just below the last escarpment of the Rocky Mountains in the great Panhandle Plains country of Texas, lies an Emerald Isle. Its name is Shamrock (Texas, that is). Every year on March 17 there is a tremendous gathering of the clan (spelled, of course, with a "c")—the O'Tolles, the O'Shaughnessys, the O'Worleys, the O'Blonsteins, the O'Pavlovskys, the O'Garmans, the O'Pakans, the O'Macinas, the O'Torgersons, the O'Lewises, the O'Lummuses, the O'Adkins, the O'Joneses, the O'Zeiglers, the O'Weldons, the O'LeBlancs, the O'Rogerses, the O'Ryans, and the O'Kellys, just to name a few of the most Irish-sounding names. It makes no difference whether you are Jew or Gentile, Mohammedan or Christian, green, pink, black, or white, on March 17 in Shamrock, Tex., you're Irish, and you'd better believe it.

Anything might happen and usually does, but whatever it is, the color of it will be green, whether it be a horse and rider in the parade or the stew at the local cafe. On this day, the crowds that gather at Shamrock will do most anything within the law short of blowing up Lord Nelson's monument, and they might even do this if they had one. The wit and charm which permeate the air would equal what one would hear in any celebration in the old country, and there are plenty of snappy comebacks—like the one where the waitress was asked by a customer if the glass of milk was fresh. She replied, "If it was any fresher, it'd be grass."

And there are plenty of Irish jokes, like the one about the Irishman who walked into the bar one morning with a bulge in his pocket. The bartender said, "MacGillicuddy, what is it you have in your pocket?" MacGillicuddy replied, "A stick of dynamite." "And what," said the bartender, "are you going to do with it?" To which MacGillicuddy replied, "Every day when O'Houlihan sees me he belts me in the side and breaks me pipe. Today, I'm telling you, he's goin' to blow his hand off."

Or the one about the widow whose husband had fallen into the river and drowned. The insurance company gave her a fortune of 10,000 pounds. A friend, consoling the widow, said, "Poor Paddy, he was a fine man, even though he never did learn how to read nor to write." The widow interrupted her weeping to reply, "Nor how to swim, thanks be to God."

And then there's the one about the Irish nobleman who was suspected of being in the IRA. The British regiment invaded his castle and literally ransacked it looking for him or some evidence. As the soldiers were leaving emptyhanded, the Irish butler said to them, "Whom shall I say called?"

And then there's the one about the will contest. The contestants claimed that the deceased's signature had been forged. The opposing counsel said that the testament was signed while the deceased was on his death bed and "while he still had life in him." To which the contestants' counsel replied, "Yes, he had a fly in his mouth."

And, of course, the one about the errant Irishman whose life had not been entirely sinless, who was about to depart this life and was being given the last rites by the Father, who said, "And, Pat, do you renounce the Devil and all his works?" To which Pat replied, "Father, the shape I'm in, I'm in no position to offend anyone."

It is a well-known fact that the Irish can do more with words than a crooked confidence man with three walnut shells and a dried pea. It is said that the average European has a vocabulary of approximately 500 words, while the Irish employ at least 5,000 in their everyday conversation. It isn't always the words but the way they put them together and the meaning that comes out. An example of this is my favorite Irish toast, "May you be in heaven one hour before the Devil knows you're dead."

So, if you want a real taste of Ireland, you can get it without resorting to the method suggested by the Irish tourist attendant when the Englishman asked her the cheapest way to get to Ireland. Her reply: "Swim." You can get to Ireland by walking, riding, or flying, if you will go to Shamrock, Tex., on March 17 of any year.

Tribute to J. Searcy Bracewell, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the death of J. Searcy Bracewell, Sr., of Houston, Tex., during the recess of the Congress, caused a tremendous loss to my home State of Texas and his hometown of Houston, Tex.

Mr. Bracewell was a man of many fields and talents—law, business, government, church, and civic affairs—and in his 50 years as a resident of Houston had contributed much to the future and progress of Texas. As a tribute to this outstanding Houstonian and Texan, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the Friday, December 3, 1965, Houston Chronicle entitled "J. S. Bracewell, a Great Houstonian" be inserted in the Appendix to the Record, along with the memorial article on page 136 of the Texas Bar Journal of February 1966.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Dec. 3, 1965]

J. S. Bracewell, a Great Houstonian

J. Searcy Bracewell, Sr., came to Houston more than 50 years ago with a brand new law degree tucked under his arm. He rented a back room in a Harrisburg drugstore for $15 a month, then embarked on what proved to be one of Houston's most successful and productive careers.

Mr. Bracewell, who died last week at the age of 73, was an attorney, but he left his mark on this city in many fields. Law, business, government, church affairs, finance, public service—all these were Mr. Bracewell's specialties.

His achievements were far too numerous to list in their entirety. Indeed, they were enough for a dozen men. Consider, for example, the varied nature of his leadership. During his career he was president of the Houston Bar Association, chairman of the Houston Port Commission, president of the old Houston Taxpayers Association, organizer of the Citizens Charter Committee which brought city-manager government to the city, chairman of the national resources division of the attorney general's office.

In his earlier years he was principal of the old Franklin School and later served as school board president in Harrisburg.

He fought the Ku Klux Klan during the 1920's. He was a defender of unpopular causes at times. He was one of Texas' leading appellant attorneys. The law firm he helped found is one of the city's most important today.

The construction financing plan he devised for Broadway Baptist Church was later used by more than 4,000 other churches across the Nation and accounted for the issuance of some $88 million in bonds.

He was indeed one of Texas' great men—a leader of vision, a dedicated and unselfish worker, one of the builders of our city. Houston will long remember him.

[From the Texas Bar Journal, February 1966]

J. S. Bracewell

J. Searcy Bracewell, Sr., 73, a Houston attorney 50 years, died November 30, 1965. Born June 9, 1892, in Bedias, Tex., he had recently retired to Roans Prairie.

Mr. Bracewell attended Sam Houston State Teachers' College in Huntsville, and received his LL. B. degree from Cumberland Law School in Tennessee. He was admitted to the bar in 1915, and had practiced in Houston since that time. He was senior partner and founder of the firm of Bracewell, Reynolds & Patterson.

He taught school in Roans Prairie for a year, 1913–14, and in Harrisburg during 1914–18. He was city attorney of Harrisburg from 1920 to 1926, and was president of the Harrisburg Independent School District board.

Mr. Bracewell served as assistant district attorney of Harris County from 1918 to 1920, and was chairman of the Charter Commission of the City of Houston in 1941 and chairman of the Houston Port Commission in 1955. He was an assistant attorney general of Texas from 1963 to 1965.

A past president of the Houston Bar Association, he had written the book, "Building Churches Through Income Financing," and a manuscript not yet published containing lectures delivered at California Baptist College on the Bill of Rights to the U.S. Constitution with a foreword by Attorney General Waggoner Carr.

Mr. Bracewell founded the Broadway plan in 1936, which was used by more than 4,000 churches over the country to finance church building. He was a member of the Broadway Baptist Church in Houston.

Surviving him are his wife, Lola Blount Bracewell, Roans Prairie; two sons, Searcy Bracewell and Fentress Bracewell, both attorneys in Houston; four brothers, District Judge Reginald S. Bracewell, John Bracewell, Emmett Bracewell, all of Huntsville; and Ernest Bracewell, Austin; two sisters, Mrs. L. L. Grawl, Houston; and Mrs. Curtis White, Hearne; and four grandchildren.

Reclaiming the American Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the dream of harnessing the resources of our Nation's nongovernmental sectors in order to fulfill pressing needs has faded appreciably in recent years. Instead, the Federal Government has come more and more into prominence in these areas.

Mr. Richard C. Cornuelle still sees great hope for the nongovernmental sectors to fulfill the challenge without total involvement by Government. His recently published book, "Reclaiming the American Dream," gives his blueprint for bringing the private sectors into more active competition with the Federal Government.

A review of Mr. Cornuelle's book, published in the January 1966, issue of Washington World magazine, follows:

"Reclaiming the American Dream"—Book by Richard C. Cornuelle

The continuing quest for a revived role for nongovernmental authority provides a target for a rash of publications dealing with new manifestations of American destiny. Some are forum contributions from voluntary and special interest agencies suggesting new walks for peripatetic Americans. Others are the offerings of solo pilots who feel the stirrings of a vanished frontier.

In the latter category the appearance of Richard C. Cornuelle's "Reclaiming the American Dream" has caused a rustling of excitement among the searchers for a new tomorrow for our wearying land.

Writing from the firsthand experience of one who has participated in the dream he idealizes, Cornuelle fills his pages with a fiery predestination whose flames are heightened by his meticulous willingness to feed with specific fuels.

While the dream itself is not successfully particularized, the filter effect is a longing for the America which saw its problems, faced them, came up with an answer and put it into effect. In essence, the American of the dream was a modern age Caesar with his veni, vidi and ultimate vici.

In meeting this challenge, the American faced the truth of himself without the aid of a couch, pill, or a picture tube. So facing he fulfilled the challenge without the thrust of a big brother government.

Cornuelle's thesis is simply that as each American has surrendered his identity into the cell-like whole which is the Federal bureaucracy, so has the possibility of action by the private sector to build a new and still greater America faded.

Unlike most conservative Pollyannas, Cornuelle does not stop with a heartful sigh about the America that was and could be again. Rather, and this is the strength of his offering, he suggests that in many ways the idle-beast has stirred. The American still can be and is a producer, a doer, a dreamer who moves beyond the ethereal wisps of his imagination and does so with impressive impact.

Accepting as the new impetus for such movement the very years that produced the malaise, Cornuelle believes the postwar existentialism inducing despair among some, has stimulated others to a search for the reality which only comes in doing.

His faith in such doing is a trifle naive. The object of his faith is the third force in American life which to him is the independent sector of our life—the sector of voluntary Americanism between the poles of the governmental and the commercial. This sector can be anything from the United Fund to the Literary Guild or the search for cancer cure. Expressions of this enthusiasm among Americans are presented, evaluated and lauded in this writing. Its forgivable chauvinism is the insistence that the sole motivating force in the independent sector is the will to do good among and for others. While we might "tut tut" Mr. Cornuelle, we might likewise grant him that such a motive is present, acceptable and valid but argue that he weakens his own case by not accepting the concomitant proffering of enlightened self and community interest.

In a very real sense, this book is a must for the American who wonders about the absurdity of a "no win" in Vietnam; a horizon on the moon and the simple facts of living with a $100-billion-plus Federal Government. It offers hope; it offers reasonable steps toward this hope; and it offers the fervor to get one there.

The reader is cautioned to temper Mr. Cornuelle's recipe with an understanding of the role and value of big government in a big world. One might also wonder whether or not there is an extended difference between the solutions and society of big business—big labor—big charity to many on a par with big government.

The strength of the volume will be those souls who will read it and take heart, applying its message of encouragement to some sector where octopus government or big business will not stir or permit action. In years ahead, Mr. Cornuelle may present a book of letters testifying to the solutions to problems brought about by private initiative through the stimulus of his writing.

National UNICEF Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day." A number of our colleagues have introduced similar resolutions.

The purpose of this proposed joint resolution is to recognize the high honor of the Nobel Peace Prize award to UNICEF and to pay special tribute to the boys and girls of our own country whose magnificent generosity in collecting coins at Halloween for less fortunate children around the world has, in a very real sense, contributed to the success of UNICEF. Our own American boys and girls have indeed helped to earn the Nobel Peace Prize.

Every President of the United States since UNICEF was established has given strong endorsement to its work. The recognition of the important work of this organization through the passage of this joint resolution by the Congress would be well deserved.

It is my hope that early and favorable action will be taken.

The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle?—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News is featuring an excellent series of articles in which its able Washington reporter, Tom Joyce, discusses the war on poverty. This is journalism at its best. In my judgment, Mr. Joyce has come to grips with realities, and his reports are worthy of our careful study. Under leave to extend my remarks, the fourth article of the series follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Mar. 2, 1966]

Boon or Boondoggle? Job Corps Steers Girl From a Wayward Path

(By Tom Joyce)

Washington, March 2.—Barbara, a 17-year-old girl at the women's Job Corps center at St. Petersburg, Fla., was absent without leave.

She was giving up in her latest attempt to escape from the past. But officials at the center, which has been beset by trouble almost from the opening day, were not ready to give up on Barbara.

They went searching. And in a week they found her—working as a stripteaser in a local "art theater" under the uncomely sobriquet of "Sugar Shaker."

Shocking? Beyond doubt.

But consider Barbara's background. She never knew her father and has not seen her mother in a long time. She was "boarding" at a State training home before she joined the Job Corps. She left school in the eighth grade.

Just before Barbara's brief sojourn into the theatrical world, a report concerning her read:

"Defiance makes it impossible to help her. She gives the impression that her past is so dominant any new way of life is impossible."

That was last summer. After the art theater episode, Barbara was placed on probation and given one more chance. At a discharge hearing just before that she said:

"I guess I reject authority. I spent some years in reform school and in a school for underprivileged children. All my relatives were gone. My river has been running a course—it has taken me a long way."

Since last summer Barbara has been doing well, especially in the classroom, where she has shown a real talent for writing and English.

"I think we're going to make it with Barbara," said Vetty Gardiner, assistant director of the center.

"In many ways she represents a lot of the kids. They are afraid to trust people. Those they have loved have disappointed them.

They have failed in school, in society, and with their families.

"Now they lack confidence in themselves and others."

The St. Petersburg center, a neat white stucco hotel on a palm-studded street in a residential section of the city, has had big problems and bad publicity ever since it opened last April 6.

In several significant ways, the trouble was exaggerated.

And it was the direct result of a terrible blunder in selecting a site for the center.

St. Petersburg is on a small peninsula on the west central coast of Florida. Unlike Miami and other plush resorts, it is a modest area attractive to retired couples.

DIXIE ATTITUDES

The 99-room hotel that houses the center is the middle of a 12-square-block area where there are perhaps more people over 70 than in any comparable neighborhood in the Nation.

Moreover, the racial attitude of the neighborhood generally resembles that of the South. And the center's population is about 50 percent Negro.

It was against this background that a crisis between the community and the center boiled over last summer.

At night in the neighborhood, long accustomed to quiet, tires screeched as young men in hotrods came to pick up their dates at the center.

The young men, many members of the leather jacket fraternity, lingered outside under the palms with the girls, few of whom appeared to have just stepped out of a debutante ball.

The neighborhood reacted angrily. There were charges, some well founded, of loose morals.

GIRLS EXPELLED

Six girls were expelled for drunkenness.

There were a number of undesirable men callers attracted to the new center.

To add to the trouble, two tough-talking tatooed girls from Texas arrived at the center. They were not prepared for integrated living and they demonstrated their prejudices with force and words before they were expelled.

Since last summer, however, the picture has changed sharply.

Young men calling for dates must sign at the desk. And there are a growing number of undesirable types who are on the official "blacklist." The girls, 16 to 21, are permitted to go out until 10 p.m. on week nights and midnight on weekends. And there is nothing to prevent them from meeting men on the blacklist away from the center.

But the list is keeping such types away from the neighborhood. And community relations steadily are improving.

Across the street is a tidy guest home, its rooms filled mostly with retired people. The owner, Taylor Hoag, agrees that "things are a lot better."

SITUATION IMPROVES

"In the beginning it was very, very noisy," he said. It hurt my business something awful. People with reservations would discover upon arrival that my place was across the street from the center they had read about in the papers. And they wouldn't stay.

"But now it is much, much better. The boys aren't hanging around outside and those who do come for dates are orderly."

He still thinks it was a mistake to locate the center in such a neighborhood. OEO officials in Washington agree. And Miss Gardiner feels that most of the serious trouble could have been avoided in a different location.

REFUSE BLAME

In Washington, officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which operates the antipoverty program, refuse to shoulder the responsibility for site selection.

They say the whole thing was left in the hands of the outside contractor, the Pinellas County Department of Public Instruction.

And, in some quarters the center is being pointed out as another example of where academic institutions and school systems have not measured up to performance of business organizations in operating Job Corps centers.

Paul Bauder, superintendent of the school department, feels this it too harsh a criticism. So do others.

But Bauder did say that "there are indications we probably are not geared to this kind of work."

NO EXPERIENCE

"We have no experience in providing housing and other services in a 24-hour operation. I don't think we realized what we were getting into.

"We have talked about management being able to do a better job. For one thing, any board of education is more responsible to the community than is business.

"Boards are elected and subject to public pressure."

And there has been a lot of pressure from real estate people in St. Petersburg not to renew the $2.4 million, 18-month contract when it expires. The feeling now is the contract will not be renewed.

A major factor in awarding the contract to Pinellas County was that its school system enjoys a national reputation in the field of adult education.

LEASE COST HIT

Another sore point with some of the local people, including the real estate men, is the cost of leasing the hotel, built in 1903, for 18 months.

At $12,000 a month, this figures out to $116,000. Some estimates put the market value of the hotel between $150,000 and $200,000.

It has been described by some as plush. It is not. But it is pleasant and the lobby, filled with sofas and overstuffed chairs surrounded by wood panels and decorations appropriate to the age of the building, usually is crowded with many of the 268 girls who occupy the 99 room sof the 3 upper floors.

It is not the same group one would find in the lounge of a college dormitory. But the setting is much the same.

Some of the conversation is rough and unpolished.

EXPELLED THREE TIMES

Theresa has been expelled from three schools and is having a difficult time adjusting. Clementine, who quit school 6 years ago is doing better, having increased her reading level three grades.

Another girl was a big city gang leader who "just got tired of it." Now she is a leader in student government.

All of the girls divide their time between classroom and vocational training including practical nursing, X-ray technicians, secretarial, sales, cosmetology and business.

Most of them are high school dropouts. Many have juvenile records. And, just as in the centers for men, the idea is to upgrade their educational levels and provide job training so they can share in the fruits of a booming America.

ONLY 10 GRADUATE

Only 10 girls have graduated and most of these returned to school. One is enrolled at Louisiana State University and is majoring in elementary education, using the typing skill she learned at the center to help pay college costs.

And 30 of the girls are going to night school in St. Petersburg to finish high school work and maybe try for college.

But the dropout rate has been unexpectedly high. So far 126 have left. The reasons are many. Six were pregnant, at least three were when they arrived for training.

A large number told Miss Gardner they were leaving because of the bad publicity, that they felt they were unfairly regarded by the community as a "bunch of bad girls with loose morals."

Two girls were arrested for shoplifting in a downtown store and withdrew rather than face expulsion.

The others?

"Lack of motivation, insecurity, and racial prejudice," says Miss Gardiner, an attractive, businesslike administrator won the confidence of most of the girls who are sticking it out.

She is afraid that the Women's Job Corps has been "oversold" to the public.

"There are going to be a lot of failures," she says, "and people aren't going to be ready to accept them."

She thinks the experiment will be successful if it works for 50 percent of the girls.

Sitting in the lobby was a 19-year-old Paterson, N.J., girl named Geraldine. "I just hope I can do it," she says. "I get scared thinking about it."

Geraldine is studying to be a medical technician. She does not date like most of the other girls—because she has a 22-year-old husband—who is in jail.

"We want to start everything all over when he gets out," she says in a soft voice that trembles a little with doubt. "He write all the time and tells me I must stay."

There are nine women's centers from Maine to California. Most of them are small units like the one in St. Petersburg. And most of them are having similar problems.

SOME BAD APPLES

In Charleston, W. Va., the center is located in the middle of a poor neighborhood, near a diner and a loan office.

And, as at St. Petersburg, there have been charges of drunkenness, prostitution, larceny and narcotics involvement. But when the charges have been tracked down, it turns out that only a small percentage of the girls are giving the others a bad reputation.

These girls are not junior league candidates. Lots of them have knocked around and been knocked around. Now, like their counterparts in the centers for men, they see the Job Corps as their last chance.

NO BLUE BLAZERS

Morale is more of a problem at the women's centers. Outside the centers for men, a lot of corpsmen wear blue blazers with the Job Corps emblem on the breast pocket. The girls are more likely to try to hide their identity when away from the centers, mainly because of the reputations for "loose conducts."

They are getting some help now, however. In St. Petersburg a group called Friends of the Job Corps has been formed by residents. Some well-to-do citizens like Sophia Daily take an active part in the center's activities in an effort to aid the girls win self-confidence.

LEARN RESPONSIBILITY

It is helping.

The girls, many of whom have never had any feeling of responsibility to others, are reacting. In volunteer programs, some are reading to the blind. Others are helping to care for aged as part of vocational training as nurses aids.

"But," says Miss Gardiner, "too many people are expecting miracles. There will be some, of course. But there are going to be a lot of disappointments, too."

When you look at these young women from the slums and tenements of America—many of whom have never really been exposed to anything resembling a respectable standard of morality—it seems that miracles are really needed if they are to fulfill roles as wives, mothers, and wage earners in a society that now is strange to them.

Answers Given

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in his hard-hitting Freedom House dinner address, President Johnson "restated the case for Vietnam and the U.S. commitment to the cause of freedom. He was eloquent in restating this country's longer commitment to the principles of free debate, saying 'that the strength of America will never be sapped by discussion,' "

I have quoted from a recent editorial in the Nashville Tennessean, which believes that events and discussions of the past couple of weeks and the President's New York speech "have helped clear the air."

Because others will find the editorial illuminating, I have the permission of my colleagues to have it inserted in the Record:

President Has Answered Some of Vietnam Questions

Whatever else may have been accomplished by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings and by Senator Robert Kennedy's recent statement on Vietnam, they most certainly have brought President Johnson forward with some answers.

In a hard-hitting Freedom House dinner address the President asserted that the United States is not caught in a blind escalation of force that is pulling it into a wider war; that it is using only necessary force and he assured his critics that never by any act of ours would there be a wildening of the war.

The President denied that it is a war of unlimited objectives, saying that the U.S. goal is to prevent the success of aggression, and that this Nation seeks no bases or domination.

In what could be construed as an answer to Senator Kennedy's proposal that the Vietcong be admitted to a "share of power and responsibility" in any postwar government, President Johnson said:

"Men ask who has a right to rule in Vietnam. Our answer there is what it has been here for 200 years: The people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else.

"We stand," the President said, "for self-determination—for free elections—and we will honor their result." At the same time the President did not say whether—and if so, how—the South Vietnamese who support the Vietcong would participate in self-determination.

The Senate hearings nibbled at the edges of the question whether this country is fighting to secure and maintain a non-Red government in South Vietnam, or whether the end objective is to give the Vietnamese people the right to decide their own destiny.

Mr. Johnson said the administration is willing to accept the decision of the South Vietnamese. "Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their own choice. Hanoi shall not impose on the South Vietnamese a government not of their choice."

The President did not get into the question whether the representatives of the Vietcong might be included in any conference or preconference respecting negotiations on peace in Vietnam, if such negotiations were possible.

One more question which President Johnson did not answer was how long the war might last, or the question of what limit can be put on the military commitment there. The answer to the first part lies with Hanoi. The President said only that "if the aggressor persists * * * the struggle may be long."

The answer to the second part is probably not something that can or should be answered publicly and officially. To do so would not only telegraph U.S. intentions to the enemy, it could very well result in Hanoi miscalculating the future.

President Johnson restated the case for Vietnam and the U.S. commitment to the cause of freedom. He was eloquent in restating this country's longer commitment to the principles of free debate, saying that the strength of America will never be sapped by discussion.

There are still perplexities about the war in Vietnam and questions which perhaps have no immediate answers. But the events and discussions of the past couple of weeks, and the President's speech Wednesday night, have helped clear the air.

No to De Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, for a decade and a half the keystone of free world security has been the NATO alliance. It is a bulwark that has weathered threats from without and doubts from within.

Today that great alliance is under assault from an old ally who appears to have lost his sense of direction. We regret the shortsightedness of General de Gaulle. But we can be sure that the common purpose of free nations will prevail over the obstinateness of one man.

The struggle for NATO unity requires the patience and cooperation. Sometimes it also requires blunt talk.

Last week was a time for blunt talk. And all Americans can be proud that our President responded without mincing words.

I am sure that all Americans will appreciate the New York Journal-American's praise of our President's plain talk to the general, and under unanimous request consent, I insert the editorial, "No to De Gaulle," in the Record:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Mar. 10, 1966]

No to De Gaulle

Diplomatic niceties often dictate a polite pause in the exchange of messages between chiefs of state. We are glad to note, however, that no such protocol was observed in the latest exchange between President Johnson and President Charles de Gaulle of France.

De Gaulle sent L.B.J. a letter regarding his views on reorganization of NATO. It reportedly requested talks between the United States and France to accomplish that end.

Four hours later President Johnson's reply was in Paris. Nothing doing, it said. There will be no bilateral deals on NATO made by the United States with any one member of the Organization. Discussions on NATO require consultation among all its members, L.B.J. pointed out, and De Gaulle had better ponder that fact.

De Gaulle had made it clear that he considers NATO washed up and that he wants France out of it by 1969, at which time any foreign troops remaining on French soil would have to submit to French command.

Fine. This is his right. But it is also characteristic of the great Frenchman that he would, in a manner that disdainfully disregards the rights and sensitivities of his allies, seek to place himself above them on an issue that directly affects their security.

President Johnson has correctly put the French President in his place.

Hartford Times Endorses Transportation Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who live in New England the question of how we create a unified, efficient, low-fare, swift, and safe system of transportation is of prime importance. It pleases me to see that one of Connecticut's most distinguished newspapers has endorsed the President's plan for a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation. Their lucid appraisal will, I think, be of interest to all Members of the House:

Modern Transportation

The President's proposal to establish a Federal Department of Transportation introduces hope of efficiency for a field in which, through lack of consistent policies and coordination, great national abilities and large sums of money are dissipated without sound result.

One thinks of the plight of the region's railroads and of the merchant marine particularly. But all of our systems of transport that should be closely allied and integrated can be brought into better conditions of public service by sounder administration.

Ideas of the relative values and importance of the various systems need to be assessed for the good of the Federal Treasury, which must provide huge subsidizations, and for the factor of usefulness on which the traveling and trading public depends.

The plan to bring transportation into a single agency does not itself set up the policies through which our facilities can be made more useful and more stable. Such policies will be the later developments of study.

But a large step will have been taken with the consolidation of authority and responsibility into one department. Few doubt that the new Department will have a troubled birth. A tremendous range of interests, competition, and priorities must be reconciled.

Yet it has been apparent for some time that indecision and conflicting policies, or lack of any policy, have hampered adequate and economical transportation. And such important side considerations as highway safety and the provision of modern, efficient mass transit have been neglected.

Like the Department of Commerce, the Department of Transportation would be a business-oriented agency. However, it should be expected that the public would be very strongly represented because it is so directly affected. In this aspect, transportation administration becomes a function as close to the people as those of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It would be a mere bureaucratic misadventure were all the activities enumerated by the President only to be dumped together and left at that. The job is to bring order out of what has become in many respects a costly mess.

North Vietnamese Control of the Vietcong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the naive and misleading statements that have been made concerning the nature of the so-called National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong, it is revealing to read the report of an experienced foreign newspaperman on this subject.

In an article published in the February 3 edition of the Manchester Guardian Weekly, one of Britain's oldest and most respected journals, Michael Wall clearly documents the fact that the so-called NLF and the Vietcong are, in reality, the creation of the North Vietnamese Communists who control their military and political activities.

I insert Mr. Wall's article to be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

VIETCONG CHANGES ITS METHODS

(By Michael Wall)

In Saigon there is a whole language of initials, and out of initials have come new, strange words. The American military setup is Macvee, Military Advisory Command, Vietnam. Arvin, one soon learns, covers the Vietnamese Government forces, the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. USOM, U.S. operations mission, is the American civil aid program. The enemy in this war for the control of South Vietnam has but two letters, VC, standing for Vietcong, which in turn means simply Vietnamese Communists. What follows is a view of the war as presented to me by people in authority here in Saigon.

The Vietcong is a faceless enemy. It has its tentacles stretching out and touching every village and town in the country. Its agents have infiltrated the Government and the administration, the Vietnamese Government forces, the universities and schools, the professions and the unions. Yet relatively little is known about it and it has not thrown up a Grivas, a Castro, or a Ho Chi Minh of its own.

One reason for the fact that no South Vietnamese Communist leader has emerged is because the Vietcong is under the direct and close control of the Hanoi government. Ho Chi Minh and General Giap are the real leaders of this war as they were of the war by the Vietminh against the French.

The war in South Vietnam is represented by the Communists as being a war of national liberation such as was fought by the Vietminh against the French. The difference today is that it is now a battle to throw out the American aggressors and overthrow their South Vietnamese puppets. This is the line that is drummed into the villagers by the Communist agents. This is what motivates the majority of the Vietcong forces who believe passionately that they are fighting to liberate their country from foreign domination.

However, the fundamental differences between the Vietminh and the Vietcong campaigns are clearly understood by the educated classes in South Vietnam. This war, which the Communists anticipated after the signing of the Geneva agreements in 1954 and actively prepared for from 1956, is clearly seen as the Communist revolutionary war being waged in the guise of the continuation of the nationalist struggle for liberation.

One of the most astounding aspects of the South Vietnamese situation in the estimation of observers here is that the Communists have not already achieved their aim in taking over the whole of South Vietnam. If indeed the struggle is for liberation why has there been no uprising on a national scale by a proud and highly intelligent people? Why have all attempts to paralyze Saigon by strike action dismally failed? Why has the Vietnamese Army continued the struggle after appalling losses and moreover still managed to attract volunteers?

These are among the questions that drum through the minds of newcomers to the Vietnam scene. The answers certainly do not lie in any devotion to the successive Saigon governments, in any wish to defend what has been a corrupt, inefficient administration, nor in any desire to adhere to the so-called Western way of life. The answer commonly given is that the war is understood to be what it is—a Communist attempt to unify Vietnam under Communist administration—and the majority of the people here are ready to fight to prevent its success. Those people who understand what communism is are not attracted by its ideology and are repelled by its methods. They do not believe the lot of those in North Vietnam is better than their own.

The groundwork of building up the Communist infrastructure in the countryside has been long and arduous. Although under the Geneva agreements the Vietminh was to withdraw its forces north of the 17th parallel, and indeed 80,000 who lived in what is now South Vietnam went north, there was left behind a skeleton organization which continued to exist in the 5 Vietminh "war zones" from which the Vietminh had operated against the French.

Over the next 4 years the Vietnamese who had moved to the north were organized and trained as military and political cadres which would become the hard core of the Vietcong battle for the south. The hard-core Vietcong units, formed and trained in the north, consist of highly professional soldiers, many of whom have 15 years' experience of war.

The political cadres are equally highly organized, training with great thoroughness in the methods of winning over the allegiance of the villagers and in organizing the infrastructure of the Communist society. The infiltration south of the military units and the political cadres began in earnest in 1959. Estimates of the actual number of infiltrators vary greatly, but the most conservative puts it between 19,000 and 25,000 since 1959.

There is evidence to suggest that in fact the number may be considerably higher and that while the official estimate of the total hard-core, full-time, Vietcong forces now in South Vietnam is 33,000, one American source said that it was certainly no less than 45,000. At the end of last year units of the People's Army of North Vietnam were identified in battle and it is possible that 10,000 of the North Vietnamese Army are in the country.

One of the prime tasks of the political and military cadres is to recruit, organize, and train local guerrilla forces. Over the last 6 years this has continued and there are at least 80,000, and probably many more, who are farmers and fishermen by day and guerrillas by night. At a still lower level is the unknown, anonymous mass of village people who are used as carriers of information and supplies, and who in totally committed villages can be relied on to use arms to prevent the incursion of government forces.

The Vietcong organization is its greatest strength, not its mystique, ideology, or its spirit. The infiltration into the villages has been a long process. The pattern of the operation is laid down in every detail from the first arrival of the political cadre of perhaps two or three men to the final arm of a fully committed combat village.

After the initial contacts the first stage is to sow seeds of discontent and to discredit the Saigon government and the village and hamlet chiefs. It is fertile ground, for the villagers know about the corruption of local officials, resent paying fees to absent landlords, and can easily be influenced by the promise of land of their own. The removal of the discredited chiefs by assassination is the next step. Last year alone 6,000 district officials and village headmen were murdered, many after ghastly torture.

With uncooperative village leaders out of the way the work of forming the various liberation associations in the village begins. The farmers, the women, the youths, the schoolboys are persuaded to join their respective movement; the farmers are given land, the women have their social status raised, new wells are sunk, a schoolhouse and teacher are provided and political indoctrination gets underway.

Captured documents have shown that it seldom works according to plan and there are many reports of self-criticism from political cadres which indicate that often, having received the material advantages, the villagers reveal a bourgeois frame of mind which has no interest in political ideology and no wish to take part in combative action.

The American and Vietnamese air strikes, the use of napalm and defoliation agents are used by the Vietcong to prove to the villagers that the real battle is against the foreign invader. In well-infiltrated villages the determination to resist the American and government forces is increased, but in others the Vietcong finds that fear of counteraction makes the villagers unwilling to have Vietcong forces in the vicinity.

In the past, the Vietcong has worn kid gloves in its work in the countryside. The political cadres have shown infinite patience, the military units have behaved with decorum, and food and supplies were paid for and not taken. In marked contrast has been the ruthless behavior of government troops.

But over the past 6 months the pattern has been changing. In the densely populated Mekong Delta, south of Saigon, there is increasing evidence that the Vietcong is now using harsh, brutal methods against the villagers to get their money, supplies, and recruits. The American military authorities put this down to their own actions in harrying the enemy, who no longer can feel quite safe in any area.

Other observers suspect that owing to severe losses among both political and military cadres the replacements are of poorer quality, less thoroughly trained, and in consequence hamhanded in their work. At the same time the behavior of government troops has improved and great efforts are being made to impress on them the importance of not alienating the villagers. The inevitable development within the Vietcong is that the North Vietnamese will play an increasingly important role both by having to provide more of the military and political leaders and the troops to make up the hard-core units.

Students of past guerrilla campaigns have estimated that the defenders require 10 men for every one of the guerrillas to achieve victory on the ground. On this reckoning the Vietcong is still vastly superior in numbers to the government and Americans. But the helicopter has brought a new mobility to war and the classic guerrilla tactics may prove no longer viable.

The National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong, is completely dominated by the recently formed People's Revolutionary Party which in turn is controlled by the Vietnam Workers' Party in North Vietnam. Thus, politically and militarily the Vietcong is controlled from the north and has small right to its claim that it represents the people of South Vietnam alone.

The chairman of the NLF, Nguyen Huu Tho, a Saigon lawyer, and the secretary-general of the party, Huynh Tan Phat, an architect, had no standing in Saigon before they disappeared to form their headquarters in the highlands near the Cambodian border. Some American observers believe that captured documents reveal a certain degree of tension within the NLF ranks between those who see victory coming only through military action and those who would like to see negotiations leading to a coalition government in the south and through that a complete takeover. But other observers discount this theory on the grounds that negotiations now would carry the smell of defeat.

The War on Poverty Examined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly evident that the lofty goals of the war on poverty are finding the road to reality a very rocky one.

I feel that now is definitely the time to examine this program and to catch the snags, before more harm than good is done.

An editorial, which recently appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel, comments favorably on this reappraisal of the war on poverty, and I include it at this point in the RECORD and call it to the attention of my colleagues.

LOOK AT THE POVERTY WAR

Recent headlines from our war on poverty have not been hopeful.

Poverty elections flop in nine cities: 700 poor housed at the Hotel Astor on antipoverty funds, Job Corps youths in riot, antipoverty aid indicted in payroll embezzlement, and so on.

Small wonder that congressional Republicants want an investigation. Significantly, they do not condemn the idea of a poverty program; they just do not think the present one is being run right.

The investigation is a good idea. More than $1,400 million has been appropriated for the economic-opportunity program and another $1,600 million is sought for the next fiscal year. That is big money.

Republicans charge there is a lack of effective guidelines: "The approach continues to be hit and miss and let us try anything once." Rebuttal could be that there can be no guidelines for a job that has never been done before. The Office of Economic Opportunity admittedly is moving across an uncharted field.

But if, as the Republican Party says, tax payers are "being cheated by poor planning and inefficiency, we have a right to know about it. And to demand correction.

If a new bureaucracy has sprung up, controlled by political bosses, while the poor are still hungry and lacking in opportunities, we have a right to demand reforms.

Only a halfhearted study, authorized by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, has been made of the OEO. This report is still suspiciously locked up.

A broad new investigation should give the taxpayers an unvarnished look. Successes should be acknowledged as well as failures. The inquiry should be supported honestly by Democrats as well as Republicans. OEO Director Sargent Shriver should cooperate and not camouflage.

Let us really see how we are doing.

Purity of Motive in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a recent speech by Presidential Aid Bill D. Moyers admonished the Nation's newsmen to appreciate that only the "purest motives" govern the actions and statements of the executive branch of the Federal Government. Such advice, if heeded, would be heeded by the naive and nondiscriminating. Citizens and the press will continue to question, to investigate, to doubt, and to seek the truth. They will not simply swallow all Government pronouncements as facts.

The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of Sunday, March 6, 1966, comments aptly on Mr. Moyers' admonition to journalists:

PURITY OF MOTIVE IN WASHINGTON

Bill D. Moyers, who gave up the ministry years ago to bring some light into the life of Lyndon Johnson, reverted to type the other day. Unloading a sermon on Washington alumni of Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism, the White House press secretary adjured the sinners of the press to have faith.

"You are unable," he said, "to accept motivation in quite the same way we in the Government believe are motivated. We so often do things out of the purest motives. The heart of the tension is that it is difficult for you to understand our motives have been as pure as they are."

We are afraid that the Tribune will have to plead guilty to the soft impeachment. Yes, to be frank, it sometimes has been difficult for us to appreciate that only the "purest motives" govern the actions and statements of an administration so wholly political as this one is.

For have we not been warned out of its own mouth so often that the buyer must beware its pronouncements? For instance, there are the cautionary remarks of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Information, who introduced the concept of "news management" during the Kennedy administration. The news became managed under a man whose theme in the 1960 campaign was "the people's right to know."

Mr. Sylvester first announced that news is part of the "arsenal of weaponry" available to a President and that it was the inherent right of a government, "if necessary, to lie to save itself." He qualified the right to lie by saying that prevarication was appropriate "in an international crisis when nuclear war threatens."

But the record demonstrates that officials and agents of Government have not confined their lying to such circumstances, but do it automatically in any context. The suspicion arises that these spokesmen are not lying to save the Government from the Communists but to save the administration from the displeasure of the public.

The respected Arthur Krock, Washington commentator of the New York Times, an old friend of the late Mr. Kennedy, said the administration sought to envelop the people in a massive propaganda "in behalf of the establishment, to inflate success or gloss over error." This, he said, it was dong "more cynically and boldly" than any other administration had ever done.

It was pointed out by Hanson Baldwin, military editor of the Times, that the administration launched this campaign because of its "sensitivity to criticism, its readiness to resent it, and a willingness to use unorthodox methods to meet it." That is still the motive under the Johnson administration.

Mr. Moyers, when asked if he believes in honest journalism, replied, "I think there are honest journalists like there are honest politicians. When bought, they stay bought."

Speak for yourself, Bill.

State Department Declares War on Rhodesians in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the State Department's approach to recent events in Rhodesia would be laughable if the results were not so unfortunate. The weird thinking which evidently is going on within the L.B.J. administration over Rhodesia is described in the following article taken from "Human Events" for March 19, 1966:

STATE DEPARTMENT DECLARES WAR ON RHODESIANS IN UNITED STATES

By Ralph de Toledano)

With sanctimoniousness not seen since the days of Uriah Heep, the State Department has argued that it joined Great Britain in its sanctions against the legitimateley elected and constitutional Government of Rhodesia on the legal ground that it had declared its independence unilaterily. For a nation that did the same—and by force of arms—this is a rather disingenous position to take.

But since legality is the State Department's gage these days, there is more than slight interest in its present careening course against Rhodesia. For what the Department is now preparing to do is not only illegal but also morally reprehensible and downright vindictive. These are strong words, but they are justified by the facts.

Since the United States hastily and obsequiously bowed low to the British by ordering sanctions against Rhodesia, a tiny mission of diplomatic representatives of that country—now without official status—has attempted to carry on their duties here. At the same time, a U.S. consul, similarly bereft of diplomatic prerogatives, has remained in Rhodesia. Recently, the Rhodesian Government set up an information office in Washington to service those interested in more than the statements dispensed by British propagandists.

(Among the lies being spread by British officials here is the singularly effective one that Americans—newspapermen included—cannot travel to Rhodesia without a British visa, which they refuse to issue. This is patently false, as I know from firsthand experience.)

Now, the State Department has moved to silence the Rhodesian Information Office, presumably fearful that the American people may discover that the official administration line is based on nothing but subservience to Britain and ideological pique. This is indirect censorship of the worst order.

In a letter to Henry J. C. Hooper, director of the Information Office, Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann states that Mr. Hooper, in properly registering under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, had noted as his principal "the Department of External Affairs, Ministry of Information, Government of Rhodesia." He then states that since the United States does not recognize the authority of Rhodesia, Mr. Hooper has "no official capacity in this country." The United States, therefore, is "not prepared to accord to you a continuing residence in this country."

In short, having learned that Mr. Hooper registered as a foreign agent for Rhodesia, the State Department is planning to deport him. Though he has been here in an unofficial diplomatic status for some months, the department did not move against him until it discovered that he was legally attempting to present his country's views to Americans.

This is plain vindictiveness, as witness the report to Congress of the U.S. Attorney General in 1964: "Registration under the [Foreign Agents Registration] Act does not imply recognition by the U.S. Government either of de jure existence or legality of the foreign principal, nor does it indicate approval by the U.S. Government of the propaganda material disseminated by the registered agent."

Mr. Mann, who seems to be trying to atone for his firmness and good sense in the Dominican crisis, chooses to overlook this statement in attempting to oust Rhodesia's information officer and suppress views contrary to those of the State Department. He also sweeps under the carpet the fact that on the list of acceptable foreign agents are representatives of an Angolan government-in-exile, a handful of terrorists outside that Portuguese possession, and an Azad Kashmiri government, existing only on a letterhead.

The United States recognizes Portugal's full and complete control over Angola, yet it has allowed members of its so-called government-in-exile to remain in this country and to propagandize for its extreme-left activism. The United States recognizes India and Pakistan as having domain over a split Kashmir, but it allows a Kashmiri "government" to have its say without harassment.

In the case of Rhodesia, the State Department, in declaring war on Rhodesia, is acting against a government which is admittedly in complete control and whose status would be de jure except for the weird thinking of this administration.

In another day, the Senate would have been up in arms about this. But with the Fulbright-Kennedy axis in possession of the headlines, U.S. policy is increasingly oriented to a leftward course. And Rhodesia, unfortunately, both believes in and practices a free enterprise economy—and has no truck with Communists. Q.E.D.

As further comment in this issue I recommend the following editorial from the Mobile, Ala., Press for March 8, 1966:

One Man, One Vote for Rhodesia

In slightly more than three lines of type, the Register recently carried the significant announcement that the United States is moving toward the closure of an "information office opened in Washington by the white-minority government of Rhodesia."

At the same time our Government is denying white Rhodesians the right to tell their story to Americans, it allows Communists, Socialists, and African dictators to flood our Nation with their propaganda.

This is part of the implementation of the one-world philosophy, one objective of which is the one-man, one-vote system to which our national leaders subscribe.

It is all part of the drive that includes action by the U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to set up a congressional investigation of the question of whether the United States should interfere with the Government of South Africa and tell it how it should run its affairs.

Members of the one-man, one-vote crusade talk of "broadening the power base," and of making "leaders responsible to the people's needs."

If they sincerely support governments which have the "broadest possible participation by citizens," they should be supporting Rhodesia instead of suppressing it.

They cannot deny today the number of Rhodesians actively participating in their Government as voters is greater than the number of voting citizens in all 30 black African nations combined.

That is because all these tribal states have succumbed either to one party, one leader rule or to military strong man dictatorship.

While they prattle and fume over alleged censorship of inflamatory reporting, and of the detention of Moscow trained revolutionaries as denials of freedom in Rhodesia, these one man, one vote partisans have no criticism for the atrocities committed in the black African nations.

All this is creating in Africa and elsewhere the kind of turmoil in which Communist subversion thrives.

Fino Introduces Bonus Bill for America's First Asian Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to provide for a bonus to veterans of the early 20th century campaigns in the Philippine Islands, who received the Philippine campaign medal.

I have received a number of letters from aging veterans of the Philippines campaigns of the early 1900's. These veterans, few and far between, are for the most part in their eighties and nineties. They badly need this money because of rising and other expenses.

These men are veterans of a war America has long forgotten, a war in which America pacified the Philippine Islands after taking them from Spain in the Spanish-American War. Throughout the islands, our soldiers fought head-hunting and cannibalistic tribes—men who fought well and fiercely for years with the weird, curved Malay and Philippine bolo knives. It was a type of war that our American soldiers were not used to, just as today's soldiers are finding Vietnam a new kind of war.

Our Philippine veterans fought a tough enemy who believed he was fighting for independence. It was a hard fight, and in the end it was not so much won with weapons as with policies of respect for the people. Our soldiers in the Philippines suffered fiercely from tropical diseases we had not yet learned how to deal with.

Today, with our minds so much on the war in southeast Asia, I think we should take time out to think of the men who fought and died for America's toehold in the Pacific in the days of the Great White Fleet and the "big stick." I urge this bonus as a tribute to the first American southeast Asian veterans, now forgotten.

There are under 500 of these veterans, perhaps far fewer. This bonus program will cost very little. We should act immediately.

Save the Children Federation: Helping the Poor To Fight Poverty—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I want to continue the story of the Save the Children Federation, a unique program to help the less fortunate which started more than a quarter of a century ago.

Young people engaged in self-help projects are their own best champions in the fight against poverty. Save the Children Federation activities for American Indians make this point

For the past 5 years, summer camp programs for Indian youth have offered self-help training in building skills, ranch improvement, herd operations and craft work; classes in health and grooming; recreation; and field trips. One hundred federation-sponsored Indian young people were placed as volunteers in hospitals, clinics, and in-the-field health groups where they learned good health habits, supported medical techniques and practiced simple nursing skills. Sixty-three of the participants who represent the potential leadership of four reservations now expect to train for a career in public health.

From its early efforts in Appalachia, SCF has grown into a worldwide organization advocating the principles of self-help. In times of emergency or disaster, the federation carries on special programs of relief, as it did during the war years to help refugee children. Since that time, the overseas sponsorship plan providing cash and needed commodities to relieve hunger and shortage, gradually changed to emphasize payments which would allow children whose parents could not afford the cost to receive basic education, or sponsorships which enabled the purchase of seed, tools, or equipment to raise the family's food production or increase its regular cash income.

To help parents realize their dreams of a better life for their children, SCF has long encouraged families to plan and carry out their own solutions for raising annual income. Wherever possible, this encouragement comes in the form of interest-free loans instead of grants. The federation's loans, supplemented by sound counseling, stimulate greater family self-reliance, influence more practical goals, and strengthen the chances of success. With such loans fishermen in Brittany bought nets and a boat to catch and sell more fish. Korean farmers purchased improved rice seed and fertilizers for more abundant crops. A Lebanese shoemaker purchased leather and tools to double his business. A Greek widow bought a sewing machine to make clothes for her children and to add a little cash by sewing for others.

Helping families to develop their earning potentials so they themselves can more quickly assume the responsibilities for their children is another strong feature of the federation's self-help program.

Recognizing that the community as well as the family can take a more responsible share in child development, the Federation takes a positive interest in upgrading neighborhoods and improving community services for the health, education, and welfare of all children. Child-family-community sponsorships overseas and for American Indians reach beyond the child to give the family a greater security and the communities a new strength.

This dynamic program offers a threefold way of accelerating child growth toward self-sufficiency, for the welfare of a child and his family is inextricably woven into the welfare of the community. This direction of federation effort provides people with an opportunity to shape a better future for themselves and their children within the framework of a healthy community of interdependent and forward-looking citizens.

These self-help sponsorships, recently introduced in the American Indian program, support long-range goals worked out by the federation with Hopi tribal officials to encourage more participation by parents and neighbors in community improvements. Many American Indian boys and girls today attend schools away from the reservation where they may enlarge their circle of friends, find courses to prepare them for contemporary vocations, and effect an adjustment to the non-Indian world. The SCF sponsorships which provide funds for school supplies, personal books and spending money help children in their new relationships and encourage wider social participation and a greater fluency with the English language.

For the families of these children, the new sponsorships provide small grants to improve sanitary conditions of each home—to repair, screen and paint windows and doors to keep out flies, and to build supports to hold water tanks provided by the U.S. Public Service, so that each household will have safe water. Sponsorships like these are a major breakthrough toward a more wholesome environment for American Indians.

An Irrelevant Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 8 brings to focus some of the irrelevant activities of the Congress in regard to Vietnam:

AN IRRELEVANT OPPOSITION

The Senate haggled for about 2 weeks over the $4.8 billion authorization for the Vietnamese war, then passed it with only two dissenting votes. The performance is not without its lessons.

The lengthy debate measures the misgivings the course of war stirs in an onlooker. The overwhelming vote largely measures how little the administration's critics have offered as alternatives which appeal when the moment arrives to assume responsibility. It would seem to follow that the critics have been talking mostly beside the point.

There was an abortive movement by 17 Democratic Senators, for instance, for an amendment saying the authorization did not imply approval of a wider war. Some 78 Democratic Representatives made similar declarations as the bill passed the House, 392 to 4. Obviously, these were less attempts to make policy than to avoid responsibility.

There was WAYNE MORSE, made of sterner stuff at least, relentlessly following his opposition to the war to the logical conclusion of voting against the authorization. Senator MORSE builds his case against our involvements from the legalisms of international law. Unfortunately, any such case will remain at best marginally relevant until some court can enforce that law against China and North Vietnam.

There was ROBERT KENNEDY, for reasons which presumably seemed good to him at the time, first offering the Vietcong "a share of responsibility" in the South Vietnamese Government, then backing and filling till no one really knew what he did mean. He served mostly to clarify that the United States, even if it should foolishly decide to, has scant right to force coalition on the unwilling South Vietnamese.

Then there was the most prestigious critic of all, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate's august Foreign Relations Committee. Senator FULBRIGHT seems to profess that Red China is naughty mainly because it "is profoundly fearful of American bases" on its periphery. He says "history suggests" that military power cannot enforce peace, and that "accommodation * * * is the only course with demonstrated promise of being able to bring about a lasting and honorable peace."

As we recall history, accommodation at Munich and Yalta didn't automatically bring "lasting and honorable peace." Nor do we remember the total failure of intelligent military measures in Greece, the Philippines, Lebanon, or the Cuban missile crisis.

We are hardly serene, either, about the "impregnable" bases the Senator would establish in South Vietnam, then bargain away to get China to agree on a "neutralized" southeast Asia. Militarily, such a strategy would allow the enemy to concentrate against each base in turn, and would present tempting targets as China develops its nuclear potential. Politically, we cannot see where the Senator finds the faintest indication China would agree to neutralization any time in the foreseeable future.

It is equally difficult to understand Mr. FULBRIGHT'S blithe confidence about enforcing any neutralization with the threat of "reintroduction" of U.S. power. The threat alone would not prevent China from overrunning its neighbors and presenting us with a fait accompli. It also could not effectively deter China's proven talent at conducting war by proxy. And we can cite few, if any, precedents offering much hope for enforcement by "major powers."

Senator FULBRIGHT and his followers might make a more lucid contribution to the debate if they met administration policy head on, dropping their dogged refusal to acknowledge precisely what that policy is. The Senator and some others insist on labeling that policy one of "unconditional surrender." Yet it does not seek, as that phrase has historically implied, the destruction of any government with international standing.

All the United States wants of Hanoi is for it to stop fomenting and supporting insurrection in the south. For that matter, all the United States wants of the Vietcong is that they stop trying to take over the nation by force. Sticking to these minimum goals, according to the critics' curious contention, is demanding surrender because we will not meet the enemy halfway—presumably letting them support a small insurrection or use terror to take part of South Vietnam.

The administration has made it plain, we think, that it is not crusading to stamp out communism. Rather, it is trying to contain communism in Asia much as it was contained in Europe. American policymakers are attempting to deny Asian communism small initial conquests; this denial is intended to curb militant appetites before they provoke war in truth waged for unconditional surrender.

That may be a slender hope; certainly it is a tricky and taxing policy that raises questions in many minds, ours included. Yet its critics have said little relevant to decisions which must be made here and now. It's easy to understand why, whatever its difficulties, containment remains the refuge of those who must not only speculate but decide.

Rogers, Ark., DeMolay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Hugh Grimm, whom I have known since our boyhood, has been one of the leaders in DeMolay since his early years. His lodge, 460, which sponsors the DeMolays of Rogers, Ark., and the DeMolays of Rogers are celebrating International DeMolay Week March 13 through 20.

I know no one who has done more to help the boys of the area than Hugh Grimm. He is a leader not only in leading boys to a better understanding of their responsibilities in life but in all other fields of community activities.

To him and to the DeMolays, my heartiest greetings.

President's E Award to Mr. Curt G. Joa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. RACE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, on February 22 of this year, on the anniversary of the birth of our first President, George Washington, I had the happy privilege of presenting the President's E Award to Mr. Curt G. Joa, of Sheboygan Falls, Wis.

Mr. Joa founded and heads a firm that presently has its machinery in 17 world markets and is in negotiations in 26 other countries. He and his firm truly deserved recognition by the President of this country and presentation of the E Award.

An even more amazing story, Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Joa's own reflections on his life, occasioned by the presentation of this E Award. These reflections are told by Mr. Joa in a letter to his daughter, Mrs. Ruth Kiela.

I feel privileged to have obtained a copy of this letter and under unanimous consent insert it in the Record. It has a beautiful lesson and story to tell to the world. The letter follows:

Boynton Beach, Fla.,
March 7, 1966.

Dear Ruth: Time has passed since we had the presentation of the E Award in Sheboygan Falls, and I have had a lot of opportunity to think about the day, the evening, and to reminisce about the talk I meant to give and the ideas I thought I wanted to get across to the people present.

I meant to write to you before this, but when I arrived in Florida after those very strenuous weeks in Wisconsin, I took quite sick. I have been on antibiotics for 10 days; I had a final examination today and got a clean bill of health from my doctor, although I have to continue with the antibiotics until they are gone, since my infection was real severe.

As I said during the presentation when I was called upon to give a talk, maybe for the first time in my life I was nearly speechless, since my mind was so occupied with the experiences and the history of the past 52 years of my life. I felt that the E Award given by the President of the United States to our company, and the presentation of the plaque by the mayor of Sheboygan Falls, was the climax of acceptance and the height of my desire to be a good citizen of the United States.

Before I was 11 years old, on August 2, 1914, the guns were booming along the east coast of Germany, where I had been sent as a last attempt to cure me of a bronchial disease, which was the aftermath of whooping cough and diphtheria that I had since I was 6 years old. The last resort the doctors recommended in those days was sea air and outdoor living. From the first day of World War I, I had been dreaming and thinking about the United States of America. During my illness I read a great deal of Cooper's "Leatherstocking Tales," and I dreamed about the largess and the greatness of the country beyond the sea, and I had made up my mind that some day I was going to cross the sea and explore the open spaces of America.

With the beginning of World War I, my health apparently was regained. The outdoor and ocean living had done the work it was intended to, and with ardor and enthusiasm I went through some of the finest schooling that youth could have. Always in the back of my mind I wanted to be prepared to at least know the language of the country where I was going to make my home. Therefore, instead of studying in what we call in Germany the humanistic gymnasium, I preferred the equivalent, the oberreal school. The difference between these two institutions is solely that one is a preparatory school for the medical and legal profession, where greater emphasis was put on the Greek and Latin languages, in contrast to the school of my choice, where emphasis was placed on modern languages—English and French—chemistry, physics, and mathematics, which I felt would serve me better in foreign lands.

My mother's brothers and sisters had migrated to the United States in the 1860's and 1870's and settled in Philadelphia and Terre Haute, and I can remember the holiday when the letters came from my uncles and cousins describing their lot and freedom and their reward for hard work in glowing letters about the United States that they, too, had chosen as their home.

I remembered all this quite well, and upon graduation from the university, Frankfurt and Wurzburg, with intense technical as well as economic training, I solicited the help of the cousins for a visa and ticket to the United States. After receipt of my diploma and doctor's degree, within 3 days, on August 11, 1924, I sailed on the SS *Arabic* of the Cunard White Star Line.

My cousins had seen to it that I traveled first class, which was an unusual treat and created even more the desire to show myself worthy of such accommodations, and when I went aboard the ship in Hamburg, I felt my goal was nearly achieved, but nothing in this life comes easy. Off the coast of Nova Scotia, near Halifax, we were caught in one of the worst hurricanes of the century.

Our ship was badly damaged, a hundred people were killed or injured, the water was running into the staterooms from the top, the lifeboats were smashed, the smokestacks were gone, and the engines drowned. I will never forget the violence of that storm that began at 7 in the morning and reached its height about 4 in the afternoon.

We were spun around, and since it was an old-time steamship that used coal as fuel, the fuel shifted and we had a 40° list—a rather marginal situation—and the sinking of the ship was imminent. Those that were alive prayed and prayed hard, and finally the winds abated at 8 in the evening and we were a drifting wreck on the ocean. Eventually we were removed and taken to New York, where we landed with much humility, and when we stepped on land, we felt that life from that day on would be a bonus.

And so the years went by, and always having in mind that I have everything to gain and nothing to lose and being so utterly appreciative of the opportunities that offered themselves, work became a pleasure. My acquisitions were sufficient to send my children to the best of schools, and I surrounded myself with capable, honest, hardworking people. Our roots were firmly grounded in Sheboygan Falls.

When disaster struck and my only son was killed, I walked down the street and Mayor Houwers said, "Curt, I want to talk to you. I know how you feel, because my son also was killed in an airplane accident. We have to make the best of it, and we have to be thankful for having had our sons, and life must go on." These were the words that gave me new inspiration, and all self-pity left me. I went to the office and the young men that Curt had engaged were called in; I asked them if they would stay with me and carry on. Their strong affirmative reply inspired me to do more work than ever and to overcome my grief in my occupation.

These were the thoughts that went through my mind when Congressman Race and Director Howe made their illustrious comments about Curt G. Joa, Inc. Nothing could have made me feel more honored, and it could not have struck me more deeply, than when Congressman Race compared me and the likes of me with George Washington, the Founder and Father of our great country. He, too, had to struggle and surround himself with people when in direst need. They had faith in his leadership, and only as a community of faithful and honest people can success be attained.

When I had to talk, I could only say, "With deep humility and sincere respect, on behalf of my family and all of our employees, I accept this award," and this is the moment when I had to combat the tears—not tears of sadness, but tears as a result of shock through joy.

As to the celebration and the party proper, I was extremely pleased that this was all done by men that had grown with me, and it was truly a remarkable piece of work when I saw the countries in which we had sold machines represented by the girls in our offices and wives of our employees and others, because with each costume I had a mental picture of the task that had to be done, not only to sell the machines, in Greece, Nicaragua, Germany, Belgium, France, and many other countries, but to instill in the people that bought the equipment the faith they had to have to make them a success. Only because I had faith in the capabilities of our workers at Sheboygan Falls, and in the United States of America, could we transmit a spirit of enthusiasm and help our customers with their difficulties in the beginning, because all beginnings are difficult.

As we all know, life begins with a cry, and life ends that way. I could go on forever and tell you about the details of the experiences we have had in each and every one of our travels that always meant another block for the house we were building. There are the days of Gustasfors in Sweden, the weeks of suspicion in Denmark, the examination of our baggage by the customs officers when our samples were scattered on the tables and we had to explain the product the machines were to make. Now, since we are making baby diapers, it is a bit easier. There were problems of financing, problems of taxes, difference in taxes in each and every country, the training of the supervisors in the factories where a different language was being spoken, and thanks to my early training, I could handle a few.

I am thankful that in my early youth I had a goal and that the attaining of this goal made me waste few moments. Even today I continue to study, be it languages, the weather for flying, new motors or engines, because it is a fast moving time and moments are precious. One gets only as much out of life as one has used these moments well.

I will never forget the parting words my father gave me. He was not enthusiastic about America, and he tied a strap around my neck with a leather bag containing $200, which was a fortune for him, with the words, "You will be lonesome, you will be in a strange land with no friends, and when you want to come home, this is your return fare." Six weeks after I was in the United States, I wrote him, "Dear father, it is truly a strange land, but its strangeness is enticing, its greatness is encouraging, and my one aim is to become part of this land," and I returned his leather bag.

I believe the E Award meant to be a recognition in my mind of 52 years of striving first to go to the United States, and then to be adopted by that country as a citizen as I have adopted her. My pride as a father was crowned by being able to award a pin to both of my daughters, as well as my wife, who have been so active and so enthusiastic in the business we are in, and had attained a right and the privilege to be on the board of directors of Curt G. Joa, Inc.

May you never forget that you, too, must have a goal, and your goal must be to carry on. You have a wonderful family, and in this pall-mall life, with its millions of temptations, it is your great responsibility to navigate a course so that 52 years hence, your sons and daughters can speak of an attainment of citizenship, which is the most valuable thing for us all.

CURT G. JOA.

Packed in Cages: No Water, No Food—Dogs for Sale in Ripley, Miss., Shock Animal-Loving Reporter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I spent the weekend in my district, and rarely have I seen the people so aroused. On Thursday afternoon in a front-page, copyrighted story, the Memphis Press-Scimitar reported in story and picture the activities of a dog auction in nearby Ripley, Miss.

The newspaper's switchboard was jammed throughout the day; my Memphis office telephone rang constantly. I was stopped on the street by all sorts of people and asked, "Why can't something be done about it?"

Our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has made an excellent beginning with hearings on bills designed to end this traffic in stolen pets and the inhumane treatment rendered by many dealers. The Congress can do something about this problem.

As evidence that Federal legislation is needed, I call to the attention of my colleagues the newspaper article and an editorial which appeared the following day:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar, Mar. 10, 1966]

PACKED IN CAGES: NO WATER, NO FOOD—DOGS FOR SALE IN RIPLEY, MISS., SHOCK ANIMAL-LOVING REPORTER

(By Kay Pittman)

The magnificent looking black collie with a shiny coat and thoroughbred lines wagged his tail as a child patted his head.

"Nice doggie," the little boy said. Then his mother tugged at his hand and the boy walked away. The collie leaped to run after the child.

That's when a rope attached to a long steel prodding bar was tightened to the strangulation point around his neck, jerking the dog upwards. His tongue hung out and the dog made gagging noises.

SPIRIT BROKEN

Then the steel bar came down hard on his nose. Blood spurted from the wound. The dog whimpered and cowered to the ground, his spirit broken.

Moments later, the collie was loaded onto a four-tiered truck with no ventilation, no water, no food—packed in with about 200 other dogs and numerous cats.

The truck belonged to a dog dealer, who bought the expensive collie for $3. He would sell the dog to a big hospital or research center for $50. The collie was on his way to possible lingering torture and certain death.

FAIRGROUNDS

I saw the collie, formerly someone's cherished pet, at the fairgrounds in Ripley, Miss.

Accompanied by a Press-Scimitar photographer, I went to Ripley for trade and auction day, which is held once a month.

Although everything from fishing tackle to grandfather clocks is auctioned or traded, the biggest single commodity is dogs. There were about 1,000 dogs there this month. Many of them, perhaps half, had apparently been pets.

Dognaping has become a serious business in the United States, and bills are now before Congress to make it an interstate offense to steal a pet and sell it for research.

DEALERS

Dog dealers are taking advantage of the growing demand for dogs that are used in vital medical research. Laboratories now need almost 2 million dogs a year.

To cash in on this need, dealers rove the country, paying a buck or two to anyone who comes forward with a dog, and no questions are asked. Family pets, trained to obedience and easy to handle, are especially prized, and the Humane Society of the United States estimates that 50 percent of all missing pets have been stolen by dognapers, who in turn sell them to dealers.

Dealers sell to laboratories. There are many Ripleys dotted across the Midsouth and the Nation.

Some of the men at Ripley freely admitted to me that they scoured the countryside picking up dogs. Pets.

One dognaper, with an Alabama license, asked me what kind of pet I wanted. "Just tell me, and I can have it for you next month." Humane Society people say Tennessee and Virginia are happy pet-hunting grounds for Pennsylvania and New York dealers.

WIRE CAGES

The Ripley trade day opens at 8:30 a.m. Panel trucks start arriving with chicken wire cages only big enough to hold one dog. Sometimes these cages are made to hold 20 dogs. Others start arriving with car trunks filled with animals of all description. Out of such a cage came the big collie. There wasn't room enough for him to stand. There were six other big dogs in the cage with him.

Putting on my best accent, I asked one dealer who was buying hundreds of dogs what would happen to the animals. He had started loading dogs on his truck at 9 a.m.

He said, "Well, little lady, I'll leave here tonight and get to my farm about midnight, then start out for a long drive up north in the morning."

And what would happen to the dogs on the truck, many of which were the pets of some heartbroken, still searching owners?

The dealer said the dogs would stay on the truck during the whole process, from Ripley onward, without food or water or exercise.

SELLERS

Many, under such crowded conditions, would probably die during the 24- to 36-hour imprisonment before arriving at their destination.

The dog dealers were buying animals from various men, most of whom were clad in overalls. Most of the men carried shotguns. I saw collars and license tags removed from some of the dogs' necks before they were sold.

I caught a glimpse of one dog bearing a Kentucky license tag, another wearing the name "Sonny Boy" around his neck.

I saw dogs beaten, kicked, and tied out behind cars and along fences for hours without food or water. I saw a nightmare of man's cruelty to living creatures.

INCOGNITO

I went to the trade day incognito having been warned by Memphis Humane Society officials that game and fish commission officers, who were evidently on the fairgrounds complex, would run off any newspaper reporters or photographer. State troopers were there too.

Just by ambling around and saying I was "looking for a good hunting dog and a house pet," I was able to observe the trades firsthand.

HUNTING DOGS

There were a number of good hunting dogs and house pets there. Men who had as many as 20 dogs in a chicken wire cage would come to me and say, "I've got a nice dog here. He belonged to my grandson. I'll sell him to you for $3."

One nice dog that belonged to a grandson was a fine looking Airedale. Another was a rare and expensive white German shepherd. He was sold to Roy Hargrove of Medina and loaded on the Hargrove truck, which bears a Cicero, Ill., sign on its three-tiered side.

The truck was so crammed with animals by noon that you couldn't have squeezed a squirrel into it.

DOG FARM

Yet more dogs were thrown into it. Hargrove and his son, William Hargrove, 40, of Cicero, Ill., operate a dog farm in Medina.

The Hargroves, like other dealers, collect dogs and sell them to laboratories and medical schools, some in the Chicago and St. Louis area. They were indicted by the Gibson County Grand Jury in December on a charge of cruelty to animals.

Circuit Judge Dick Jerman of Alamo will hear the case on May 4, a case which has attracted national attention to practices involved in the handling and sales of dogs and cats.

RESCUE

I rescued a wirehaired terrier, usually an expensive dog, from one seller with a Tipton County, Tenn., tag on his car. He had no license plate on the back of the car. He pulled the dog out of the trunk and sold it to me for $5.

I also bought an emaciated, but still proud looking, English setter from another Tennessee dealer for $4. The setter was nothing but a boneyard.

TOTE BAGS

I noticed that the dealers with the largest trucks bought few small dogs. They purchased mostly large dogs—shepherds, collies, hounds, and the like.

People also brought tote bags crammed with cats, some selling for 10 cents a pound, to them. Puppies were also bought by the pound.

They bought large dogs because beagles, retrievers, and German shepherds are ranked high on the labs "most wanted" list. These dogs are purchased for $2 or $3 and sold to the labs for $30 to $50. Cats sell to labs anywhere from $1 to $4.50.

MEDIC CENTER

The Memphis Medical Center buys no dogs from dealers. It purchases dogs, under contract, from the city dog shelter. Director Otis Caldwell said a shelter board, many of whom are members of the Humane Society, sets the policy for operation of the city-operated pound.

Caldwell said any dog that is picked up and not wearing a license is held for 3 days. If he is not claimed he is put up for adoption.

Dogs that are sick are gassed.

Dogs that are never claimed or that no one seems to want are sold, under contract, to the Memphis Medical Center.

No dogs in the Memphis hospital operation are bought from dog dealers.

REGULAR FEE

Dogs sold to the medical center are purchased for the regular $2 pound fee.

Last year 7,634 dogs were redeemed or adopted.

In addition the shelter provides the University of Tennessee with 4,300 dogs, Kennedy Hospital 319.

Caldwell said 4,800 dogs, those which were badly injured or diseased were gassed. He said the center handled 18,000 dogs last year.

PERSIAN CAT

One dealer told me he had a "nice Persian cat" in the truck and would try to find it for me. He told me this while he was prodding and stuffing a pregnant boxer dog, obviously a former pet, into the already bulging jam.

The wire-haired terrier I rescued is a well-trained male dog. I took him home with me. He was starved for food and water and would wince every time you touched him for fear of being hit.

One of the sellers in Ripley said they didn't get enough money for the dogs to "waste money on food" for them. Sometimes they carry the animals they have picked up around in trucks and cages for 2 or 3 days until they sell them to dealers.

SICK PET

My terrier may be your dog. If you can identify him, he's yours. I took him to Foote Animal Clinic where Dr. W. B. Miesse is trying to restore him to health. Dr. Miesse said the dog has suffered. He's ill and needs attention. He's been needing it.

The terrier had obviously been a pet. He obeys orders and responds to commands. I almost cried as the dejected dog I call "Scottie," ate an egg fixed for his breakfast. When he finished, he weakly raised his head, licked my hand and feebly wagged his tail, his first show of animation or affection in 24 hours.

SASSY

Almost as much as a child, the domestic dog is part of the human heart and the human home for reasons no one need explain.

I know because I have a 2-year-old "cockerpoo" (half cocker, half poodle) dog named Sassy. She is my 7-year-old daughter's favorite playmate and almost another child to me.

I saw Sassy's face in the face of every dog at Ripley.

I was sorry that I didn't have enough money to buy all of the dogs.

And I was thankful that Sassy, a happy pet who sleeps on the foot of the bed and demands her morning coffee like a dictator, does not have to wake up such horror.

I hope she never strays.

THE MARKET IN DOGS

It's one thing to use in medical research a homeless dog from a public pound. It's another thing—and a vicious one—to use somebody's beloved pet which has been stolen from a front lawn.

A dramatic revelation of the latter type of operations here in the Midsouth was given in a story by staff writer Kay Pittman in yesterday's Press-Scimitar. Because so much of this has been going on over the country, both houses of Congress are concerning themselves with legislation to regulate the sale of such animals in interstate commerce. The lawmakers don't have in mind making dognapping a Federal crime, although many pet owners would like it to be. Some of them suggest hanging as an appropriate penalty.

We all know that medical schools and some research laboratories need dogs and other animals for experiments that may benefit man. It can also be conceded that these scientists are not out to hurt the animals.

But they have apparently not been careful enough about their suppliers.

Scores of animal welfare groups appeared before a House subcommittee this week to protest that pet theft for research is widespread. Yet it was also testified that thousands of unwanted cats and dogs are put to death annually in municipal pounds. If this is true, both labs and pounds have been overlooking a beneficial arrangement. We were glad to report yesterday that the Memphis Pound seems to be operating humanely and sensibly in this respect.

Anyway, don't be surprised if some law gets passed in the field. Pet owners are voters as well and all Congressmen know the adage, "He who loves me, loves my dog."

Role Is Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary McNamara's report that our Armed Forces can meet the Vietnam demands without weakening our position in other areas is "welcome assurance," the Denver Post says editorially.

The paper believes the Secretary deserves much credit for "the tremendous feat of deploying within a matter of months a combat ready force of 300,000 men some 10,000 miles away and supporting them in combat."

The editorial is concise, and in the belief that others will want to see it, I am offering it for the RECORD:

WELCOME ASSURANCE FROM MCNAMARA

Secretary of Defense McNamara has given the Nation powerful assurance that our Armed Forces can meet the demands of the war in Vietnam without weakening our military position in other areas of the world.

McNamara himself has played the major role in building up those forces since 1961, and the statistics he released this week on the buildup of our military forces during the last 5 years are impressive.

He deserves a good deal of the credit for "the tremendous feat of deploying within a matter of months a combat ready force of 300,000 men some 10,000 miles away and supporting them in combat—without calling up the Reserve forces, without a general extension of tours on an involuntary basis and without invoking the usual economic controls."

This force of 300,000—215,000 on land—represents about 10 percent of our "total active duty military strength," McNamara said. There is obviously a good deal left to meet problems in other areas and a good deal more that could be mobilized.

In describing our strength, its mobility, its capability and its adequacy to meet the challenges ahead, McNamara is on sound ground. As long as our policy to provide whatever it takes to protect South Vietnam, we have confidence that policy will not fail for any lack of men or supplies from McNamara's department.

We feel less certain, however, about McNamara's analysis of what the Communists will try to do or be able to do. Too many faulty predictions along that line still echo throughout southeast Asia and haunt the men who made them.

We hope McNamara is right when he says the Communist buildup of manpower will have to come to a peak sometime this year because it will not be possible for Hanoi to support any more men in South Vietnam.

If that is so, it will be possible for the United States to set a limit to its own manpower buildup. Under present conditions, with 215,000 men on hand and another 20,000 on the way, it is not possible to tell how many men we will need. Our strength for this year is expected to rise to 350,000 or 400,000, but it may have to go higher.

No one can tell for sure how far the Communists will be willing to go or what new assistance Hanoi may receive from Peiping or Moscow. We will simply have to be ready for anything, including an unreasonable response from the other side. Despite his measured optimism at this stage, we're sure that is what the Secretary intends.

The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle?—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, the fifth article of a series written by Washington reporter of the Detroit News, Tom Joyce, discussing war on poverty follows:

COMMUNITY ACTION AND THE WAR ON POVERTY: MAKE THESE PEOPLE ASHAMED TO STAND IN A WELFARE LINE

(By Tom Joyce)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—A Los Angeles Negro who softens his militancy with a smile was asked what he was trying to accomplish through a war on poverty community-action program.

The scene was a sparsely furnished office on the second floor of an old frame building precisely in the geographical center of Watts, the ghetto scorched and bloodied last August.

Ocie Pastard, the 28-year-old Negro, leaned over his desk and replied in a firm voice to the question:

"To make these people ashamed to stand in a welfare line."

The answer came like a splash of cold water in the face of this reporter, who had been asking the same question from the Nation's Capital to San Francisco and receiving answers couched in the poverty war's new jargon.

The most frequently heard explanations: "To organize the poor," "to get them thinking about their problems," "to inspire them to action," "to promote self-help."

Many poverty experts disagree with Pastard's cold, frank way of putting it. They would phrase it differently, saying the goal is to motivate the poor to do something about their own poverty.

But it always seems to come out much the same way.

And the overriding question is always the same: how do you inspire the poor, people frozen in poverty, inured to its misery and without means of escape?

STIR INTEREST

The philosophy of community-action programs, viewed by many as the heart of the battle against poverty, is to arouse their interests and imagination by demonstrating that there are ways of breaking the stranglehold.

Pastard is community-actions program director for Westminster Neighborhood Association Inc., financed by a $982,000 antipoverty grant.

It is on such programs that the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) is spending $685 million of the $1.5 billion set aside for poverty-war programs this year.

How do they work? The scope is limited only by imagination.

How well are they working? As both critics and proponents of the daring new approach imagined they would, depending on where one looks.

In the jungle of Harlem, where giant rats, dope pushers and prostitutes work at night, the youth-oriented community action program is known as Haryou-Act. The name comes from two prepoverty war organizations that merged after the national war was declared—Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited and associated community teams.

LARGEST IN NEW YORK

It is the largest single antipoverty project in the Nation—one plagued by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's self-serving brand of politics and charges of mismanagement of funds. Federal authorities are waiting, and not too patiently, for the executive director, a Powell lieutenant named Livingston Wingate, to "reconstruct" the financial books.

That is one side of Haryou-Act.

To find out about the other side, you must talk to people like the 21-year-old unwed mother named MagDalean who works in a program for young people as an office assistant.

She was 14 when she became, in her words "a pretty good hustler."

Speaking freely, she admits she was involved in narcotics, too.

"I was a pusher and I was on the stuff myself," MagDelean admits.

Last Christmas was the first since she was 15 that she did not spend in jail. Her three children, the oldest of whom is 11, were being cared for by her parents, who had ordered MagDalean out of their house.

Now she is living at home again.

A NEW LIFE

It began last summer when a Haryou worker came to her neighborhood to talk about the program. Somehow, and she is not clear about it herself, she was moved to join a summer "crash program" for youths, working on a parade designed to dramatize the antipoverty fight.

Because of her work, she was promoted to the office job when the summer program ended.

"I was real scared when I first came," she confessed. I didn't think these squares would accept me. They knew all about my background and everything like that."

But the squares did accept MagDalean, whose vocabulary and style of speech belie the hard fact that she quit school when she was 14.

"You learn a lot of things when you're hustling," she confessed.

How much does she earn while working and learning? Fifty dollars a week. Not much with three little children, she allows.

"When I was hustling and pushing John (narcotics) I used to sometimes spend more than that in one day," she says. "But now I have respectability and I wouldn't trade that for all the money I could make on the street corners. Who knows, someday I might even meet a nice guy who wants to marry me?"

Working in an office down the hall is an attractive, 20-year-old named Barbara, a sophomore at Hunter College. Before she got her job as an office assistant at Haryou, her stepfather criticized her ambitions and, in frequent rages, would hurl her books into the trash can. Now she keeps her books in the office, has a quiet place to study and the $1.25 an hour she earns allows her to continue college.

THE PROGRAMS

Dozens of other programs are helping in Harlem, where an estimated 7,000 to 10,000 youths are out of school and out of work. And not even Wingate's harshest critics are suggesting anything more serious than mismanagement of antipoverty funds and perhaps political motivation.

There are some sputtering, mismanaged programs in Harlem, too.

Some neighborhood centers, located in old storefronts and aimed at adults, seem destined to failure as they drift along without organization or leadership.

Under the terms of the Economic Opportunity Act, the legislative machinery to carry out President Johnson's war against poverty, a community action project may be almost anything from a course in homemaking to job training.

It must be planned with local initiative, financed with 10 percent local funds (either in cash or "in kind" such as office space, furnishings and manpower) and designed to get at the roots of poverty in one way or another.

The broad guidelines have resulted in some sharp criticism and some shapeless programs.

FRISCO SLUMS

A 10-minute taxicab ride from elegant Nob Hill in San Francisco is one of America's worst slums. There are no colorful cable cars and its residents do not dine at Fisherman's Wharf. Officials of San Francisco, where the poverty program seems hopelessly bogged down in political bickering, say it is ready to explode into a racial nightmare.

There is despair on the streets, where drunks, prostitutes and dope addicts weave in and out of doorways in broad daylight. The school dropout rate is alarmingly high. Unemployment is twice that of the rest of the city.

It is an uglier sight than Harlem, maybe because most of the buildings are dilapidated frame structures, many of which escaped the fire that razed most of the city after the 1906 earthquake.

A LEADER

This is the 280-block district known as Western Addition.

It is a concentrate of all the problems found in American ghettoes.

In the middle of this filth and decay is an old two-story building with a rough, handlettered sign announcing it is the headquarters of Western Addition's antipoverty program. Inside is Wilfred Ussery, 37-year-old Negro architect, who has given up a good job with a national firm to run the program.

What are his objectives? To get the people of Western Addition organized and thinking about what they can do to help themselves.

And after that? This will have to wait, says Ussery.

Paid doorbell ringers, recruited themselves from poverty's ranks, are out trying to discover what the poor think about their own needs and wants, whether they would like to participate in some kind of a program.

"I hope that out of all this will come programs for social change," says Ussery, a national vice chairman of CORE.

"We don't want instant success. It won't be until the second or third year that real results start to show."

FIRST STEP

And for the beginning, he feels that getting people organized and thinking is more important than programs for jobs, job training, and concrete aims.

Dr. Arthur Coleman, a Negro doctor-lawyer who is the mayor-appointed chairman of San Francisco's antipoverty council, is openly skeptical of the Ussery approach. But he is reluctant to make a blanket condemnation "because it might just work in the end."

In other community action programs there is palpable success.

One is a small Chicago project with the unlikely title of LBJ which stands for Lawndale for Better Jobs. Lawndale is one of the poorest areas in the city.

LBJ is an employment service. Its six-man staff works in three little rooms in the basement of a rundown school building in the middle of a slum neighborhood. Its initial funding of $16,000 covers all expenses and salaries for 4 months.

So far it has found jobs for 200 residents of the neighborhood. They are paid an average of $1.75 an hour, ranging from $1.25 to $3.76. And 70 percent of those placed have stuck with the work, in a variety of jobs.

For an employment office, the operation is anything but orthodox. The clients are recruited from bars, poolhalls, streetcorners, and any place the hopeless gather to forget the pain of their indigence.

The philosophy is that a man without a job won't be hanging around the house where he is an easy target for his disappointed wife's wrathful barbs.

The idea was conceived and developed by Monroe Sullivan, a Catholic lay worker who had worked in the area while serving with the Catholic Interracial Council and with the Chicago Commission on Human Relations.

EARNS $8,400

A 29-year-old former high school teacher, Sullivan's salary works out to $8,400 a year.

His philosophy: "There are no deep-seated Freudian problems to solve here. Just jobs."

Sullivan deals with employers in the Chicago area, finding out what jobs are available and persuading employers to gamble with his clients.

The two fieldworkers were recruited from the neighborhood. One is Mrs. Virginia Easterly, a short, stocky housewife with a pleasant smile and a lot of courage.

On a typical afternoon in Lawndale she enters a dreary bar where the odor of stale beer and unwashed men fill the misty air. At the end of the bar is a lonely figure, half asleep over a glass that is nearly empty.

Mrs. Easterly taps him on the shoulder. There is a look of alarm. Is she the welfare worker or someone sent by his wife? Neither, Mrs. Easterly assures him.

"Would you like a job?" she asks.

"I didn't come here for no comedy floor show," the man replies. "Get lost."

AN ENTRY

"I'm serious," returns Mrs. Easterly. She places a card next to the beer glass. "There is a good chance we can find you work if you want it. Drop by."

It is surprising how many do. And Sullivan calls it "A direct feed from the taverns."

"Our philosophy," he says, "is to get to the guy who has given up, whether he is in a tavern or a poolhall."

LBJ represents a new approach to finding jobs for people.

"The key," says Sullivan, "is being in the neighborhoods. The kind of people who live here just don't go downtown where the State employment services are located.

"And the State agency to a lot of people * * * and they are people with little education who have trouble expressing themselves * * * represents authority, big government bureaucracy and a lot of redtape. They are actually afraid of it.

"Besides, the State service doesn't make it a personal thing in dealing with the employer. It doesn't try to persuade an employer to give a man with a record a chance.

"It is easy for the middle class person to say that there are plenty of jobs for people who want them. But middle class people are more sophisticated about job hunting, and they know people who have jobs who can help them out.

"The unemployed man here is utterly confused about the job market. He doesn't know where to begin looking so he just gives up."

Several big city antipoverty agencies have begun placing employment offices in neighborhood service centers.

Atlanta is one. The arrangement there is an employment counselor from the State employment office in each of four neighborhood centers where there are a variety of services for the poor.

MANY PLACED

So far, 1,500 unemployed have been placed in jobs.

Chicago, Detroit, and other cities have adopted similar programs and all are enthusiastic about the new approach.

But the hard success stories are not the rule in community action projects. Many are just getting launched. Others are drifting in orbit, the start of a job-training program here, plans for a birth control clinic there, and frequent pleas not to judge the program too harshly so early in the war.

Many cities are just getting neighborhood centers into operation.

Where they have been started, they have become the heart of the community action program.

There are such centers operating now in Chicago, Detroit, Atlanta, Los Angeles, and New York.

They are in the middle of poor neighborhoods where, theoretically, they can develop services where the victims of poverty live and where they can inspire the same victims to do something for themselves.

PUT TO WORK

In such centers the poor themselves are put to work in a new field of employment generated by the poverty war. They are euphemistically called subprofessionals and they are the frontline workers. Their job is to find out from the poor what their problems are and whether they are interested in trying to help solve community problems.

A woman named Lilly Mae in Los Angeles' Watts area is a slob. With no money for furniture or clothes, she has given up on herself and her house. A man from the neighborhood center appears. Like thousands of others put to work by community-action programs, he is paid $333 a month.

He is conducting a survey of the neighborhood and wants to know if Lilly Mae has any view on poverty.

A block meeting is being organized for next week and the man wants to know if Lilly Mae would agree to have it at her house. After much persuasion, she finally yields.

Others come to the meeting, many reluctantly, where a community action staff specialist leads a conversation. It gets off slowly. There are grumbles about what a "lot of nothin'" is going on. "How's this gonna help?"

Someone suggests that what the neighborhood really needs is better police protection. Another voice asks timidly if there would be any value in trying to clean up the neighborhood, maybe plant some flowers.

What about a program for job training? If something like that could be done maybe the thing would be worth while.

From such meetings may come the seed of self-help.

Eventually a class on homemaking is started in a center. Another deals with something as simple as consumer training.

It may sound inane, but in many ghettos where residents are captives of a store because of geography, lack of transportation, or some other reason, price gouging is standard practice. Unscrupulous grocers hike prices, deal in short weights, and charge heavily for cashing checks.

ABOUT 700 PROGRAMS

In Watts such a merchant was forced out of business through a boycott inspired by the leaders of a community action program. A weighing station was established in the heart of a Chicago ghetto.

About 700 community action programs are now in motion.

All are part of the great experiment—to test whether the poor can really play major roles in helping themselves.

The war on poverty does not deal in traditional dole payments, except in a very few of its programs. Money is not handed out for groceries, rent, and the like. Many poor have the mistaken notion it is and they go away from places like the neighborhood centers grumbling.

The idea, instead, is to get at the causes of poverty, which are ignorance, illiteracy, lack of training, hopelessness, and sometimes just a simple lack of what used to be called, in less complicated times, get up and go.

But President Johnson's poverty fighters go beyond a simple criticism where there is an obvious absence of motivation. They ask if something cannot be done about it.

Some cities, Detroit and Atlanta leaders among them, are concentrating heavily on adult education, using new approaches to get the poor to participate.

The idea is to make the schools a warm, friendly part of the community.

In Atlanta the program is headed by Alan Koth, who was with Flint's esteemed community school operation before he was hired away.

School dropouts make up the largest part of the adult poor population. And to them, school is a symbol of defeat, a place crammed with unhappy memories of failure. How, then, do you arouse their interest in adult education?

One way is through community action programs where the poor themselves are asked about what kind of courses they would like.

SCHOOLS HELP

Schools in the poverty neighborhoods are kept open at night. There are social activities as well as classes. Gymnasiums are open for children to participate in organized sports.

Counselors are on duty at night to help with personal problems.

This is what is happening in Atlanta, where regular teachers are paid $4 an hour to teach the night classes.

In one of the classes is a middle-aged woman who works for Goodwill Industries during the day. She is taking courses toward a high school diploma.

Why? She feels a diploma will lead to a better job. And, with only the income from her 95-cent-an-hour job, she is supporting two daughters who, by day, attend the same school. She hopes that her interest in education will encourage them to stay in school.

One man who is attempting to improve his reading and writing confessed that he has been turned away from many jobs because he could not fill out an application without "making a lot of mistakes."

To his surprise he has found others in his classes who have had the same experience.

Forty-one Percent Favor U.S. Viet Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Times Herald of Carroll, Iowa, has published the results of a poll of Iowa farmers which shows that the majority of those interviewed favor the present policy in Vietnam.

They support continuing military action while remaining ready for negotiations.

Since I feel certain that many of my colleagues will want to see the article on the poll results, I am making it available for publication in the RECORD:

[From the Carroll (Iowa) Times Herald, Mar. 2, 1966]

FORTY-ONE PERCENT FAVOR U.S. VIET POLICY

DES MOINES.—What do Iowans think the United States should do in Vietnam.

A poll of Iowa farmers by Wallaces Farmer shows that only 10 percent of those questioned wanted to go all out to win quickly. At the other extreme, only 4 percent said, "withdraw completely."

Almost half—41 percent—couldn't see anything better than present policy, "continue military action, but remain ready for negotiations."

Twenty-three percent suggested we start negotiations and stop fighting. Seven percent of those polled said we should step up military activity while 15 percent had no definite views to express.

More men than women (13 percent to 8 percent) wanted to "go all out to win."

A farm woman in Clay County with a boy near service age said, "If we declare war, go all out to win quickly. It would be over. It's going on and on and we'd better try to get it over with."

A farmer in Tama County said, "What do we have now if it isn't war? We might as well declare war if that is what it takes. Clean things up over there and get our boys home."

A man in Greene County said, "I think the war should be stepped up some. My goodness, Vietnam isn't any bigger than Texas, and I think we could clean things up in a hurry with our equipment."

Most warlike were the men of 65 and over. Less warlike were the men in the 21 to 34 age group.

School Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced the bill H.R. 12805 on February 14, I am quite pleased to see many of my distinguished colleagues have joined me in sponsoring such legislation.

One cannot help but note the many comments by these colleagues and material in the RECORD Appendix wholeheartedly favoring the school milk program.

In this material are many similar statements from school administrators, therefore, I am pleased today to place into the RECORD the strong endorsement of Mr. John Prasch, superintendent of schools, Unified School District No. 1 of Racine, Wis., which is my First Congressional District.

The letter from Mr. Prasch follows:

UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1,
Racine, Wis., March 8, 1966.

Hon. LYNN E. STALBAUM,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STALBAUM: By action of the Racine Board of Education I have been directed to contact you concerning Federal financing of the special milk program as it has operated in connection with the hot lunch program for schools. We think the school lunch program, and particularly the special milk feature, has been one of the most successful Federal aid programs to schools. We, therefore, regret and respectfully protest current plans to reduce subsidies to this program.

At a time when the Federal Government is making significant advances in school subsidies, it appears highly inconsistent to make those advances at the expense of existing programs which are successful and for which administrative machinery is already established.

Cordially yours,

JOHN PRASCH,
Superintendent of Schools.

Emergence of a New Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the face of Chicago has changed dramatically under the leadership of Hon. Richard C. Daley, who has served as mayor since 1955. His accomplishments speak for themselves.

Mayor Daley has moved forward with bold vision and with determination to improve health and sanitation services, to modernize the fire department, to complete construction of the modern O'Hare International Airport, to install a vast network of efficient freeways, to initiate urban renewal projects for removal of slum areas, to revitalize the downtown business area, to improve the police system and the welfare system by appointing able administrators, and to make countless other improvements.

In the past decade, under Mayor Daley's leadership, both the face of Chicago, and its public image, have changed for the better. Although most Chicagoans are familiar with the far-reaching improvements taking place in our city, the rest of the country continues to keep in mind an image of Chicago which no longer exists.

Max Steiner, president of the Clifford Peterson Tool Co., and a recognized civic leader in the Chicago community, has written a discerning letter to the Chicago Tribune commending it on its efforts to re-create the public image of Chicago. His comments draw attention to the emergence of a new and better Chicago. It is my pleasure to insert Mr. Steiner's letter, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on March 10, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His letter follows:

CHICAGO: NO. 1 CITY

CHICAGO, March 7.—After reading the first two installments on your series on our great city I am compelled to write to congratulate the Tribune and to thank you for removing the "second city" label from Chicago. I was delighted to see this highly important series of articles. The writer, David Halvorsen, obviously has done an enormous amount of careful research, and his first two installments are gems.

For a long time I have felt that Chicago and those who talk about our city were doing it an injustice by not laying claim to supremacy above all other cities in the Nation. We may fall behind in a quantitative analysis, but a qualitative evaulation certainly places our city on top in so many significant areas.

Mr. Halvorsen is making this abundantly clear. The writer is not only accurate but eminently fair in crediting Mayor Richard J. Daley with providing impetus to a dramatic and dynamic push to bring Chicago to its present level of preeminence. The mayor's skill as a municipal administrator and innovator is well known throughout the Nation. It is, I think, a laudable instance of excellent reporting that Mr. Halvorsen should accurately tie the beginning of Chicago's reach for supremacy to the beginning of Mayor Daley's administration.

I do not think the significance of this important profile of Chicago will be lost on Chicagoans. Nor will it escape the attention of other interested Americans across the Nation. Business, cultural, social, religious, political, and other leaders cannot help but ascribe to this extraordinary milestone the real meaning it has for Chicago's future.

For now that our city has shaken off its second-city cloak and wrapped itself proudly in a new mantle of peerless quality, we can only move foward still, at a pace that is likely to dazzle all onlookers. As great and as magnificient as our city is, it is certain now to strive for even more opportunity to serve well its citizenry and the State and Nation of which it is a part.

MAX S. STEINER,
President, Clifford Peterson Tool Co.

Watershed Projects in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, this week I received an annual report on watershed projects being carried out in the Fourth Congressional District.

No Federal program has contributed more to the welfare of all the American people than the Soil Conservation Service.

I am extremely pleased that the 1,000th soil conservation structure contracted for in the State of Texas is in my home county of Collin. Dedication ceremonies for this structure will be held this year.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Soil Conservation Service, and particularly Mr. H. N. "Red" Smith, State conservationist, and include herewith his report.

This report shows that the Fourth Congressional District of Texas has more flood control structures than any other congressional district. A total of 195 flood control dams have been constructed, and additional structures will be underway before July 1, 1966.

The Soil Conservation Service is currently participating, along with other Federal and State agencies, in comprehensive investigations of the lower Red River Basin below the Denison Dam and the Sabine River Basin. These investigations will include studies of the potential and needs for all water and related land resources.

It is anticipated that additional projects will be developed under Public Law 566 to provide watershed protection, flood prevention, water management, and recreation throughout this area. This is a program without parallel in this country.

The report follows:

TEMPLE, TEX.,
March 2, 1966.

Hon. RAY ROBERTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RAY: This is my annual report to you on watershed projects being carried out by people in your congressional district and the State. In addition to the information for your current district, the status of watershed projects for the area to be added to your district through the reapportionment of Texas congressional districts will be furnished.

High public interest in the small watershed program is evident. Applications for assistance on watershed projects under Public Law 566, 83d Congress, continue to be made at a faster rate than work plans can be completed. Sixty-three watersheds in the State are awaiting planning assistance. Some watershed groups have encountered problems in securing land, easements, and rights-of-way. However, in most cases, the sponsoring local organizations have made good progress in carrying out their responsibilities for project development.

During the past fiscal year, the State of Texas furnished $125,000 to accelerate the development of watershed work plans. Local sponsoring organizations contributed an additional $86,000.

The following shows the status of watersheds in operation and planning wholly or partially in your district:

WATERSHED APPLICATIONS AND STATUS OF PLANNING

Applications for planning assistance under Public Law 566 have been received and approved on seven watersheds; namely: Choctaw, Sanders, Caney, upper Bois d'Arc, lower Bois d'Arc, and upper Lake Fork Creek, and the upper Sabine River. Watershed work plans have been prepared and approved on Caney Creek and upper Lake Fork Creek watersheds, and planning has been completed on Choctaw Creek watershed at this time and the work plan is undergoing review. To date, the sponsors of the other three watersheds have not met all the requirements for receiving a recommendation for a planning priority from the State soil and water conservation board.

In the authorized portion of the Trinity River in your district, work plans have been prepared and approved on eight watersheds and all of them are now in operation. A complete revision of the work plan covering the East Fork above Lavon watershed was completed in 1963. This revision was made to bring the plan up to date and for inclusion of a multiple-purpose structure to include municipal water supply and development of recreational facilities for the city of Van Alstyne.

WATERSHEDS IN OPERATION

Upper Lake Fork Creek (Public Law 566), (Hunt, Rains, and Hopkins Counties): Construction has been completed on 17 of the 23 planned floodwater retarding structures. No additional structures are scheduled for contracting this year.

Caney Creek (Public Law 566), (Fannin and Grayson Counties): Good progress has been made in this watershed this year.

Two of the planned 15 structures have been contracted and are nearing completion. In addition, four sites are scheduled for contracting before June 30, 1966. A major development in this watershed last year was that the Fannin County Commissioners Court agreed to furnish financial assistance to the Caney Creek Water Control and Improvement District in securing the remaining land, easements, and rights-of-way required to complete the project. The sponsors expect four to six structures will be ready for contracting in fiscal year 1967.

Sister Grove Creek (Trinity), (Grayson and Collin Counties): Thirty-six of the thirty-eight planned structures are completed, and the sponsors have cleared one additional site for contracting this year. They also have started clearing easements on the 15 miles of channel improvement planned in the watershed. The 1,000th structure in the State was contracted in this watershed. Dedication ceremonies are scheduled to be held for the 1,000th structure this year.

East Fork above Lavon (Trinity), (Collin and Grayson Counties): To date, 50 of the 74 planned structures are completed and 9 sites are under construction. Two additional sites are set up for contracting in fiscal year 1967.

Upper East Fork laterals (Trinity), (Collin, Rockwall, and Kaufman Counties): Twenty-seven of the twenty-eight planned structures are completed, and the one remaining site is scheduled for contracting this year.

Lower East Fork laterals (Trinity), (Kaufman County): The 12 planned structures in this watershed have been completed.

Rosser-Trinidad laterals (Trinity) (Kaufman County): Construction has been completed on the two planned structures in this watershed.

Rowlett Creek (Trinity) (Collins, Dallas, and Rockwell Counties): Six structures have been completed to date in this watershed. No structures were contracted this year, due to problems encountered by the sponsors in securing land rights and due to inability of sponsors to adequately carry out their financial responsibilities.

Pilot Grove Creek (Trinity) (Collin, Fannin, Grayson, and Hunt Counties): To date, construction has been completed on 14 of the 34 planned structures in the watershed, and 7 additional structures are scheduled for contracting this year.

Cedar Creek (Trinity) (Rockwall, Van Zandt, Kaufman, and Henderson Counties): Construction has begun to move ahead in the Cedar Creek watershed. To date, 22 of the 139 planned structures have been completed or under contract, and 5 additional sites are scheduled for contracting by June of this year.

The major development in the Cedar Creek watershed last year was the activation of local interests by the Cedar Creek Watershed Association. Mainly through their efforts, Van Zandt County has agreed to furnish financial assistance in securing all remaining land, easements, and rights-of-way for structure in the portion of Cedar Creek in Van Zandt County. This year, the watershed association made arrangements with the city of Terrell and Kaufman County Commissioners Court to get their help in securing the remaining land, easements, and rights-of-way on two construction units that would clear approximately eight sites for construction.

Little Elm and Laterals (Trinity) (Collin, Denton, and Grayson Counties): Construction got underway in this watershed late in fiscal year 1965. To date, 7 of the 23 planned structures have been contracted, and construction is nearing completion. One additional site is scheduled for contracting this year. A highlight of last year was the activation of local interests by the sponsors. Through the joint efforts of the Collin County, Denton-Wise and Upper Elm-Red Soil and Water Conservation Districts, arrangements were made with the Grayson County Commissioners Court for assistance in securing the remaining land, easements, and rights-of-way in the Grayson County portion of the watershed.

There were 264 floodwater retarding structures constructed or under contract as of March 1, 1966, in the 50 Texas watersheds authorized for operations under Public Law 566. It is anticipated that 29 additional structures will be contracted for construction in these projects prior to June 30, 1966. The total number of structures for the State, built or under contract as of March 1, is 1,069 and work should begin on 84 additional structures prior to the end of the fiscal year.

PROJECTS IN COUNTIES TO BE ADDED TO REVISED CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT NO. 4

In the counties added to your district, no active watershed projects are underway in Smith and Upshur and only one new project in Van Zandt.

Mill Creek (Public Law 566) (Van Zandt County): An application for assistance was made on this watershed in March 1964. The State soil and water conservation board recommended a priority for planning in July 1965, and the administrator of the Soil Conservation Service authorized planning on January 10, 1966. The development of the watershed work plan will get uderway in March. The sponsors of the project are the Kaufman-Van Zandt and Neches-Sabine Soil and Water Conservation Districts, the cities of Canton and Edgewood, and the Van Zandt County Commissioners Court.

COMPREHENSIVE BASIN SURVEYS

The Soil Conservation Service is currently participating, along with other Federal and State agencies, in comprehensive investigations of the lower Red River Basin below Denison Dam and Sabine River Basin. These investigations will include studies of the potentials and needs for all water and related land resources. All subwatersheds of the basin will be thoroughly studied to determine the potentials for development of projects under Public Law 566 for the purposes of watershed protection, flood prevention, water management, recreation, and other needs. All subwatersheds that are feasible for project development and that have the potential for installation during the next 10 to 15 years will be identified. Studies were initiated in 1963 and will be completed in 1968.

Attached for your further information is a status report on watershed protection and flood prevention activities under Public Law 566 in Texas. This report shows progress in construction and planning and current planning workload.

I plan to be in Washington during the week of March 14, and hope for a brief visit with you to provide any additional information you may need.

I send best regards.

Sincerely yours,

H. N. SMITH,
State Conservationist.

Des Moines Register Supports Bandstra Proposal on Electoral College Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. CULVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my fellow Members to an editorial from the Des Moines, Iowa, Register, of March 7, 1966, regarding electoral college reform.

My colleague from Iowa, BERT BANDSTRA, has been a tireless advocate of responsible reform in this important area, and has won wide respect for his views on the subject. I believe the editorial expressing support for a proposal advanced by Mr. BANDSTRA, as well as the proposal itself, merits the close attention of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

[From the Des Moines Register,
Mar. 7, 1966]

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORMS

U.S. Representative BERT BANDSTRA, Democrat, of Iowa, has appeared before a Senate subcommittee to raise an important point concerning President Johnson's plan to abolish presidential electors. The electoral vote of the States would be retained, under Johnson's plan, but cast automatically for the presidential and vice-presidential candidates getting the highest popular vote in the State.

This would prevent the running of uncommitted electors, or the occasional case in which an elector bolts the ticket on which he was elected. Such devices might permit a minority to deadlock the electoral college, since a candidate must have a majority to be elected, and throw the choice of President into Congress for decision.

BANDSTRA favors the principal features of the Johnson plan, but he believes the requirement of an electoral college majority for election should be dropped. The candidate getting the highest electoral vote for President or Vice President should be declared elected whether he gets more than 50 percent of the electoral college vote or not, BANDSTRA argues. Congress would be called on to decide the election only in case of a tie under this suggestion.

The requirement that a candidate for an office have a clear majority to be elected usually is made to assure that the winner will have substantial support in office. This is desirable, but has no meaning when a candidate can get a majority of the electoral votes without getting a majority of popular votes, as has happened in connection with the Presidency. It is popular support that is important in this case, not electoral votes.

Since the requirement for an electoral vote majority does not assure majority popular support, BANDSTRA seems to be correct in arguing that it serves no purpose and could be dropped, allowing the candidate with the highest electoral vote to win.

It also has the merit of reducing the electoral role of Congress to the lowest possible minimum. There is reason to fear and avoid as much as possible the chance of a presidential election by Congress.

The danger that the public desire may be thwarted by factional interests is too great to allow the legislative power to name the Chief Executive any more often than is absolutely necessary.

The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle?—No. 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, the sixth article of a series written by Washington reporter of the Detroit News, Tom Joyce, discussing war on poverty, follows:

Our City Halls Are Taking a Beating: The Politics of Poverty

(By Tom Joyce)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—The city halls of America have become battered bastions in the war against poverty.

They have been assaulted by the poor—and their newly emerging leaders—from Boston to Los Angeles. Few have been spared, and a lot of political blood already has been spilled.

For one thing, the poor themselves are being driven into politics by the assault on poverty.

For another, fast-growing cadres of civil rights leaders, arguing that they represent the poor in whose name the war is being fought, are discovering that the antipoverty campaign has created convenient machinery for them.

City hall establishments, on the other hand, have a natural political interest in the growing antipoverty war chests, the big organizations that are being built and the rich new crop of voters the program is expected to engender.

PROGRAM HURT

The political skirmishes are working against the war. In some cities and towns the fight against poverty has given way completely to the battle of political forces.

At the heart of the controversy is the first general order of the poverty war—the one that dictates maximum feasible participation of the poor in community-action programs.

Other phases of the war—like the Job Corps—have been spared the political infighting, because they are not covered by edict.

Complicating things is the fact that no one really knows how much participation of the poor is really possible in programs where they are supposed to propose and help develop their own devices to break the cycle of poverty.

What it boils down to is how many representatives of the poor should be included on the boards that run the citywide or umbrella community-action programs.

In the South there is an additional problem, since participation of the poor also means participation of Negroes.

POOR IN CONTROL

San Francisco is the only major city where spokesmen for the poor have actually won control of antipoverty machinery from city hall. That was 6 months ago, and despite grants totaling $1.8 million in community-action funds, not a single significant program is in motion.

Mayor John Francis Shelley, a big, affable Irishman, seems to be enjoying the struggle that the victors are having in trying to put the program into effect.

Asked how his city's antipoverty program was going, he chortled and replied:

"What program?"

Under pressure from representatives of the poor, some of them self-styled, Shelley agreed to an open meeting and election to settle the issue. The poor representatives ended up with a 51 percent majority on the board of the umbrella agency.

"I have just sat back since then," Shelley said. "They haven't contacted me, and I haven't contacted them. Let's see what they do now.

"I hear a storm is blowing up inside the council about leadership. What will come of it I don't know. We have given them their reins, and the wagon hasn't moved."

Ghetto leaders, who led the battle against Shelley, concede that San Francisco now represents a supreme test in the controversy over whether the poor are equipped to devise and develop their own means of escaping poverty.

DETROIT PRAISED

But they say they are willing to take the responsibility.

In Detroit, Mayor Cavanagh has handled the issue so skillfully that some antipoverty experts wonder if the Detroit programs really deserve the constant praise they get from Washington. Could it be, they ask, a case where defects in the program have been covered over by avoiding an open conflict on the representation issue?

But there is no evidence to support the question, and the consensus in poverty war circles is that Detroit's operation is an outstanding one.

Detroit's total action against poverty (TAP) policy advisory committee is made up of 26 members appointed by the mayor and 16 elected from the city's 4 designated poverty areas. But there are plans to increase the poor representation to 24 when new poverty districts, termed target areas, are funded.

The mayor's appointees had numbered only 23 until he recently named 3 new ones—to satisfy a requirement that the committee include spokesmen for city departments of housing, welfare, and health.

There have been no public charges that Cavanagh was acting to block a majority of the poor from gaining control when delegates from the new poverty areas are seated.

There is reason to believe that he feels strongly that if the programs are to work, the poor must be substantially represented.

OTHER PROBLEMS

He think it would be absurd, however, for the poor to have control of the machinery—as in San Francisco.

Neither does he think that only the poor can best determine their needs and cures.

"This," he says, "is like saying that if I had a malady, only I would know the cure." There are some other problems.

Cavanaugh, for instance, feels that the poverty war is spawning new leaders who think city hall is some kind of monolith to be torpedoed.

And he has told OEO Director Sargent Shriver that big cities are having trouble because the poverty war has helped create a sociology that city hall has to be torn down.

In Chicago, a bitter political battle is going on between Mayor Richard Daley, frequently described even by fellow Democrats as the arch-type political boss, and followers of Saul Alinsky, self-appointed spokesman for the poor everywhere.

The fuss has seriously impeded, but not halted, Chicago's antipoverty projects.

ONE APPROACH

Daley sees city hall as the rightful source of leadership in the war on poverty.

A Daley spokesman does not deny that there are political advantages to be derived from running the show. "But what is wrong," he asks, "with political control of a program if it is a good program?"

The Daley approach is aimed at jobs and job training. There is no strong objection to projects fostering an understanding of art and culture, but they are regarded only as subsidiaries.

A central theme is that the poor must organize to develop leaders, talents, and incentives.

"Organize for what?" Daley's top lieutenants ask. "So they can develop community leaders who are only out to break the power structure?"

The question articulates a fear that many big city administrations have about the antipoverty fight. They ask if the Federal Government should be financing attempts to batter down city hall.

A CRITIC

It is because of such concern, and pressures generated by it, that Shriver and the OEO have retreated on the question of maximum feasible participation.

The consensus now seems to be that if the war on poverty has a chance of succeeding, the local programs must be in the hands of established forces—city governments, business, labor, and proven welfare and service agencies—with the poor represented but not in control.

One who disagrees is Alinsky, who is making a career of organizing the poor and assaulting power structures.

Alinsky-inspired organizations are at work across the Nation, in cities like Detroit, Chicago, and Syracuse.

Cavanagh has had to run hard and fast to keep ahead of one such outfit in Detroit—the West Central Organization.

Alinsky is one of the chief critics of the war on poverty, describing it as a big "hoax" aimed at stifling the voices of the poor.

He is convinced that the poor can get the things they need—like better housing and better jobs and more services—only through organized power.

Alinsky's home-base operation is The Woodlawn Organization (TWO), probably sharpest thorn in Daley's side.

Woodlawn is a sprawling ghetto, one that presents a somber panorama of squalor and despair as it is viewed from the elevated trains that rumble over it.

The man who runs TWO is the Reverend Lynward Stevenson, pastor of the Bethlehem Covenant Presbyterian Church. His philosophy:

"The only way you get things is through the use of power. And power comes from two sources—money and people. And we don't have any money in this neighborhood."

How is such power employed?

CRITICIZES DALEY

As an example, Stevenson says TWO forced slumlords to make $1,475,000 in building improvements. TWO members staged surprise marches in well-to-do neighborhoods of slumlords passing out handbills like this:

"Did you know one of your neighbors runs a slum building? He is ——. He owns and operates one of the filthiest buildings in Woodlawn at ——. This dump is not fit for human beings to live in."

There also have been marches on city hall and boycotts of merchants.

Like Alinsky, Stevenson is a critic of the poverty war, saying: "It is making the same mistake welfare always has, creating a dependency. We are still just putting bandages on people to cover up the wounds. The only thing that will solve the problems is social change and the war refuses to deal with people who can bring it about."

CALLS FOR FACTS

Stevenson charges that Daley blocks any meaningful participation by TWO in the city's antipoverty fight. And he says that Daley is forcing projects down the throats of people, using party precinct captains to "intimidate poor representatives on the advisory council."

He especially attacked a slum-beautification plan, arguing that "a slum cannot be beautified."

Daley vehemently denies the charges, saying Stevenson has been unable to offer a single name or a single solid case to support his accusations.

In New York, the central political rub is with Haryou-Act, the big antipoverty projetc in Harlem. Officials of the citywide umbrella agency complain bitterly that "there is a wall around Haryou." They say they cannot penetrate the wall for a real look at what is going on .

POWELL WINS

There was a bitter fight for control of the program and few people were really surprised when it was won by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, who has a sharp eye for situations that offer political advantage.

And Haryou, the biggest single antipoverty project in America, with hundreds of jobs to be filled, offers an inviting piece of machinery with which to reward political supporters.

Nobody has to point this out to ADAM CLAYTON POWELL who installed his own lieutenant as Haryou Director even though the consensus seemed to indicate there were more qualified condidates.

In the beginning, POWELL was a fiery critic of city hall control of the war. But not too long ago he moderated his position, saying that probably there should be some sort of middle ground between "unfortunate extremes."

He cited Chicago to illustrate what he called "minimum feasible participation of the poor" and characterized Newark as being "so politically pure that it has antagonized all the city councilmen and ignored the mayor."

NEWARK ISSUE

He alluded to the fact that in Newark politicians and appointed city officials, not the poor, have been denied anything approaching what might be called "maximum feasible political participation."

With few exceptions, city officials were virtually excluded from the umbrella agency, called the United Community Corp.

And while OEO officials in Washington were busy praising Newark as an outstanding example of "maximum feasible participation," sulking city officials were thinking about ways to get in on the action.

A solution that has gained wide support, however, is expansion of the board to seat 26 officials of city agencies, including the 9 members of the city council.

Newark's $9 million program was never really in control of the poor anyway. While city officials largely were excluded, real control rested in the hands of established leaders of social agencies, civil rights groups, and community organizations.

LIVES IN NEW YORK

One thing that irks city officials is the fact that the $23,000-a-year director of the umbrella agency, 37-year-old Cyril D. Tyson, is a former Haryou-Act, worker who continues to live in New York.

Many of the headaches over participation of the poor have developed by the very way the city boards had to be set up in the beginning.

Generally there were no ready-built organizations to take on the work of the war against poverty. And they just grew, in a rather logical way.

In many cases city officials and representatives of welfare agencies and established community services got together with businessmen and others and set up shop. Then they picked delegates to represent the poor.

And as was, and still is the case, these representatives themselves were not poor but supposedly either lived in the neighborhoods or had some kind of interest in the people who did.

One of San Francisco's representatives of the poor, for instance, is a Catholic priest in Chinatown.

POLITICAL HEAT

Now, more and more, spokesmen for the poor are being named in neighborhood elections.

But the elections themselves generate a lot of political heat. In Los Angeles, for instance, there are charges that people responsible to Mayor Samuel Yorty have gerrymandered the election districts.

Because of political fighting, Los Angeles County so far has made little real progress in its antipoverty programs even though it has received about $40 million.

There is constant bickering between minority groups. Residents of the Spanish-speaking community complain loudly that, since last summer's riot, OEO officials have channeled most of the money into Watts because of pressures from civil rights groups.

Many Mexicans say they feel they are being punished for not rioting.

A COMPLAINT

One to register such a complaint is Mrs. Rosita Moreno, a representative of the poor on the central board. She and her husband live on a retirement income of $3,300 a year.

"All the attention," she says, "is on Watts. They tell us to wait. But we are tired of waiting—tired of hearing manana. It is no longer good enough."

Shriver himself has not escaped political barbs. There have been charges that he has dealt too easily with Daley because he has political ambitions in his home State of Illinois, where the Chicago mayor wields powerful influence.

New power struggles are certain to develop. But the direction of the war now seems away from any notion that maximum participation of the poor means control of community action programs by the poor. Experience is not on the side of those who would have it that way.

Confusion Over Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh Press, last week had an excellent editorial on the "Confusion Over Vietnam."

It explains very clearly, I think, the need for our active participation in South Vietnam. It states President Johnson is deserving of "the most determined support we can muster for him" while performing this most difficult task of accomplishing the containment of communism in North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I feel it will help some who may be confused.

Confusion Over Vietnam

It is quite evident to anyone with ears that public opinion about the Vietnam war is in some disarray. And that confusion about this struggle, more than anything else, contributes to differences of opinion and most of all to uncertainty.

This need not be surprising, since the Vietnam conflict is not like any other war in which this country has engaged, not even like Korea which also generated some confusion and split opinions.

In Korea, there was a frontal attack by Communist armies. We can understand that as war. World War II, once it started, clearly united the country—because we were directly attacked without provocation.

But Vietnam is something else. It began with the Communist attempt to take over South Vietnam by subversion.

By skillful trickery, the Communists were able to make their grab for power appear as an insurrection from within the country. When that didn't fully work, they went on to terrorism. (In 1960, Secretary McNamara has said, more than 2,000 Vietnamese officials and civilians were murdered or kidnaped.)

Later the Communists began pouring trained guerrillas and organized military units into South Vietnam.

So the war has grown, not because the South Vietnamese or the United States sought to "escalate" it, but because the Communists, as they were frustrated in their indirect attempts to seize the country, went on to more forceful, more direct and more obvious stages.

In such circumstances, people in this country and elsewhere couldn't easily recognize that the seemingly disorganized, bewildering turmoil in a far-off Asian country was, indeed, a frightful case of Communist aggression.

The Communists had failed, in Korea and elsewhere, to achieve their ends by sudden, explosive attack. So in Vietnam they tried more subtle means. But the purpose was the same, to conquer an independent nation for their own domination.

Senators in Washington should know all tis. That is their responsibility. Instead, many of them have bene indulging in a rambling, endless and belated dispute over policies—the result, if any, being simply more confusion.

Samuel Lubell, the eminent pollster, reported after 3 weeks of interviewing people around the country that the Senate debate had changed the minds of almost nobody. But about two-thirds of the people he interviewed, he said, simply want to step up the fighting and force the Communists to quit.

What is hard for people to understand, obviously, is President Johnson's effort to keep the war contained. But his purpose is to avoid, if possible, a much wider war, involving Red China in force, which would cost us much more dearly in lives. This purpose amply justifies his effort, gamble that it may be.

So, altogether, the nature of the war and the bewildering manner in which it developed were bound to produce confusion which the Johnson administration simply will have to tolerate.

In turn, the President, in this most delicate and difficult task, deserves the most determined support we can muster for him, even if at times we are perplexed.

Los Angeles Antipoverty Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the recently held election in Los Angeles designed to elect representatives of the poor to the local antipoverty board has raised a number of questions about the failure of the vast number of eligible voters to participate.

In the following article from the Christian Science Monitor some of the answers are given. This is not the whole story, but the article does accurately indicate some of the basic underlying causes of the election's failure in the city of Los Angeles.

The article follows:

Discontent Traced in Poverty War Voting

(By Curtis J. Sitomer)

LOS ANGELES.—In terms of cast ballots, Los Angeles's antipoverty election was something of a fizzle.

It seems to indicate widespread disenchantment among affected citizens with the local administration of the War on Poverty program. Minority leaders confirm this disenchantment.

Only 1 percent of the county's 300,000 eligible voters from poverty pockets turned out March 1 to elect seven community representatives to the antipoverty program's decisionmaking body.

The Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency's 23-member board administers Federal funds and programs under the Government's war on poverty. Its membership includes city-, county-, and school-appointed officials—and now elected representatives of the poor. Up to recently so-called poverty members were appointed—on an interim basis.

PARTICIPATION DEBATED

Actual participation by the poor in policymaking for Los Angeles' Job Corp, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Head Start, school enrichment, and other antipoverty programs has been at the center of a bitter struggle between local government officials and minority-group leaders for the past year. Strong resentment by Negroes and the Mexican Americans that they were being "sold down the river by downtown politicians" in the poverty program came into sharp focus during the Watts riots in August.

Voters needed neither to "speak the language" nor be literate. They only had to affirm that their family income was $4,000 or less a year and that they were over 18 years old or the head of a family. The 56 candidates who sought the seven posts also had to meet the same requirements.

VIEWS OFFERED

Negro and Mexican-American leaders, however, state:

The election was a deceptive gimmick to fool the people that they are going to have a voice in the policymaking. They will not, the leaders say.

The "white power structure" has paid little attention to citizens' demands of 75 Negro and Mexican-American groups up to now. This election won't change things.

"We [Negro leaders] have been let down and betrayed before. What indication is there of fairer administration of these programs now?"

The numerical composition of the EYOA board is still unsatisfactory to most members of the "poor" community. They want greater representation than seven members.

"The Redeemer," a Worthy Motion Picture That All Should See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am asking for this moment to call attention to the Members of the U.S. Congress that a very worthy motion picture is currently making the rounds in theaters throughout the United States. The picture is entitled "The Redeemer," produced by Family Theater, an organization founded by Father Patrick Peyton, who thus becomes the first priest-producer in American History.

Currently, this film has been shown in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the States of Texas and New Mexico. It has been widely acclaimed. The technical excellence of the production and the reception it has received by both critics, clergymen, and the general public, prove that wholesome and religious entertainment can be a success, not only financially but spiritually.

At a time when so many of our motion pictures that are being shown have an adverse effect, particularly on young people, it is welcome news to learn that efforts are being made to have presented a film which has such a meritorious effect on people. One of our major national problems is the growing crime rate and increasing defiance of law and order, in all age groups and conditions. There is little doubt among many analysts of the problem that much of this is traceable to the crime, sadism, and violence presently depicted on the screens of the Nation.

There is little doubt that youth tends to imitate. Youngsters exposed to unsavory fare on television 3 to 4 hours a day cannot fail to absorb, at least subconsciously, many of the attitudes, emotions, and conflicts depicted into their systems and perhaps incorporate these into their own patterns of behavior. It is for this reason that a film like "The Redeemer" should receive national recognition in that it can influence young minds in the same manner, but toward an opposite direction.

As this Nation was founded upon principles derived from our common Father, we as a nation should especially take pride in pictures making Him better known and loved. "The Redeemer," which is one of these pictures, should therefore receive our every support and encouragement.

I understand that inquiries on this matter can be addressed to Rev. Albert Heinzer, C.S.C., 7201 Sunset Boulevard Hollywood, Calif., or better still, here in Washington, D.C., to Rev. Raymond J. Cassel, C.S.C., American International Pictures, 1100 Vermont Avenue NW., room 704.

I strongly recommend that all Members of Congress take the opportunity to see this picture and I am certain it will be a refreshing and rewarding experience. It is my understanding that the picture will be shown in our Nation's Capital at one of the local theaters very soon, and I would suggest you watch the newspapers for its premiere.

Rev. Patrick Peyton, Rev. Albert Heinzer, and Rev. Raymond Cassel are truly three of God's great noblemen, and deserve the commendation of the entire Nation for their uplifting efforts.

American Auto Joins Phillips-Eckardt in Business Expansion—Recognition for Mr. Weissman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last month it was announced that the American Auto Accessories Stores, with headquarters in my hometown of Wilkes-Barre and under the able direction of its president, Mr. Oscar Weissman, whom I have had the distinct pleasure in knowing for many years as well as his distinguished father before him, the late Mr. Charles Weissman, had become the foundation of a new retail division of the Phillips-Eckardt Electronic Corp., with offices in Oakbrook, Ill., a Chicago suburb. As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I include the front-page news story as well as the editorial on Mr. Weissman which appeared in the February 10, 1966, edition of the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader.

The news story and editorial follow:

AMERICAN AUTO JOINS PHILLIPS-ECKARDT IN BUSINESS EXPANSION

Announcement was made today of Oscar Weissman from his offices here that American Auto Accessories Stores, Inc., have become the foundation for a new retail division of Phillips-Eckardt Electronic Corp.

Mr. Weissman's announcement was made jointly with James J. Pelts, executive vice president of this midwestern manufacturing company speaking from his offices in Oakbrook, Ill., a Chicago suburb.

Mr. Weissman and Mr. Pelts emphasized that the American Auto Accessories Stores chain of 11 stores will continue to be served by all of its present personnel under the leadership of its present management, with no change in the policy which has characterized it since it was founded in 1913 by the late Charles Weissman, a pioneer in the automotive supply industry.

ON AMERICAN EXCHANGE

Phillips-Eckardt Electronic Corp., a publicly owned company, with over 2,000 shareholders, is traded on the American Stock Exchange. It is known as the world's largest manufacturer of Christmas decorations and ornaments. Mr. Weissman will be a principal stockholder of the company. It has factories in Irvington, N.J.; Joliet, Ill.; San Juan, Puerto Rico.; Wallenfels, West Germany; and York, Pa. The latter plant, a 270,000-square-foot modern one-story structure situated on 22 acres of land, was opened in 1965.

The present board of directors of Phillips-Eckardt Electronic Corp. is comprised of Mr. Pelts, Arnold H. Maremont, Howard Wolfson, Jerome Comar, Merle A. Hayward, and Herman C. Bernick.

Mr. Pelts stated that it is the intention of the company to expand its board of directors to include further representation for its broad scope of diversification.

WEISSMAN POLICYMAKER

Mr. Pelts expressed great pride in announcing that Mr. Weissman will be a vice president of Phillips-Eckardt, and the president, operating head, and the policymaker of the new retail division of home and automotive supply stores, with full authority and responsibility for the expansion of the operation. It was also pointed out that the division will bear the name of American Auto Accessories Stores, Inc.

Long known and recognized as a leader in the business and civic affairs of northeastern Pennsylvania, this development gives Mr. Weissman and his marketing talents national recognition. He declared that he chose to join with Phillips-Eckardt Electronic Corp. over several other nationally known companies in his long-range program of developing a greatly enlarged chain of automotive and home supply stores because this association afforded the best opportunity for growth and advancement of the executives, store managers and personnel of the American Auto chain.

Mr. Pelts, in turn, stated that the joinder with American Auto afforded him and his family and his board of directors a particular source of pleasure because the union of the two companies for the development of a retail division signaled a formal business association with Mr. Weissman with whom he and his family has enjoyed a close social relationship for over two decades.

WILL CONTINUE HOME HERE

Mr. Weissman is a director of Cordovan Associates, Inc., Dayton, Ohio, and of Nationwide Tire Co., city, and is vice president of the Automotive Associates of New York City. He was a former president and chairman of the board of directors of Dean Phipps Stores, Inc.

He is the first one in the automotive industry who has been president of both the Second Generation Club and the Quarter Century Group, the social and fraternal organizations of the automotive industry. At a recent auto accessory convention in Chicago, he completed his term of office as the host and greeter, the title of the executive officer of the Quarter Century Group.

In making this announcement, Mr. Weissman wished it to be known that he will continue to maintain his home and his executive offices in the city.

NUMEROUS AFFILIATIONS

Mr. Weissman is a director of the First National Bank of Wilkes-Barre, a director of Percy A. Brown & Co., and a director and officer of the Hub Clothing Co. He serves the American Red Cross as a member of its board and its treasurer. With Guthrie Conyngham and Andrew J. Sordoni, Jr., he was a cochairman in 1957 of the first United Fund campaign conducted here.

Mr. Weissman is a member in perpetuity of the Jewish Community Center and a past member of its board of directors. He is affiliated with Temple Israel of Wilkes-Barre and is a treasurer of that religious body, and is a member of various Masonic bodies, including Landmark Lodge No. 442, Caldwell Consistory and Irem Temple. A veteran of World War II, he is a member of American Legion Post No. 132, the Jewish War Veterans and the Disabled War Veterans.

Mr. Weissman is married to the former Charlotte Smulyan and resides at 30 Riverside Drive. A daughter, Mrs. Charles Cahn, II, resides in Baltimore, and a son, James, is a freshman at the University of Virginia.

Henry Greenwald of Rosenn, Jenkins & Greenwald, represented the American Auto Accessories Stores, Inc., in the negotiations, joined in by Attorney Herman L. Krekstein, of Philadelphia. Phillips-Eckardt Electronic Corp., was represented by its general counsel, Bernard Nath and Donald G. Lubin of Sonnenschien, Levinson, Carlin, Nath & Rosenthal of Chicago.

American Auto Stores, Inc., Division of Phillips-Eckardt: Recognition for Mr. Weissman

Six years ago yesterday, on February 9, 1960, an editorial, published in the Times-Leader the Evening News a week previously, appeared in the Congressional Record at Washington through the extension of remarks of Representative Daniel J. Flood. The editorial was headed "Land of Opportunity—Oscar Weissman Acquires Chain."

The editorial began:

"That our country and our community offered almost limitless opportunity to men of ability, initiative, and foresight was strikingly demonstrated when formal announcement was made that Oscar Weissman, president of the American Auto Stores with headquarters in Wilkes-Barre, had purchased controlling stock interest in the Dean Phipps Stores, a retail chain with headquarters in Scranton, 60 outlets, 2 warehouses, and a realty subsidiary."

Further down in the editorial there was this:

"Mr. Weissman has faith in the future of America and in the free enterprise system. So obviously he is set to grow with the country, picking up where his father left off."

There was more, but that is enough to serve our purpose here today—to show that our faith in Mr. Weissman was fully justified. Dean Phipps is a closed episode, but it furnishes a background for another milestone in the life of Mr. Weissman and the history of the American Auto Accessories Stores, which have become the foundation of a new retail division of Phillips-Eckardt Electronic Corp., with offices in Oakbrook, Ill., a Chicago suburb.

Phillips-Eckardt is the largest manufacturer of Christmas decorations and ornaments in the world, with factories in five cities. American Auto which has 11 stores in northeast Pennsylvania was founded in 1913 by the late Charles Weissman, a pioneer in the automotive supply industry and father of Oscar Weissman.

Under the arrangement, American Auto will continue under its present management and will be served by its present personnel. Mr. Weissman, who will become a vice president of Phillips-Eckardt, will be the operating head and policymaker of the American Auto Accessories Stores division. This new setup will give Mr. Weissman national recognition and will be shared by his local associates.

American Auto has been a family enterprise and will continue to be operated in that manner. The Weissman family has had social ties with many of his new associates for two decades, so it was not surprising that he decided to join with them rather than other companies that approached American Auto.

It is good news for Greater Wilkes-Barre that not only will Mr. Weissman maintain his home and headquarters here, but none of his other business and civic ties will be affected.

As one of the second generation in business, Mr. Weissman has picked up the gauntlet which his father, with whom he was associated in the early days, dropped. He has been honored not only with appointments on many boards of directors, but by organizations, locally and nationally.

Wilkes-Barre has produced a score of famed business executives in its history and it is a privilege and pleasure to add the name of Oscar Weissman to the list. A man of his ability and idealism should go far in life.

Inflation: The Ill-Defined Economic Bogeyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about inflation these days. As a matter of fact, "inflation" may be the most used and least understood term in today's political and economic lexicon. Prof. Leland J. Pritchard, of the University of Kansas, has written an excellent and brief analysis of inflation which was printed in the University Daily Kansan on March 7.

It follows:

Inflation: The Ill-Defined Economic Bogeyman

Inflation is the bogeyman of economics, an ill-defined and much bandied-about term that conveys a feeling of impending hardship if not actual economic catastrophe. Because of the difficulty of defining inflation with any degree of exactitude, some economists have suggested that the term be completely avoided. Since the public taste for the word shows no sign of abating, perhaps it is better to formulate a concept, although admittedly nebulous and inadequate, rather than allow the nonprofessionals to preempt the field.

Economists generally define inflation as a chronic "across the board" increase in prices. This is merely a description of the consequences, the overt evidence, of inflation; it is not a description of causes.

Economists, being "wordsmiths" by trade, also have a whole lexicon of terms to describe types of inflation or inflation processes. We are advised that there is: creeping and hyper inflation, reflation, disinflation, deflation, and of course, just plain inflation. Explanations of inflation are given in terms of the wage-price spiral, the price-wage spiral, cost-push and demand-pull.

From this melange of terms, which describes both nonexistent as well as existent phenomena, the economic rationalizers are able to obtain professional sanction for almost any variety of bias or ignorance. By appropriate selection it is possible to "pin the monkey of inflation" on almost anyone's back. The "back" selected depends on the particular group in the community the rationalizer wishes to discredit.

Thus businessmen are prone to discuss inflation in terms of the "wage-price spiral"; while the AFL–CIO people emphasize that it is the "price-wage spiral." Politicans, not wishing to alienate either group, find the "cost-push" explanation handy.

To avoid the ills and pitfalls of inflation we are incessantly advised to take a whole spectrum of "cures," the remedies recommended depending on the particular collection of prejudices and the degree of ignorance the advocate is laboring under.

Remedies for inflation (some of which actually have validity under certain circumstances) include: raising taxes (sales taxes if you are rich, income taxes if you are poor), holding the "price line" (labor), keeping wages down (management), raising interest rates (bankers), lowering interest rates (nonbankers), balancing the budget (nonoffice holders), balancing the balance of payment (almost everybody), eliminating foreign aid (Republicans), expanding exports (businessmen), cutting down on imports (businessmen), expanding imports (consumers), raising particular tariffs (on the goods you have to sell), lowering particular tariffs (on the goods you have to buy), increasing depreciation allowances (businessmen), increasing profit margins (businessmen), reducing profits (labor), and so on ad nauseam.

Actually there is no such thing as the "wage-price spiral"; the "price-wage spiral," or the "cost-push spiral" in the sense that increases in wages, prices or costs are causes of inflation.

Unless effective demands (money times its velocity) are adequate to prevent a cutback in sales, or a diversion of purchasing power to the price raisers, any administered increase in prices will result in less sales, smaller outputs, less employment, lower payrolls and less demand for products—in other words, depression and deflation in due course.

Similarly if a strong union is able to force wage rates up, this will not have inflationary effects. In fact quite the opposite will happen unless the increase in wage rates is accompanied by increased productivity. Given such an increase in productivity there would be no increase in costs or necessary price increases. Thus is avoided the deflationary impact which would otherwise ensue from an increase in prices generated by an increase in labor costs.

If an increase in wage rates, prices or costs (including interest costs) is not a cause of inflation, then what is? Before responding to this question let us first examine in more detail the nature and implications of inflation.

Inflation, as noted, is evidenced by a chronic increase in prices. As such it produces injustices as well as harmful economic effects. Due to the depreciation in the purchasing power of the dollar, those whose savings are held in a fixed number of dollars are, in effect, being robbed. And those whose incomes are relatively fixed suffer, in effect, a reduction in their incomes.

Inflation is especially severe on the elderly, the pensioners, those dependent on social security or welfare, or on life insurance annuities. And it robs all persons who attempt to build up an estate through life insurance, bonds or in any other form payable in a fixed number of dollars.

Fluctuations of specific prices, however, are not an evidence of either inflation or deflation. In fact price flexibility is a necessary attribute of a healthy market economy. Nor is a short-lived general movement of prices up or down inherently harmful. This too may be necessary to bring about needed adjustments in the economy.

In fact if the price level were absolutely stable, there could be no increase in per capita real incomes except as wage rates and other forms of service incomes were increased. In other words, if labor productivity is increasing (as it has been in this country for many years), and the price level is stationary (which it has not been) an increase in wage rates is not only not inflationary, it is absolutely essential to the maintenance of a continuous flow of products to the primary consumer markets.

It is impossible to judge the relationship of wage rates to inflationary developments without a thorough economic analysis. Wage rate increases may be the result of inflationary developments, may take place in an entirely noninflationary situation, and may, if accompanied by increased unit labor costs, produce deflationary effects in the economy.

But if wage rate increases do take place in a noninflationary environment, this presupposes productivity increases sufficiently, so that product prices fall by an offsetting amount, thus leaving undisturbed the purchasing power of the dollar. In other words the price level (represented, for example, by the Department of Labor's Consumer Price Index) must remain constant.

This has certainly not been true in the United States since 1939. The dollar has become approximately a 40 cent dollar since the beginning of World War II. This has occurred, in spite of a vast increase in the output of goods and services, because the volume of dollars being offered for goods and services has increased by a much greater amount than has the volume of goods and services being offered for dollars.

From the end of 1939 and up to the end of 1965 the commercial and Reserve banks of this country have been allowed to create a net addition to our money supply of $288.4 billion. This is an increase of 432 percent over the money supply existing in 1939. During the same period the gross national product (in real terms) has increased 191 percent. In other words we have been manufacturing dollars more than twice as fast as we have been producing the services and final products on which money can be spent.

Further accentuating inflationary pressures has been the increase in the rate at which we are spending our money. In 1939 the rate was 20.2. That is, all of our money turned over (was spent) 20.2 times in the year 1939. Aggregate purchasing power was therefore 20 times the volume of primary money ($38.9 billion) in existence at that time. By 1965 the annual rate of spending had increased to approximately 36 and the aggregate purchasing power exerted in the economy had risen from about $780 billion in 1939 to $6,143 billion in 1965, an increase of approximately 688 percent. This is the percentage that should be compared to the GNP percentage of 191.

Had not a vast increase in the dollar volume of financial and duplicative transactions and transfer payments taken place, and $130.5 billion of the new money been impounded in time deposits in commercial banks, the price level would have risen much higher.

The historical record of this and other countries is clear on this point; there can be no chronic increase in the price level without a concomitant increase in the money supply. If we wish to avoid a depreciating dollar we should, therefore, restrict the growth of the money supply.

But in doing so we will create an intolerable level of unemployment. Given the degree of downward inflexibility that exists in our price structure (due principally to more or less inherent monopoly elements) it appears to be impossible to have a low level of unemployment (less than 4 percent of the gainful workers) without at the same time enduring the ills that flow from a chronic across-the-board increase in prices.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, until 1878 the Bulgarians had been suffering under the autocratic regime of the Ottoman Turkish sultans. For four centuries their historic homeland had been part of the Ottoman Empire, and they were subjected to the detested rule of their oppressive masters. During that long period they had tried to free themselves on innumerable occasions, but all their efforts had proved unsuccessful, and each uprising against their oppressors was ruthlessly suppressed. But during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78, they had the support of the Russian fighting forces, and as the result of that war they secured their freedom. In the treaty of peace signed on March 3 of 1878, their freedom was recognized by the Turks. That day marked their liberation, and to this day it is observed as their Liberation Day, their national holiday.

Since that distant day of 88 years ago, Bulgarians have had their trials and tribulations in the two World Wars, but during the last two decades they have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Just as their forefathers fought their Ottoman oppressors for centuries before their final liberation, so today they are carrying on their relentless struggle for their freedom against their ruthless Communist oppressors.

On the 88th anniversary of their liberation day let us hope that they will again regain their freedom and enjoy the blessing of peace in their homeland.

Same Old Leopard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for years the State Department has been trying to convince the American public that the Communist Government of Poland is mellowing and is not a typical brutal, diabolical type of Red regime. Thus, the Communist Government of Poland has been propped up by foreign aid and subsidized sales of surplus agricultural commodities even though it is providing economic support to Castro and to the North Vietnamese regime.

The Polish Communist Government has a chance this year to demonstrate whether it has "mellowed" or has any respect for the history, traditions, and culture of the Polish nation. The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial Tuesday, March 8, points out the evident determination of the Warsaw Soviet-controlled government to suppress freedom of religion in Poland and in particular, interfere with the planned visit of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski to the United States.

Same Old Leopard

The Communist government of Poland yesterday informed Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski that he cannot make his planned visit to Chicago August 26 unless he and the Catholic Church of Poland "change their disloyal attitude" toward the Red regime. Chicago has one of the largest Polish communities in the United States, and the cardinal's visit had been eagerly awaited.

Cardinal Wyszynski was coming here to celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of the establishment of Christianity in Poland. He was to be accompanied by a delegation of the Polish episcopate in an act of homage to St. Mary of Jasna Gora, the Polish shrine at Czestochowa.

The Communist Premier, Joseph Cyrankiewicz, notified the cardinal that a travel ban imposed upon him January 9 would remain in force as long as the cardinal and the church remained unsympatheic to Communist authorities and policies. No one believes that the cardinal will alter his views; so the Chicago pilgrimage appears doomed. A visit to Poland planned by Pope Paul for May is now unlikely to occur.

These developments provide added proof, if any is needed, that the Washington administration and the State Department are the victims of delusion in their policy of toying with Communist regimes in Eastern Europe in the belief that they can be weaned away from vassalage to the Soviet Union.

For a long time the administration has clung to the notion that national independence was asserting itself in the satellite states, and that they had become less than completely Communist. In pursuit of this will-o'-the-wisp, the administration has lavished loans and food on Poland and other of Moscow's puppets, and even now it has resumed its campaign to obtain approval of wider trade with these regimes.

The ban laid upon Cardinal Wyszynski and other Polish prelates shows how insubstantial such wishful thinking is. The Polish Communists have no desire to ingratiate themselves with the people of the United States, or even to make a gesture in that direction. All Chicago will be disappointed at the outcome, but the intransigence of the Warsaw Reds may at last be brought home to Washington.

War on Poverty a Boon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News, on March 9, concluded a series of articles by Reporter Tom Joyce on the first 18 months of the war on poverty program. The series, as its theme, asked the question whether the war on poverty was a "boon or a boondoggle."

In an editorial also appearing in its March 9 edition, the News answered by stating, "Without question we believe it is a boon." The editorial then goes on to analyze the war on poverty program and some of the criticism which has been made against it. The editorial concludes:

> Looking back on these first 18 months, we don't agree with those who claim money's being poured down that ever-present rat hole. More accurately we have been throwing it like a handful of seeds over an acre of fertile soil.
>
> Some of the seeds have blown away in the wind; others have fallen on rocky ground; some have produced healthy young plants, and many have not had time to germinate.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues, and insert it as a part of the Record.

PLENTY OF FEDERAL BOONDOGGLING BUT WAR ON POVERTY A BOON

With this edition of the News, a careful study of the first 18 months of President Johnson's much ballyhooed war on poverty by reporter Tom Joyce is concluded. The basic question posed at the start was whether this war was a "boon or a boondoggle."

Without question we believe it is a boon.

It is very easy to criticize this scheme. Born as a political campaign tool, it has been a political pawn ever since. True to the traditions of the Federal bureaucracy, it has attracted its share of incompetents, redtape, and corruption. It has meant more Federal fingers in local affairs, huge costs with small dividends and a good deal of controversy.

We do not expect the criticism to stop, nor should it stop if there is something to criticize.

Let us hope, however, that the critics give ample thought to the facts as developed through the efforts of Joyce and others who have taken the time to make on-the-spot investigations.

For every person who reads about a rumble at a Job Corps training site, there are others who were there and can testify that job skills are being taught effectively to young people who would otherwise be destined to swing aimlessly through a lifetime cycle of poverty.

For every person who believes "you can't erase poverty," there are others who have been working in the slums and have seen this poverty cycle being broken.

In the strict sense, it is probably true that some people will always be poor because their health, age, or intellect frustrate all efforts to lift them out of misery. But each new effort to ease the burden of the 34 million "poor" uncovers more effective ways to reduce that number.

The best time to fight poverty is right now, when abundance is so evident. It is also the time when progress comes hardest, for the poor are more easily overlooked. And the clear need for controlled Federal spending to ward off inflation further complicates the problem.

In view of the evident successes of those poverty war programs dealing with youth and job training for those with the most limited skills, it seems obvious that the strongest possible support must be given such programs.

A task of this immense size demands priorities, and if the first year and a half of experience has taught anything, it has taught that the poverty cycle can most effectively be broken at the level of the young.

Looking back on these first 18 months, we don't agree with those who claim money's being poured down that ever-present rathole. More accurately, we have been throwing it like a handful of seeds over an acre of fertile soil.

Some of the seeds have blown away in the wind; others have fallen on rocky ground; some have produced healthy young plants and many have not had time to germinate.

President James G. Patton and Vice President Glenn Talbott Step Down After 25 Years of Distinguished Service to the National Farmer's Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, at its national convention in Denver, Colo., which began yesterday, March 13, and will end on Thursday, March 17, the National Farmer's Union will honor two distinguished leaders who are stepping down from their posts of responsibility and leadership. President James G. Patton, and Vice President Glenn Talbott, have both served with distinction and dedication the great organization known to all who take an interest in agriculture, the National Farmer's Union.

I have today sent a telegram to Jim Patton and Glenn Talbott which, under unanimous consent, I will include in the Record at this point.

The telegram referred to follows:

To James G. Patton and Glenn Talbott, President and Vice President, National Farmer's Union, Denver, Colo.

(Attention of Walter A. Hasty, Jr.):

Have recently learned of your decision to step down and not seek reelection to the presidency and vice presidency of the National Farmer's Union. Would like to take this opportunity to extend you both my very best wishes in the days and years ahead knowing that in the future you both will continue in the same tradition you established in your positions of responsibility and leadership in the National Farmer's Union.

Best regards,

MEL LAIRD.

Fifty Dogs Dead—Owner Arrested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week near Buffalo, N.Y., a man was arrested for cruelty to animals. Dogs, which he stated he was keeping for experimental purposes, were found in very poor condition—underfed, diseased, and improperly housed. Simultaneously, the House Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains, Committee on Agriculture, held hearings last week on legislation that would regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats used for experimentation.

Considerable attention has been focused recently on the atrocities committed by so-called dealers who procure animals for sale to laboratories. Before the animals reach the laboratories, where they are used for research and experimental purposes, many instances of abuse have been uncovered. Dogs and cats have been found half starved, diseased, and without proper shelter, along with evidence that many have died due to neglect.

No reasonable person will deny that research carried on in our hospitals and laboratories is essential and of great importance. Experimental animals are needed for this purpose. But these animals should not be subjected to extreme cruelty, and the thievery of pets should be severely dealt with.

Since it is apparent that local authorities are unable to cope with the existing situation, legislation is needed not only to halt widespread dognaping activities but also to assure proper treatment and handling of animals used for experimental purposes.

There are undoubtedly sources of supply which use humane methods in the handling and transportation of these animals. However, our society cannot condone the practices of unscrupulous dealers whose primary interest is in the lucrative aspects of their operation and who have no consideration for the well-being of the animal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article that appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 7, 1966, concerning the conditions of about 100 dogs found in shacks in the town of Eden, N.Y.

FIFTY DOGS DEAD; OWNER ARRESTED—FORMER EDEN WARDEN HAD MANY OTHERS IN BAD SHAPE

A former dog warden, who said he was serving mankind by providing dogs "for experimentation," was charged with cruelty to animals Saturday after authorities found about 100 ill and neglected dogs in shacks in the town of Eden.

Leroy Rubeck, 55, of 8649 Hunt avenue, Eden, pleaded innocent before Peace Justice Robert E. Maier, who released Rubeck without bail for a hearing next Saturday at 9 a.m.

State troopers, investigating a woman's complaint of a lost dog, found the ill animals and the corpses of about 50 dogs, in three shacks on March Road, Eden, property which police said was leased by Rubeck.

DEAD DOGS BURIED

Agents of the Erie County Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals took more than 50 dogs to the SPCA shelter, 205 Ensminger Road, town of Tonawanda.

"We've had hundreds of calls about the animals," William C. Sullivan, superintendent of the Erie County SPCA, said today.

"I'm going to put an extra man on during the evenings for the next couple of days," he said.

Mr. Sullivan said he believes the story published today in the Buffalo Evening News will bring more requests for dogs than he can handle.

One wing of the shelter at 205 Ensminger Road, town of Tonawanda, has been set aside for people coming in to view the dogs collected over the weekend.

Rubeck, the town dog warden until 2 years ago, spent Sunday, on Erie County Health Department orders, burying the dead animals in a common grave near the shacks.

County health officials said the dogs died of "malnutrition and distemper."

Police and SPCA agents referred to "dognappers" in other parts of the country who sell animals to research agencies.

SPCA TURNED AWAY

"Apparently this spot was generally known in the town but nothing was ever done about it," said Trooper Milton C. Bartlett.

"The SPCA tried to investigate without a warrant once but was turned away."

"When I got there, I saw 20 dead dogs on a mound outside. I checked the shacks and found more dead ones with the living ones inside. There was no sign of food and the water pails were empty."

The troopers returned Saturday afternoon after Judge Maier issued a warrant.

Trooper Bartlett said he saw Rubeck and: "I asked him about the dead dogs and he said heavy snow kept him from getting to the pile. He said he fed the dogs every day. He told me he was keeping them for experimental purposes and the Government owned them."

THE WORST MESS

Special SPCA Agent Tom Collins described the shacks in Eden as "the worst mess I ever saw. It was indescribable."

"We left about 70 of the healthier-looking dogs out there," Mr. Collins said, "and Sunday when we went back there were only three left."

Mr. Rubeck said the Government came and took the dogs.

Police and SPCA agents also found and impounded 25 dogs, identified by tags as belonging to Rubeck, on property owned by Robert E. Webster, 2767 Shadagee Road.

A .22 caliber rifle was in one shack. "I had to shoot a lot of them," Rubeck said. "They had distemper and were dying."

Mr. Collins said the SPCA destroyed 25 dogs brought to the shelter from the Eden shacks. "They were in bad shape," he said.

He suggested that anyone missing a dog visit the town of Tonawanda shelter.

Bonds for the Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to me a very worthy and patriotic suggestion from a constituent who expressed concern over the influence on our fighting men in South Vietnam of minority group demonstrations.

Mr. Guy S. Sandulli, Jr., Hickory Road, Waterbury, Conn., recommended that the Treasury Department Savings Bonds Division set aside a special day for the purchase of savings bonds and that the day be called "A Bond for the Boys." Mr. Sandulli very patriotically suggested that the bond purchase would help to support the war and show the people of other countries that there are 180 million people behind our boys in South Vietnam and also make it clear to our fighting men that the demonstrations in question are by a very small minority group.

I have already thanked Mr. Sandulli for his recommendation and I have also forwarded it to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler. Mr. Fowler has replied that Mr. Sandulli's suggestion will receive thorough attention and will be given every consideration by the Savings Bonds Division. The Secretary of the Treasury has also asked me to extend to Mr. Sandulli his appreciation for Mr. Sandulli's patriotic concern.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith Mr. Sandulli's letter of February 2 in which he recommended the "Bond for the Boys" day and I also include Secretary Fowler's reply. I do this for the purpose of calling to your attention a sound suggestion from a solid citizen who is not only concerned for the well-being of our Armed Forces but also shows interest in the Nation's fiscal strength and economy.

WATERBURY, CONN.,
February 2, 1966.

The Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On a recent newscast, I heard that our boys in South Vietnam are in very low spirits because of the demonstrations of some of the people here in the States.

Could it be possible to set aside 1 day in the near future whereby every "head of the household" would buy one or more U.S. Savings Bonds as a token of our support for the fighting men and also show support for the policies of our Government. This day could be called, for example, "A Bond for the Boys." This bond would help support the war and show the people of other countries that there are 180 million people behind our 180,000 boys in South Vietnam.

Maybe this would be a small way of showing our fighting men that these demonstrations are from a very small minority group. I would appreciate your comments.

Sincerely,

GUY R. SANDULL, Jr.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1966.

The Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: We appreciate the interest you evidence in our savings bonds program by forwarding the good suggestion from your constituent, Mr. Guy R. Sandulli, Jr., of Waterbury, Conn.

Let me assure you that our Savings Bonds Division has been acquainted with the suggestion and that it will be given every consideration. The idea is similar to one used effectively during the first war bond drives.

In the words of President Johnson, as he announced the higher interest rate of 4.15 percent, "it supports our fighting men in Vietnam who need to be supported at this very hour and it supports the cause of our freedom everywhere in the world." A copy of the President's statement is enclosed.

I know you realize that our savings bonds people receive numerous suggestions related to the promotion of our program. However, in relation to its applicability and within the framework of our budgetary allocations, Mr. Sandulli's "Bonds for the Boys" recommendation will receive thorough attention.

I am sure you will want to extend to him our appreciation for his patriotic concern and we are indebted to you for your thoughtfulness.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

Define Obscenity—Call a Spade a Spade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress too strongly or too often the importance of early consideration by the other body of my bill, H.R. 980. This legislation, passed almost unanimously by the House of Representatives last year, could halt the unsolicited flow of obscene mail and materials through the U.S. mails. This legislation gives the American postal patron the much-deserved right to decide if his home should be invaded by filth peddlers.

A much-heralded decision may be reached soon by the Supreme Court in regard to three obscenity convictions, but this is not a complete solution to the mounting problem. The type of legislation passed by the House last year can, in the meantime, become the first effective legislative tool to curb the dissemination of obscenity.

I hope my distinguished colleagues will study the following editorial, which recently appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Catholic Standard of January 27, 1966:

OBSCENITY—A MOUNTING PROBLEM

The increasing lack of restraint in the printed material displayed and sold at newsstands and delivered through the mails is a matter of deep concern to many Americans. The blatant and cavalier manner in which nudity and intimate sex affairs are treated in pictures, cartoons, and in print is shocking to any person of normal sensitivity and perception. Magazines and paperbacks once sold "under the counter" in the "sin cities" of the world are now publicly displayed and openly sold throughout our country.

To combat this evil, which finds a particularly fertile field of buyers among our youth, is the concern of many organizations and individuals in our country. Catholics and non-Catholics alike are seeking legitimate and effective means to curtail the publication and dissemination of this material which is not only offensive to common decency but is also inherently evil.

The U.S. Supreme Court presently has under consideration three cases arising out of alleged violations of obscenity laws. Two are State cases and one is a Federal case. In all three, the appealing parties claim that their publications are immune from prosecution under the free speech provision of the first amendment.

In earlier obscenity cases the Supreme Court has broadened the protection given to the type of publication now under review. In so doing it has rendered it very difficult to enforce existing obscenity laws.

The time has come to call a spade a spade. In the cases now pending before it, we hope that the Supreme Court, in the interest of the common good and welfare, will carefully reexamine its prior decisions so that its approach to the present cases will be realistic and discerning as well as legalistic.

Accent on Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal these days about protest groups, particularly among the younger generation. As long as the rights of others are not violated, and sincere protest does not take the form of violence and destruction, I am always prone to see the positive rather than the negative. This, in my belief, has been the foundation of America's strength.

In fact, while a great many people see these vocal protests and other manifestations as corruptive and unjustified, I am inclined to view peaceful demonstration with a spirit of tolerance. Dissent is healthy. I like to see the conventional wisdom subjected to dispute.

Nonetheless, it is always pleasant and eminently reassuring to learn of the experience of groups which are committed to the sureties of democratic life which all of us, in essence, respect. They help to restore a real balance when all of our communications media are bent, by nature, toward reporting contentions and upheaval.

I have long been impressed by a performing group known as the New Christy Minstrels. They are a musical ensemble comprised of eight boys and two girls, whose average age amounts to 20 years.

They say, in chorus:

> It seems to us that the only voices being heard around the country belong to the anti-this or anti-that groups. What about for-this and for-that teams of young Americans whom, we are sure, outnumber the anti-groups by millions?

The New Christy Minstrels report that they will make no effort to protest against protesters. They will stress, at every occasion and at every appearance, the preservation of American traditions.

In a joint statement, the group said:

> We hope to encourage campus leaders to conduct polls on national issues and to conduct debates based on knowledge and fact. Fear and anger are emotions, and emotions create blind spots. We will do all we can to aid those millions of young Americans who are dedicated to preserve the traditions of the United States, its history, and those creeds for which it stands.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the true patriotic spirit, and I doff my hat to this inspiring ensemble.

Support Given

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Lincoln, Nebr., Evening Journal, of March 2, 1966, states that the evidence of support given for President Johnson's policies in South Vietnam must be sad news for the Communists.

The paper believes:

> It would be a good guess that the recent congressional vote quite accurately reflects the opinion of the American public about staying with the task in Vietnam.

The paper adds that in his determination to stop Communist aggression, the President has the backing of Congress and the American people.

With the belief that the editorial will be read and judged on its merits, I am making it available for publication in the RECORD:

SUPPORT FOR U.S. COMMITMENT

No one in the United States should be surprised that both Houses of Congress have given a topheavy endorsement to reinforcing the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam by nearly $5 billion.

Judging from the great amount of oratory that has been directed against the United States position in Vietnam, however, even some Americans might have been surprised at the extent of the vote approving more war expenditures. The total vote in both Houses was 485 to 6.

Surely this overwhelming support for a more determined effort to check the Communist threat to all southeast Asia must come as a shock to Communist leaders abroad who have tried to read widespread dissent into the shrill but isolated voices raised against U.S. intervention in that part of the world.

It would be a good guess that the congressional vote quite accurately reflects the opinion of the American public about staying with the task in Vietnam. This would mean that just a fraction over 1 percent of the people of this country feel we should not do what is necessary to protect South Vietnam from a Communist conquest.

This, and not the noisy demonstrators, is the evidence that Hanoi and Peiping and Moscow now must heed.

The congressional vote is not itself a mandate for this country to escalate the Asian conflict. But it does provide President Johnson ample backing for whatever measures are called for to respond to Communist actions.

The President has been quite restrained in using the full measure of military force since the bombing lull was ended several weeks ago. Air attacks on North Vietnam have been even more selective than before the lull and have been aimed almost solely at cutting off supply routes to the south.

However, ominous signs of stepped-up Communist activity are coming from neighboring Laos and Thailand, the United States' stanchest ally in that part of the world, and Cambodia grows more important as a sancutary for Communist forces harrassing South Vietnam.

If greater U.S. participation is required to answer these threats, President Johnson unquestionably is prepared to make the necessary commitments. In this resolve, he clearly has the almost unanimous backing of Congress—and, more importantly, of the American people.

The Cleveland Playhouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take great pleasure in inserting a tribute to my city of Cleveland's best known and most reknowned contribution to the arts in this country:

THE CLEVELAND PLAYHOUSE

Perhaps in none of the arts has the cultural explosion of recent years boomed so loudly as it has in the theater. These welcome noises of theatrical eruption are new in most sections of the United States, but there is one city where—to the delight of discriminating theatergoers—such sounds of creative activity have been reverberating for fully half a century. That city is Cleveland, Ohio, where the Cleveland Playhouse is now celebrating its 50th anniversary, yet remains vigorously young in spirit despite its theatrical status as "grandaddy" of American regional professional theaters. Nor are the benefits of this half-century of distinguished service limited to Cleveland alone, for wherever professional theater makes itself seen and heard in the United States today, there are some reverberations that echo back to the pioneer efforts of the Cleveland Playhouse.

The Cleveland Playhouse began its illustrious record when, in 1915, a group of nonprofessional enthusiasts gathered together to create a local theater in protest against the stereotyped commercial theater then current. In 1921, the group engaged Frederic McConnell as its first paid director and he, along with two professional associates he selected, nursed the Cleveland Playhouse through its infant days until it grew into such size and competence that there was no doubt of its worth and impact on the American theater scene. But while the vigor and versatility of the Cleveland Playhouse continued to increase, time was exacting its toll from McConnell, its director. In true theater tradition that the show must go on, the torch of leadership and the mantle of director was bestowed upon K. Elmo Lowe, who was one of the original two professional associates chosen by McConnell. Frederic McConnell retired in 1958.

Today, under the guidance of the ubiquitous Mr. Lowe, the capable hands of a paid staff of almost 100 dedicated actors, designers, technicians, and administrative personnel, present the Cleveland Playhouse plays in three theaters for a 9-month local season and a summer season at Lake Chautauqua, N.Y.

The Cleveland Playhouse is a nonprofit theater incorporated under the laws of Ohio and governed by a board of trustees headed by Kenyon C. Bolton, president. Its property is held by the Playhouse Foundation, also a nonprofit organization, the president of which is George Gund, who is one of Cleveland's outstanding business and civic leaders.

In its 50 years of operation, this outstanding group-oriented theater has presented some 900 productions—the plays ranging from early Greek to contemporary drama. But, as if this staggering plenitude on the local level were not enough, there are other facets of activity which extend far beyond the immediate Cleveland area. There is the Playhouse Shakespeare Festival for students, which is the oldest Shakespeare festival in the United States, and which runs for approximately 2 months each spring, playing to 25,000 students from a tristate area. It's an inspiring sight when the young playgoers, most of whom have never before seen a live production, arrive by busloads to fill a 550-seat theater for matinees priced at 75 cents per ticket.

The playhouse touring company, for the past 5 years, has presented to enthusiastic audiences from coast to coast such classic fare as Shaw, O'Casey, Jonson, Ibsen, Wilde, Marlowe, and Checkhov. This touring unit has made a tremendous impact on the national theatrical scene, playing for the most part in small communities and in universities which have infrequent access to professional threater. Critic Sam Anderson of the Cleveland Press wrote: "In cities where the troupe has appeared, the newspapers have reflected a glowing appreciation. It is interesting to note that it takes a non-New York company to go out on the road and make this impression."

A special facet of the Cleveland Playhouse activity that has national implications is its Apprentice and Fellowship Program, which offers a unique opportunity for aspiring actors and technicians to attain professional status by working with professionals. While training in the various theater departments, the apprentices supplement their activity in the theater's regular program with participation in studio performances prepared under the supervision of staff members and presented for the entire theater company. Fellowship awards are made both to successful playhouse apprentices and to actors from various parts of the country who have not previously worked at the Cleveland Playhouse.

Another contribution to the cultural development of our children is the playhouse children's theater, in which some 350 youngsters are enrolled. There is no tuition; a small registration fee covers activities for the season. In addition to three annual children's productions, there is a continuing program of creative dramatics. It is this aspect of the program that is near and dear to the teaching staff, because it enables them to give the child an avenue of self-expression, to offer a controlled emotional outlet, to help build good attitudes and appreciations, to provide opportunities for growth and social cooperation, and to help develop the latent imagination of the child.

The Cleveland Playhouse fearlessly ventures into the unknown, and "unproduced" plays, with their potential promise or pitfalls, have always been a vital part of the playhouse operation. Manuscripts numbering more than 100 are received each season from both aspiring and established playwrights all over the United States, and the Cleveland Playhouse has produced some 50 worthwhile new plays in as many years. Most of these first productions were written by unknown writers; others were written by such prominent authors as Elmer Rice, Maurice Valency, William Wister Haines, Tennessee Williams, Maxwell Anderson, and Ben Hecht.

Over the years, these multifaceted activities of the Cleveland Playhouse have evoked enthusiastic comment from prominent theater spokesmen and from writers for widely circulated publications. This is what some of them have said:

Brooks Atkinson, New York Times writer: "Cleveland is lucky with its playhouse, where the staff is not afraid of work, ideas, or entertainment. A Gotham theatergoer may be pardoned for looking a little enviously at a working institution like the Cleveland Playhouse where the drama is continuously cultivated as an art."

Playwright Ben Hecht: "The Cleveland Playhouse well may be the only future possible for the American theater. I'm sure that our next generation will see a hundred such animated drama centers as the Playhouse, and what a boon for tomorrow's playwrights and actors that would be."

Broadway and Hollywood Actress Margaret Hamilton: "I feel toward the playhouse what a loving and loyal graduate feels toward a cherished school. I was given the opportunity to learn, to grow through actual experience, and I never cease to be aware of it."

Similar testimonials fill many pages in the annals of Cleveland Playhouse history. They underscore the unique and enviable position of the Cleveland Playhouse in the American theater movement. In this, its golden anniversary season, that remarkable institution echoes the past, is abreast of the present, and anticipates the future and, as the oldest professional resident theater in the United States, stands as an example and an inspiration to regional theaters everywhere.

Era of Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the complete inconsistency in the administration's foreign and domestic policies is noted in a very penetrating editorial in the Des Plaines Valley News on Thursday, March 3. This editorial observation is a brief but pertinent and irrefutable commentary on the policies of complete confusion being followed by the administration:

ERA OF CONFUSION?

One can't help wondering what the fuss is in trying to prevent our Nation from being overrun by Communists.

While our soldiers are dispatched to hold the Vietcong at bay to prevent the spread of communism, so that it won't spread through Asia, Europe, South America, and eventually take over running our Nation (so we are told), our legislators are doing their level best to give voters exactly what the Communists claimed they wanted.

Lenin and Stalin were the first to propose that a strong federal government take over the rights of tiny states, that everyone be given medical care through government channels, that the unemployed should be put to work on government projects, that the aged be given social security, that the unemployed be trained at government expense for the jobs they are fitted for.

Today we see the antipoverty program executives recommend that every person be guaranteed an income of not less than $3,000 annually, that benefits as much as $125 per week for as long as a period of 1½ years be offered to practically all who are unemployed (House bill 8282 proposal).

Our U.S. State Department asked nations to cooperate in blocking the supply of goods to North Vietnam. Britain does not bother to listen, for shipments from that country to North Vietnam continue. Then it asks U.S. support to block shipments of goods to Rhodesia.

When London was bombed daily by Hitler's air arm, the war continued. When Berlin was bombed, the war continued. Now we are to understand if North Vietnam is bombed, that war will end. It will take the foot soldier with the bayonet to take and hold any territory.

We have no inflation according to Government sources, yet notice that the price of meat is nearing $1 per pound for practically all cuts. While 250 million Kennedy 50-cent pieces have been minted, How many have you seen cross your palm? (Incidentally, you can get 55 cents each from coin collectors for hoards of Kennedy half dollars at the present market price.)

This period may be described in future histories as that of false optimism, or utter confusion, in light of the observations above.

Time To Take Inflation Threat Seriously

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have called the attention of this House to the dangers of inflation. I am pleased to note from the press and otherwise that others are beginning to be concerned also about this threat to our economy and, of course, the potential disaster posed thereby to our Government.

On yesterday the Washington Star carried a very timely editorial on this subject. The article is worth reading. The time to do something about this is now.

The editorial is as follows:

TIME TO TAKE INFLATION THREAT SERIOUSLY

Inflation is now a clear and present danger for the United States. President Johnson, in in a moment of rare candor, has conceded it is "perhaps our most serious economic challenge in 1966." House Republican Minority Leader FORD declares it will be the top political issue this year. And a host of economists and business leaders are voicing alarm.

"We already have an overheated economy, and more gas burners are being turned on," warns Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president of Bankers Trust Co. Raymond J. Saulnier, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, says that we now have "all the signals of inflationary danger we need to tell us that the time has come for genuine restraint."

Any housewife can confirm the news with a trip to the supermarket. But the picture is apparent on a much broader scale. Wholesale prices are rising at the rate of around 3 percent annually after a long period of stability. Industry stockpiling in the final quarter of 1965 reached an abnormal high, indicating business feared inflationary price rises.

Further pressures lie ahead. A Commerce Department survey shows that business will spend more than $60 billion on plants and equipment this year, an increase of 16 percent over 1965. President Johnson has seized upon the figure as encouraging evidence that things are under control. It is, in fact, evidence to the contrary. A rise of this magnitude, on top of government spending, is bound to add fuel to the inflationary flames.

The President obviously hopes the problem will go away by itself and not bother him in an election year. Decisions on a tax increase, spending cutbacks and wartime controls are being put off.

But what is the situation today? We will have 235,000 men in Vietnam within 2 months. by the end of 1966 the figure could easily exceed 350,000, the total land forces we committed in Korea. Our logistic base in Vietnam very soon will accommodate 400,000 men.

We had price controls during the Korean war. They were imposed at a time when the Nation had ample spare manufacturing capacity and surplus labor. The current Vietnam spending, on the other hand, has been imposed an already booming economy. With defense expenditures set to soar by at least $12 billion between fiscal 1965 and 1967, Washington must recognize the danger signals soon.

There is another hazard lying further ahead. Americans have been on a buy-now, pay-later binge. In the past 10 years consumer credit has skyrockered. In 1955 it totaled $38.8 billion. Now the figure exceeds $85 billion.

There's nothing wrong with consumer borrowing as such. In fact it plays a major role in financing our expanding market for durable goods. But during periods of high economic activity, the increased purchasing power it offers can be a dangerous source of inflationary pressure. And in any ensuing recession, paying off the multimillion-dollar debts can aggravate a downturn.

Back in December one Senator remarked during hearings by the Joint Economic Committee that consumer credit was "the most explosive element in our economy." He asked Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board if it wouldn't be wise for Congress to give the Board standby authority to impose the credit controls it had during the Korean war. Mr. Martin agreed.

Such powers need not be used at once, of course. But they would enable the FRB to move quickly if necessary, an authority the Board does not now have.

The irony of all this talk about inflation as an election issue is that the Republicans in Congress apparently will not take Representative Ford's advice seriously. In his cautious efforts to dampen the boom by raising a couple of excise taxes and speeding up corporate tax payments, L.B.J. handed the Dirksen-Ford forces a campaign weapon. But individual Republicans have sold out, worried about their records with oldsters and veteran voter blocs.

Consider the amendments to that tax-raising bill last week. Senator Prouty, a Vermont Republican, tacked on a social security clause that would have cost nearly $800 million in fiscal 1967. Twenty-three Republican Senators also lined up to keep the excise tax on telephones at 3 percent instead of raising it to 10 percent, a move that would have knocked $315 million out of the proposed tax increases. A House-Senate conference later repaired the damage but the episode undercut the GOP position.

Or consider the GI benefit bill signed into law earlier this month. The President had proposed a measure covering only combat veterans. But Congress, including scores of Republicans, rammed through a bill extending the education and other benefits to anyone who had served since January 31, 1955, a year not remembered for its battlefield hazards.

"I just had my budget busted wide open," the Chief Executive conceded in signing that bill. It will cost a quarter-billion dollars more the first year than originally planned.

Election year or not, the time is at hand for some responsible decisions. The Federal Reserve Board has helped the administration in the anti-inflation war by monetary measures, including a raise in the discount rate last December. The banks last week tightened money even further on their own by raising the prime rate.

But monetary measures can't do the job alone. The administration must begin applying fiscal discipline, too. The 1967 budget, insisting that we can afford both butter and guns, proposed an increase of some $3.2 billion in Great Society programs on top of this year's total of $10.8 billion. The impact of all this on a straining wartime economy is simply too much.

Assuming President Johnson will not now back down from his spending schemes, there remains only one serious weapon in his anti-inflationary arsenal: A general tax increase. This is a measure that will be welcomed by no politician in an election year. The President, however, cannot delay much longer. It has been amply demonstrated that the sort of "jawbone legislation" he has so far employed—wage-price guidelines and stockpile-dumping threats—cannot possibly do the trick.

In the words of United States Steel Chairman Roger Blough, "trying to find out how long we can contain this mounting head of steam while continuing to heat up the boiler is something like playing Russian roulette." Amen.

Minute Man National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Massachusetts are extremely proud of the fact that it was in our area that the American Revolutionary War began back in 1775. The National Park Service is in the process of restoring the Lexington-Concord area which was the site of the first battle of the war as closely as possible to its original state as Minute Man National Park.

To accomplish this end the Park Service is purchasing property along the battle route. Last summer the Service purchased the famous home of Samuel Whitney, Louisa May Alcott, National Hawthorne, and Daniel Lothrop, known as the Wayside, in Concord. It was purchased from Miss Margaret Lothrop who generously gave the Park Service the furniture and memorabilia of the successive inhabitants of the Wayside.

The historic home is described in the winter 1966 edition of the Smith Alumnae Quarterly, as Miss Lothrop was a graduate of Smith in the class of 1905.

Certainly, we all appreciate Miss Lothrop's generosity in making available the items that will add so much to our understanding of the Wayside and the periods in our history of which it was so much a part. .

Under unanimous consent I include the article in the Record:

The Wayside

The Wayside, in Concord, Mass., lifelong home of Margaret Lothrop, 1905, was bought last summer by the National Park Service as a part of the Minute Man Historical Park, and with it, by Miss Lothrop's gift, went furniture and memorabilia of the successive inhabitants of the house, collected and preserved by Miss Lothrop and her mother. The Wayside covers an extraordinary panorama. Built in 1717, the house was altered and enlarged by various owners. It belonged in 1775 to Samuel Whitney, muster master of the Minute Men of Concord, and in it were stored arms and supplies for the rebellious Colonists. In the next century it was the home of Bronson Alcott when his daughters were young, and on one of its eight stairways the high-spirited Louisa May and her sisters played Pilgrim's Progress, as she later recounted in "Little Women." In 1852, when the Alcotts moved next door to Orchard House, the Wayside was bought by Nathaniel Hawthorne, who lived there the rest of his life. From Hawthorne's heirs the house came into the possession of Miss Lothrop's father, Daniel Lothrop, in 1883. He was a pioneer publisher of children's books, who had married Margaret Sidney, one of his most successful authors. In the sittingroom where Hawthorne had read aloud to his family the manuscript of "Tanglewood Tales," Margaret Sidney wrote many volumes of that series popular with generations of children, "The Five Little Peppers." Among close family friends who were entertained there in Miss Lothrop's memory were Whittier and Dr. Holmes and Julia Ward Howe.

Miss Lothrop over the years has searched out stories in manuscript and print describing the life of the house and the authors associated with it. She has documented its contents, including the Hawthorne furniture bought from his daughter, Rose. Visitors, in Miss Lothrop's words, "will find the house little changed from the days when Emerson, Thoreau, and others sought its hospitality." As owner, she was hostess to literary historians and countless others. It is thanks to her self-imposed task as curator and historian that the house has preserved the atmosphere and traditions of the past.

Did Washington Pray at Valley Forge—Jim DeMasters Sets the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine in Kansas, Mr. James B. DeMasters, has an abiding interest in the promotion of patriotism. Jim was quite taken aback when he read a critic's statement in a newspaper that the story of George Washington praying at Valley Forge was a "pious fraud." Jim immediately began to research the question. On March 2, the Kansas City Star printed the results of his research, which sets the record straight. It follows:

Someone has raised the question "Did Washington really pray?"

My research produced this account by Wesley Bradshaw, originally published in the National Tribune in December 1880:

"The last time I ever saw Anthony Sherman was on the Fourth of July, 1859, in Independence Square. He was then 99 yedrs old, and becoming feeble. But though so old, his dimming eyes rekindled as he gazed upon Independence Hall.

" 'Let us go into the Hall,' he said. 'I want to tell you an incident of Washington's life'.

" 'From the opening of the Revolution we experienced all phases of fortune, now good and now ill. The darkest period we had, I think, was when Washington, after several reverses, retreated to Valley Forge, where he resolved to pass the winter of 1777. Ah, I have often seen the tears coursing down our good commander's careworn cheeks, as he would be conversing with officers about the condition of his poor soldiers.

" 'You have doubtless heard the story of Washington's going to the thicket to pray.

Well, it was not only true, but he used often to pray in secret for aid and comfort from God, the interposition of whose Divine Providence brought us safety through the darkest days of tribulation.'"

JAMES B. DEMASTERS.

When Life Seemed Simpler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, because the following article written by John Barbour of the Associated Press captured so well a bit of America that is past, I would like to make it available to my colleagues and others. I am sure those who grew up in the "era of the vacant lot" he describes will recall with nostalgia some of their own experiences.

Mr. Barbour's article which appeared in the Sunday edition, March 13, of the Washington Post follows:

WHEN ALL WAS RIGHT WITH THE WORLD

(By John Barbour)

Sometimes, when you look back, it's like boyhood was just one vacant lot after another—if you were lucky enough to be born in the right place.

Those small fallow stretches between houses were the furnishings of being young. And you feel a little sad when you think that your son is growing up without them, without the privacy of tall grass without the sight of his own blue sky going on forever, without the familiar press of the earth against his back.

There aren't many vacant lots anymore. The real estate men seem to think a vacant lot is a wasted lot.

The vacant lot was a thousand things. It was the glue that held a young neighborhood together. It was the mutual home of victory gardens, a place to burn leaves, a harmless plot to set up a swing, a toboggan run, a junior ski slope. It could be flooded into an ice rink in winter, paced off for a baseball diamond in summer. It was a badminton court, and a football field.

It was the beginning of society all over again, the place where the new kid on the block could find the first tentative overture of friendship, the first challenge of strength, the first taste of victory and defeat. It was a battlefield, a wrestling arena, a boxing ring. It was a tree house, mutually built and shared. It was caves and tunnels. It was a fort against a thousand enemies at dusk when drums beat in the hills.

It was a place where mothers could beam their voices into the darkening day and be answered by a small, reluctant, dirty image trudging out of the wilderness. It was an insulation between generations, between houses, between ways of life.

NOW IT'S BY THE NUMBERS

What is it like to grow up without a vacant lot, in a suburb where houses are less than an argument away, where people apologize to their next door neighbors for shouting at their own children?

Builders seldom leave room for vacant lots. Some of them plan parks, keep the grass neatly cut, the walks neatly trimmed. But they seem sterile, meant for baby carriages, not adventure. Swings don't hang from trees, but from metal frames in neat rows.

Things are well-ordered now, shared by timetable. The Little League ball game on a regulation field has replaced the impromptu game where everyone could play, and the sides weren't even, and right field was an automatic out—by common agreement.

By 6-foot standards, the vacant lot wasn't very big. But for a boy, or a girl, it was a day's journey in any direction, a place to try out a new compass, a world nobody wanted. It was his dirt; he could take it home, and he did. They were his cockleburs, and they clung to his corduroys, and later to his bedspread.

It was late one summer day when the two men came to my vacant lot in a Detroit suburb. They drove a stake into the ground and nailed up a sign that said, "for sale." But vacant lots are rough on signs. People bounce balls against them, use them for shields in grass bomb fights. Dozens of small hands swing from them.

By fall, the sign, dented but still legible, was a tabletop in the clubhouse dug into a hollow—by any logic, more useful than it had ever been before.

Sometimes vacant lots come to mind at Christmas. In a day when all toys have batteries, and move and talk and fight wars over the carpeted living room floor, in a day when toys play with themselves, what a gift a vacant lot would be.

The vacant lot was an arena for the imagination. Garbage can lids and bushel tops were shields, and swords and rifles were made of wooden slats. Wooden apple crates and broken skates became scooters.

Vacant lots were of all kinds. In Los Angeles, there were vacant lots, parched and filled with what were called earthquake cracks. And you found a quarter in one and dreamed thereafter of Spanish treasure pouring out of a crevice in the earth, and you filled your socks with it and carried it home. So what if it was only dirt.

A boy who grew up on the concrete playgrounds of Manhattan remembers vacant lots filled with trash, broken bottles, beer cans, and clearing away part of it near the brick wall of a building so he could play handball.

MIDWESTERN MEMORY

A friend from a small Midwestern town remembers the big hill in his vacant lot and a pond nearby, and toboggan slides in winter, and trees too big to embrace. But when he went back, a grown man, the hill was only a gentle rise, and the trees something less than the "redwoods" he remembered.

The beauty of a vacant lot was its vacancy. It had room for everything, for marbles and mumbley-peg for a pen-knife game of cut the pie and a contest with milk-bottle caps. It was the secret home of a hen pheasant and her orderly queue of chicks. It was a rabbit burrow hidden in grass. It was milkweed with a soft licorice smell and sticky white sap. It was the sour taste of a blade of field grass.

Maybe some day the neighbors will get together, pool their poverty and give one of the house plots on the block back to wilderness again, and to kids. But it's not likely, is it?

Rabbi Morris Adler's Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Morris Adler died as he lived—a hero.

His war was against intolerance, against lack of integrity, against immorality and ignorance. His weapons were the sweet words of reason and hope and concern for the future, backed by a life of living explicitly and exactly that which he preached.

The world will miss him. Indeed, the world needs him and others like him. He was among the leaders who lead with no thought of personal gain or glory and whose only wish was to show, through God, the proper path for mankind to follow.

The influence he had upon the entire Detroit area was profound and lasting, and will lead, I am sure, to better understanding and tolerance in decades to come.

He was builder, not destroyer, a man who believed passionately in the cause of mankind and who worked patiently to improve the lives of his fellow men.

The Detroit News paid tribute to Rabbi Adler's life in a recent editorial which I urge my colleagues to contemplate.

RABBI MORRIS ADLER'S LIFE

Neither the broad shoulders nor the mental brilliance of Rabbi Morris Adler were able to withstand the shattering violence of a disturbed murderer's weapon. In these last few weeks, his struggle to retain life was no less impressive than his lifelong effort to improve it for us all. He lost the last battle, as we all must, but he had already won the other.

He would not agree, perhaps. He would not look back to past victories, but ahead to new challenges.

Yet Rabbi Adler did improve life, and in so many ways it staggers the mind to recall his many gifts. Scholar, writer, builder, humorist, diplomat, counselor, and rabbi. Yes, rabbi—a gentle giant of a man who gave himself to God and, by this gift, to all mankind.

So many of our lives have been touched by Rabbi Adler's life—and death—that these few words can only hint at the value of his own. Many are those, we know, who will take the words of a Hebrew prayer on the anniversary of death as their own:

"All the goodness, the sweetness, and nobility of that life I will remember."

James G. Patton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues join with me today in paying tribute to James G. Patton, one of the great voices in American agriculture. After 25 years as president of the National Farmers Union, he is stepping down. All of us regret this necessity. The loss is made doubly difficult because Glenn Talbott is stepping down from the vice-presidency at the same time.

These stalwart champions of the American farmer have made their impression upon the events of the past and have helped to shape the things to come. Without this kind of leadership, the farmers position would be much less favorable than it is today.

All of us know that the farm problem has not been whipped. But without the keen foresight of men like James Patton we would still be groping in the darkness of night. The dawn of a new day in agriculture is coming and Jim Patton has helped to bring it about.

We hate to see him go—but we are eternally thankful that he was here.

Mysterious Investigators Harass Author of "Unsafe at Any Speed"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleague a very ominous and disturbing article in the March 6, 1966, issue of the New Republic. This article relates in some detail the personal attacks and questionable investigation to which Ralph Nader, author of "Unsafe at Any Speed," has been subjected.

I believe this entire episode to be an encroachment on Mr. Nader's personal life, his character, and his integrity. It is one thing to legitimately investigate a man's abilities and to inquire into his experience and capabilities. But I certainly think the actions reported in this article go far beyond the bounds of decency and propriety. And I further believe that many of the investigators misrepresented themselves to those people from whom they requested information about Mr. Nader.

If any individual or group believed Mr. Nader to have misrepresented facts or situations in his book, he should have been publicly called upon to defend his position.

If an American citizen cannot write a book or article, particularly on a subject on which he is considered authoritative, without detrimental repercussions, then I think it is time for some fast and honest soul searching.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have included in the Record the article from the New Republic for all to read in its entirety:

The Dick

(By James Ridgeway)

Ralph Nader is a lanky Washington attorney of 32 who recently has been getting publicity because he went after the automobile makers for not designing safer cars. He wrote a book, "Unsafe at Any Speed," which told what was wrong with cars; he was a major witness before Senator Abraham Ribicoff's Subcommittee on Traffic Safety; and most likely he will testify before the Senate Commerce Committee when it holds hearings on the administration's highway safety bill.

The automakers, who first ignored Nader, have now turned on their most vigorous critic. This is precisely the sort of knockdown public fight Nader was hoping for, but instead of open battle, he finds himself suddenly distracted from the task at hand and locked in a subterranean struggle against an uncertain enemy.

Nader first felt someone was watching him January 10 in the Kirkwood Hotel at Des Moines, where he had gone to testify before the State attorney general's inquiry into traffic safety. He remembers seeing a man, two or perhaps three times in the hotel, once on his floor; for reasons Nader can't explain, the man made him feel uneasy.

Nader was to testify before the Ribicoff subcommittee February 10. In the days before he was to appear, he received several odd phone calls that increased in their frequency until on the evening of February 9, when he was trying to put the finishing touches on a prepared statement, Nader got half-a-dozen phone calls. A voice would say, "Mr. Nader, this is Pan American," and then hang up. Or, "Mr. Nader, please pick up the parcel at Railway Express." And finally, "Why don't you go back to Connecticut, buddy-boy." (Nader's home is at Winsted, Conn.). Nader's appearance before the committee was marked by a sharp clash between Senator Carl Curtis, of Nebraska, and Senator Robert Kennedy, of New York. Curtis kept pretending he could not understand what Nader was saying and finally Kennedy, in short temper, said this was a deliberate attempt to keep Nader from completing his statement, and to let him alone. The next day, a Friday, Nader went to the New Senate Office Building for a television interview. As he was coming out, one of the building guards told him two men had been tailing him. The men asked the guard which room Nader had gone into, and then volunteered they had been following Nader around the country. The guard reported the incident to his superior, who asked the men to leave the building.

WHAT JOB?

During the next week, Nader's landlady got a call from a man checking to see whether her tenant paid his bills on time. Nader's stockbroker received a visit from a man who said he worked for "Allied Investigations." His client wanted to hire Nader. He wanted to know about Nader's credit and his habits. In Cambridge, Mass., Harold Berman, a professor at Harvard Law School who taught Nader, got a call from a man who as Herman remembers, it said he worked for a research organization. He said Nader had given Berman as a reference for a job. In Boston, Thomas Lambert Jr., the editor in chief of the American Trial Lawyers Association Journal, a publication that had carried a number of articles by Nader, was visited by man who looked very ivy league. He said his name was "Mr. Dwyer" and he worked for a "Management Consultants" or "Management Associates" at 53 State Street in Boston. He also represented a client who wanted to hire Nader. He asked about his drinking habits and his technical capabilities Lambert was pleased to recommend Nader; he sent Nader off a note telling of the visitor and wishing the young attorney well in whatever the new job might be. But Nader had not applied for any job.

Sunday evening, February 20, Nader left his room in northwest Washington and went up the street a couple of blocks to a drugstore. He was standing at the magazine rack when a young, attractive brunette he had never seen before approached and said, "Pardon me. I know this sounds a little forward. I hope you don't mind, but can I talk to you?" She said a few of her friends often got together to discuss various problems of foreign affairs. They wanted to get all viewpoints. Would he join them? Nader was dumbfounded. Trying to get rid of her politely, he said he was from out of town. But the girl persisted. Oh, she said, that's alright; there was a meeting that night. Nader said he wasn't interested and turned his back. The girl left.

Monday morning Nader took a plane to Philadelphia, where he was to appear on ABC's "Mike Douglas Show."

That same day at a little after noon, Frederick Hughes Condon, a lawyer for a life insurance company in Concord, N.H., to whom Nader had dedicated his book, got a call from a "Mr. Warren," who said he wanted to come by the office and ask Condon a few questions about his friend, Ralph Nader. He said he had a client who wanted to hire Nader to do some research and writing, and in this connection he was looking into Nader's background, partly to make sure he led a normal sex life and was not involved in leftwing politics, and also because he needed to know whether Nader was capable of doing work in fields other than car design. Condon asked Warren who the client was, but Warren said he could not disclose that. So Condon asked him who he was. Warren said he worked with an attorney, a Mr. Gillen, of New York City, who specialized in investigations. His suspicions already aroused, Condon told Warren to come by the office later that afternoon.

Nader had finished the "Mike Douglas Show" in Philadelphia; he was late for a 3:30 United Air Lines flight back to Washington. The other passengers had boarded when he hurried up to the gate at 3:25. Suddenly, he was aware that two men who had been sitting on a bench nearby had risen and boarded the plane after him. They took seats near his. They seemed to be especially interested in Nader.

It was midafternoon that day when the telephone rang in the New York City apartment of Dexter Masters. Masters had written a complimentary review of the Nader book that appeared a few weeks before as the lead article in "Book Week." Masters remembers picking up the phone, "A smooth-talking fellow said he understood I had reviewed the book for 'Book Week' and could I tell him anything about Nader. I said I didn't know him and what did he want to know for. The man said he represented the 'Gillian' Agency or something that sounded like that. He said one of the operators was a former FBI agent. They were investigating for a client who was interested in hiring Nader to write some articles. Did I think it really was a good book? I said I thought it was an excellent book and so had written." The man thanked Masters and hung up. Masters, thinking this one of the silliest pieces of detective work he ever had encountered, called Nader's publisher, Richard Grossman, to tell him the story.

At about 4:15 the United flight with Nader aboard was in its landing approach at Washington's National Airport; the two men seated near him looked like small-time salesmen. The plane came to a stop, and Nader went down the ramp, then ducked in and out of a number of doors at the airport to shake the men. He got into a cab, and as it headed for downtown Washington, Nader looked through the back window for the men. They had disappeared.

Condon, meanwhile, was closeted with a vice president of his company for much of the afternoon and it wasn't until 4:30 that he got free to see Mr. Warren, who now was calling himself Mr. Gillen. As the secretary ushered Mr. Gillen into Condon's office, the lawyer remembered he wore heavy black-rimmed glasses, was of medium height with a barrel chest and gray hair combed straight back. Gillen had a nervous manner when he asked leading questions, and he insisted on holding an attaché case in his lap. By now Condon was sure the man was a detective, and he was ready to believe the attaché case held recording equipment. But Condon was playing dumb.

Gillen came right to the point. He asked repeatedly whether Nader had a driver's license and from what State. Had he owned a car at Harvard? Had Condon ever seen him drive a car? What make car did he own? Had he ever had any automobile accidents? Condon could not remember Nader driving and didn't know whether he had a license or not. (Actually Nader has a Connecticut driver's license.)

Gillen said he heard Nader traveled a lot. Did Condon know where he had gone? Why wasn't Nader married? Did he get financial help with his book? Did he have any left-wing political affiliations? Gillen said Nader was of Syrian ancestry. Was he anti-Semitic? Condon assured Gillen that Nader's personal life was normal; he didn't to Condon's knowledge belong to any political groups on one side or the other, that he had traveled to Mexico, and perhaps he had gone to see relatives in Lebanon, where his parents came from (not Syria), and that he was decidedly not anti-Semitic. Then Gillen sought to discover when Nader had met Senator RIBICOFF and what his connections with the Senator were. Condon said he didn't know, and wasn't at all sure that Nader even knew RIBICOFF.

"SOMEBODY MIGHT YELL"

Finally, Gillen asked Condon a few questions about himself. Condon is a paraplegic. Some years ago he fell asleep at the wheel of his car, which went off the road and crashed. The doors opened as it rolled over, and Condon, half in and half out, had his spine twisted. Gillen wanted to know if Nader had dedicated his book to Condon because of this accident. Did Condon think his injury was caused by unsafe design? What was the make of the car he was driving? Where had the accident taken place?

Having in this manner discovered the depths of Nader's intellectual abilities from his friend, Gillen said he really didn't know what job his client had in mind for Nader but he was sure it would be a good one, and picking up his attaché case, he bid Condon goodbye. Condon immediately wrote up the conversation, sent Nader a wire, and later that evening phoned him in Washington.

Now Nader was sure he was being investigated and probably followed. The girl in the drugstore had been a lure; he reasoned that the auto companies would like to get anything they could to discredit him as a future witness before congressional committees considering auto safety legislation. His suspicions were further aroused 2 days later, on Wednesday, February 23, when on the way to meet a friend in the afternoon, he stopped off to buy a package of cookies at a Safeway store near his boarding house. There were perhaps 30 people in the store, the usual raft of children, some women and a few single men. As he was looking about for the cookies, a girl, blonde and wearing slacks, came up to him and said, "Excuse me, but I need some help. I've got to move something heavy into my apartment. There's no one to help me. I wonder if I can get you to give me a hand. It won't take much time. Will you help?" Nader said he was sorry but he had a meeting and was late already. The girl persisted. "Please," she said. "It won't take long." Nader refused. Then, although there were a number of other people in the store who might have helped her, the girl turned straight around and left the store.

Neither Allied Investigating Service in Washington nor Management Consultants in Boston cared to discuss this matter. Both are private detective firms. After some prodding a spokesman for Allied said there was no investigation of Nader; John Dwyer, of Management Consultants at 53 State Street, said, "I am not at liberty to discuss any of these matters." But a reporter was successful when he reached Vincent Gillen, of Vinvent Gillen Associates, the detective firm in Garden City, N.Y. Mr. Gillen seemed flustered. "We've made inquiries about Nader," he said. "I spoke with Condon myself; another of our men contacted Masters." Gillen said he could not disclose the name of his client, but he said, "A lot of people were mentioned adversely in that book." Recovering his composure, he told the reporter: "I am a private investigator. We have hundreds of clients; we write thousands of reports, primarily on employment matters. I was asked by a client to make an invertigation of Ralph Nader. I understand that he is an intelligent, articulate fellow. And my client told me he was considering him for an important job, to do research on something, I don't know what."

"I knew Nader was a writer," Gillen said, "and I went out and bought 'Unsafe at Any Speed.'" Gillen read the book and "felt like staying in bed. I was afraid to drive a car," he said. "I thought at the time, he'd better know what he's talking about or somebody might yell."

"Is somebody yelling?" the reporter asked. There was a pause before Gillen said once more that Nader was being considered for a job. The investigation was not yet complete, the detective said, and then added, "All I can say is, it is good for Nader."

Farmer in the Nation's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, throughout his long career in and out of public life, James George Patton, retiring president of the National Farmers Union, has been a farmer in the Nation's service. Tonight, in Denver, Colo., the organization which he has headed for 25 years is honoring Mr. Patton for the long and dedicated service he has given it.

Jim Patton's distinctions and accomplishments are too numerous to catalog at this time. His presidency of the National Farmers Union goes back to 1940. He has been a top advisor to President Franklin Roosevelt and in subsequent administrations.

From time to time, Jim Patton has been mentioned as a possible Secretary of Agriculture. If that had happened, he undoubtedly would have enjoyed a period of distinguished high office, but he might not have been able to give full sweep to his many interests. This Nation and the world might never have reaped the full benefits of his broad sympathies and activities.

The food for peace program, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N., even the Peace Corps and the war on poverty were brought into being, in part, through Jim Patton's leadership.

While advancing the interests of the family farmer, his legislative concerns have also ranged from health care to Federal aid to education, from fair employment practices to a defense of the one-man, one-vote principle. He was a moving force behind the Full Employment Act of 1946, and played an important role in the administration of the Marshall plan.

Jim Patton's world view, his vision of a great and peaceful society, can be appreciated from his own words, written some 14 years ago: "The real war we must wage is not one with guns, tanks, planes, and atom bombs, but a war against poverty, ignorance, disease, landlessness, and hopelessness."

Mr. Speaker, we see in these words a man whose constituency is not only the farmers of America, whom he has served so long and so faithfully, but all men everywhere who have ever hoped for a better world.

De Gaulle's Dud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, among the many annoyances that press upon our President and his advisers, few are as vexing as the annoyance of Charles de Gaulle and his continued assault on NATO.

Yet De Gaulle is but one man—a temporary throwback to the nationalism of another era.

And NATO is a deeply rooted institution—a bulwark of strength that has made the difference between freedom and servitude in the Atlantic Community over the past 17 years.

De Gaulles may come and go; but institutions like NATO live on, whatever their form, as an expression of a common will.

That common Atlantic will has been tested and proved over the years. And no more dramatic evidence of its resilience has come our way than the bomb General de Gaulle tossed at it last week—a bomb that proved to be a dud.

In the New York Journal American, Warren Rogers has given us a perceptive analysis of the President's swift response to De Gaulle's recent letter—and the consequences of that response. I insert this article in the RECORD in order that my colleagues may share Mr. Rogers' insights:

DE GAULLE'S NATO "BOMB" PROVES A DUD

(By Warren Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—Nothing demonstrates so clearly how times have changed in the East-West confrontation than the coolness with which President Johnson scooped up Charles de Gaulle's bunt and threw him out by a country mile.

A few years ago, the French President would have had the entire North Atlantic Treaty Organization in a tizzy with his suggestion that France take over all NATO bases in France. At this time, it drew a "Here we go again" yawn, with only Communist propagandists paying much attention—and that only by dint of rote, like Pavlov's dog salivating at the sound of the bell.

De Gaulle, of course, had telegraphed his intentions at his February 21 press conference. He knows the rules of the game, too. As a consequence, the State Department and the White House had plenty of time to ready their reaction. It went out last Monday within hours of receipt of De Gaulle's letter to the President formally proposing talks that would lead to French control of United States and other NATO bases on French soil in 1969.

De Gaulle's tireless—and tiresome—nationalism is pondered often and long at the State Department. Experts there have been prepared for years for anything irksome De Gaullé might attempt. They are even ready with plans to remove NATO headquarters from Paris, not simply to close the 14 U.S. bases there and withdraw the 30,000 Americans on duty there.

Belgium or Luxembourg are obvious possibilities for host to NATO headquarters. Either would be as delighted to pick up the millions of dollars that would add to their economies as Frenchmen would be to lose them.

The speed of the U.S. reaction was important. Coupled with the President's firm rejection, it was the best possible way to head off rumors and loose talk that would have been detrimental to America's world position generally. Officials here will never forget the diplomatic propaganda beating they took because they writhed in agonizing indecision here while the Russians split Berlin with barbed wire and then—emboldened by U.S. confusion—followed with a brick-and-mortar wall.

President Johnson could afford to be cool because NATO has served its purpose. Created in Washington in 1949, when the West at last knew that Stalin was out to rule the world with the Red army as his chief instrument of power, the alliance has worked. Except for America's atomic arsenal in the early years and the American Army and Navy later on, it was little more than a paper tiger. But it worked.

It was the citadel to which the West rallied and stood firm, until Stalin died and Russia mellowed and Western Europe recouped its strength and almost the whole world came to realize there would be no world war III in Europe because it was unthinkable.

Under terms of the treaty, France or any of the 14 other member nations can bow out in 1969. Thus, De Gaulle in effect is serving notice he may wish to exercise his option. It may be that by 1969, or soon thereafter, others may wish to join him. If so, it would not be catastrophic—nor even so bad as if Thailand should suddenly decide to quit the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), for that is where containment of the new threat from Communist China is now centered.

Government Credibility: How Wide the Gap?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it is not only difficult to obtain information from Government sources on occasion, but there appears to be a growing feeling that it is more and more difficult to accept fully the information that is given out by various Government agencies and spokesmen. The Government's credibility is under attack.

The U.S. system of government depends on the people's being informed of what its Government is doing. There have been serious breakdowns in this important communications link.

There are signs today which indicate an erosion of the principle of an informed electorate; an electorate which, given the facts and full information, can continue to support its Federal Government in its wise decisions, and correct the Government when it is unwise.

An analysis of the erosion of the credibility of Government information was published in the Chicago Sun-Times on Sunday, March 6, 1966. The analysis, written by Associated Press correspondent, Saul Pett, follows:

GOVERNMENT CREDIBILITY: HOW WIDE THE GAP

(By Saul Pett)

WASHINGTON.—In a town of passing prose favorites, this year's phrase in Washington so far is the "credibility gap" in government.

Question: does it in the fact exist? Answer: It does, or seems to, and seeming to, it exists. Among governments foreign and domestic, is this new in history? No. New or old, at what point is it dangerous for a democratic government to tell less or more than the truth, to squeeze it, sculpt it or withhold it? That is the question no one seems able to answer; every attempt is like nailing Jello to the wall.

Here, one is led into a never-never land where morality and necessarily clash; where cold wars are more complicated than hot wars and shooting wars are undeclared; where hardheaded men of the world disagree with Boy Scouts who never had to meet a payroll; where the people's right to know is balanced, precariously, with the "people's right not to know"; where diplomacy and political maneuver, like film, can curl up and die from exposure; where the end, always the end, it is hoped, justifies the means.

The moral dilemmas may obscure the point of danger but not the ultimate danger itself. In his book, "Freedom or Secrecy," J. Russell Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post, posed it:

"If a government repeatedly resorts to lies in crises where lies seem to serve its interest best, it will one day be unable to employ the truth effectively when truth would serve its interests best. A government that too readily rationalizes its right to lie in a crisis will never lack for either lies or crises."

THE LINGERING CLOUD OF DOUBT

There have been lies.

In 1960, the government of Dwight D. Eisenhower lied about the U–2 plane shot down over Russia.

In 1961, through its ambassador at the United Nations, the government of John F. Kennedy lied about the Bay of Pigs invasion.

In each case, the deception was exposed in a moment of profound national pain. But in neither did the President nor his administration continue to suffer from a lingering doubt about its word.

The administration of Lyndon B. Johnson has had no single moment as traumatic as the U–2 incident or the Bay of Pigs. It has not been obliged to make public confession of attempted deception. And yet there lingers over Washington today a cloud of doubt—large and gray in the minds of some, small and off-white in the minds of others.

The symptoms are various. In a poll taken late last year by the Opinion Research Corp., for the Columbia Broadcasting System, one of the questions concerned the truthfulness of official U.S. announcements of American casualties and other Vietnamese war information. Of those polled, 67 percent believed it was sometimes truthful; 15 percent, always truthful, and 13 percent almost never truthful.

Last December U.N. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg spoke of a "crisis of confidence" in explaining why Washington disclosed its position on the reputed second peace feeler from Hanoi. Goldberg denied the crisis was justified but did say, "We have a great problem maintaining our credibility with our own people."

Many observers detected another symptom in the spectacular peace offensive launched early in December by the administration with an undiplomatic blaze of pyrotechnics. Few here doubt the first purpose of that effort: Peace in Vietnam. But the intensive, worldwide effort to convince friend and foe and neutral alike of the U.S. sincerity, in which this country seemed to be begging to be believed, reflected an unofficial uneasiness about its reputation for meaning what it says.

INCIDENTS THAT ERODED CREDIBILITY

The problem of credibility has resulted from a series of large and small incidents.

Last February U.N. Secretary General Thant, in a rare display of undiplomatic language, said there had been a peace feeler from Hanoi and that the American people were not getting all the facts. The White House insisted there were "no meaningful proposals" then before the Government. The word meaningful was lost. The impression grew that there had been no feelers at all.

Then in November came the magazine article by Eric Sevareid in which he said that during the 1964 presidential campaign Thant told Adlai Stevenson he had obtained Hanoi's agreement to meet with an American representative in Rangoon. Had there been such a proposal? "Yes," the State Department now said, on November 15. Officials today still insist the offer was too nebulous to take seriously. Clearly, Thant disagreed. In any case, was it too nebulous to admit at the time?

Last August 31, the Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew, claimed a CIA agent had offered him a $3,300,000 bribe 5 years before. The State Department denied the charge. Then Lee produced a letter from Secretary of State Dean Rusk apologizing for the incident. Then the State Department admitted it. Then and now, the State Department insists the denial was a result of bureaucratic error, that the man issuing the denial hadn't known the facts. Possible? Possible.

In October 1963, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara predicted that the bulk of American military forces (then mostly "advisers") would be out of Vietnam by the end of 1965. Early in the spring of 1965, he predicted that neither U.S. combat troops nor more money would be needed in Vietnam. Late in 1965, after his last trip to Vietnam, the Secretary said, "We have stopped losing the war." And at least one Pentagon reporter was heard to grumble, "When did he ever say we were losing it?"

Any man can guess wrong, but wrong guesses from McNamara would seem as startling as profanity from an archbishop. McNamara, in this case, is the victim of his own public image—the man with the computer mind into which he feeds only facts, not wishful thinking. And always it is remembered that it was from McNamara's Pentagon that an assistant secretary, Arthur Sylvester, once rode forth to proclaim the Government's right to lie in emergencies.

Those who know McNamara insist that his predictions were honest, correct as of the moment, wrong as of later.

AN EASY WAY TO MISUNDERSTAND

Among war reporters in Vietnam, the question is often asked, is the Government leveling with us on enemy and American casualties? The Government insists it is. How, asks the reporter, can you call our losses "light" when a whole company was wiped out? You can, says the Government, when a battalion was involved. But was a battalion involved? asks the reporter. The question goes round and round.

Transcending the battle of credibility is the ultimate agony of the Vietnam problem itself. A war difficult to understand is easy to misunderstand. Ambiguity breeds dissent and dissent, especially as it hardens, breeds suspicion.

The war in Vietnam has no battle lines, no chartable progress, no easily seen goals. The United States is not fighting the real villains, we are told, but their proxies—the Vietcong for Hanoi, Hanoi for Red China, with Russia a questionable stockholder. We are not fighting all out because we dare not, it is said, risk a large war. We are fighting them on the ground but we dare not risk commitment to a ground war in Asia. We advise, we escalate, we bomb, we pause, we seem to beg the world, anybody, to get us out and to the conference table, we bomb again, we ask the United Nations to do something while we firm up our commitment to Saigon with a hastily called conference in Hawaii.

The complexities of the cold war almost defy understanding, if not hope.

And always there is the big bomb to complicate the complications, to quicken the doves and slow the hawks.

"The last three Presidents of the United States," it is pointed out on a penultimate level of government, "have had to think of a full nuclear exchange as a real possibility. Thus, neither President Johnson nor Secretary Rusk ever blasts the other side by name. They have avoided creating a war psychology because it would be too dangerous in the nuclear age. Thus, the dissenters are left more room to create psychology in the other direction."

Among historians, the whole question of government credibility is viewed with varying degrees of concern.

Henry Steele Commager is disturbed, he says, by the "increased trend" in Washington to disguise the truth.

"It is due to the heavy role of the military. Countries confronted with military problems act this way. They justify it in terms of national security. I don't think it's justified now. The habits of deception carry the danger of self-deception; you can begin to believe your own propaganda."

Samuel Eliot Morison is less disturbed. "I think in war or at a time of delicate negotiations you can't hold a government to admit everything. There is no more of a trend now than there has ever been but in recent years events have come so fast and thick there seems to be more of it."

U.S. HISTORY REPLETE WITH EXAMPLES

As it is with all nations, American history abounds not only in examples of official secrecy but also contradictions between government postures and government acts, between the promises of candidates and their deeds after election, between the "inside" attitudes of government and the public positions taken under political pressure.

Thomas Jefferson as a candidate opposed creation of a national bank, and supported it as President. During the Texas revolution against Mexico, the U.S. Government pretended to be neutral but wasn't. The contemporary public was never told of Grover Cleveland's cancer operation in 1893 (nor later the extent of the illnesses of Woodrow Wilson in 1918 and Franklin Roosevelt in 1945).

Wilson, the apostle of "open covenants openly arrived at," was forced, when the chips were down at Versailles, to negotiate the treaty in secrecy with David Lloyd George and Georges Clemenceau while a bayoneted American marine kept out all intruders, including representatives of minor allies, defeated Germany and, even the President's own associates in the American peace delegation.

In 1939 Franklin Roosevelt, the President at the start of World War II, said America would be "neutral in fact, if not in spirit," and the country was neither.

In 1952, the Eisenhower administration came in with much talk of massive retaliation and the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek, and delivered neither.

In 1961, according to the Arthur Schlesinger memoir, President Kennedy told U.S. Ambassador Stevenson. "You have the hardest thing in the world to sell. It really doesn't make any sense—the idea that Taiwan represents China. But, if we lost this fight, if Red China comes into the U.N. during our first year in town, your first year and mine, they'll run us both out. * * * We can delay the admission of Red China till after the election."

In the campaign of 1964, Lyndon Johnson appeared as the apostle of restraint in Vietnam and Barry Goldwater, the knight of escalation, and the war was escalated a year later under President Johnson.

In all these examples in history, the reader takes his choice, between a suspicion of deliberate deceit or a more gentle consideration, that events can make a lie of the best of promises.

WE AMERICANS ARE SO PONDEROUS

There is in Washington today a man of great experience in Government and the world, who has been high in the inner councils of several administrations. He no longer holds office and, in semiretirement, enjoys a relaxed urbanity about recent world history. All the talk of doubletalk in Washington, from the U–2 incident onward, fills him with an amused sense of irony.

"For a people with a supposed sense of humor," he says, "we Americans are so ponderous. In diplomacy and Government, there are various grades of the truth as there are in private life. When a hostess we detest invites us to dinner, we don't tell the truth. We say, 'Oh, darling, I'm simply devastated but we're tied up.' This makes for grease in our social relationships.

"In foreign affairs we use the same gentle forms of deception, which deceives no one but gets no one mad. There are accepted forms of deception but we do not deceive our enemies or friends or ourselves about our serious intent. * * * These recent difficulties you mention don't require a change in policy but a change in stage management."

Lyndon Johnson has been known to have an acute sense of secrecy dating back to his Senate days. An old friend and aid once tried to explain it: "I think it's the gambler or politician in him. He just doesn't like to reveal his next move. He plays things close to the vest."

Thus, there have been occasions when neither the press covering him nor the Secret Service protecting him nor the crew flying him knew precisely where the President was going until they were airborne.

Thus, nothing is said to infuriate the President more than to have one of his appointments leaked before he makes the announcement. It is a common joke in Washington that the best way to kill a Presidential appointment is to rumor it in advance. One former Government official insists he knows of two appointments that were rescinded because of advance leaks.

The tools for imagemaking, a common phenomenon in America, are prodigious in the Presidency. A President controls the vast machinery of the executive branch and its hundreds of press agents. He can, by the timing of his announcements, achieve maximum effect favorable to him and unfavorable to his opposition. Headlines and TV cameras follow a President everywhere.

Thus, there was nothing un-American in the suggestion that perhaps one of the reasons Mr. Johnson hurried to Honolulu for a conference about Vietnam was to take the play away from a Senate inquiry into his Vietnam policy.

"Manipulation of the news is a constant activity of both parties. Only they do it better." This was said by a Republican, who was an assistant to President Eisenhower, with equal parts of envy and indignation.

WORD FROM THE MOSS COMMITTEE

No study of Government credibility is complete without considering the question of freedom of information. Periodically, over many years and administrations, reporters and editors have complained fiercely of undue official secrecy under which bureaucratic error or worse might have been hidden under the veil of national security.

Ten years ago a committee was set up in the House, chaired by Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, to investigate such complaints. It found many, ranging from official reluctance to divulge details on Government contracts (where there was no competitive bidding) to the Pentagon's insistence that the Pentagon telephone book was classified, as was the work of the Lincoln Centennial Committee.

The Moss committee, Democratic-controlled, brought many improvements. It appears to have been busiest during the Republican administration of Mr. Eisenhower. It is considerably less busy during the Democratic administration of Mr. Johnson. Why?

"On the basis of complaints we receive," said Moss, "this administration has a reputation for an almost perfect score in not abusing the handling or withholding of information. We get fewer complaints now. If anyone feels I'm playing politics, let him bring in a complaint."

But then there is Sam Archibald, staff director of the committee, who told this reporter: "Yes, there have been improvements. But it is also a fact of life that Democrats are less inclined to clobber a Democratic President."

Sam Archibald, an appointee who can be fired by the committee, authorized the use of his name behind that quote. Either he has a private income or he must be one of the bravest men in this town, where anonymity is fearless and truth, a sometime mystery of mirrors.

Conservation and the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of addressing the 30th annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation at the Hotel Hilton in Pittsburgh last Friday, March 11. I include the text of my remarks hereafter:

Conservation and the Congress

Thank you for inviting me to your 30th birthday party. There are some who might not like to admit to the passage of the great divide which a 30th birthday signifies. Bnt when you look back at the America of 1936, when the National Wildlife Federation first convened—an America of a conservation movement up against the ropes, with the remains of our forests burning, our soil eroding, and our ducks and geese about to go the way of the passenger pigeon—you can be proud of your 30th birthday and the progress you have made.

It is good to share the platform with a distinguished conservationist, Gov. William Scranton. I had the honor to serve on the House of Representatives Banking and Currency Committee with Bill Scranton some years ago. Now, you may not think of the Banking and Currency Committee as the center of the consevation movement. But when we needed to get a bill through Congress making available surplus Government grain unfit for human consumption for migratory waterfowl, we wangled the bill before Banking and Currency on the theory that surplus grain was essentially a banking operation. Anyway it worked, and the bill became law.

In discussing conservation and the Congress, let me exude some optimism. I am optimistic because in a democracy, people in the end get what they really want. And the American public is now ready to back an all-out drive on man's pollution of his environment.

The American public has had enough of streams and lakes which stink to the heavens from human wastes, which are gory with the blood of packinghouses, which are sterile from the acids from mines and industries, which are covered with a coating of detergent foam from somebody's laundry, or of cottage cheese from a processing plant. The American public is fed to the teeth with air that is polluted with harmful gases and solids. We are deeply ashamed with the contamination of our land by longlasting pesticide poisons.

What about water pollution? Fortunately, people no longer are debating whether pollution should be abated. Now they are debating how pollution control can best be achieved. Are we ready to pay for it? The people of New York State said so last fall by a vote of four to one. Citizens of St. Louis, of Omaha, and of Kansas City and Portland, Oreg., have said so. And the President is calling for a massive water cleanup campaign, one affecting rivers from their headwaters to their mouths. There is reason for optimism here, if we will but keep moving.

Air pollution is a particularly insidious problem, because the harmful gases are generally invisible. We often do not recognize the dangers until an epidemic of respiratory diseases hits, or until gardeners no longer can grow leafy vegetables near the highways, or until there is extensive structural damage to buildings and bridges—an $11 billion bill annually.

A prime cause of air pollution is automobile exhausts. It is high time we take notice of the automobile population explosion—incidentally, one population explosion we can discuss without raising the religious issue.

The auto industry, we learn, is equipping new 1968 models with air pollution control devices. But will people keep the air pollution devices on their autos and use them? More important, will they pay the cost of keeping the engine tuned up and running at peak efficiency—for no exhaust device can ever replace a faulty combustion process? Will they help reduce refuse burning? I am confident they will, but conservationists and other concerned citizens must intensify their educational campaigns in this direction.

Can we afford to be optimistic about pesticide poisons? Well, Federal and State agencies are tightening controls. Industry is doing a better job of educating people in the proper use of these dangerous materials. Pesticide research is getting important money in the Federal budget. I have hopes that we can develop biological controls that will control pests without poisoning the environment.

We can be optimistic about the establishment of public outdoor reoereation areas, even though the President's program to round out the National Park Service by 1972 appears ambitious. The Congress this year already has enacted legislation establishing the Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina. It appears possible that the following areas also can be established this year: Sleeping Bear Dunes and Indiana Dunes Lakeshores in Michigan and Indiana, Oregon Dunes Seashore in Oregon, the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas, and the Bighorn Canyon and Flaming Gorge National Recreation Areas in the West.

A lot of action is scheduled for this year on classifying wildernesses, on establishing wildlife refuges. I wish I could be as optimistic about the chances of the wild rivers bill (a topic which your handsome National Wildlife magazine covers so beautifully in the current issue). Several of us Wisconsinites are plugging mightly for establishment of scenic waterways on the St. Croix and the Wolf. The latter, by the way, would save not only one of the Midwest's last free-flowing rivers, but one of our historic Indian tribes, the Menominees, which lives along its banks.

There are many other opportunities. The Redwoods, the Buffalo, and Allagash Rivers, and the North Cascades simply must be preserved. I am convinced that they will be.

All of us are awaiting the results of the new Public Land Law Review Commission. I am hopeful that only those lands which are actually needed for residential, commercial, or industrial sites will pass out of Federal ownership. These public lands that remain must be managed for multiple uses, including fish and wildlife and recreation.

Speaking of multiple use, you and I have seen the devastating effect of six-strand barbed wire fences and hog fences erected by livestock interests and the Bureau of Land Management on the public domain in the Western States. The fences may hold the sheep, cows, and horses, but they also interfere with the natural migration of our priceless antelope resource. You and I have seen the pictures of antelope that get caught on the prongs of the barbed wire fence and starve to death.

It has been an exciting experience for me to work with Tom Bell and others in the Wyoming Wildlife Federation in standing up for the public's interest in these beautiful animals. We have brought our fight to the Department of the Interior. This morning I am happy to announce that Bureau of Land Management Director Charles Stoddard has just informed me that the Bureau will, from here on out, cancel the grazing permit of any grazer who puts up an unauthorized fence on the public domain; and that the Bureau is working to identify unauthorized fences already erected, and will require that they be taken down or otherwise modified in order to permit the free migration of antelope.

This is progress. I hail Secretary of the Interior Udall and BLM Director Stoddard for it. And I applaud the Wildlife Federation for yet another successful fight.

I am sure you also are aware that with the advent of the Job Corps, many of our young people are being sent to camps throughout the United States to assist in important conservation management work. We, therefore, should give our support to Director Charles Stoddard of the Bureau of Land Management for suggesting that applicants for Job Corps work be competent and alert to the requirements for the particular effort in which they will be involved. In Director Stoddard, we have a dynamic leader who will do a job if he is given the right personnel and tools to work with.

There is reason for optimism in the new cropland adjustment program. If the Department of Agriculture and the State wildlife agencies work out cooperative programs, I am confident that thousands of acres of privately owned land can be opened to public hunting and fishing. This is another area where you can provide real leadership.

When we stop water and air pollution, we help protect fish and wildlife. When we preserve areas for public recreation rather than for commercial or industrial sites, we help wildlife. When we manage public lands for multiple use or take private lands out of intensive agricultural production, we enhance the opportunities for wildlife.

But we need to do more. We need to halt the drainage of wet lands of prime importance to fish and wildlife. We have put a stop to Federal subsidies for the drainage of waterfowl wet lands, but unsubsidized drainage goes on.

We need to preserve more duck production areas. I hope that the accelerated waterfowl wetlands acquisition program can be accelerated some more. I have joined Congressmen DINGELL and SAYLOR in sponsoring new legislation which would allow U.S. duck stamp funds obtained by a voluntary surcharge to be used to set aside wetlands in Canada and also in the United States for propagation purposes and for establishment of wintering grounds in Mexico. Under this legislation, volunteer citizens groups such as Wetlands for Wildlife and your own National Wildlife Federation affiliates will be able, through private funds, to acquire these areas where presently there is objection to their being acquired as public areas. A dollar spent in a Canadian marsh or in the prairie pothole country of the United States may breed a lot more ducks for our flyways. It may also be important to spend a portion of the funds for wintering grounds in Mexico.

We must set aside areas for the protection of endangered species of wildlife, not only in the United States but all over the world. I have introduced legislation looking toward an international United Nations conference in which all governments can join in a cooperative effort to conserve wildlife. International trade in wildlife and its products must be controlled. This traffic today threatens many species of birds, mammals, and reptiles. We must demonstrate the economic and spiritual values of wildlife. We must combat fashions—such as the leopard skin coat fad, and superstitions—such as the belief that powdered rhinocerous horn is a sex stimulant. We must help the new countries—and some of the older ones as well—develop their own sound conservation programs.

This has been an optimistic report. But please don't disband, on your 13th birthday, with mutual congratulations that the job of preserving wildlife is done. On the plane to Pittsburgh, I read in Esquire of the vision of the future of Dr. William Cummins of the Navy's Taylor Model Basin. They're developing a hovercraft that will be ready to go shortly. And here is what Dr. Cummins says:

"If I were a duck hunter I'd cruise over swamp grass and use by boat for a blind. If I were a fisherman, I'd want an inflatable hovercraft that I could unfold from the trunk of my car, and then attach an outboard motor and hover along a rocky stream * * * at 30 or 40 miles an hour."

If we can ground Dr. Cummins for just a few years, we may be able to save our fish and wildlife yet.

The National Wildlife Federation, since the beginning, has taken the lead in coordinating conservation efforts. Women's and youth organizations, civic clubs, garden groups, and even organized labor have vital interests in the things you stand for. Invite them to join you. Zero in on broadscale conservation problems, rather than directing your major efforts toward detailed hunting and fishing regulations.

It was my friend, the late Clem Miller of California, who told you back in 1961 that the word "cooperation" has a magical effect on Congressmen. "We are so busy being ground down by the relentless effects of political competition," he said, "that the parties who can sing in unison are greeted with open arms. To the conciliator we are frequently willing to give our devotion."

Nor should we automatically consider that all industry is bad for conservation. The petroleum industry, I am told, has made real strides toward reducing its damage to natural resources. Many timber concerns provide outstanding receational opportunities on lands managed for sustained yield. Some electric power interests recognize the values of preserving certain streams as wild rivers. And so it goes. I think you well can meet with many of these groups to find ways of cooperating for the benefit of conservation.

Above all, I urge you to keep your own organizations strong. Develop intelligent, responsible, and dedicated leaders who have a recognized status in their own communities. Organize affiliate groups in all areas to give your broad representation. Make your voices heard in the State Capitols—and in Washington, D.C. As one who knows—and as one who can say this sort of thing—take the information which your national headquarters develops and distributes so effectively, and then act on it. Buttonhole your Congressmen when they are at home. Get them committed on specific issues before the elections. Write us. Wire us. Call us. I can honestly say that most Members of Congress really want to know what you—their constituents—think about current issues. There are more conservationists in the Congress than you might think.

Conservation is an attitude, an approach, a concept which permeates our lives. As a conservationist, I wish the National Wildlife Federation well as it presses forward to bring this concept to all the people of the United States.

The Bravest Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, every war in which the United States has participated has been marked by notable acts of heroism by Americans. Another such deed occurred recently when the Vietcong and North Vietnamese regulars overran the Shau Special Forces Camp in Vietnam. The extraordinary heroism of Maj. Bernard F. Fisher, of Kuna, Idaho, is graphically portrayed in the following news story appearing in the Salt Lake Tribune, published in Salt Lake City, Utah, on March 11:

> DA NANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"It was the bravest thing I've ever seen a pilot do."
>
> These were the words a fellow pilot used to describe the daring rescue of a downed fighter pilot by Maj. Bernard Fisher, 39, Kuna, Idaho.
>
> BRAVES CROSSFIRE
>
> Major Fisher Thursday plopped his battered A1E Skyraider into the middle of a savage crossfire and plucked his downed wingman to safety.
>
> "This is the most daring rescue I have heard of since World War II. I can't think of anything in Korea to match it," said one Air Force officer.
>
> Maj. Stanford W. Myers, Newport, Wash., minutes before had crashlanded his flaming Skyraider on the tiny airstrip of the Shau Special Forces Camp.
>
> LEAPS INTO DITCH
>
> He jumped from the flaming plane into a ditch as a solid barrage of .50-caliber machinegun bullets screamed over him in all directions.
>
> As two other pilots zoomed as low as they could with protective strafing, Major Fisher slammed his propeller-driven fighter to the ground in a nearstall.
>
> While Vietcong watched popeyed, Major Myers sprinted to the open cockpit of the Fisher plane and dived in.
>
> RECOVERS WITS
>
> Meanwhile, one Communist attacker recovered his wits and ran toward the chugging plane, his machinegun blazing.
>
> He got to within 20 feet of the craft before strafing planes above cut him down.
>
> Major Fisher then slammed down the throttle, roared head-on at a machinegun post and took off.
>
> FLEW COVER
>
> Flying cover over the tiny strip were Capts. Dennis B. Hague, 28, Kellogg, Idaho, and John Lucas, 28, Steubenville, Ohio.
>
> "If there was ever a guy who could have pulled it off, Fisher was it," said Hague. "He [Myers] tried to land with his gear down and I heard Major Fisher shout, 'Snatch your gear up.'"
>
> "He is what you call one hell of a pilot," said fliers at Homestead Air Force Base, Fla., where Fisher was stationed before.

Mr. Speaker, Major Fisher's wife has reported that her husband writes her every day, but she doubts she would have heard of his exploit except from others. Mrs. Fisher, who returned to Kuna—where she was reared—with their five sons ranging in age from 5 to 16, said Major Fisher has an Air Medal and has been recommended for a Distinguished Flying Cross.

In what was probably the understatement of the year, Mrs. Fisher told reporters:

> I'm pretty proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans can be proud of Major Fisher whose unfaltering courage, surprising audacity, and superb flying skill rescued a comrade from death or capture by the enemy.

All Americans can join with Mrs. Stanford W. Myers, the wife of the rescued airman—the Myers also have five children—who said:

> Thank God for that guy who had guts enough to land.

"Rhodesia and Race: New Stress on Segregation, Tribes Is Like Apartheid—Heightened Tensions Seen"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been critical of the Smith regime in Rhodesia have been accused of "planned myopia" by apologists for that Government. But their criticism of American Government officials is exceeded by their indictment of the American press for its reporting of what is happening in Rhodesia. If I might quote from the widely circulated report of the rightwing American-African Affairs Association:

> News reaching the United States has come almost exclusively from British circles taking their lead from Labor Party publicists.

The Rhodesian Government has constantly emphasized the theme that there is no racial discrimination in its policies and its views are fundamentally different from that of the South African Government. But many of us have been skeptical of these views; we feel that the racial attitudes of the present leadership in Rhodesia will lead that country to an increasing denial of the rights of the black Africans, similar to what has happened in South Africa in the last 18 years.

We have felt that the Smith regime made the unilateral declaration of independence in order to remove any restraint from Great Britain concerning the treatment of the black Rhodesians.

Recently the Wall Street Journal sent its staff reporter, Mr. Paul Lancaster, to Rhodesia. Mr. Lancaster reports in the March 11 issue:

> There are indications that the racial attitudes of Rhodesia's 220,000 whites, which traditionally have diverged from those of white South Africans, now are drifting closer to the policies of their neighbors to the south. * * * Should the present trend persist and become more pronounced, it would almost certainly heighten tensions in this already troubled part of the world.

I am anxious to see if the Wall Street Journal will now be classified as one of those publications "taking their lead from Labor Party publicists."

The article follows:

> RHODESIA AND RACE: NATION MAY BE MOVING CLOSER TO SOUTH AFRICA IN ITS POLICY ON COLOR—NEW STRESS ON SEGREGATION, TRIBES IS LIKE APARTHEID—HEIGHTENED TENSIONS SEEN—RIGHT OF ADMISSION RESERVED
>
> (By Paul Lancaster)
>
> SALISBURY, RHODESIA.—The signs reading whites and nonwhites that segregate the races in everything from telephone booths to public parks in South Africa are missing here. So are the police who sometimes wait on corners in South African cities to check the passes the government requires blacks to carry so it can control their movements.
>
> But in other ways there are indications that the racial attitudes of Rhodesia's 220,000 whites, which traditionally have diverged from those of white South Africans, now are drifting closer to the policies of their neighbors to the south. Such a development obviously holds far-reaching implications for Rhodesia's 4 million blacks, whose status is the central issue in the economic struggle Britain and its allies are waging against the breakaway regime of Prime Minister Ian Smith. Should the present trend persist and become more pronounced, it would almost certainly heighten tensions in this already troubled part of the world.
>
> A visitor arriving here on a flight from Johannesburg still finds that the absence of rigid public segregation makes the atmosphere in Salisbury distinctly different from that in South Africa. But it soon becomes apparent that things are not as free and easy as they seem at first.
>
> EUROPEANS ONLY
>
> Besides the entrances to many restaurants are discreet little plaques that say "Right of Admission Reserved"—which means no Afri-

cans. Some public restrooms are divided into two sections—one open to all races and the other marked "Europeans Only." Moreover, a visitor quickly learns that Rhodesians are not always pleased by the observation that the racial climate here differs from South Africa.

Says Jeremy Field, a tobacco farmer whose father, Winston Field, preceded Mr. Smith as Prime Minister: "I think South Africa may be closer to the right solution than we are. There is a basic difference between black and white, and any policy that doesn't accept this won't work." His wife, Heather, who is one of the many Rhodesians born in South Africa, suggests that life here would be pleasanter for all if more public facilities were openly segregated. "Signs would make it easier for Africans," she says. "They would know what they could do, and they wouldn't have to worry about it."

Most of the land in Rhodesia is divided into white and nonwhite residential areas. Aside from that important exception, the country's stated racial policy is that it follows a nonracial course, and this is true at least in theory.

There is no official policy of segregation in public places. Businesses are free to discriminate if they wish and many do. But here in the capital city two of the leading hotels admit all races.

VOTING RULES

In politics, there are no racial qualifications for voters on either of the two voter rolls, one of which is made up of more highly qualified voters who elect 50 members of parliament and the other of which is made up of less qualified citizens who choose 15 members. Though in practice it works out so that the 50 A roll members represent whites and the 15 B roll members represent blacks, the voter qualification rules require only that certain income and education standards be met.

Thus there is nothing to keep Africans who meet the requirements from voting on the dominant A roll; indeed, a few already do. Nor is there any legal barrier to Africans' assuming a commanding role in the government eventually, should they take full advantage of their rights—something many have declined to do in the past because of a black nationalist campaign calling for nonparticipation in the present political setup.

All this is a far cry from South Africa, whose announced long-term goal is to separate the races as completely as possible. "South Africa has its policy and we have ours," says Prime Minister Smith's minister of information, Jack Howman.

When Rhodesia issued its unilateral declaration of independence from Britain last November, South African Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd expressed friendship for Rhodesia. But he felt compelled to add that "with respect to color policies there is no similarity between the policy of separate development" of South Africa and "the policy of partnership as applied in Rhodesia."

DRAWING TOGETHER

All the same, since the declaration of independence, the rest of the world increasingly has tended to bracket South Africa and Rhodesia together as bastions of white supremacy in a largely black continent. And the signs that the two nations are in fact drawing closer together are numerous, even though at this point Rhodesia clearly is not receiving all the gasoline and other help it would like from South Africa to enable it to ride out the economic sanctions brought against it by Britain and others.

"There's definitely a drift toward South Africa on racial matters," says a man who was one of Rhodesia's leading political figures in the past but now has been forced out of public life. "South Africa's influence here is strong and growing. The radio here uses more and more South African programs. Some businesses that admitted Africans in the days of the federation are segregated now." (The reference is to the now-dissolved federation embracing Rhodesia and what are now Zambia and Malawi.)

Some observers blame the pressures brought to bear on Rhodesia by Britain and black-ruled African states for what they see as this nation's hardening racial position. They say that fears of being forced into hasty acceptance of rule by ill-prepared black politicians caused Rhodesia to depart from an essentially moderate racial course and brought to the fore white supremacist elements who promised to head off black domination.

"Maybe I was too optimistic, but I think things were moving in the right direction for the Africans here until recently," says one non-Rhodesian resident of Salisbury. "Now, however, the whites are being pushed in the direction of white supremacy, and as long as the pressure keeps up it's going to get worse."

But some critics of the solidly entrenched Rhodesian front government are less charitable. One British-born Salisbury businessman argues that all the talk by government officials and their supporters about the need to maintain standards and avoid the chaotic conditions that exist to the north, where black governments have taken over has always been a smokescreen. Insists the businessman: "They're out to build apartheid here."

Discerning the Government's true position is not easy. Some Cabinet members seem to be unabashed white supremacists, but the views of other officials are more elusive. One of those whose views are particularly hard to pin down is the Prime Minister himself.

A LOOK AT SMITH'S VIEWS

During last spring's election campaign, Mr. Smith was reported to have said that there would be "no black rule in my lifetime." He subsequently has insisted that what he really meant was that there would be "no black extremist government" in his lifetime; the only criterion for the achieve*ment of political rights is whether or not a* man is civilized, not the color of his skin, he he has asserted. Some observers are willing to take his words at face value and argue that Mr. Smith should not be classed as a white supremacist. "I'm sure that Smith in his own mind is prepared to accept majority rule and that the only question is timing," says one U.S. student of Rhodesian affairs.

Others are highly skeptical of this judgment, however. They note that in 1961, when constitutional changes designed to bring about wider African participation in government were being debated, Mr. Smith opposed them. This was true even though the provisions at issue, which are retained in the new Constitution promulgated after the declaration of independence, incorporated precisely the sort of nonracial voting qualifications the Prime Minister now says he favors. The position Mr. Smith took in 1961 causes the skeptics to doubt his sincerity today when he insists he supports full political rights for all qualified citizens regardless of race.

"They just want a few of us to vote," maintains an African chauffeur from Salisbury. The chauffeur, an articulate 31 year old, says he can't meet the standards for the franchise at present.

These standards do not appear particularly high; among the categories of citizens eligible for the B roll, for example, are those with an income of $739 a year, or those with an annual income of $370 coupled with 2 years' secondary education. But in a land where the majority of the Africans practice subsistence agriculture and have almost no cash income and where an African who goes to work for a white farmer earns about $125 a year plus food and housing, the income requirements appear hopelessly beyond reach for many. As for the education standards, while a steady increase in spending on African schooling by the white government means that almost all African children now start school, only 1 in 30 of these youngsters even begins the secondary level.

CLAMPDOWN ON SCHOOL INTEGRATION

A school administrator in Salisbury says that in his field he recently has seen several signs of what he regards as a tendency to bring Rhodesia's racial policies more in line with South Africa's. Among them: Agitation in parliament to stop predominantly white private schools from enrolling Africans; the forced closing last December of an African secondary school located in a European section of Salisbury and staffed by European women on a volunteer basis, and an order to a white missionary outside Salisbury to stop sending his children to an African school.

Some government critics also see a movement in the direction of apartheid in the increasing stress being placed on African tribal groupings here. Preservation and strengthening of tribal life is an important aspect of South Africa's racial policy; the justification is that it gives Africans freedom to develop their own way of life to the full and reduces social frictions.

A committee of the Rhodesian parliament recently advocated a simliar effort to encour*age tribal life here. It urged that Africans* living in the black "townships" outside cities be grouped according to tribal affiliations and recommended that the powers of the traditional tribal chiefs be increased.

Opponents of such steps both here and in South Africa say the underlying motive is to divide the Africans and thereby make it *easier to control them. Moreover, a young* African who lives in a township outside Salisbury indicates that at least some blacks regard tribal affiliations as a heritage of their long years as second-class citizens and are not at all eager to cling to tribal ties. "We're all mixed up where I live," says this African. *"There's no point in dividing us."*

Adds a well known white Rhodesian who opposes the emphasis on tribalism: "For 75 years we've been trying to reduce the power of the chiefs. Now the Government is trying to build them up. It's just like South Africa."

Commissioner Rosel Hyde Held in High Esteem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dwight William Jensen, writing in the March 3 edition of the Idaho Observer, published in Boise, Idaho, points to the very high esteem in which Commissioner Rosel Hyde of the Federal Communications Commission is held.

Commissioner Hyde is one of many Idahoans who have risen to high rank in the Federal Government and who are known to all those who deal with them as men of the very highest integrity and ability.

Commissioner Hyde, Mr. Speaker, the dean of all Federal regulatory agency commissioners, has served well his native State of Idaho and all of the people of the United States.

It is a pleasure and honor for me, Mr. Speaker, to place in the Record Mr. Jensen's tribute to Commissioner Hyde.

The article follows:

[From the Idaho Observer, Mar. 3, 1966]

A Firm but Gentle Bureaucrat

(By Dwight Wm. Jensen)

Of Idaho's three men on Federal regulatory commissions, two are former Republican Congressmen and well-known in the State. The other is also a Republican, but in his own State he is not well known outside his own circles of family, friends, and professional colleagues. But in his field he is respected, honored, and liked.

Rosel Hyde is the senior member in point of service on the Federal Communications Commission—and on all the Federal regulatory commissions. He is a bureaucrat from way back, but to him seem to apply none of the standard prejudices against bureaucrats. He is characterized as knowledgable, honest, firm but gentle.

Fellow Commissioner Lee Loevinger says of him: "He is gentle, quiet. He is very firm in his convictions but, unlike me, he is not aggressive. He may express his convictions only in his vote. He has a deep regard for constitutional law. He is very capable, very well-liked. He is conservative."

Loevinger and Hyde often find themselves dissenting from opinions reached by the rest of the Commission; Loevinger, unlike Hyde, is a liberal.

FCC Chairman E. William Henry, calling Hyde "one of the deans in this business," notes that "on many occasions I have expressed the highest confidence in the ability and integrity of Commissioner Hyde." Hyde and Henry don't always see eye to eye on the role of the FCC.

Hyde was born April 21, 1900, on a homestead in Bannock County. He helped clear the sagebrush from part of that tract. He grew up in Downey and went to grade school there; some relatives still live there; his own legal residence still is in Bannock County.

As a boy, he helped his father build one of the old open-wire, ground-return telephone systems, using barbed wire fences as part of the line and crossing over road junctions and across gates. The system hooked up a general store and half a dozen homesteaders and settlers.

After being educated in Downey, Salt Lake City and Logan, Hyde entered Government service in 1924. He took the civil service examination and went to work on the staff of the Civil Service Commission. From 1925 to 1928 he worked on the staff of the Office of Public Buildings and Parks.

Hyde has been with what is now the Federal Communications Commission since 1928. When he joined it, it was the Federal Radio Commission and he was an assistant attorney. He rose to be general counsel before being appointed a Commissioner in 1946.

Some of his major contributions as a Commissioner included work in the immediate postwar period to obtain prompt consideration of applications for new television stations and thus help expand television nationwide. He led the way to settling a rulemaking controversy regarding color standards in 1953. (He was Chairman of the FCC that year.) He has served on international telecommunications conferences.

Professional broadcasters speak kindly of Hyde. Sol Taishoff, editor and publisher of Broadcasting magazine, once wrote, "For a bureaucrat, Commissioner Hyde is a quiet, unobtrusive man. He isn't given to alliterations like "vast wastelands" or catch-phrases about "television's Appalachia." He is no raconteur although he likes a joke and can quip with the best.

"The lawyers specialized in the communications practice, the deans of laws schools and the judges who know administrative law will attest Commissioner Hyde's achievements as a scholar and as an innovator in Federal regulation. But they also know him as one Government official who believes the Constitution and the Communications Act mean what they say and that administrative agencies should not attempt end runs to circumvent their intent.

"What isn't generally known about Mr. Hyde's illustrious career—even by many of those who lived through it—is that he, more than anyone else in Government or outside—was responsible for getting television off the ground and into nationwide service."

Taishoff tells the story of how that happened. Television allocations in 1953 were bogged down by FCC procedures. There had been a 4-year freeze on allocations because of blunders made in 1948. There was a clamor for service. Hyde, then Chairman of the FCC, adhered to the letter of the law but introduced shortcuts, expedients, and agreements, and in 19 months got 270 new television stations authorized, making television finally truly national in scope.

"Mr. Hyde," continues Taishoff, "is more than the dean of the FCC because of seniority. He has been the FCC's Vice Chairman through Democratic administrations as well as Republican. He knows more about the inner workers of the FCC at the staff level than any of his colleagues.

"There probably is no regulation on the books that affects broadcasting in which Mr. Hyde did not have a hand. And chances are many of them would have been much more stringent had it not been for his wisdom and restraining hand."

Need Federal Authority for Auto Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you and the other Members of this body an articulate expression of support for those of us striving for better automotive safety. The Denver Post, one of the Nation's most highly respected newspapers, makes this statement of support in an editorial.

The Post believes that as a result of statements by President Johnson and others:

> There is hope that traffic will, at long last, receive the attention at the national level which it must have.

Many of my colleagues are vitally concerned about the inhuman waste of lives on our highways. Thus it is encouraging to note that this concern is shared and supported by a major newspaper. I offer the editorial for inclusion in the Record:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Mar. 1, 1966]

Federal Authority Needed for Auto Safety

As this is written, Colorado has just gone through its bloodiest weekend of 1966 as far as highway tragedies are concerned.

Eleven persons, ranging in age from 17 to 70, were killed.

National figures for weekend traffic deaths are not yet available, but is is probable that in the 50 States more than 1,000 persons died in an awful rubble of shattered glass and crunching steel.

That is more than twice as many fatalities as occurred in the San Francisco earthquake of 1906.

It is the shame of our callous generation that we shrug off such a rate of destruction of our fellow humans as "normal" and nothing to get really concerned about. What's happened to people?

So far this year in Colorado traffic deaths are running more than 23 percent ahead of 1965, which set an alltime record.

If that increase should prevail throughout the country, 60,000 Americans will die needlessly on streets and highways this year, as compared with 49,000 last year.

We consider murder a major problem of our civilization, but 10 people are killed in traffic for every person who falls a victim of homicide.

Until now traffic safety has been left in the hands of State and local authorities. That approach has been a dismal failure, it must now be apparent to everyone.

We have now reached the point where every child who is born has no more than a 50–50 chance of escaping death or serious injury at some time during his life in an automobile.

Fortunately, there is a growing awareness that old methods of dealing with car accidents are not good enough.

There is a realization that there will never be adequate inspection of automobiles for safety, adequate procedures for weeding out unsafe drivers or uniformity of traffic codes in all States unless the Federal Government gets into the lifesaving business.

States are unable or unwilling to insist that new automobiles which go on the market be engineered to provide a high degree of protection to those who will ride in them.

There is a new conviction that if it is a proper function for the Federal Government to spend $700 million a year to enforce airplane safety for the 12 percent of the population which travel by air, there should be no hesitancy about using Federal authority to safeguard the auto-riding public, which includes almost everyone.

As a result of statements by President Johnson and diligent work by such Members of Congress as Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff, Democrat, of Connecticut, and others there is hope that traffic safety will, at long last, receive the attention at the national level which it must have.

The hope will be realized if the women and parents of America, the persons whose lives have been touched by traffic tragedies and those who possess social conscience will lend support and encouragement.

We assure those who are striving for effective means to preserve lives and prevent injuries that this newspaper, for one, backs them to the fullest.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*	1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*	
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg*	914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*	
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*	1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3642 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*	301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn*	119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George, *Idaho*	
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*	800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	4517 Wetherill Dr., Westmoreland Hills, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*	The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*	
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	

Appendix

Senator Edmund S. Muskie Outlines Broad Program of Water Quality Control Before American Water Works Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier this month, the American Water Works Association, the oldest association of its kind in the field, conducted a public water supply seminar at the Sheraton Park Hotel. Featured among the participants, was the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], who is recognized as one of our most effective exponents for a more aggressive attack on problems of water pollution.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution since its organization under the knowledgeable and capable leadership of the Senator from Maine. His speech before the members of the American Water Works Association, "Water Quality and the National Interest," gives further evidence of the Senator's broad grasp of the field and his farsighted approach toward water resources planning. I commend this address to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER QUALITY AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, at the public water supply seminar, American Water Works Association, Washington, D.C., March 1, 1966)

President Baxter, officers, members, and friends of the American Water Works Association, I am glad to be able to join with you in your seminar on our public water supply requirements. The times are auspicious for such an occasion. On February 18 I introduced, on behalf of myself and a number of my colleagues—now 40 in number—amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. On February 23 the President sent a special message on our natural heritage of the Congress. Much of that message dealt with water pollution control and abatement. Yesterday legislation to implement the President's proposals was introduced in the Congress. Tonight President Baxter and I are scheduled to leave for Germany with Secretary Udall and other members of a special Presidential mission to study pollution and related matters.

No one can complain that water pollution is not getting its share of attention. The real test will come in seeing how well we translate words and aspirations into effective action.

Th problems of pollution are not new. They have plagued man from the earliest civilizations. Man cannot live without creating wastes, and those wastes represent a potential threat to his health and to life itself.

But in recent years the threat has been magnified and has become, in effect, a new problem. Our population has grown to a point where our water needs are almost greater than the available supply. At the same we have succeeded in creating chemical and radioactive wastes whose characteristics have almost defied our efforts to clean them up.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 represented one of the major steps in a national effort to grapple with the fact that water is not an unlimited resource. As Abel Wolman has put it—in his imaginatively titled Scientific American article, "The Metabolism of Cities"—"As man has come to appreciate that the earth is a closed ecological system, casual methods that once appeared satisfactory for the disposal of wastes no longer seem acceptable. He has the daily evidence of his eyes and nose to tell him that his planet cannot assimilate without limit the untreated wastes of his civilization."

There are those who reject this approach. There are others who pay lipservice to the doctrine of pollution control and abatement—as long as it doesn't cost any money. But, fortunately for the conservation of our water resources, there is an increasing number of our citizens who are ready and willing to make the necessary investment in the improvement of water quality.

High quality water is more than the dream of the conservationists, more than a political slogan; high quality water, in the right quantity at the right place and at the right time, is essential to health, recreation, and economic growth.

This was the philosophy of the Water Quality Act of 1965, the basic purpose of which is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources. Prior to the enactment of this legislation, our primary concern was with repairing past damage and slowing the advance of pollution. Now, we have turned the corner, to focus on tomorrow's needs as well as today's crises.

We know, for example, that our present national water use rate is in the vicinity of 350 billion gallons a day. Our total supply of water is 1,200 billion gallons a day. The most we can extract, economically, is about 550 billion gallons a day. By the year 2000, barring major advances in reuse, we will have a water deficit of 200 to 400 billion gallons a day. And that deficit will not be evenly divided.

The Water Quality Act is not the final answer to these needs. But it was designed to provide us with two important instruments for the establishment and implementation of a national water policy: (1) the new Water Pollution Control Administration, directly responsible to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and armed with a mandate to consider all aspects of water pollution control and abatement; and (2) the water quality standards section, designed to stimulate cooperative Federal-interstate-State-local water resources planning and aimed at improvement as well as repair of those water resources.

In addition, the act provided for modest increases in Federal authorizations for sewage treatment construction grants, a pilot program to deal with the problem of combined storm and sanitary sewerage, a bonus for regional planning of sewage treatment systems and a special enforcement provision for situations where shellfish harvesting is prevented as a result of pollution.

The act, as finally signed, was the product of a long struggle. There were times when we despaired of obtaining agreement. But the compromise achieved by the Senate and the House, was, in several respects, more effective than either the original Senate or House version.

Our success in implementing the Water Quality Act and in providing additional tools for the war against pollution will depend on our skill in identifying specific pollution problems, in planning the optimum utilization of our water resources, in making appropriate decisions on the construction of effective municipal and industrial waste treatment works, and in achieving scientific and technical advances in the removal of waste and the treatment of water for reuse.

The identification of water pollution problems is not as simple as it may seem. In the past we have concentrated our attention on what we might call "conventional" pollution—human waste, organic materials from food processing, suspended solids and toxic residues from industrial processes. For the most part those wastes could be traced and controlled. Now, however, in addition to attacking these wastes, we must cope with the impact of dispersed and persistent wastes which cannot be traced to individual plants or municipal sewer systems. The "new" wastes include fertilizers, herbicides, fungicides, insecticides, and irrigation residues from agricultural pursuits, detergents from homes, radioactive wastes from atomic energy and research plants, and salts and other materials which wash off highways, parking lots, garages, and buildings.

Many of these pollutants are not biodegradable. They defy conventional treatment and build up in water supplies, making them undesirable and dangerous for reuse. And, as we learn more about the dangers of long-term low level exposure to some of these materials we realize that no waste substance can be written off as harmless in our increasingly crowded society.

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution is aware that research in the area of detecting, identifying, controlling, and treating "dispersed" and chemically complex wastes must be accelerated.

The second major area of water quality activity must come in the acceleration of our waste treatment facility construction. Several steps were taken in the 1st session of the 89th Congress, including the temporary increase in sewage treatment grant authorizations, the bonus provisions for regional sewage treatment systems, and the research and development funds for improved methods of dealing with combined storm and sanitary sewage—all in the Water Quality Act, the water and sewage grants in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and the Public Works and Economic Development Act, and the new rural community water and sewer program under the Aiken act.

Any extension of the treatment systems, particularly on a regional basis, suggests the possibility of more integration between municipal and industrial treatment systems. We recognize that there are problems of waste compatibility, but there is evidence that in many areas economies could be achieved, to the advantage of industries and municipalities.

The final major area of concern is advance waste treatment and purification of water reuse. The drought which has affected the Northeast in the past few years has accelerated concern with water supplies. Technologically there are several ways of dealing with the problem. We can transport water from areas where the supply exceeds the demand. We can draw on the resources of the sea through delination plants. We can treat our waste water and reuse it to a much higher degree than we do today.

Each method has its disciples, and the discussions of the relative merits of each sometimes approach the level of a theological debate. The general approach our subcommittee has taken is that no one system provides the answer, but that a combination of all three will be needed to meet different circumstances in different parts of the country.

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution is endeavoring to meet each of these major concerns, with new programing and increased fund authorizations.

"Steps Toward Clean Water," a recent report by the subcommittee, documents the costs of launching an effective program of pollution control and abatement. For instance, the present level of Federal aid for treatment plants is $150 million a year. But the subcommittee has estimated that present needs in our major cities, alone, total more than $1.3 billion. In 6 years this total will double.

The subcommittee found that the national price tag for needed treatment facilities will be about $20 billion by 1972. This would provide secondary treatment facilities for 80 percent of the population, plus tertiary treatment for 20 percent of the population, including some joint industrial-municipal systems.

In our quest for clean water, we are in a race against the clock: a race we cannot afford to lose.

To meet this challenge there must be a greater effort by all levels of government. To beef up Federal participation and to stimulate our States and cities my subcommittee has made several recommendations.

These include increasing Federal authorizations nearly seven times, to a total of $6 billion through 1972; eliminating the present dollar ceiling for Federal grants for treatment facilities; paying 30 percent of the costs of treatment facilities, regardless of the individual project price; providing a bonus to projects in which the State matches the Federal contribution; providing Federal loans for cities when the States do not share in the cost; enabling cities to apply directly for Federal help when their States do not match Federal grants; and strengthening research and development efforts for advanced waste treatment and industrial-municipal systems.

All of these proposals would support an effective implementation of the water quality standards provisions of the act of 1965 and the development of sound water resource planning and development.

Since the enactment of the Water Quality Act of 1965, the members of the subcommittee have been concerned with the appointment of a Water Pollution Control Administrator. He has now been appointed. But there is still a period of administrative uncertainty ahead.

The President has proposed the transfer of the Water Pollution Control Administration to the Department of the Interior in a reorganization plan he submitted to the Congress yesterday. A number of us have reservations about the proposal. We must resolve our questions or act to disapprove the plan within the next 60 days.

In addition, the President has proposed organizing the water pollution control program along river basin lines. This proposal is based partially on the Water Quality Act of 1965 and partially on the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965. It would, in effect, tie eligibility for Federal sewage treatment construction assistance to participation in a river basin plan which includes the use of water quality standards, expanded enforcement and long-term local financing arrangements.

A second major feature of the President's proposal is a tightening of enforcement procedures, including a reduction in the time required to implement enforcement actions under the present act, authorization for subpena powers for the Secretary in connection with enforcement procedures, provision for citizens' suits in Federal district courts where damage from pollution is alleged, and expansion of the authority of the Secretary in setting water quality standards.

Finally, the administration's legislation provides some increases in Federal assistance for sewage treatment construction, an increase in Federal assistance in State pollution control programs and an increase in the authorization for Federal water pollution control research.

The President's proposals are far reaching. They provide additional evidence of his concern with the conservation of the quality of our environment. Taken with the other proposal pending before the committee, they offer the Congress an opportunity to build an imaginative and sound water quality improvement program on the foundation of the Water Quality Act we developed and enacted last year.

But beyond the action of the Congress, beyond the recommendations of the President, the final responsibility for achieving our goals will rest with you who must labor in the field, helping to develop water quality standards to meet your local and regional needs, developing the specific sewage treatment systems, and administering control and abatement programs at the State and local level.

As we approach our hearings on the legislation before us, we shall solicit your counsel and advice on the most desirable and effective ways in which we can improve the Federal role in enhancing the quality of our water resources.

He Died for a Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, many of America's finest young men are giving their lives for their country in Vietnam today. These young men, dedicated and devoted to freedom, are making the supreme sacrifice for those of us here at home. And the anguish of those who survive is very real.

I was very deeply impressed by the words of a grieving mother whose only son had been killed in Vietnam in mid-February. Mr. James Paterson, of Palatine, Ill., said:

> A lot of people have been saying, "What a waste." It would have been a waste had he been killed by a car out on the street. But he died for a cause. If some day people can be free because of his death, it was worth it.

Mr. Speaker, WO Ross J. Paterson was only 22 years old when he was killed while on a night patrol in Vietnam. He had everything to live for, to look forward to—and yet, he died. He died for a cause, the cause of freedom. And his parents understand this; in their grief they understand the purpose of their deep personal loss.

At this time I want to enter into the Record an article from the March 3, 1966, edition of the Arlington Heights, Ill. Herald which describes the story of Warrant Officer Paterson's burial in a typical suburban community near Chicago:

[From the Arlington Heights (Ill.) Herald, Mar. 3, 1966]

HE DIED FOR A CAUSE

"A lot of people have been saying, 'What a waste,'" spoke Mrs. James Paterson, the mother of Ross J. Paterson, the first soldier from Palatine to be killed in Vietnam.

"It would have been a waste had be been killed by a car out on the street," she said. "But he died for a cause. If some day people can be free because of his death, it was worth it."

Mr. and Mrs. James Paterson, 361 North Ela Road, are proud parents. They speak readily of their only son who was killed on February 16. He was a helicopter pilot with the 1st Cavalry (Air Mobile Division) of the U.S. Army.

Ross Paterson was only 22. He came to this country when he was 14 with his parents from England 9 years ago.

"Want to return to England?" his parents had kidded him several times.

"You can go, not me," he would reply. Ross loved this country. He was proud to be an American citizen. He and his parents became naturalized citizens in 1963 and he joined the Army in 1964. He went to Vietnam in August 1964.

He was buried in Memory Gardens Cemetery Monday in Arlington Heights. Arlington Heights was Ross' first home in the United States. He attended Arlington High School.

A short service was held for him at Lauterburg & Oehler Funeral Home in Arlington Heights and then a full military ceremony was held at the cemetery. The Reverend Samuel N. Keys, vicar of St. Simon Episcopal Church, officiated.

More than a hundred former friends from school days in Arlington Heights attended.

Mrs. Paterson recalled the Battle of Britain in which British flyers fought off the German Air Force.

"A thousand men fought that battle and made it possible for people like us to come to American and live as we want," she said. "We hope to look back on our son's death and see that it was worth it also."

Ross had always been interested in flying. Through an Army man stationed here a few years ago, he became interested in the Army Air Corps.

In Vietnam he flew a rocket-carrying helicopter which gave close support to ground troops when regular artillery would have endangered our own men because of their closeness to the enemy.

"He never told us much," Mrs. Paterson said. He never mentioned his awards and always gave us the impression he did very little."

Ross was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal shortly before his death. When he died while on a night patrol, he had just recently been promoted from warrant to chief warrant officer.

In a letter, Ross remarked his war was an "impersonal" one, having fired at unseen targets. "I've never seen a Vietcong and I hope it stays that way," he wrote.

"It's been gratifying to know people care so much," his parents said. They have in the past week received many letters of sympathy and encouragement from people they do not know.

The Patersons received a letter from Army Chief of Staff Gen. Harold K. Johnson.

The general wrote, "It is with sorrow that I write to you at this time of personal grief. The loss of your son, WO Ross J. Paterson, on February 16, in Vietnam, is also our Nation's loss because he served his country with bravery and honor.

"I can understand why you may find it difficult to comprehend fully the purpose served by the loss of your son in a remote place such as Vietnam. Though God's ways often are hidden from us, we belieev He has a purpose in each life, and that in His sight there is a nobleness in the sacrifice of life so that freedom and loved ones shall not perish."

General Johnson went on to recall this country's other struggles in recent years with the Communists and concluded, "This is why the fulfillment of God's purpose sometimes calls for the ultimate sacrifice of our most precious treasure.

"For His gift of life, your son is forever noble among men."

The Patersons said they are well aware that many men are dying in Vietnam, many of them fathers.

For this reason, the Patersons have asked that in lieu of flowers any donations be given to the Ross J. Paterson Memorial Fund. Money in this fund will be used to aid widows of 1st Cavalrymen.

General Clarke Says President Merits Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, retired, visited the 5th Army NCO Academy at Fort Riley on Thursday, March 10. While at the post, he had an opportunity to visit with many of the officers who are forming the new 9th Division at Fort Riley.

General Clarke is one of our outstanding military authorities and while at Fort Riley he discussed our present policies in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on General Clarke's visit to Fort Riley, written by John D. Montgomery, be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL CLARKE SAYS PRESIDENT MERITS SUPPORT

(By John D. Montgomery, civilian aid to the Secretary of the Army)

Solid support for President Johnson's policies in Vietnam and warm praise for Fort Riley, its personnel and facilities and the surrounding communities was voiced today by General Bruce C. Clarke, retired, who was a visitor at the military post Wednesday and today.

General Clarke, who served 42 years in the Army before his retirement, has commanded many of those now engaged in the Vietnam fighting, and he and Mrs. Clarke have two sons on duty there. A son-in-law recently was rotated home from Vietnam. He sees the Vietnam conflict from the viewpoint of the deeply concerned individual, the professional soldier, and the dedicated citizen.

Speaking of some of the senior officers and noncommissioned officers at Fort Riley, General Clarke said, "I know from long association with them, they are experienced, dedicated, and are outstanding leaders and trainers. Their plans, as explained to me, for building the new 9th Division, are thoroughly complete, realistic and practical. Fort Riley is a very definite permanent asset to Kansas and this area, as well as to the Army.

Discussing the Vietnam situation, General Clarke said "I am sure the President has at his fingertips the greatest means for securing full and valid information * * * He also has a fine group of advisers in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have known and served with them all.

"As Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces he [the President] is our captain and quarterback. He has a right to expect loyalty from all on the American team."

General Clarke's answers to questions during the interview follow in full:

Question. General, it is good to see you back in the Fort Riley-Junction City area. What brings you to Kansas at this time?

Answer. I have been asked to speak to the class at the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth on Friday, and so I came a day early to visit my old friends in Junction City, Manhattan, and Fort Riley. I consider this an ideal Army-civilian community where members of both cooperate so well for their mutual advantage. I really never miss an opportunity to visit Fort Riley if I am in the area. I am always happy at the chance to see soldiers again after having been one for 42 years.

Question. How have you found things at Fort Riley?

Answer. Fort Riley is in excellent shape, and in good hands. I could list many of the outstanding experienced officers and senior NCO's you have here, but I will only mention General Eckhardt, Colonel Roseborough, Col. C. P. Miller, Colonel Murphy, Sergeant Major Meyer, and Sergeant Major Wendling—the top people in the new 9th Infantry Division and Fort Riley. And I know from long association with them that they are experienced, dedicated, and are outstanding leaders and trainers.

Their plans, as explained to me, for building the new 9th Division, are thoroughly complete, realistic, and practical.

Question. Is Fort Riley adequate for the job?

Answer. Oh, yes—with the new increase in area at Fort Riley, it has become a very fine division training post. It has good terrain, good facilities, good climate, good soil trafficability. It is now one of the Army's finest division training stations.

Fort Riley is a very definite permanent asset to Kansas and this area, as well as to the Army.

Question. What do you see as the future of Fort Riley?

Answer. I see a very bright future. Here you see combined the spirit, prestige, romance, and history of the Army's past with the modern facilities and concepts of the future. I look to Fort Riley being the home of a combat division constantly. That does not mean you may not have divisions moved out and new ones moved in or organized here, and men going and coming as the demands of the Army for combat troops are supported, but that is the reason for having and creating combat-ready troops at Fort Riley.

Question. You have been interested in the Association of the U.S. Army. What importance do you place on the central Kansas chapter?

Answer. This is the one organization in which the military and civilian join to better understand each other's points of view and to further cooperation. Its public relations value in the vicinity of a large Army post such as Fort Riley is very great and valuable. I encourage wide membership in your chapter.

Question. As you know, the 1st Division left from here for Vietnam. We are proud of them and what they are doing there. How do you see the war in Vietnam?

Answer. I have only available to me the reports in the papers, magazines, on radio, and TV, and the privilege of talking to my friends who have been there and have come back. But, I am convinced we are doing well there. I see a turning of the tide in our favor. I have great confidence in our "first team" which we have now in Vietnam from General Westmoreland on down. I too am very proud of the Big Red One.

I am sure you realize that the logistics and construction requirements employ a great part of the troops available to General Westmoreland.

Question. When were you last there?

Answer. I was there briefly in 1962; but prior to that when I was commanding general of the U.S. Army in the Pacific, I visited and traveled in Vietnam on a couple of occasions.

Question. Have you anything to say about the critics of our policy in Vietnam?

Answer. It is always easy to criticize. There is no problem in being an expert when you are not inhibited by experience and responsibility. I have heard little practical changes recommended by responsible people in what we are doing. I am sure no one objects to practical, honest, constructive suggestions. They are always welcome.

Question. Then you approve of what President Johnson is doing in the Vietnam situation?

Answer. Yes, I do. I have asked myself, and have asked many others: "Suppose you found yourself President of the United States tomorrow morning, what changes would you make in the conduct of our operations in Vietnam?" I have received very few practical answers that we could live with and still maintain our great position and influence for peace under law in the world.

Question. Do you consider the President to be well informed and well advised?

Answer. Of course I am only a bystander on the Washington scene; but I am sure the President has at his fingertips the greatest means for securing full and valid information ever available to a President of the United States in wartime. Very few others are so well informed. He also has a fine group of military advisers in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have known and served with them all. On the Army side, Generals Wheeler and Johnson have been under my command. They are our best in my opinion. The President is also very well served by the advice, experience, and knowledge of one of our greatest soldier-statesman, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.

Question. I have heard you say many times that the President wears several hats. What do you mean by that?

Answer. The President wears at least four hats: First, he is head of the Democratic Party. As such, he is open to partisan disagreement and dissent. Second, he is the Chief Executive Officer of our Nation. As such, he is open also to attacks if he does not execute well the laws of our country. Third, he has the exclusive responsibility for the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States. Fourth, he is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces in the conduct of military operations and their support.

When he puts on the last hat, he is in a very special position in his relations to the men of the Armed Forces, our country, our enemies, and to other countries in the world. He is our captain and our quarterback. He has a right to expect loyalty from all who are on the American team.

Question. You speak of loyalty. As a general who has had many commands, both in peace and war, how do you describe the loyalty you refer to?

Answer. I am a team player. On any team each member is expected to play his part for the common good of all. The cement that holds the team together is loyalty—loyalty is four ways or directions—to those above, to those below you, to those associated with you, to yourself. I feel the time has come to make a maximum team effort to successfully complete as quickly as possible our mission in Vietnam. If everyone measures up to this loyalty test, it will raise the morale and give added strength to our troops in the Vietnam area, to those in training at home, and will provide a united front to our opponents and hasten the day when our enemies will be willing to negotiate a just peace.

Question. Why do you think it is that there appears to be less political support for our troops in Vietnam as compared with other wars?

Answer. I am not sure of the various degree of support in past wars for our troops. I am aware however that we have not fought recently a war without a callup of the Reserve components. In previous cases the troops involved and their relations and friends were more concentrated from one area and more associated with a particular area or State and hence have had a greater political consideration and support. The regular establishment of our Armed Forces is pretty uniformly spread over the entire country.

Question. General, you speak with great feeling. You must have many close ties with our men in Vietnam?

Answer. Yes, I do. I have been privileged during my career to command and train several million American soldiers and marines in peace and war. I have at times placed great demands upon them. They have never failed me or our country. They have been loyal in all the directions I have pointed out. Many of them are now fighting in Vietnam. Two of them happen to be my sons. They are in Vietnam under the legal orders of a legally elected President of the United States, carrying out his legal directives. They deserve no less than the full support without reservation of all Americans here at home.

Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of Members of the House today who will remember a dear and valued friend of ours, now deceased, who served with great distinction in this body for many years—Eugene E. Cox, of Georgia.

Gene Cox served with ability and courage, voting always in acordance with his judgment and his conscience.

Gene Cox was my dear and valued friend—a friendship that is one of my treasured memories.

When I was first elected majority leader in 1940, in the Democratic caucus called to elect the leader in the House of the Democratic Party—Gene Cox handled the floor fight for me.

In connection with the celebration of St. Patrick's anniversary our late friend the evening of March 17, 1938, delivered an address before the Hibernian Society of Savannah, Ga. His address is one of the most searching and eloquent I have ever read in his tribute to St. Patrick, and in the contributions of those of Irish blood to the cause of independence and liberty and to the development and growth of our country.

While our late friend is no longer with us, his splendid eloquence and address the evening of March 17, 1938, is still alive.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include the eloquent and living address delivered years ago by my dear and valued friend, the late Eugene E. Cox, of Georgia.

ADDRESS OF HON. E. E. COX, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SECOND GEORGIA DISTRICT, TO BE DELIVERED BEFORE THE HIBERNIAN SOCIETY, SAVANNAH, GA., EVENING OF MARCH 17, 1938

As we are gathered here to pay reverence to Ireland's patron saint, so, everywhere in the world, where men and women of the Irish race may meet, they, too, are gathered in this annual tribute to good St. Patrick.

Tonight, the skies of the world are darkened by growing clouds of dictatorship, despotism, and oppression. Almost alone on this fear-ridden globe two nations and two peoples still hold aloft with courage and determination the glowing torch of national freedom and individual liberty, still lighting with the gleam of hope the gathering gloom of lost liberties and vanished freedom which now enshrouds so many peoples of the world. Those two peoples and those two nations are this great constitutional Republic of the United States and the brave and determined people of the Emerald Isle.

You know the story of good St. Patrick. You recall the beautiful traditions told you at your mother's knee of that shepherd boy who was born 389 years after the advent of the man of Galilee. You recall that he was the son of a small landowner at Bannanuenta. As a shepherd, he tended the herds of a chieftain of Milchu, amid the green hills of county Antrim. At the age of 16, while tending his sheep, he was set upon by a roving band of men who had been making a raid on King Niall. Taken prisoner, he, together with his sheep, were carried into Connaught where he was captive for many years. Escaping on a ship used to export Irish wolfhounds, he landed on the coast of Gaul, friendless and alone, a youth of 22. Making his way finally to the monastery of Lerins, there he lived for several years studying the principles of Christianity.

Deeply mystical, he pondered long and intensely upon the story of the Saviour and the teachings of the ancient Christian fathers.

While in the monastery, he had a dreamlike vision. And, as Patrick was a man of vision, so since, the men and women of Irish blood have been not a visionary people, but a people of vision.

Patrick, in his vision, saw a man named Victorious bearing many epistles in his hands. On one of these the youth read the words "The Voice of the Irish." In this vision he heard his people say, "We pray thee, holy youth, come and walk among us as before."

This vision inspired Patrick to return to Ireland as a missionary. First, however, he spent some 14 years in a place called Auxerre to prepare himself for his mission. After being ordained a deacon, he returned to Ireland to teach his people the message of the Saviour.

Tradition says that St. Patrick, teaching among the hills and dales of Ireland, used the highway and the byway as his pulpit and his classroom. To illustrate the Christian principle of the "Trinity" he would pluck a shamrock from the roadside and use the three leaves of the one stem to symbolize in simple fashion that underlying principle of Christian doctrine.

No more striking and beautiful tradition exists in all sacred history than that of the triumph of St. Patrick's great courage, his deep faith in Christian teachings and the power of truth, as related in the story of his meeting with the King, the princes, and the hierarchy of Ireland in the famed halls of Tara.

Gathered there in annual ceremonial rites of their sun worship, these lords of Ireland were disturbed by the presence of St. Patrick who had set up his tent beside the great hall of Tara and, as the stars came out, had lighted his own ceremonial fire in accordance with his Christian faith. Hailed before the lords of Tara Hall, so eloquently did Patrick plead the cause of Christianity, so simply and yet so profoundly did he illustrate by the shamrock the principle of the Trinity, that he won the protection and later the conversion of these lords of the country to the Christian faith.

This marked the turning point of his mission. With an alacrity unapproached by any other people in history, the truth-hungry people embraced the beautiful philosophy of Christianity—and no people through persecution, though hardship, and even up to the portals of death itself have been more devout, more faithful, and more courageous in their faith than have the Irish people.

So long as history shall record the story of St. Patrick's mission, so long as the waters of the lovely Shannon shall flow gently to the sea, so long as the beautiful lakes of Killarney shall reflect upon their bosoms the blue vault of heaven, so long will the men and the women of the Irish race love their Emerald Isle, revere their St. Patrick, cherish their shamrock, and uphold the principles of national freedom and individual liberty.

There is in all the history of the human race no more sad and glorious a saga of a numerically weak people so imbued with love of freedom, so devoted to personal liberty, as to fight through centuries against overwhelming odds until they won that national freedom and personal liberty, than that of the struggles of Ireland for national autonomy and the liberty of the individual.

Times without number the green sod of old Ireland has been crimsoned by the blood of brave men and women willing to yield up their lives that their posterity might know the blessings of freedom.

As St. Patrick labored long and lovingly to free his people from the darkness and oppression of paganistic superstitions and to lead them out into the light of Christian understanding and fellowship, so the Irish people, true to their faith in their patron saint and faithful to their heritage, have fought and bled and died in the cause of liberty not only in their own little island but in every country of this globe where the struggle for liberty has taken place.

The history of the United States is emblazoned and glorified with the names of brave and brilliant men and women of Irish blood who have helped in the struggles for the freedom of our democracy and the personal liberties guaranteed to us under our constitutional Bill of Rights. Largely to them is due the credit for the blessings which we enjoy today and the liberties which enable us to gather here tonight to pay honor and reverence not alone to St. Patrick but to the Irish people; to the bravery and the devotion with which the sons and the daughters of the Emerald Isle have fought for their ideals of liberty in every land under the sun where liberty has been wrought and won by the struggles of man.

It is a fact of which the Irish people may justly be proud that no nation, no race, has given as many, in proportion to their total numbers, to the cause of liberty in the United States as have the Irish people.

Half of the Revolutionary Army was made up of men of Irish blood.

Even before the great struggle for our own liberty began, many men of Irish lineage were among the signers of the Declaration of Independence. While this Nation was but a confederation of independent and self-determined States, and while the Federal Government was weak and unorganized, Irish Governors were helping to mold and to nurture in the breasts of the colonists love of liberty and hatred of oppression. Can we ever forget the illustrious names of those who with bravery unsurpassed, courage magnificent, defied the King of England and signed the Declaration of Independence. Col. James Smith, George Taylor, the delegate from our own State of Georgia, Matthew Thornton, delegate from New Hampshire and later chief justice of that State, Thomas McKean and George Read, of Delaware, Edward Rutledge, of South Carolina, Thomas Lynch, of South Carolina, Charles Carroll, of Maryland, and Charles Thomson, Secretary of the Continental Congress; these were Irish men who signed that ringing declaration for national freedom and personal liberty which changed the course of history in the world.

When the American colonists, goaded and driven to revolt by the oppression of the British King across the seas, even as the Irish people in the Emerald Isle were goaded to desperation by British Kings, at last awakened to revolt against intolerable wrongs, thousands of Irishmen sprang to battle. Not only did men of the Irish race compose half of the Continental Army under George Washington, but many of the most brilliant Revolutionary leaders who distinguished themselves for their bravery and ability were men of Irish blood.

It is a fact of which all men and women of Irish lineage are justly proud that the first blows for freedom in America struck on land and on sea were delivered by a Sullivan and an O'Brien.

One of the most eloquent voices raised in the Continental Congress on behalf of freedom was that of John Rutledge, of whom Patrick Henry said, "He is America's greatest orator."

So grateful was Gen. George Washington for the assistance of Irish patriots that on the historic night of March 17, 1776, when the English troups fled from Boston, Washington ordered that the watchword in the patriot lines that night should be "St. Patrick."

After the war was won, and victory rested upon the banners of liberty beneath which had so proudly marched the Irish legions, General Washington, as the first President of the new Republic, accepted membership in the New York branch of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. In his letter of acceptance he wrote:

"I accept with singular pleasure the ensign of so worthy a fraternity as that of the Sons of St. Patrick in this city—a society distinguished for the firm adherence of its members to the glorious cause in which we are embarked."

Parke Custis, adopted son of George Washington wrote this beautiful tribute to the heroic sons of Ireland who had helped to win American independence: "Inscribe upon the tablets of American remembrance eternal gratitude to Irishmen."

The history of the Revolutionary struggle is filled with Hibernian names like Murphy, Kelly, Shea, Burke, Sullivan, O'Brien, and others.

It must be a never failing source of deep satisfaction to every Irish man and woman to remember that Lord Mountjoy, when informing the English Parliament of the surrender of Cornwallis, said: "England has lost America through the exertion of Irish immigrants."

One cannot read the history of the Revolutionary struggles without being impressed by the names of the many Irish leaders. Maj. Gen. John Sullivan opened the war on land by storming Fort William and Mary. He commanded the right wing of the Continental Army at Trenton, Brandywine, and Germantown. His older brother, James Sullivan was a brilliant member of the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts and held many posts of honor within the gift of that State, being twice its Governor.

I want to recall to you the epic of Maurice O'Brien and his five sons. It always delights good Irish hearts.

The British warship *Margaretta*, put in at Machias Bay, Maine, in May 1775. She had been sent to subdue the rebellious colonists. Maurice O'Brien with his five sons got together a band of patriots and they put out in their fishing boats and promptly captured this proud British ship of war. Angered and humiliated, the British Admiral sent two more warships, the *Diligence* and the *Tapnaquish*, to punish the colonists, and to recapture the *Margaretta*. Instead, Maurice O'Brien and his five sons, heading a band of patriots, again put out in their fishing boats and promptly captured these two additional British warships. Sometime later, O'Brien's oldest son, Jeremiah, sailed with the three prizes to Watertown where the Provincial Congress was in session, and delivered them over to the Congress to become a part of the American Navy.

We cannot forget that on July 14, 1774, Irish John Glenn presided at an historic meeting of the Sons of Liberty here in Savannah. At the same meeting were other Irish patriots including Farley, Bryan, Gibbons, and Butler.

Commodore John Barry, another fighting Irishman, was the father of the American Navy, although the O'Briens might well be classed as its grandfathers. Commodore Barry put to sea in the *Lexington*, the first officially commissioned American fighting ship.

Brig. Gen. Richard Montgomery, a trained military officer, not only rendered invaluable service in training Continental troops, but with amazingly small forces he captured Fort Chambly, Fort John, and stormed Montreal.

Who is there of us here tonight can ever forget the heroism of Sergeant Jasper, who gave his life for the cause here in Savannah?

One of the brightest spots in our Revolutionary history is to be found in the action of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Philadelphia. In 1780 the supplies for the Revolutionary Army were so meager that General Washington could neither pay nor properly feed his men. At this juncture, 92 Philadelphia merchants combined and subscribed, by pledging all their personal property, the then tremendous sum of 312,000 pounds to provide supplies for the patriot soldiers. Of this amount, more than one-third was raised by the local members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

It would take hours to detail to you the names of Irish men and women who have distinguished themselves in every field of activity known to man. In war, in religion, in literature, medicine, education, art, music, industry and invention, Irish names shine with a luster never to be dimmed. Remember James Logan of Armagh, Secretary to William Penn; Dr. John McKinley, Governor of Delaware; Edward Rutledge, Governor of South Carolina; George Clinton, Governor of New York; James Sullivan, Governor of Massachusetts; George Bryan, Governor of Pennsylvania.

Gov. George Clinton, after winning the rank of general in the Revolutionary War, was elected Vice President in Washington's second term, and again elected to the same office with President Madison. John Rutledge, after a long career in politics, and after having served in the field with the Revolutionary forces, was appointed Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court by George Washington.

Men of Irish blood have more than once been honored with the Presidency of the United States. James Buchanan, James K. Polk, Andrew Jackson, Chester A. Arthur, William McKinley and Woodrow Wilson were men in whom flowed the blood of Erin.

When the Mexican war came about, one-third of the troops under Gen. Winfield Scott were volunteers. Among these were a corps of 2,000 native-born Irishmen. No more beautiful tribute has ever been paid to Irish soldiers than that wtriten by General Scott in a letter now preserved as a part of the official record of the Mexican campaign. He said of his Irish troops: "Not one ever turned his back on the enemy or faltered in advancing to the charge."

The history of that war carries the names of such able leaders as Gen. James Shields, soldier, sailor, lawyer, schoolteacher, and the only man ever to sit as U.S. Senator for three States in turn. He was born in Counin Tyrone. Maj. Philip Kearney, Maj. Theodore O'Hara, Capt. Mayne Reid—scores of the brave leaders in the Mexican conflict were Celts.

Can we ever forget Stephen W. Kearney who seized California for the American flag?

The fame of Gen. George Croghan, who distinguished himself in the battle of Monterey, will never die.

Yes, my friends, it is true that liberty in America, as in so many lands, has been bought largely by the blood of Irishmen.

By the time of the Civil War, citizens of Irish ancestry had become so diffused throughout the Nation that it was an inevitable consequence that they should furnish able leaders on both sides of the conflict.

Happily, the hurts and the hatreds of that unfortunate struggle have long since faded, and we are one people united in this Nation. Therefore, it is without rancor that we may pay tribute to Gen. Pat Cleburne who died for the Southern cause, Postmaster General John H. Reagan of the Southern Confederacy, Gen. Joseph Finnegan, and the others who gave the best of themselves for the "Lost Cause," while at the same time we pay tribute to the bravery of Gen. George Meade of Gettysburg, Gen. Phil Sheridan, Gen. Patrick F. Meagher, Gen. Phil. Kearney, and other courageous leaders of the Northern forces.

We find in the field of education a brilliant array of Irishmen. There was John Sullivan of New Hampshire. George Taylor, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. Thomas Halfpenny, known as "the Schoolmaster General of Illinois." William Tennent was an early president of Princeton University. Dr. James McScarron founded Brown University. Prof. John Brown was the first president of our own University of Georgia. Gov. John Hart was the founder of the public school system of Maryland. William Barton Rogers founded the world-famed Massachusetts Institute of Technology. And we must not forget his father who was a brilliant member of the faculty of the College of William and Mary.

In the field of invention we find the proud names of Robert Fulton, who made steamships practical; John P. Holland, inventor of the torpedo-armed submarine; Christopher Colles, who together with Fulton, originated the American Canal system, including the Erie Canal.

I have not time to list the distinguished names in the field of medicine beyond mentioning Dr. William J. McNeven who is known as the "father of American chemistry."

No race has given to the world greater names, or abler statesmen, more successful generals, more eloquent orators, more enchanting poets, more entrancing musicians, more powerful religious leaders, more energetic builders than have the Irish people.

Among those whose names are famous as pioneers in the development of industry, railroads, and other constructive adventures, we find John W. McKay, James C. Flood, James G. Fair, and William O'Brien, who developed famous gold and silver mines in the West. John McKay with James Gordon Bennett formed the company which first laid two transatlantic cables.

Patrick B. Delaney, for many years associated with Thomas Edison, originated more than 200 inventions.

Cyrus H. McCormick invented agricultural implements which revolutionized farming in America. James J. Hill built railroads. Thomas Fortune Ryan was high up among the financial wizards. William Corcoran, great banker, gave to Washington, D.C., the beautiful Corcoran Art Gallery.

It was men such as these who helped to hew this great Nation out of the primeval forest. Always in the forefront of the pioneers were to be found the Celts. It has been said that "The Irish built the railroads of America."

The Irish are a strange mixture of melancholy and levity. The tear and the smile oftimes sparkle on the same cheek together. The warm, deep, impetuous, and emotional Irish temperament naturally gave us great men in literature, art, music, and the stage. Among them we find Victor Herbert, the great music master; John McCormack, lark-throated singer of ballads; "Chauncy" Olcott, golden-voiced troubador of beloved memory; Edward A. McDowell, the composer.

We have those great Irish-American artists, George Barrett, George P. A. Healy, and Thomas Moran.

Among the sculptors we find Andrew O'Connor, Mulligan, John Henry Foley, John Hogan, St. Gaudens.

Can we ever forget those superb actors, Boucicault, Tyrone Power, John McCullough, John Brougham, Sheridan Knowles, to mention a few?

And the poets: The immortal James Whitcomb Riley, Charles G. Halpin, John Boyle O'Reilly, James Jeffery Roche, Mayne Reid, and Father Ryan?

The Irish race, which has found glory on a thousand battlefields and disgrace upon none, has found distinction in every other line of useful human endeavor as well.

In the field of religion it is accurate, I think, to say that no race has given proportionately so many of its sons and daughters to the great cause of Christianity as has the Irish race. It would be futile for me here tonight to even attempt to add any luster to the long and brilliant array of Irish men and women who have been able and devoted leaders in both the Catholic and the Protestant churches. Cardinals, archibshops, bishops and a legion of earnest, devoted and able priests, nuns, and preachers have distinguished themselves in their field.

And now, let me turn to the women of the race.

The beauty of the Irish lass has again and again been told in story and in song. Beautiful of form, beautiful of heart, and beautiful of mind have been the women of the Emerald Isle.

Legend says that Fingal, hearing that his son, Ossian, the poet and warrior, was attached to a lady of Caledonia, thus remonstrated in favor of an Irish girl:

"My son, of the noble line of Heremonian heroes, thou gallant descendant of Erin's kings, the down of youth grows on thy cheek; martial renown is loud in thy praise; Romans fear thee—their eagles were dazzled by the lightning of thy spear; they flew before thee like timid birds before the hawks of Leinster. Is it in the morning of thy fame, bright with the sunbeams of martial glory, that thou wouldst ally thyself with the daughter of the Pict, and thus sully the royal purity of Milesian blood? Thy country is proud of thy exploits, and the virgins of Erin sigh for thy love. Cormac's bards sing of the deeds of thy bravery in the strife of the mighty. O then, Ossian, of dulcet harmony, listen to the voice of thy father.

"Albanian maids are fair; but fairer and lovelier are the chaste daughters of thine own wave-washed Isle of wood-crested hills. Go to thy happy Isle, to Branno's grass-covered field. Ever-Allen, the most brilliant gem in the diadem of female loveliness, the trembling dove of innocence, deserves thy attachment. The pure blood of Milesius glows in her guileless heart, and flows in her blue veins. Majestic beauty flows around her as a robe of light, and modesty, as a precious veil, heightens her charms. She is as lovely as the mountain flower when the ruddy beams of the rising sun gleam on its dew-gemmed side.

"Go, take thy arms, embark in yonder dark-bosomed ship, which will soon bear thee over ocean's foam to green Banno's streamy vales where thou wilt win a pure virgin heart, that never yet heaved with a sigh of love. For thee the vernal rose of passion will first effuse its sweetness through her sighs, and blush in all its beauty on her cheek."

When war has called and liberty was to be defended, the woman of Erin has given up her men with aching heart and tear-drenched smile. She has bade them go—and fought her grief and loneliness in secret.

When the wail of orphan or the moan of the aged and the sick have reached her ear, who has been quicker than the woman of Erin to go to them to soothe with her tender touch, to cheer with her soft word, to help with her deep and ready sympathy, to minister out of her love for all mankind? Neither friend nor foe has lacked the loving and tender ministrations of the woman of Erin when they were wounded or sick, if she knew.

Who can count the numberless orphans who have been mothered by the Irish women? Who can count the lonely aged and infirm whose hours of agony have been eased by her sympathy, as deep as the ocean and as wide as the sea?

Who can count the numberless whose last conscious contact with the world they were leaving was the tender touch of an Irish woman's compassionate hand?

And I am reminded at this point of the fact that Margaret Gaffney Haughery was the first of her sex to whom a public monument was raised in the United States. The daughter of poor Irish immigrants, she devoted her life to the friendless orphans of all races. In our own beloved Southland, at New Orleans, she began her work and before she passed on she had established three large homes for friendless children and a fourth institution for the aged and infirm. And, too, she had won the beautiful name throughout this Nation of "The Orphan's Friend."

Glorious as have been the exploits of Irishmen in war, in statesmanship, in government, in commerce and industry, in art, and literature, none has been more glorious than the accomplishments of the Irish women in mercy, in charity, in tenderness, in love, in motherhood.

And so tonight do I salute the women of Irish blood with reverence and with admiration. God bless them for their loveliness, their tenderness, their sympathies and, I must add, their bewitching rougishness, beneath which always is the steadfastness of the oak softened by a beauty, as Fingal said, like "the mountain flower when the ruddy beams of the rising sun gleam on its dew-gemmed side."

And now, my friends, a word as to the trend of events and the signs of the times in our own land.

The Nation has been through hard years. It appears to face still more hard years. While unemployment, fear and worry assail us at home, we see the rising, spreading clouds of dictatorship and oppression covering the skies of Europe. The glares and the smoke and thunder of war, the stench of slaughter, the cries of the wounded and the moans of helpless women and children rise from the land of China and shock the world.

There are profound and valid reasons why the citizens of Irish blood can exert a powerful and effective influence upon this Nation and through it, upon world affairs.

This depression is basically a depression in a sense of spiritual values, of which the Irish people have such a keen perception.

Conditions in our own nation and in the world are the result of a depression in generosity, justice and fairness of which the Irish people have such an amplitude.

The world is suffering, and our own nation is suffering from a depression of appreciation of the profoundly sound economic and spiritual teachings of Jesus Christ, an appreciation so deeply a part of the Celtic soul.

The world is in travail this day because of a depression in mercy, charity, justice, the Golden Rule, the spirit of live and let live qualities with which the Irish race is so bountifully endowed.

This is not a depression of material things. It is a depression of the sense of the right use and application of material things.

So, then, the traditions, the teachings, the very nature of the Celtic race are such as to at once impose upon you a profound duty to aid in breaking this depression because you possess in such rich abundance the qualities the exercise of which alone can bring a heartsick and fearful world relief from the terrors which confront it.

For that reason I feel deeply the privilege that is mine in being given the opportunity to discuss with you these grave problems tonight.

As I have just said, this depression is not due to any loss of material things. No great plague has swept the globe and decimated the population. No great cataclysm has destroyed our natural resources. The fertility of our land still remains. We are confronted with the strange and hitherto unknown paradox of want and privation in the midst of too much of everything. Strange as it is, it is not a scarcity but a seeming overabundance of material things that besets us. We are not starving, as a Nation for lack of things; rather we are suffocating from what is said to be an over production of those things which are necessary to the more abundant life.

Where then is our difficulty? First, it is lack of purchasing power among the masses. We can readily see that if everybody in the United States had the means with which to purchase all that is desired, there would be no depression in this Nation. That lack of purchasing power results in unemployment. Unemployment brings up the problem of relief. Relief, in turn, involves grave questions of alteration in moral character.

These problems of unemployment and relief have been well portrayed by conclusion drawn from a questionnaire circulated by the New York City Welfare Council in March 1932. The moral costs of unemployment and relief were found, so far as the individual is concerned, to be:

Discouragement, depression, desperation—often to the verge, and sometimes to the point of actual crime.

Bewilderment and mental confusion.

Loss of self-confidence, development of a sense of failure and inferiority, or a thwarted feeling of helplessness.

Loss of initiative and sense of responsibility, indifference, indolence, apathy, and lethargy.

Passive submission and endurance, loss of courage to go on looking for work or to try anything new; or obsession with the necessity of finding work, inability to take interest in other activities or to meet obligations.

Occasionally a sense of importance, as part of a front-page problem, enjoyment of the situation and of the attention it brings. Bitterness, disrespect for law and religion, moral and spiritual deterioration; cynicism, resentment, antagonism, rebellion—against the wealthy, against society, against the Government; loss of pride and self-respect, carelessness about personal appearance, sensitiveness, avoidance of social contacts.

Or, on the contrary restlessness, craving for excitment and distraction, leading to drinking and gambling; mental and nervous disturbances, from irritability and excessive worry up to serious neurological conditions; contented acceptance of lower standards and dependence upon charity; constant fear, even when again employed, and a sense of insecurity; desire to give up well-paid, skilled seasonal work for city employment or anything that would insure a steady income, however low.

We find, upon examination, that many factors enter into this condition of unemployment, which we call depression, and which involves its corollary of relief with these stupendous moral costs which I have just listed for you.

The whole disturbance begins in fear and is based in fear. There is no difference, of course, between a so-called condition of overproduction of material things and a condition of underconsumption of material things due to a lack of purchasing power. It is wholly incorrect to say that there is an overproduction of material things until every man, woman and child in the Nation is provided with a full sufficiency of all those things. That condition, of course, has never been reached in any country, particularly in America.

The basic fear underlying every depression arises out of unsettled governmental policies; class and sectional strife; fear of revolution or of entanglements in foreign affairs which may involve the Nation in foreign wars; threats to our constitutional democracy; excessive taxation; and an unbalanced national budget, with a mounting national debt.

All of these factors, generating fear, uncertainty, and hesitation on the part of the consumers and the public generally, naturally result in a reduced demand for goods and services. This reduced demand is reflected very quickly in a fear in industry and agriculture that results in reduced production, which in turn aggravates unemployment and further reduces consumer demand.

It is obvious, of course, that the opposite of these factors will be required to reverse the trends. That means to say that the sectional and class hatreds and strifes must be quieted. There must be settled governmental policies in fundamental matters. Cooperatives instead of disruptive effort between industry and labor, government and business, political parties, groups and classes must be brought about.

Foreign policy must be so clarified as to assure the people that this Nation will not be involved in any entangling foreign alliances which could result in dragging us into another war. A reduction of governmental costs, a reduction of hampering and punitive taxation, and at least some prospect of reduction of the national debt must be brought about.

To further quiet the fears of threat to our constitutional democracy, there must be a return to Thomas Jefferson's concept of government, which means a return to State sovereignty and self-determination.

The policy of preserving our free institutions must be clear and unmistakable.

Conditions calling for swollen powers of a centralized Federal Government must be eliminated.

We must return to individual self-reliance, labor democracy instead of labor despotism, industrial stability instead of industrial instability, courage instead of timidity on the part of capital, and fair dealing as between sections and classes.

There is perhaps no race of people in this world, the individuals of which are more self-reliant and courageous, than the Irish race. Irish men and women do not want to be kept. What they want is a chance to keep themselves. They do not want Government doles or relief. What they want is an opportunity to earn by their own intellect and their own strength their own way in the world. The Irish people are a proud people; they are proud of their individual independence. They are proud of their ability to meet life as it is and to conquer adversity.

I have said that this Nation is one people united. That is true, and because it is true no class of citizens in this Nation, and no section of this Nation can possibly prosper continuously at the expense of other classes or other sections.

Since long before the Civil War, the economic trend in this country has been to subjugate the interests of the South and the West to the more powerful and more populous North. Following the Civil War, this trend was accentuated. Just as it has been discovered as an economic fact that this Nation cannot be prosperous with its agricultural population impoverished, so it is being discovered that this Nation cannot be prosperous with its South or its West held in poverty.

It is an unfortunate fact that there still remains too much of the old blindness that has supported the belief that the North could prosper at the expense of the South and the West. We still face today efforts to impede the industrial and cultural development of the South because it is feared that that development may in some way detract from the industrial and cultural progress of the North. This is peculiarly true of the manufacturing industry.

It is obvious to every clear thinking man and woman that a prosperous South and a prosperous West would mean new and richer markets at home for the industrial East and the agricultural North and West. Just as we so clearly perceive that a prosperous farmer means a good customer for industrial products, and just as we clearly perceive that a prosperous industrial wage earner means a good customer for agricultural products, we can also clearly perceive that a prosperous South means a good market for both the industrial and agricultural products of the other sections of the United States.

Strange as it may seem to you, those of us who have represented the Southland in the Congress have faced for the last several years, and still face, these efforts to impede the industrial and agricultural progress in the South. We have fought to secure for the South that equality of opportunity in industry which by reason of natural advantages and favorable conditions belongs to the South, and I may say to you that we intend to keep on fighting, until we are given that equality of opportunity for industrial and agricultural and cultural development that is our right and of which we are fully capable.

We, of course, want a national defense adequate for any exigency, but we will never favor the expenditure of a single dollar or the sacrifice of a single young life in another foreign war in foreign fields.

These, in general, are the fundamental problems underlying both the depressed conditions at home and throughout the world.

As the insidious disease of dictatorship spreads through the world like some deadly pestilence, we find here and there at home a few voices tentatively raised to preach communism or fascism—one and the same—dictatorship. Is it to be so with us?

We find those who, while enjoying the very liberty of free press and free speech that permits them to dare these despicable suggestions, would outrage that liberty by advocating that it be abolished. Is it to be so with us?

We find those who would prefer a Stalin, or a Hitler, or a Mussolini to our glorious free constitutional Republic. Is it to be so with us?

We have those who would advocate the stripping of the States of their sovereign rights and who would clothe a central government with a power of control which would make of the sacred Bill of Rights a hollow mockery and of religious, political, and personal liberty, an empty phrase. Is it to be so with us?

We have those who believe the Constitution is outworn and worthless; that democracy has failed; that the American people are not fit to govern themselves; and who would set up a government not only to guide but to control us. Is it to be so with us?

My answer is "No." And again, "No."

The American people can govern themselves. They are the most capable, courageous people in the world. The States have not lost their sovereign rights, nor have the people ceased to be the Government.

I have asked, are these things to be so with us? I answer, "No," because here are too many patriotic Americans in whose veins flows the liberty-loving blood of Old Erin. Who can believe that the sons and daughters of those who fought through the long centuries against overwhelming odds for the freedom of the Emerald Isle would sit by and see the freedom of their America wrested from them?

Who can believe that the sons and daughters of Old Erin, so long as the memory of the blue-breasted lakes of Kilarney, the gentle-flowing waters of the Shannon, the grass-covered hills and the streamy vales of their fathers' land, the thatched cottages and the tang of the peat smoke is theirs, will sit idly by while the precious heritage of political and religious freedom and individual liberty is snatched from them by the slimy fingers of subversive communism or by the foul clutch of fascistic claws—regardless of what name is given the act?

No, my friends, we can fight and conquer this depression just as your forebears fought and won the freedom which some would now steal from you.

As St. Patrick, by the invincible might of truth and right, vanquished paganism and subdued superstition to free your ancestors, so we can vanquish want and subdue injustice by the same might of truth and right.

Not while Irishmen are brave, not while Irishwomen are lovely and courageous, will any dictator ever set his heel of oppression upon this fair land of ours.

Not while we follow the cross of Christ and the ideal of liberty shall even want and hunger, privation and suffering be made the weapons of those who would steal away our freedom under the guise of giving us security.

The government of Thomas Jefferson is not dead.

But it is your task and mine, men and women of the Ancient and Honorable Order of Hibernians, whose 126th anniversary we are celebrating tonight, it is your task and mine, I say, to be on guard, to be ever vigilant because eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

We each must do our share toward breaking this depression. We must support our government. We must stand by our public officials and our elected executives. But when any man, be he ditchdigger or high executive, proposes to curb our liberties, to destroy our Constitution, to dethrone the sovereignty of our States—let us oppose him; not in blind anger, not in resentment, not in hatred—but with that deep determination to uphold liberty, with that abiding faith in the power of right and justice, with that full trust in a benign providence which over the centuries sustained the Irish people through their storms of tribulation.

And so, in conclusion, let me say that tonight America is grateful for the Irish men and women of this Nation, because there is writ on the tablets of their hearts the love of liberty and justic so deep that no dictator can ever erase it; no danger can ever make it pale into impotency; no threat can ever cause it to be hidden in fear; and no oppressor, no matter how clever or how powerful, can ever take this Nation from its foundation of constitutional democracy so long as Irish hearts beat with life.

Thank God for the Irish.

Welcome News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News states editorially:

> The President's plan to expand Federal and State safety research efforts is welcome news.

It adds:

> The President gave a needed boost to legislation which would require Federal safety standards and labels for tires.

The editorial, informative and typical of others which support the proposed safety program, is offered for the RECORD where its full contents may be studied.

L.B.J. ASKS TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAM—A MINIMUM FEDERAL PLAN

If, by some horrible chance, passenger airliners began falling out of the skies at the rate of one a day, killing some 130 people in every crash, it would only be a matter of weeks before the public outcry forced legislation to halt the chaos.

Curiously, although traffic accidents claim just this sort of a death toll right now—every day—America somehow has felt the problem beyond solution.

In the belief that it is not, and that new laws can make a meaningful dent in the death and injury statistics, President Johnson has finally given his support to a basic minimum of Federal legislation for traffic safety.

Most satisfying was his full support of "safe performance design standards for tomorrow's vehicles." As the President outlined it, his proposed legislation would give the automobile industry 2 years to comply with these standards voluntarily. If the manufacturers proved obstinate, the Secretary of Commerce would be empowered to require compliance for all vehicles in interstate commerce.

Such a system will not satisfy the industry's severest critics, who feel immediate and mandatory legal pressure is the only language the automakers understand. But while a case can be made for that view, the industry is quite obviously giving more concern to safety now than ever before. It should be given an opportunity to meet its responsibilities on the voluntary basis the President suggests.

Perhaps more important than this voluntary versus mandatory debate is the character of the safety standards themselves. All too often the fight to encourage action by Government regulation is lost when the regulations are drawn to satisfy the party being regulated rather than the public.

The President's plan to expand Federal and State safety research efforts is welcome, for, in spite of all our safety data, there is a woeful lack of scientific justification for many of today's slogans and practices. But here, again, care must be taken to insure the independence of government research from undue industry influence.

Finally, the President gave a needed boost to legislation which would require Federal safety standards and labels for tires. If adopted, the measure would go a long way toward guiding the tire buyer through what is now a jungle of meaningless and confusing labeling practices.

The need for new laws is manifestly clear. How long must we wait for action

White House Hocus-Pocus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the "crisis of confidence" is with us today and it is not getting any better.

Columnist James Reston discussed this great problem in a recent column which appeared in Chicago's American. Mr. Reston's column follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Jan. 18, 1966]

WHITE HOUSE HOCUS-POCUS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—When Bill Moyers took over as White House Press Secretary, he had a single aim. This was to establish confidence in the integrity of the public and private statements made in the name of the President.

Nobody ever worked harder than Moyers to avoid this assignment or to achieve this objective after the job was forced on him. But the sad fact is the thing has not been done.

The "crisis of confidence" he vowed to end is still with us, and the events of the last few weeks have actually made it worse.

In explaining the recent dramatic diplomatic offensive to bring about peace talks in Vietnam, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg told the press:

"There has been great concern as to whether we really are pursuing what has been said is a path to peace. * * * We have a great problem here maintaining our credibility with our own people."

NO BID TO NEW YORK?

In explaining why the President had not intervened in the New York City transit strike, the White House said Mr. Johnson had not been invited to do so.

Technically, this was quite true at the time, if "intervention" means putting the President personally into the negotiating chamber, but practically, the President needs no invitation to say publicly what he thinks about that fiasco, and as a matter of fact, he actually intervened through his Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, to try to bring about a settlement, even before Wirtz went to New York City at Mayor Lindsay's request.

The White House statements about the steel negotiations have been even less candid. For some unexplained reason, Moyers took the position that the whole settlement with United States Steel came as sort of a pleasant surprise to the President over the news ticker.

As a matter of fact, Roger Blough, president of United States Steel, was here talking to a member of the Cabinet—apparently Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense—about the problem, and if the settlement was a surprise to the President, it certainly was no surprise to several of his principal associates.

Nevertheless, even after the settlement was reached, the White House kept playing games with the reporters. "I don't know," Moyers told them Thursday afternoon, "with whom any of the steel company officials might have met. I do know there were no meetings in the White House and no meetings involving White House officials."

SUCH STATEMENTS DOUBTED

All this may be true, but if differs widely from the private accounts of men actually engaged in the whole steel controversy, and the point is there is now such doubt about these White House statements, that many people here simply do not believe them.

What is generally believed is that the administration put severe pressure on the steel companies not to go along with Bethlehem's $5 a ton price rise, that at least one member of the Cabinet discussed what would be acceptable to the administration, and that all this was done with the knowledge of the President.

The public relations techniques of the administration are merely making things worse. The President is trying desperately to start peace negotiations over Vietnam. He is trying to hold back prices, and he is doing far more than is generally realized to end the paralysis in New York City.

In the process, however, and not for the first time, his manuevers are getting in the way of his purposes, and the paradox of it is that Moyers, who is actually the conscience of the White House, is caught in the middle.

Cooperation Through Resource Development Spurs Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, community development has become a term often heard these days in the United States. This includes regional development. Regions, that because of various unifying factors are true communities, greatly benefit through the cooperative pursuit of common goals.

In these regional communities interdependent town and country areas work together to develop local resources for their mutual well-being.

This is the idea and spirit behind the resource conservation and development projects of which there are now 20 throughout the Nation.

One of the newer R.C. & D. projects is located in Ravalli and Missoula Counties, in the First Congressional District of Montana. This project, along with nine others, has been granted planning assistance and a project coordinator has been assigned to help the local sponsors of the project draft a work plan.

R.C. & D. projects are locally initiated and sponsored programs for accelerating current conservation activities. The projects, which are administered by the Soil Conservation Service, aim at improving the local economy through orderly and full development and use of available natural resources.

The 10 original R.C. & D. projects, established only 2 years ago, already have demonstrated their great worth to the areas they serve.

The residents of the Bitterroot River Valley in southwestern Montana plan to realize the potential of their scenic, forested region with the coordinating help of the R.C. & D. project. They expect to bring about orderly land use adjustments which in part will mean further development of the tremendous recreation potential that exists in the watershed—a factor of particular significance with the continuing increase in tourism to the high mountain country of the great American West.

I am gratified that my district has been chosen for one of the early R.C. & D. projects. I am confident that these projects will multiply in the years ahead as the importance of regional development becomes better understood. Federal assistance is nowhere more justified than in the conservation and development of our soil and water resources. They always must be the Nation's first consideration, for upon these basic resources America depends for its sustenance, growth, and well-being.

I insert the following conservation data:

Comparative table—Soil Conservation Service appropriation

	1965 appropriation	1966 appropriation	1967 budget estimates
Conservation operations:			
1. Assistance to conservation districts, communities, etc.:			
(a) Soil surveys	$19, 095, 601	$19, 380, 000	$15, 930, 000
Acres mapped	(52, 897, 072)	(52, 000, 000)	(35, 000, 000)
(b) Technical programing and installation services	$84, 878, 608	$87, 878, 000	$91, 483, 000
(c) Snow surveys	$591, 855	$584, 000	$587, 000
(d) Operations of plant material centers	$1, 241, 491	$960, 000	$1, 020, 000
Total	$105, 807, 555	$108, 802, 000	$109, 020, 000
Watershed planning:			
1. Project investigation and planning	$6, 320, 615	$5, 853, 000	$6, 397, 000
Projects authorized for planning	109	100	50
Watershed protection:			
1. Watershed works of improvement	$60, 196, 221	$54, 946, 900	$53, 645, 000
2. Loans and related expense	7, 100, 000	5, 500, 000	5, 000, 000
3. River basin program development	3, 943, 469	5, 884, 100	7, 914, 000
Total	71, 239, 690	66, 331, 000	66, 559, 000
Projects moved into construction stage	59	80	35
Flood prevention:			
1. Works of improvement	$26, 117, 103	$25, 371, 000	$25, 454, 000
2. Loans and related expenses	200, 000	200, 000	200, 000
Total	26, 317, 103	25, 571, 000	25, 654, 000
Great Plains conservation program:			
1. Cost-sharing assistance	11, 436, 000	12, 500, 000	12, 500, 000
2. Technical services and related expenses	3, 427, 803	3, 582, 000	3, 612, 000
Total	14, 863, 803	16, 082, 000	16, 112, 000
Unserviced applications	4, 312	4, 500	5, 000
Resource conservation and development:			
1. Project investigation and planning	$310, 000	$612, 000	$312, 000
2. Resource development and technical assistance	1, 003, 000	2, 235, 000	3, 762, 000
3. Loans and related expense	500, 000	1, 500, 000	500, 000
Total	1, 813, 000	4, 347, 000	4, 574, 000
Total all funds	226, 361, 766	226, 986, 000	228, 316, 000
Man-years	15, 622	16, 921	16, 576 −345

Interpretative data—1967 budget estimate for the Soil Conservation Service, conservation operations

INCREASES	
For staffing 18 new conservation districts	$515, 000
For continued accelerated operations in Appalachia	1, 417, 000
For assistance with land use planning related to recreational developments	1, 028, 000
To operate new plant material center	51, 000
Pay Act costs	807, 000
Total	3, 818, 000
DECREASE	
Soil survey operations	3, 600, 000
Net	+218, 000

Reimbursements for technical services to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:

	1966		1967	
	Amount	Man-years	Amount	Man-years
Agricultural conservation program	$8, 500, 000	1, 164	$5, 000, 000	664
Cropland adjustment program	150, 000	17	200, 000	22
Cropland conversion program	50, 000	5	50, 000	5
Total		1, 186		681

NOTE.—Net man-years, 505.

Watershed protection: A decrease of $1,444,600 for installation of works of improvement in Public Law 566 watershed projects is proposed.

By the end of the fiscal year 1966 it is estimated that a total of 740 watershed projects will have been approved for operations under Public Law 566. Of this number an estimated 113 projects will have been completed, leaving 627 projects under way at the end of 1966. It is estimated that an additional 120 projects will be approved for operations in 1967, for a total of 747 projects under way during that year.

The $56,239,000 estimated to be available in 1967 would permit 35 new construction starts in 1967 of which 7 are proposed to be in the Appalachian region.

The projected obligations would fund all projects estimated to be under way in 1967 at about $75,000 for each project.

Resource conservation and development: In the fiscal year 1967, planning work will be started on additional resource conservation and development projects. Developmental work will be accelerated on the 10 projects which are now in the installation stage and started on the 10 projects authorized for 1966.

Flood prevention and the Great Plains conservation program are proposed to continue in 1967 at the same level as in 1966.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS 1966 RESOLUTIONS ON APPROPRIATIONS—CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

Conservation district programs create new wealth in rural and urban America. They reduce waste and damage in the use of soil, water, and related natural resources. They strengthen the economic capability of rural America and thus contribute to the health of the total national economy.

Conservation district programs reduce flood hazards and the silting of rivers, harbors, and reservoirs. They create additional private employment opportunities. They develop a strong market for the products of industry. They develop a wider usefulness for all of America's natural resources. They develop new and improved water supplies for industry, agriculture, recreation, and municipalities. They add to the fish, game, and wildlife population.

Conservation district programs promote privately owned recreational space and facilities. They provide an organized channel for the practical application of research and science for current resource problems. They encourage the improved management and marketing of farm-produced timber and wood products. They contribute heavily to the beauty of the countryside.

Conservation district programs help upgrade the social and economic well-being of entire communities and regions.

To help implement these programs of conservation operations in the Nation's 3,000 conservation districts, technical assistance is furnished by the Soil Conservation Service. Federal funds appropriated to the Soil Conservation Service are inadequate to furnish sufficient technical assistance to meet the growing obligations in district operations.

A current district-by-district evaluation of staffing needs revealed a shortage of 1,533 man-years of technical assistance to meet the workload in district programs. It would cost $10¾ million annually to finance this backlog of work.

The estimate proposed in the Federal budget for conservation operations for 1967 is $109 million. This amount of funds will finance some 400 fewer technicians than the 1966 appropriation.

In view of the need for 1,533 more man-years of technical assistance, instead of 400 less man-years, the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate $120 million for SCS conservation operations in 1967.

APPROPRIATIONS—WATERSHED PROGRAM

The NACD believes that greater attention should be given to water and related land resource problems in upstream watershed areas. It is there that rain and snow fall and the pattern of water use, management, and disposal within each river basin originates.

We believe that locally sponsored watershed projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566) are the key to the solution of many upstream water problems. We believe that greater use should be made of such projects to provide works of improvement needed for flood prevention, agricultural water management, recreational use, municipal and industrial water supply, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Under the current level of appropriation for watershed protection, 80 new watershed projects can be started annually. The budget estimates for 1967 propose an appropriation of $66½ million. This would permit only about 35 new watershed projects to be started in 1967. To continue the current rate of new watershed project starts in 1967 would require $12 million more than is proposed in the budget estimate.

Therefore, the NACD requests the Congress of the United States to appropriate $78½ million for watershed protection in 1967.

Further, the NACD is concerned about the lack of funds which has created and perpetuated a serious gap between applications for assistance and action to plan and install needed measures in upstream watersheds. Over 2,400 applications have been received. It has been possible to authorize planning assistance on less than half of them.

Therefore, the NACD requests the Congress of the United States to appropriate $10 million for assistance to local sponsoring organizations in planning watershed projects during 1967.

SOIL SURVEYS

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts strongly urges an increased Federal contribution toward the rate of progress in the soil survey program. Complete soil information in a readily available form is vital to the development of both industrial and agricultural enterprises to their highest potential. The character of the soil is a major factor in the management and utilization of vital water resources.

Soil, as a basic natural resource, is highly significant to the welfare of all the people, whether dedicated to use as cropland, grassland, woodland, wildlife habitat, water reservoirs, recreational facilities, streets and highways, building sites or industrial locations. Too often, the lack of sound soil survey information covering key areas has been a major causative factor in costly mistakes made in the development of both farm enterprises and urban, suburban, and industrial development.

Scientific soil classifications provide a sound basis for predicting the suitability of soils for residences, business and industrial uses, sewage disposals, streets and highways, and recreational facilities as well as for agricultural purposes. Soil data are useful and benefit all our people as soon as soil survey reports are published and released for public use.

We take the position that there is need for an increase in appropriations as will make possible an acceleration by at least 25 percent in the development and publication of soil survey reports.

The 47th Anniversary of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion's National Commander L. Eldon James, in his acceptance speech to the convention delegates at Portland, Oreg., said:

> The responsibility we face now and in the months ahead is to back our Government's determined policy in South Vietnam and further—to help rally the first support of all Americans to the defense of freedom there. We shall do our determined best to support our Armed Forces in every way that will enable them to do their job and to return home.

With these words, Commander James echoed the pledge to safeguard justice, freedom, and democracy which the American Legion first made when it was founded 47 years ago and which it continues to uphold as a sacred trust today.

The American Legion has grown and prospered since it first came into being during the Paris caucus held March 15–17, 1919, and has become an organization which has served America patriotically and steadfastly over the years through three major conflicts, World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and now, the Vietnam conflict.

Such distinguished Americans as Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Bennett Clark, Eric Fisher Wood, and Henry D. Lindsley were among the 463 founding officers and men of the American Legion in 1919. This small group has grown today to a strength of more than 2,000,000 active members who play a vigorous role in promoting educational opportunities for our youth, in protecting the moral strength of our Nation, and in defending our country's security both at home and abroad.

From sponsoring high school oratorical contests to supporting the American Legion baseball program, from protecting the fallen and disabled veteran to initiating drives for passage of legislation as far reaching as the GI bill of rights, the American Legion has always stood for selfless service to all Americans. It has always done its utmost to protect the American way of life, and the great institutions of freedom, such as the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, that have served as solid foundations on which our country's greatness has been built.

Today, we celebrate the 47th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion. I want to take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to the American Legion on reaching this milestone, and to wish its members Godspeed in many more years of useful service to our deserving veterans and to a grateful nation.

Letters to the President in Support of Our Efforts in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include letters to the President of the United States together with a newspaper article which explain better than anything I could say the attitude of our servicemen and their loved ones toward this country's efforts in Vietnam.

MASSAPEQUA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Massapequa, N.Y., February 24, 1966.

Hon. President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT: Last evening, I had the pleasure of listening to your speech at the Waldorf and I must say it was excellent and very pertinent to the situation.

I have a son in Vietnam and being a fifth generation American, I am very proud that he is able to be there. I am enclosing a clipping from our local paper that explains his attitude. I thought perhaps it might be of some small consolation to you that all of our youth are not whining cowards.

Ever mindful of the many letters that you must receive, I hope that you are able to read this personally. My son's address is: 1st Lt. David N. Noble, O87843, USMC, 4th Battalion, 12th Marines, Battery M, FPO, San Francisco, Calif.

Sincerely,

CHARLES NOBLE,
Director of Physical Education.

VIETNAM MARINE: PROUD TO BE HERE

A 24-year-old Massapequa marine, who has had more than his share of experiencing peril in two of the hot spots of the world, this week wrote from Vietnam, where he is currently stationed, to thank the people of Massapequa for their support.

First Lt. David Noble, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Noble of 220 New York Avenue, wrote the Post:

"Needless to say I am very proud to be here and I strongly feel that what the United States is doing is altogether necessary to check the spread of communism in this part of the world."

Lieutenant Noble last year was featured in a Post story that described his recent experiences in another trouble spot; the Dominican Republic. Noble at that time recounted some of the unusual aspects of that holding action and then announced he was going to Vietnam.

Noble said, in the June 17, 1965, issue: I feel we have to make a stand in South Vietnam now. If we don't do it over there, we'll have to do it here.

The young marine this week end told the Post:

"At the present time I'm stationed near Hue, which is in the northern part of the Republic of Vietnam. I've spent a very interesting and sometimes exciting tour of duty so far."

The lieutenant continued, "I served as an artillery forward observer for 2 months and for the past 5 months I have been the executive officer of a 155-millimeter howitzer battery."

Lieutenant Noble said he expects to leave Vietnam sometime this June and return home early in July.

The Massapequan added:

"It is really too bad that there are people at home who censure our action as well as our presence in Vietnam without really understanding the situation here. These people do not discourage the men serving here in that they represent a tiny faction of the U.S. population, whereas the majority of the people are behind us."

The young man was one of Massepequa high school's stars in football and lacrosse. A 1959 graduate of Massapequa high school, Noble graduated from Cortland State Teachers College in 1963.

Noble's father is the physical education director of school district 23.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson,
LBJ Ranch, Texas.

Dear Sir: My husband is in Vietnam. He is there by choice. He has been in the military service for a little over 8 years. He is a soldier. He believes that fighting is his job, and in Vietnam he is doing his job. He feels that it is not only his duty, but he also feels and knows that if we don't stop the Communists in Vietnam, we will have them here in the States and even in our own private homes.

My husband said that he wants to fight in Vietnam, now, so that our son will not have to grow up in a communistic country.

My husband is fighting now so that, maybe, our son will not have to fight in any war when he grows up. My husband and I do not understand why so many of these teenagers are against the war in Vietnam. Is it that they are against war itself or is it because they don't want to get involved in something that is dangerous? Or, is it because they are scared? Don't they know that it is just as dangerous to breathe or walk down a street? Or, to do anything? Don't they know that they can die easier walking across a street than dying in a war?

You are probably wondering, by now, where I get off cutting down the poor misguided teens of today. Well, when I was married, I was only 17. I have a 15-month-old son. I lost a baby in June of 1965—I am at present pregnant. My husband is only 25 years old. If he dies in Vietnam, I will be a widow at either 19 or 20. I am at present 19 years of age. I have learned to live with the fact that I may have to raise my children by myself.

You see, my husband and I neither one believe in divorce or remarriage. You see, our love is so complete that there is no room for another man or woman. As Jimmy, my husband said, what would he do with two wives or I with two husbands, in the life that awaits us after death on this earth?

I feel strongly about my husband fighting in Vietnam. I agree with him 100 percent. I understand and agree with his reasons for him being in Vietnam.

I wish the teens of today would stop and think. Maybe, if they did, they would understand our cause in Vietnam. Maybe, then, they will come to understand why my husband and many more husbands, sons, and boyfriends are fighting in that far-off land.

They are fighting to keep freedom for themselves and their children and their children's children. Maybe someday, the teens of today will understand what freedom really means. Freedom is so sorely taken for granted. Maybe, if they lost their freedom, they would know and understand the reason our young men are fighting in Vietnam.

Maybe, someday, the teens of today will understand. I only hope they find out before it's too late.

Sincerely,
Marguentte Worstell.

South Dakota State Legislature Concurrent Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, along with other members of the South Dakota congressional delegation, we have introduced legislation authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Oahe unit, Missouri River Basin project, in South Dakota. In this connection I would like to call to the attention of the members of the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs particularly, and the Congress, the resolution adopted by the South Dakota State Legislature in support of the project.

The resolution is as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

Concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress to promptly review and approve authorizing legislation for the construction of the Oahe unit, an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota) the House of Representatives concurring therein):

Whereas the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887) as supplemented and extended by the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 641) authorized a general comprehensive plan for the conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin; and

Whereas the Oahe unit is an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project, which following exhaustive studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation has been found to be engineeringly feasible and economically justified as evidenced by that agency's report titled "Oahe Unit, James Diversion—South Dakota, Missouri River Basin Project," dated May 1965 which was subsequently approved by the Secretary of the Interior on October 6, 1965; and

Whereas residents of South Dakota have for many years counted on new irrigation development possible through the construction of the Oahe unit to justify the large sacrifice of 509,000 acres of productive lands given up for the storage of water behind the four main-stem reservoirs constructed with the State; and

Whereas the development of the Oahe unit will further result in increased and stabilized agricultural production from lands which are presently under production, which in turn will result in many benefits to the State of South Dakota, the region, and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the 41st Legislative Assembly of the State of South Dakota sincerely and respectfully petitions and urges the Congress of the United States to promptly consider and take favorable action authorizing the construction of the Oahe unit; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, the members of the Missouri River Basin States' congressional delegations, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Adopted by the senate January 11, 1966.

Concurred in by the house of representatives February 2, 1966.

Charles Droz,
Speaker of the House.
Attest:
Paul Imman,
Chief Clerk.
Lem Overpeck,
President of the Senate.
Attest:
Niels P. Jensen,
Secretary of the Senate.

The Real Issue in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Frank A. White is one of Indiana's best known and best loved journalists. His famous column "The Hoosier Day" appears regularly in newspapers all over the State and I have long enjoyed his friendship.

In the March 4, 1966, Martinsville, Ind., Reporter, "The Hoosier Day" states a simple and unequivocal truth that has all too often been totally ignored or flatly denied in the debate on our role in Vietnam. The United States, as Mr. White makes clear, is in Vietnam as a devotion to principle; we seek neither gain nor profit, and charges of aggression leveled against the United States are totally wrong. I commend his remarks to all, and especially to some Americans who seem to feel the United States is always wrong and those who oppose us are always right.

[From the Martinsville (Ind.) Reporter, Mar. 4, 1966]

The Hoosier Day

(By Frank A. White)

So many mean things have been said abroad and in the United States about our being in the Vietnam war, when will someone say the truth.

Our presence in Vietnam is one of the greatest examples of unselfish philanthropy and devotion to principle the world has witnessed. We seek not one square foot of territorial gain, not one dollar of material profit.

American boys, cream of the crop, are spilling rich red blood in jungles of Vietnam not alone to help education, health, and economic growth of a small nation.

They die fighting for a principle of small nations remaining free of Communist takeover and to have self-determination.

The Louis Harris public opinion poll, national, shows that doves, hawks, owls, and chickens differ as to war methods. But public opinion remains two to one that we have a job to do in Vietnam and should stay. Our fighting men there write to me, "we have a job to finish—we belong here."

Will we surrender the vast land and population mass of Asia to Red atheism? To do so might be the determining factor in a world enslaved by communism.

Congressman Richard L. Roudebush who knows war firsthand, put it well. He said: "Stakes in southeast Asia are enormous. We must consider what would happen if we pulled out of that war-wracked area.

"First, Malaysia would undoubtedly fall to the Communists, perhaps overnight. This would mean that Red China would dominate the Straits of Malacca, where more than 12,000 ships a year pass. Closing these straits would be fatal to Japan, India, and the Philippines.

"Burma would then be a sitting duck for Mao's armies, and Indonesian dictator Sukarno could control the communications lines between the Philippines and Australia. Thailand, already advertised by the Communists as a takeover target, would be next in line. These are established facts and are known to the free world. Most of the free nations are not helping us. Many are actually giving aid and comfort to our enemies by permitting their ships to transport cargo to the Communists in North Vietnam."

We have many denominations and religious sects. The underlying principle of all is that those who are strong must come to the aid of his brethren, regardless of race or nationality.

The war that is waged in Vietnam at this hour will determine whether the 16 million people of that country will be freemen or forever be enslaved by atheistic communism. How can churchmen look the other way and be silent in this crisis?

How can leaders of great church organizations assume the role of military experts to tie the hands of our President and those charged with decision in the winning of the war of freedom and self-determination?

What about the bitter and endless charges of cruelty against American soldiers? Much has been made of an American soldier shooting before television a Vietcong woman. The camera did not show she was reaching for a machinegun and it was life or death for the American and his buddies. Much has been said of destroying Vietcong crops and the accidental killing of a baby in a tunnel by a grenade.

How little has been printed or shown of Vietcong atrocities. Have we shown the fact that the Vietcong took a 14-year-old refugee, had him stand on a rock and beat his feet to a pulp with gun butts. They then said, "Now run to freedom." Has anything been said of driving 110 tacks in a ring about a refugees skull and the Vietcong saying "here is your crown of thorns." Or have we been shown the Vietcong driving chop sticks in a refugee's ears, saying "now listen to the priest read the Bible."

There are 700,000 half-starved refugees in South Vietnam while we have a problem of surpluses of food.

How can anyone be blind to the lessons of history as it relates to Communist domination?

A Patriotic Gesture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I received a letter from the wife of a young man who had been drafted. Because of the short notice he received from his draft board, the young man was unable to give his landlord the 30-day notice required by his lease. Therefore, the landlord at first decided to hold the security deposit.

However, when I wrote to the company which owned the apartment house explaining the circumstances, I immediately received a check for the deposit by return mail, and I have sent it to the draftee's wife.

The owner of the apartment is Yorkview Corp. Since landlords are often considered hardhearted, I am pleased to disclose this fine gesture and commend the officers of the Yorkview Corp., and especially its president, Alfred Sanzari.

Timely Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, along with many other papers, the Philadelphia Inquirer has warm words for President Johnson's special message on crime.

The paper believes one of his most important recommendations is the creation of a high-level commission to revise Federal criminal laws—and also important, it says, is his urging of States to follow suit in their jurisdiction.

Because others may peruse the editorial with benefit, I herewith am making a copy available for printing in the RECORD.

THE SPECIAL MESSAGE ON CRIME

Perhaps the most important of the recommendations made by President Johnson in his special message to Congress on crime is the creation of a high-level commission to revise Federal criminal laws—and his urging of States to follow suit in their jurisdiction is no less so.

It requires no lawyer to confirm that our varied legal entities are constantly embroiled in a "crazy quilt" patchwork of statutes, as the President noted—and if they could be reorganized and made less confusing and self-contradictory (and less full of loopholes) by 1968, as he has asked, the Nation would be far better off in its unending struggle with spreading criminality.

Mr. Johnson's suggestions for bail reform, for heightened educational effort for and on the part of law enforcement officials at all levels, for narcotics control and for the finding of jobs for "good risk" ex-convicts also seem reasonable.

There was, of course a special poignancy in his attack on the too-easy procurement of mail-order guns. His predecessor in office fell victim to one of these, in the hands of an irresponsible, muddled assassin who had had to produce no credentials to obtain the gun. Federal action in this arena has clearly been warranted for years—even before John Kennedy was murdered—and it is to be hoped that Congress will dally on this no longer.

But there is one aspect of the war on crime to which the President made little reference: pat-on-the-wrist justice. We may develop the best national and local law enforcement agencies in the world, and the most clear-sighted law codes, but they will only be frustrated if the men on the bench cannot bring themselves to administer the prescribed penalties with full vigor.

The thug who walks through courts like revolving doors will not be impressed or repressed by either codes or cops so long as he can consistently "beat the rap" and knows it.

We believe Mr. Johnson's program deserves serious attention and considerable congressional support; it should, however, be accompanied by a substantial measeure of judicial reform to be effective.

Centerville Iowegian Comments on 4-Year Terms for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, I testified before the House Committee on the Judiciary and placed myself on record as opposed to the proposal to extend the terms of Congressmen to 4 years.

My personal feeling is that the House of Representatives should remain as close as possible to the people, and that 2-year terms for its Members are necessary to retain this democratic tradition.

On this point, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members an editorial from the January 21, 1966, issue of the Centerville Iowegian of Centerville, Iowa.

The editorial correctly points out that government today is a complex process, often hard for the average citizen to understand, and adds:

> But by bringing all the Members of the House of Representatives to an accounting each 2 years, most certainly this wing of Government is going to stay pretty well attuned to the people.

This, I think, is the strongest argument for retaining the 2-year terms for Congressmen. As I said in my statement to the Committee on the Judiciary, I believe we should continue to honor the Jeffersonian principle of frequent elections.

I might add that I do not agree with the editorial's contention that a "snap of the Presidential fingers," directed at the Congress, gave the President "just about everything he wanted last year."

The legislative process, like government as a whole, is a complex process. Very rarely, if at all, does the Congress pass an administration bill without important changes.

For example, last year the President recommended a 2-year extension of the feed grains program, which is of great importance to my home State of Iowa.

However, the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, voted out a bill calling for a 4-year extension of the program. It was this recommendation, not the President's, which eventually became law.

And I would also like to point out that, once the committee's bill reached the floor of the House, it was the minority party which gave support to the Presidential recommendation for only a 2-year extension.

In any case, I agree with most of what the editorial says. Two-year House terms are a stimulus to democracy, and frequent elections insure that Congressmen will have a real interest in explaining the legislative process to their constituents.

The editorial from the Iowegian follows:

Congressional Tenure

The President has asked for a constitutional amendment permitting Congressmen to be elected for 4 years rather than 2. This, no doubt, will have the enthusiastic approval of harassed Congressmen who find themselves campaigning most of the time. One must admit that it also has certain virtues.

For one thing, a Congressman could better devote his energy to the legislative business at hand rather than racing back home for every clambake and babbling something that no one remembers at old settler reunions. All this represents a drain on his time, finances, and means he can give the urgent business at hand less attention.

There is also the fact that this affords Congressmen a chance to find out what their job is all about before they face the voters seeking a new lease on his political life.

Yet, there is one phase of the plan that seems so overriding that it washes out the virtues and we simply cannot support the 4-year idea. It will tend to solidify executive power, make it more powerful and in turn weaken legislative influence.

This present Congress is an excellent example. A huge Democratic landside swept a two-thirds majority into office. The President got just about everything he wanted last year. A snap of the Presidential fingers and Congress responded, especially the House of Representatives.

The idea of allowing this kind of a situation to prevail without the people having some voice or chance to vote a new mandate doesn't impress us as the wise thing to do. The people need frequent checks on their government, and this 2-year accounting Congress faces is an excellent way of maintaining our checks and balances. The year 1966 should be an accounting year, not 1968. Every 2 years the entire House of Representatives has to stand up and be counted and if the people aren't pleased with the ways things are going, this is an excellent avenue of expression.

Government has a way of growing away from the people. For one thing it is so complex, difficult to understand. But by bringing all the Members of the House of Repsesentatives to an accounting each 2 years, most certainly this wing of Government is going to stay pretty well attuned to the people. We like this and want to see it retained.

It is also a way of telling the President how people feel about the trend of events. This private check by the people is so desirable that we simply cannot approve the 4-year idea.

Traders With Hanoi Face Rough Going

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the continuing conduct of free world trade with North Vietnam while thousands of our boys are in daily combat in the south is deeply disturbing the American people. Just as disturbing has been the administration's policy of keeping the true facts about this traffic from the American people and its don't-rock-the-boat approach to bringing an end to this shocking aid and comfort to our enemy.

My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain] has devoted himself to the task of digging out the facts and pressing our Government to take stronger measures to dry up this source of supply to a nation on an allout war economy. The information he has made available has had its legislative impact with the Congress, both in this session and last, approving floor amendments, not requested by the administration, prohibiting foreign aid to any country which allows its flag vessels to carry goods to or from North Vietnam.

It is is indeed encouraging therefore to find that the efforts of Congressman Chamberlain are being recognized both here in Congress and back home as well. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I am pleased to make available to my colleagues an editorial appearing in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., on Wednesday, March 9, 1966, entitled "Traders With Hanoi Face Rough Going":

Traders With Hanoi Face Rough Going

The economic waters are becoming increasingly rough for free world ocean commerce with Communist North Vietnam.

Late in February, U.S. Representative Charles E. Chamberlain, Republican, of Lansing, who has taken the lead in Congress in opposing such shipping, reported that the U.S. State Department had at long last decided to bar ships carrying goods to and from North Vietnam ports from carrying cargoes financed in any way by the U.S. Government.

This report was followed by announcement that the AFL-CIO maritime union planned to boycott ships of nations trading with North Vietnam.

Three top leaders of the maritime workers said last week after a meeting with Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann that the threat of the boycott already had cut down shipments to the Hanoi regime. One of them said the threat of tieups had produced assurances from some foreign ship owners that they will not carry goods to North Vietnam, which is supporting Red aggression against South Vietnam.

In Athens, it was announced that Greece had banned all ships under its flag from sailing to or from North Vietnam.

The announcement said the move was made to protect the lives of the crews and the security of the ships because of dangerous war conditions around Hanoi, capital of North Vietnam. It also was said that Greek ships on charter would be allowed to fulfill present contracts but the charterers will have the right to serve notice of cancellation.

Apparently in line with the State Department's blacklist, the U.S. Agriculture Department has announced that it will bar—with certain exceptions—shipment of food and other farm product cargoes on foreign-flag vessels which have called at any North Vietnam port on or after January 25.

This action will apply to all programs of the Agriculture Department, including food for peace and world food program shipments.

Exceptions will be made if vessel owners give satisfactory assurances that no ships under their control will be employed in future trade with North Vietnam.

The maritime union leaders went ahead with their boycott plan in spite of a State Department plea that the problem be handled on a government-to-government basis.

The maritime workers have had good reason to feel that Washington was not trying to discourage free world trade with Hanoi as effectively as it could have.

Official claims have been made that free world ships have not been carrying anything of strategic value to North Vietnam but even if this is true anything that benefits the economy of the Communists strengthens their ability to wage war against the South Vietnamese and the Americans who are fighting and dying in resisting Red aggression.

We congratulate the maritime union leadership for taking a more realistic and sensible view of the Hanoi trade issue than some officials in Washington have been taking until recently.

We also commend Representative Chamberlain for keeping up the fight in the face of what must have appeared to be discouraging odds.

Keynote Address of the Honorable F. Bradford Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the Record the attached keynote address of my colleague, the Honorable F. Bradford Morse, before the Massachusetts Junior Chamber of Commerce Governmental Affairs Seminar:

Keynote Address of Congressman F. Bradford Morse, Before the Massachusetts Junior Chamber of Commerce Governmental Affairs Seminar, Yankee Drummer Inn, Auburn, Mass., February 26, 1966

Anyone who read the newspapers this week had cause to be depressed about the State of the world and the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy. General de Gaulle announced that he would withdraw French forces from NATO and insist on national control of all military bases when the present NATO Treaty expires in 1969. Great Britain engaged in an acrimonious debate about the decision to reduce her defense establishment by one-third over the next 4 years. President Nasser of the United Arab Republic told a Cairo audience that it might be necessay for the United Arab Republic to wage a preventive war against Israel.

The failure of the United States to find a lost hydrogen bomb in the tomato fields of Palomares threatened to disrupt our defense arrangements with Spain and to complicate our efforts to reach agreement on a nuclear nonproliferation treaty in Geneva. Violence again shattered the fragile truce in the Dominican Republic. Military coups ousted governments in Syria and Ghana.

All of these things are cause for concern; yet I think they may be a hopeful sign. A sign that we will, as a nation, snap out of our total preoccupation with Vietnam and remember that the leader of the forces of the free world cannot forget its strategic responsibilities elsewhere around the globe.

It has been just about two decades since the leadership of the free world was thrust upon the United States. We did not seek that leadership. Indeed, throughout the 1930's we sought to avoid "entangling alliances'" as though the counsel of George Washington in 1796 was appropriate to the

20th century. Only slowly and painfully did we take even limited steps to assist the Allies in their struggle against Nazi domination in Europe. It was not until our own territory was brutally attacked at Pearl Harbor that we took decisive action.

World War II cost us heavily, yet it cost our European Allies much more; their homes and their cities, their industry and communications, in addition to their manpower. The United States went from war to a renewed prosperity as pentup demand for consumer goods made itself felt dramatically in the marketplace. Europe faced a long and grim struggle to rebuild—within the shadow of yet another aggressor—the Soviet Union.

In 1947, after the grim winter that nearly brought Europe to its knees—we knew that our interests and our obligations would prevent our total demobilization and would prevent our return to the isolationism of the past.

Czechoslovakia fell to the Communists; Greece faced Communist guerrilla forces in her hills; the historic Dardanelles were threatened once more.

The United States made a fundamental decision. Our national security would require a continuing presence around the world—not necessarily a military presence, but a moral presence. The prestige we gained in World War II as a global power; our economic power; our ideological commitment to self-determination, liberty, and world order under law, required that we declare and support our determination to guard the gates of liberty against the hostile forces of oppression—Communist as well as Fascist.

Beginning with the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine and the North Atlantic Treaty we pledged our substance for the defense of freedom. We publicly declared that our interests were engaged around the world. We agreed to meet aggression in Europe, in the Middle East, in Latin America, and in southeast Asia. The United States is a party to mutual defense pacts with more than 50 nations around the globe.

I recite this history not to defend the U.S. role as a kind of global gendarme, but to sober us in assessing our responsibilities. Can we afford the luxury of preoccupation?

If we have learned anything from our 20 years as a global power, we should have learned that our role demands flexibility of response. As we met challenges to freedom in Berlin, in Korea, in Suez, in Lebanon, in Laos, in Cuba, in the Congo, in the Dominican Republic, and now in Vietnam, we recognized that the maintenance of nuclear superiority alone could not preserve the peace. We expanded our capacity to defend against limited wars.

But flexibility means more than the deployment of forces and the balance of nuclear and tactical weapons. It requires a resilience of mind as well. Far too often we have been guilty of intellectual rigidity. Can it be said that our policymakers have become so absorbed in the crisis of the moment that they have lost perspective on the forces and the problems that will confront us for years to come?

We became so convinced that Great Britain would be admitted to the European Common Market that we failed to develop a plan for our relationships with Europe under other circumstances. We still tend to treat General de Gaulle as a temporary nuisance rather than a representative of the new dynamics of a new France.

We were so preoccupied with Europe and China in the 1950's that we virtually ignored Latin America until our Vice President was attacked in Caracas and the Soviet Union gained a foothold in Cuba. It was not until 1960 that President Eisenhower developed a new strategy for the Latin American social revolution which was already in progress.

We were so concerned about the nuclear capability of the Soviet Union that we failed to perceive the importance of the nuclear efforts going forward in France, in China, in India, and in Israel.

The telltale signs of singlemindedness appear today in the Vietnamese situation. I mentioned a few newspaper headlines of the past week. Each of them raises significant questions for U.S. foreign policy. I am concerned that our top policymakers appear to be giving insufficient attention to the answers.

What is the future of the Atlantic Alliance? As General de Gaulle correctly pointed out, the situation has changed dramatically since the signing of the NATO Treaty in 1949. But economic prosperity and talk of peaceful coexistence should not take us off our guard in Europe. And what of our own commitments? If France withdraws its troops and Britain reduces its entire defense establishment how much American effort will be required to take up the slack?

How long can a new arms race go on in the Middle East before the entire region is embroiled in combat? The resumption of President Nasser's bellicose statements against his Israeli neighbors practically coincide with a resumption of U.S. assistance to Egypt in the form of surplus food sales. Have we permitted short run changes in President Nasser's tactics to dim our view of his long-range intentions in the Middle East?

How did we happen to lose a hydrogen bomb in Spain? Will our inability to find it lead to Spanish efforts to force our withdrawal from strategic military positions in that country? Will the incident impair the effectiveness of our efforts at the disarmament talks in Geneva? Is there anything more important right now than the cessation of proliferation of nuclear capability?

It is now more than 10 months since the beginning of the crisis in the Dominican Republic. Yet the country is still in turmoil with the timetable for free elections seriously set back by a new outbreak of violence. Can we regard our intervention as entirely successful in light of recent reports that an important wing of a major political party has been taken over by Communist forces?

None of these questions has an easy answer. My concern is that we aren't trying hard enough to find the answers.

A nation—like a man—is as good as its word. Can our commitments be credible if we lack the resources to back them up? What is the most appropriate allocation of our men and materiel? The distinguished military editor of the New York Times, Hanson Baldwin, wrote a most disturbing article last week in which he pointed out that "the Nation's armed services have almost exhausted their trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere." Of the 22⅓ available active divisions cited by the Secretary of Defense in his recent report on our military posture, only 2 or 3 are suitable for combat duty in Vietnam.

The shortages of manpower and equipment found all over the world raise questions about the adequacy of our military planning. They also suggest that shortsighted political thinking coupled with inadequate diplomatic planning may have contributed to our predicament.

If we permit our preoccupation to deepen and our concentration of resources to continue, we may, if confronted with a new explosion in Berlin, Cuba or the Middle East, be virtually incapable of effective response.

It is for this reason that I find the events of the past week hopeful. They demand our distraction and force us to face up to the large questions. Vietnam is today, indeed, the most dramatic and demanding challenge to the free world, but it is by no means the only one, and in the perspective of history it may not prove to have been the most important.

As Sir Winston Churchill remarked in 1947, when we were barely embarked on the new and uncertain adventure of the postwar period: "Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them."

Asia Scholars, Specialists Support U.S. Viet Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., in its issue of October 23, 1965, appeared a sound and convincing letter signed by Dr. Wesley R. Fishel, and a number of other distinguished scholars and specialists, which I herewith include in my remarks. The convincing opinion of those who are a party to the letter are worthy of profound consideration.

As they well said, and I quote:

> If there is any lesson that should have been learned by us since 1919, it is that collective security is the only effective means to deal with totalitarianism on the march.

In connection with this statement, "Lest we forget," we should remember in the 1930's that weak leadership in England and France was an invitation for Hitler to move into the Saar, later Austria, demand and obtain the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia, later took over the remainder of Czechoslovakia and then came Poland and World War II. Firmness in leadership such as shown now by President Johnson, may well have averted World War II.

Unfortunately, arrogant Communist aggression exists in the world of today just the same as it did less than 40 years ago under Hitler and the Nazi regime.

ASIA SCHOLARS, SPECIALISTS SUPPORT U.S. VIET POLICY

To the EDITOR OF THE STANDARD-TIMES:

We, the undersigned, write as scholars and specialists, most of whom have devoted much of their adult lives to study and work in south and east Asian affairs. Included in our number are most of this Nation's small nucleus of specialists of Vietnam. Many of us have lived in Vietnam itself.

We feel compelled to write in response to what we consider the distortions of fact and the emotional allegations of a small, but vociferous, group of fellow university teachers regarding the war in Vietnam. We must first observe that those who have signed advertisements and petitions represent a very small proportion of all university professors. Further, the petition signers include disproportionally fewer scholars in the fields of government, international relations, and Asian studies. To our knowledge, no acknowledged expert on Vietnam itself has signed the advertisements appearing in the New York Times protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam. A mere handful of scholars with Far East credentials identified themselves with these protests.

Quite apart from the merits of American policy—past or present—we believe the manner in which the petitions and many "teach-ins" have been presented is a discredit to those who would call themselves scholars.

The Vietnamese war and its related political context are enormously complex. Even most qualified experts disagree on important facts or the meaning of those facts. It is no surprise that they also disagree on alternative courses of action.

It serves no useful purpose, therefore, to engage in name calling, distortion, emotionalism, and gross oversimplification. Many of our fellow scholars, no doubt eminently qualified in their own fields, are in our view guilty of unacademic behavior in their protests of Vietnam policy.

For the record, therefore, we feel compelled to make the following assertions of fact:

1. The Vietcong initiated the present war in South Vietnam. They did so in gradual stages, beginning with assassination, terror, and bellicose propaganda. This was followed by sabotage, subversion, and small-scale guerrilla attacks; in later stages, large-scale frontal assaults were employed. Only in the last stage did the U.S. Government feel compelled to increase its military involvement substantially.

2. The Vietcong is a Communist-led and Communist-controlled political movement. Its aim is to establish, by any available means, a Communist rule in South Vietnam.

3. It is false to compare the war now being fought in Vietnam with that which was fought by the French between 1946 and 1954. That was a colonial war, fought by Vietnamese of every variety of political complexions to achieve national independence. The Government of Vietnam since 1954 has been a truly Vietnamese national regime, and it is fighting now to maintain its independence. That it is not without faults goes without saying. This, however, is not the issue. Surely it is of some significance that not one prominent nationalist of all the thousands of such men in South Vietnam has defected to the Communists since 1954.

4. The People's Revolutionary Party, which leads the Vietcong, is a segment of the Lao Dong (Communist) Party of North Vietnam. The Vietcong itself was organized by the North Vietnamese, armed by the North Vietnamese, and trained by the North Vietnamese. This is not to deny the fact that many of its cadres were originally born in South Vietnam, and later trained or indoctrinated in the north. Nor is it to deny that thousands of South Vietnamese were persuaded or forced to join the Vietcong in the south.

5. The Vietcong have employed methods of terror, torture, and outright murder that, on a smaller scale, rival the atrocities of the Axis Powers in World War II. Thousands of innocent people (including women and children) have been deliberately slaughtered by the Vietcong as "examples" for the South Vietnamese. Beheading and mutilation are not uncommon. For American academics to bemoan the "brutality" of the South Vietnamese response, without the slightest comment on the initiators of the brutality, is the epitome of bias.

6. The Communist regime in North Vietnam is among the harshest and most brutal in Asia. All opposition has been exterminated. The society is organized into cells of mutual surveillance. No free elections of any kind have been permitted. The living standards of the people are low even by Asian standards.

7. In contrast, the people of South Vietnam, until the stepped up Vietcong attack, were enjoying a far better living standard. Hunger was virtually eliminated. Industries were expanding. Schools, clinics, and social welfare services were proliferating rapidly. Between 1954 and 1961, there were four elections, conducted with varying degrees of freedom.

8. The Geneva accords were broken first and repeatedly by the Communists, as documented by the records of the International Controls Commission.

9. The President has offered to hold unconditional peace talks with Hanoi and has been rejected repeatedly by Hanio, Peiping, and Moscow. The burden of proof is now on the Communists.

10. Communist conquest of South Vietnam would, in our view, lead inevitably to a deterioration of resolve throughout south and southeast Asia. While the non-Communist states in the region are not likely to fall in actual geographical sequence (i.e., the "domino" theory), we believe these nations would eventually succumb politically and/or militarily to Chinese expansion following an American withdrawal from Vietnam. We further believe that Chinese hegemony over southeast Asia would be disastrous to American national interest and will severely compromise the capacity of Japan, the Philippines, India, and Pakistan to survive as independent nations.

If there is any lesson that should have been learned by us since 1919, it is that collective security is the only effective means to deal with totalitarianism on the march. Our negotiations and agreements must not be "Munichs." Rather they must be backed by clear evidence of our determination to maintain the arrangements agreed to as the conditions for peace. Men who prize liberty are unwilling to settle for peace at any price. Nor does negotiation from weakness and without conditions serve to placate imperial ambitions. The surest guarantee of peace in Asia is what it has always been everywhere: Recognition by all that our commitments to our allies will be honored. And we shall use the peace thus secured as Americans used it in post-war Europe, and as President Johnson has pledged to use it for Asia. The basis for a lasting settlement in Asia will be built as we create the conditions for freedom through social and economic programs no less than through military means.

Organizational affiliations are listed for identification purposes only: Dr. Wesley R. Fishel, Michigan State University; Prof. P. J. Honey, University of London; William P. Maddox, New York City; Prof. Ralph L. Turner, Michigan State University; Dr. Charles Wolf, Jr., the Rand Corp., Dr. George E. Taylor, University of Washington; Prof. William B. Dunn, University of the State of New York; Prof. John D. Montgomery, Harvard University; Dr. Charles A. Joiner, Temple University; William Henderson, Socony Mobil Oil Co.; Dr. Frank N. Trager, New York University; Rev. Francis J. Corley, S.J., St. Louis University; Dr. Chester L. Hunt, Western Michigan University; Dr. Lucian Pye, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. David A. Wilson, University of California; Dr. Amrom H. Katz, the Rand Corp.; Dr. John T. Dorsey, Vanderbilt University; Dr. I. Milton Sacks, Brandeis University; Dr. Ralph H. Smuckler, Michigan State University; George K. Tanham, the Rand Corp.

Dairymen Aroused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, dairy farmers in New Jersey's Second District, which I have the honor to represent, are understandably exercised over the announced intention of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to suspend Federal milk marketing order No. 4, which presently covers our area, and place Delaware Valley milk producers under milk marketing ordering No. 2, which now covers the northern New Jersey-New York area.

Hearings on the USDA's plan to change the current status of Delaware Valley dairy farmers have been held but, to date, no change has been officially announced. Numerous meetings have been held in Washington between dairy farmers now included under order No. 4 and their congressional representatives and with officials of the USDA.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues two editorials commenting on this situation which give an idea of the situation which our dairy farmers will face if the USDA follows its announced plan. The first is from the Bridgeton, N.J., Evening News, one of the daily papers in the second district; and the second appeared in New Jersey Better Farming. This is a matter of deep concern to me and to my constituents, and I am, therefore, inserting these editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Bridgeton (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 8, 1966]

DAIRYMEN AROUSED

A dispute which has raged quietly behind the scenes and threatens to come to a head soon pits the U.S. Department of Agriculture against most of the 5,800 dairymen who supply milk to the Greater Philadelphia area.

While milk prices to consumers are not involved, we feel that the dispute is the business of everyone in the Philadelphia milkshed, which includes Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, because action threatened by the Department of Agriculture would deprive the milk farmers of $10 million a year in income. And that is a concern of all businessmen in the area, for such a loss to the economy of any area is not to be passed over lightly.

The dispute, as we understand it, centers about two principal points: One is that the Department of Agriculture contends that it cannot enforce the present milk marketing order against violations by a handful of chislers who undercut minimum price provisions by giving kickbacks to brokers or other middlemen. The other is that dairy interests primarily serving the New York market want to absorb the Philadelphia market, as they did the New Jersey market several years ago. What appears to be clear is that the Philadelphia milkshed farmers are doing better under their order than the New York-New Jersey farmers are doing under theirs.

The change which the Department of Agriculture proposes, under prodding by overwhelmingly stronger and more numerous New York interests, would at the very least result in a loss of 50 cents per hundredweight of milk income to Philadelphia milkshed farmers, while New York market dairymen would increase their take by 6 cents per hundredweight. That would result in a $10 million annual loss to the economy of the Delaware Valley.

As we see it, the Philadelphia order should be amended to make it enforceable and it should be enforced. To abandon it, or change it to a different market form either because of pressure from elsewhere or from frustration does not seem to us to be a defensible position for the Department of Agriculture.

[From New Jersey Better Farming]

Milk Matters

The controversy over the future role of the Delaware Valley milk marketing order continues unabated. On the political scene, Pennsylvania's two U.S. Senators have made strong appeals for retention of order No. 4.

Senator Hugh Scott informed the Secretary of Agriculture that hearings concluded last November on the USDA's proposal to abandon the order in favor of another form of marketing "showed that 90 percent of the dairy farmers and handlers under the order want it retained with amendments to render it more enforceable."

The USDA proposal to abandon the present order is based on its claimed inability to enforce it against minimum price infractions.

Senator Scott said that "these 5,400 dairy farmers and their communities would stand to suffer a loss of $10 million a year if the Department did not retain the present type of marketing order."

This order provides for a so-called handler pool of a type in effect in the market for 23 years. It regulates the marketing of milk in greater Philadelphia, covering dairy farmers in Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and south Jersey.

OTHER SUPPORT

Senator Joseph Clark wrote Secretary Freeman that since the type of milk marketing pool has no direct effect upon consumer prices, he felt that order No. 4 producer interests and desires should be supported.

A number of other Members of Congress from the order No. 4 area have urged that the present order be retained and provided with "enforcement teeth."

The Interstate Milk Producers' Cooperative, Philadelphia, which suports retention of the handler-type pool in the order No. 4 area, told the USDA, in a recent brief, that "the Department has the full cooperation of Federal courts, when it chooses to enforce the milk marketing order for the Delaware Valley marketing area. The only question," it said, "is whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture chooses to abdicate his duty."

In refuting the USDA's contention that it cannot enforce the order, Interstate cited two 1965 cases in the Federal courts which it said demonstrated this cooperation of the courts.

An opponent of Interstate's stand, the United Milk Producers Cooperative of New Jersey, has proposed combining the New York (order No. 2) and Philadelphia milkshed marketing orders.

Pennsylvania: First in Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 14, 1966, Gov. William W. Scranton transmitted the following message to the Pennsylvania State General Assembly on the subject—"Pennsylvania: First in Highways."

Message to the General Assembly by Gov. William W. Scranton, Pennsylvania: First in Highways, March 14, 1966

Mr. Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker, members of the general assembly, Pennsylvania: First in highways.

A noble ideal—but also a realistic goal. A goal that is rapidly being realized.

We have not set out to become first in highways simply to light up the sky. We are not fascinated with bigness for its own sake.

We believe that Pennsylvania must have the best highway system in the Nation, because improved highways mean expanding industry, mean more jobs, mean better safety conditions, mean driver convenience for each and every citizen of the Commonwealth.

The location of our State is uniquely fortunate. We form the bridge between the two most prosperous market areas in the world—the eastern seaboard and the Great Lakes region of the Midwest. To take full economic advantage of this blessing of geography, we must provide a highway system that will channel the riches of both of these regions into our cities and into our rural heartland.

Highways will bring us industry, distribution centers, tourists, new homeowners, new research centers, new entire communities.

And that is not all. Highways will link together our own cities into a network for economic and social interchange. Highways will provide ready access between the large cities and their suburbs. Highways will offer new leisure time opportunities to our increasingly prosperous people.

This is the future prospect. It is swiftly becoming the present fact.

We are now entering the second year of the gigantic 10-year highway construction program that was launched at the midpoint of this administration.

Every index shows that we are reaching the intermediate goals that we established for this program.

Let us look briefly at the accomplishments of the year just passed.

Construction expenditures—the actual money paid out for miles of highway completed—rose from $230 million in 1964 to $255 million in 1965—an increase of more than 10 percent.

But the more meaningful figure is that of construction awards—showing the amounts that have been authorized to contractors for construction along our highways. This figure rose from $234 million in 1964 to $296 million in 1965—a whopping increase of 26 percent. Both years were new record highs for Pennsylvania.

Other guidelines show the same story: total mileage advertised—up 10 percent; maintenance construction—up 8 percent; interstate miles opened—up 57.6 percent.

Figures alone do not reveal the full extent of our progress.

One year ago I said that we must tool up the Department of Highways to make possible the most rapidly expanded road building program in American history, and that we must free the highway program of the vicissitudes of regional and party politics. Both objectives are clearly within reach.

Businesslike procedures have been installed throughout the department of highways—that former musty stronghold of antiquated methods. Computers have replaced laborious manual systems of calculation. Engineers have been freed for creative services—one operation that formerly required eight full days of work by a professional engineer is now completed in 2 hours.

For the first time in highway department history, we have an accurate forecasting system for more than 1,500 road building projects. Every other week, schedules are checked to make sure construction dates are being met. The old predict-and-pray method of construction scheduling has been replaced by a clockwork procedure.

The State highway commission, a major reform accomplished in this administration, has meanwhile given continuity and consistency to the allocation of highway projects. No longer do the highways go only to those counties with great political pull, or to counties which are controlled by the party in power in the State. Construction awards are made on a system of priorities, based on need.

This month the highway commission will begin a series of public meetings in all 11 highway districts, to determine where the next additions to the highway program will be made. These decisions will not be subject to change by the next administration, regardless of which party wins this year's election. Pennsylvania, at last, has a long-range highway building program.

In the next fiscal year, we will make further dramatic increases in construction expenditures and construction authorizations. The total budget for 1966–67 will be $625,469,254—a 10 percent increase over last year. (Included in this sum is $68,100,000 of State highway and bridge authority expenditures.)

Construction expenditures are projected to rise to $320.6 million in fiscal 1966–67. This continues the sharp acceleration that has been underway since 1963. In 1965–66 we at last are breaking through the legendary $250 million construction year limit. Next year we expect to achieve better than a $300 million construction year.

The rise in construction awards is even more startling. For purposes of comparison, we will use low bids on projects advertised to establish this trend, since our data on actual authorizations is incomplete beyond the last few years. Note that in the first highway budget submitted by this administration in 1963–64, we called for projects advertised in the amount of $207 million—then the second highest figure ever projected for that purpose. Our final budget calls for $400 million to be allocated for low bids on projects advertised—an increase in 4 years of almost 100 percent.

Truly this is progress.

Construction costs—including the costs of engineering and right-of-way purchase—account for 64 percent of the total highway budget for 1966–67. These figures represent road and bridge improvements for every county in the Commonwealth.

Consider some outstanding examples of projects on which substantial progress will be made during the next fiscal year:

All 313 miles of the Keystone Shortway will either be open to the public or under construction—well in advance of its original schedule.

The long-awaited Holtwood Bridge, which for decades has floated like a tantalizing promise before the people of Lancaster and York Counties, will begin to become a reality.

In Pittsburgh, the "Bridge to Nowhere" will at last begin to go somewhere.

In Philadelphia, construction will continue on the Delaware Expressway and other sections of some of the most expensive highway building in the Nation.

Along the northern tier, renewal of Route 6 will be pushed ahead. Construction of the Corry Bypass and the Youngsville Bypass will begin.

In Scranton, the Spruce Street Bridge will be built.

In the remainder of the Anthracite Region, construction will proceed on the Anthracite Expressway, and the first segments of interstate 84, providing a direct route to the markets of New England, will be financed.

In the suburban counties surrounding Philadelphia, bypass construction will begin at Coatesville, West Chester, and Sellersville.

In the west, work will start on the Allegheny Expressway and the Beaver Valley Expressway.

These are but a few of the projects included in the challenging construction schedule planned for the next fiscal year.

Of the $320.6 million allocated for construction in the budget, nearly half—$150.6 million—will be devoted to work on Pennsylvania's share of the Interstate Highway System. This is almost $18 million more than was provided in the record 1965–66 budget.

During the last calendar year, 93 miles of new interstate were opened in Pennsylvania—13 miles more than had originally been projected. In the current year, 98 more miles will be added.

From a lagging position among the States in construction of the interstate, we have now forged up among the leaders. By the end of 1966, more than 1,000 miles of the 1,584 miles of interstate assigned to Pennsylvania will be in use.

On other Federal-aid systems, expenditures for construction on primary highways will be increased from $34 million to $36 million—on secondary roads from $11.9 million to $12.8 million—on urban highways from $23.2 million to $34.6 million.

For the first time, this year's highways budget will make available funds for the Appachia road development program. The State will participate to the extent of $10.7 million, and will make available an additional $1 million to communities that have applied for Appalachia grants under the local access road improvement plan.

A most important part of the 1966–67 budget is the inclusion of $6 million for elimination of high-accident-frequency areas along the roads of the Commonwealth. This amount will make possible elimination of 118 such areas.

Also in the field of improved safety conditions, an accident analysis unit has been established in the department. This unit will work closely with the State police and the Traffic Safety Bureau to determine causes of accidents and recommend highway improvements that will eliminate special dangers.

Under this year's budget, the department will return $44.1 million to our 2,561 municipalities for maintainance and construction on their streets and roads. This represents an increase of $6 million over 1965–66.

The State's own maintenance budget has risen to $83.1 million—almost $8 million higher than last year's figure. This additional money will enable us to further improve our already outstanding maintenance program.

Good roads require more than record construction outlays. Maintenance of the highways we now have is an absolute necessity. During the past calendar year, 3,114 miles of major maintenance improvements were made by our highway crews. This compares with 2,883 miles the year before.

We have placed our maintenance emphasis on those projects that can be carried out in a single construction season—thereby limiting inconvenience to Pennsylvania motorists.

This year's budget has been designed to achieve maximum road construction. We have not hesitated to resort to the highway and bridge authority funds that were made available through wise action of the legislature. We have invested the future of Pennsylvania in the construction of a highway system that will meet tomorrow's needs.

This investment has been neither haphazard nor imprudent. If we do not build the highways of tomorrow today our share of the economic and social fruits of tomorrow will inevitably be reduced.

This year's highways budget is tight, but it meets our economic and social imperatives. It will enable us to take one more long stride on the 10-year, $10 billion highway construction program.

Pennsylvania: First in highways.

It is neither a myth nor a dream. It is an approaching reality.

It is a challenge that only the fainthearted will dare to neglect.

We are making historic progress. Let's get on with the job.

Mario DiCecco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that Mario DiCecco is 70 years old, but I know that this must be a fact because I read it in the Waterbury Sunday Republican of March 6, 1966, in a sympathetic article by Ruth Parsons.

It is fashionable today to talk about spreading culture and developing an interest in the arts and I have supported these movements. At the same time it is educational to know something of the career of a man who did these things on an individual basis over many years in the difficult cultural terrain of Waterbury, Conn.

I, am personally and intimately familiar with his contributions to the people of our city and area and as I include this biographical piece in the RECORD I want to express my affection for Mario DiCecco and my deep appreciation for his outstanding service as a good citizen.

MARIO DICECCO, 70, HAS DEVOTED WHOLE LIFE TO WORLD OF MUSIC

(By Ruth Parsons)

"I neglected everything for my music and the orchestras—everything, my family, my home, my business. But it is all right, I love it. I want to. I have no regrets. There have been many crises, but we have survived—and we have not compromised."

This uncompromising stubborness and intensity of Mario DiCecco when he is convinced he is right has made him "controversial" all his public life. His friends and foes are alike in their fierceness, and seem to have always been.

And for all this scrappy determination in the face of adversity, DiCecco is a very gentle, and a shy, man.

To his friends, he seems a vigorous giant, though scarcely more than 5 feet tall. He has had some victories, gained much recognition for his talents, and has had some very large and heartbreaking defeats. Even in defeat he is among the blessed, because he is a man in love with his work. Few people are so fortunate.

And with all of his avowed neglect of his family, his six children grew to adulthood stable and cultivated, and two of his sons, Bruno and Luca won Fulbright Fellowships for musical study and have gone on to gain wide recognition as international concert performers and university teachers in their own rights.

At 70, muscular and intense, his voice soft with an almost British inflection, DiCecco should be an inspiration to those disadvantaged children everywhere.

THE EARLY DAY

He said, "I came right to Waterbury when I stepped off the boat and onto the train that deposited me at the railroad station" then at the intersection of Meadow and Bank Streets. "The town has changed some, since I came," he noted. The family settled in the Abrigator which "was not the best place in the city to live," and it was an entirely different environment than the sunny fields of Italy where he spent those first 8 years.

"For 2 years after I came to the Abrigator there was scarcely a day when I did not wear a black eye." Fresh off the boat, I wore knee pants and I spoke no English. This offended my tormentors I guess, and I was beaten almost daily when I didn't run fast enough. They spat on me, and they tore my clothes."

"But when I learned to fight and scrap back, and became a leader in my right, then I got my revenge. And I was beaten no more," he said, and the memory of that triumph, to judge by the glint in his eye, is still pleasurable all these decades later.

"But even then, fighting or no, my love was for music," he said.

"In Italy, I would always follow the traveling bands and the hurdy-gurdy. The hurdy-gurdy came most often, and I would walk out 5 or 6 miles to meet it, just so that I could tag along its side on its travels to the village.

"None of us, parents or brothers, then played instruments—but we all, always, loved and appreciated music. I think it is the beautiful Italian countryside, the blue sky, the sun, the fields, that breed things artistic.

"As a small child in Italy I thought of nothing but music; I dreamed music. And so it remained."

It was in Waterbury, however, that the violin came into his life, and the meeting was in the old Quarter Store on Grand Street, where a violinist performed every Wednesday and Saturday evening for the benefit of patrons of the sheet music counter. "Whenever he played, I could be found posted against the rail," he said.

He soon received his own violin, and then "I studied hard, very hard. I exhausted my teachers, so there were no more here." Then nervous and excited, he went to Yale University to be auditioned by the great Troostwyck who told him, the words never forgotten, "Calm yourself. You have more talent than is good for you."

A little later he received similar praise from Percy Granger. The great pianist, on an autographed photo he gave the young musician wrote, "You have great talent. You have the future of a Tosc." "I blush to tell you this," the maestro said. "I do not display the photograph. But it is so."

After the Yale audition, he went to the Von Ende School in New York City, and at the ripe old age of 17 began teaching there as well as studying. Exhausting this, he began at the Washington Square College of New York University where he studied under Maximillion Pilzer, the concert master of the New York Philharmonic, and then under Franz Kneisel who directed the Kneisel quartet.

JOINS ORCHESTRAS

His studies completed, he joined several orchestras and played throughout New England and New York for the next several years, including a stint as first viola with the old Washington Square Orchestra.

Then he returned to Waterbury to settle down, open his own school and raise his family.

He realized he was developing some fine violinists in his school and finally, in 1925, for reasons he described as selfish (he wanted a showcase for his pupils) he founded the People's String Orchestra.

In those pre-TV and popular radio days, the only music provided the city was through traveling troupes and the little symphony which is described as being more social in nature than musical, and which gave a pleasant little concert once a year. It did not satisfy DiCecco's idea of music.

His amateur pupils, who were doctors, nurses, accountants, and architects, were joined by three professional cellists from New Haven, and these in turn brought in more musicians, until finally there were about 60 in all who took part in concerts in the old Buckingham Auditorium.

DiCecco was then invited to take over the direction of the Newtown Orchestral Society by its parti-time conductor, the Reverend Paul Cullen. This group, orginally 8 or 10 members, was quickly enlarged to about 50 musicians, and included among its members the author, Hendrick Van Loon, New York Sun music critic, Henry Simon, Mrs. Stuart Chase, and the two teenage children of children of Raymond Gram Swing.

It was through the Newtown society that he met Grace Moore who became his good friend, and her protege, Dorothy Kirsten who made her musical debut with the Newtown orchestra under DiCecco. The orchestra played together until World War II when it gradually broke up.

While still conducting in Newtown, he decided to again organize a Waterbury orchestra, again "for my pupils, and also for the city."

His early work with his new Waterbury Civic Orchestra was nothing short of heroic, and working like a human dynamo he bought the music, arranged it, interviewed performers, conducted lessons, and rehearsals, wrote stories for the newspayer, and letters, made posters, sold tickets, neglected everything else in his life to keep it going. He said "It was a hard time. But I loved it. It was what I wanted."

After a year and a half of this frantic activity, he decided that while the orchestra was very good, he needed to get organized. He wrote letters to prominent people explaining his cause, and enlisted the aid of several who became members of a board of directors headed by President William J. Pape; Vice President John P. Elton, and Secretary John Monagan, "who was just a boy then."

"It was John who said, 'What if there is a deficit? Who will stand it?' and I said, 'I will,' and there was—and I did," said DiCecco, explaining how the orchestra weathered financial crisis after crisis for much of its 25 years.

For many of those years, he worked without salary, and then he was finally paid the magnificent sum of $900 a year, and then finally, $2,700 for what amounted to a full-time job.

And in the midst of this, he still found time to organize a junior symphony orchestra which played for several years; and the symphony chorale, a group of 125 voices which for 8 or 9 years presented requiems with the full orchestra in Wilby Auditorium.

But financial crisis continued to follow crisis, until the much publicized orchestra crisis in 1962 when new board members and old disagreed in a split that resulted in the city acquiring two orchestras, where there had been one—the Waterbury Symphony, and the new DiCecco orchestra, the Waterbury Philharmonic Society.

The new philharmonic orchestra still has its problems, but they do not seem insoluble, and it performs on schedule. In addition during its 3 short years has brought live opera to Waterbury twice, "Traviata" and "LaBoheme," and is now preparing for the third, "Butterfly," to be presented this spring as the finale to the philharmonic winter concert series which begins Saturday in Wilby.

So DiCecco, at 70, shows no signs of slowing down. He is still enthusiastic about teaching and brings his string ensemble through the city schools without change for "introduction to music" concerts where he demonstrates the instruments, discusses their physical characteristics and role in the orchestra, and describes his especially arranged music to the children before it is played.

And, as ever, both he and Mrs. DiCecco, an accomplished musician in her own right, teach young hopefuls in the school.

As for growing old, DiCecco doesn't really believe in it, and at the same time, since one must grow old if one is to survive, he believs it should be done right.

"It is too bad that in this country every age must live in its own compartments," he said, "with most compartment occupants striving to be in the one next younger."

"When a woman gets a little plump, for example, and loses that youthful freshness," he said, "many seem to lose themselves. They falsify their bodies, their hair, they cover their skins with makeups so that nothing about them is real. They are all false. They throw away all of the beauty of maturity, the softness that comes with years and makes the face so expressive.

"Before, age was a matter of great pride. You would say, 'How old are you?' and your friends would answer and you would say, 'How marvelous.' "

"Now," he said, "people are shocked at mature age. 'Too bad,' they say, 'How very old.' "

But how old indeed, even today, depends on who.

Ask any DiCecco fan and say, "DiCecco is 70," and they will answer, "Yes, how marvelous."

The President's Message on Transportation: Another Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on transportation proposed, among other matters, to transfer the Maritime Administration to a new Department of Transportation, and to submit legislation to improve safety measures and guarantees of financial responsibility on the part of owners and operators of passenger-carrying vessels sailing from our ports. My own initial reaction to the President's message and these particular proposals appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1966.

On February 18 and 19, 1966, the executive board of the Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, expressed its opinion by unanimously adopting two resolutions bearing directly upon both the status of the Maritime Administration and foreign-flag passenger cruise ships. In the interest of insuring that these views are made known to my colleagues, the full text of the two resolutions is set forth below.

INDEPENDENT FEDERAL MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Whereas, the creation of an independent agency to administer this country's maritime laws would focus greater attention in the American merchant marine, with the ultimate objective of revitalizing the industry and enabling the United States to meet its foreign commerce needs and defense commitments pursuant to the policy set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; and

Whereas as one of the numerous branches of the Department of Commerce, the present Maritime Administration is forced to compete with the other programs administered by that Department, resulting in the failure of the Maritime Administration to properly administer the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; and

Whereas the present structure of the Maritime Administration constitutes an inconsistency in government organization, since the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 created an independent status for aviation in a Federal Aviation Administration; and

Whereas the organizational structure of the present Maritime Administration has caused the alteration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 by vesting final authority for the promotion of merchant marine policy in the Secretary of Commerce thereby eliminating the judicial and procedural protections inherent in an autonomous board as provided for in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO urges the passage of legislation creating an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution upon adoption be forwarded to the chairman and members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the chairman and members of the Senate Commerce Committee, urging the passage of legislation creating an independent Federal Maritime Administration as this would alleviate the many problems cited above and would constitute the first step in the revitalization of the U.S.-flag merchant marine.

Unanimously adopted.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR CRUISE SHIPS

Whereas the lower safety standards of the *Yarmouth Castle* resulted in the loss of the lives of many American citizens; and

Whereas the perpetuation of such lower standards continues to place the lives of many unsuspecting American travelers in jeopardy; and

Whereas the blatant advertising campaign used by the operators of foreign-flag cruise ships, such as the *Bahama Star* (Panamanian registry) and the *Ariadne* (Liberian registry), continues to misrepresent and misinform the American public as to the safety standards applicable aboard the vessels, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, urges the enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States aimed at imposing the same safety standards on foreign-flag cruise ships as are applicable for U.S.-flag vessels and calls upon the Department of State to take steps to renegotiate the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea so as to upgrade the safety standards of all foreign-flag vessels plying the oceans of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption of the foregoing, copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman and members of the Senate Commerce Committee; the chairman and members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Secretary of State, urging immediate action.

Unanimously adopted.

Unrelated Business Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, I participated in a panel discussion for the annual midwinter meeting of the American Business Press at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. Other participants were Mr. Mortimer M. Caplin, Mr. William Knox, special adviser on Scientific and Technical Information in the Executive Office of the President, and Robert Saltzstein, counsel for American Business Press.

The forum was devoted to Washington considerations affecting the business press. I discussed the need of increased expenditures for postal mechanization. Mr. Knox covered the necessity of disseminating results of the $16 billion per annum Federal Government research program. Mr. Caplin discussed the need for applying the unrelated business tax to profits derived from advertising in publications issued by tax-exempt organizations.

Mr. Caplin's comments on this subject are of the utmost importance, particularly in view of the Treasury Department's current interest in the subject. Mr. Caplin's statement, which I include in the RECORD, carries forward the President's request to Congress to "deal with abuses of tax-exempt private foundations."

However, it is that portion of his remarks relating to Treasury's proposed regulations on advertising which I believe so timely and significant. I likewise concur that these regulations ought to be issued soon, and commend the comments of the former Commissioner of Internal Revenue to all Members of Congress, as most thoughtful.

The above mentioned follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF MORTIMER M. CAPLIN ON "LEGISLATION TO CURB BUSINESS COMPETITION FROM TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS"

In his economic report of January 27, 1966, the President stated: "Against a background calling for fiscal restraint, I cannot this year endorse any specific legislative measure, however meritorious, involving significant net tax reduction." The President did go on to state, however, that "improvement of our tax system is a continuing need which will concern this administration, and which deserves the support of all Americans." "We must constantly seek," he said "improvements in the tax code in the interests of equity and of sound economic policy."

One major goal was said to be "simplification of the tax law."

Another stated aim was "a more equitable distribution of the tax load."

"Finally," the President stated, "we must review special tax preferences. In a fully employed economy, special tax benefits to stimulate some activities or investments mean that we will have less of other activities."

One specific tax reform was selected, which the President said " can be accomplished this year." With that he added: "I call upon the Congress to deal with abuses of tax-exempt private foundations."

Why is the subject of tax abuses by private foundations of interest to the American Business Press, an association of specialized business publications?

TREASURY REPORT ON FOUNDATIONS

In response to the investigation and reports of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, the Treasury Department on February 2, 1965, issued a report on private foundations. Overall, the record of foundations was found to be a good one. Most foundations substantially comply with the tax law. At the same time, instances of serious abuse were pointed to, and corrective legislation was called for.

The Treasury listed six categories of major problems:

1. Self-dealing.
2. Delay in benefits to charity.
3. Family use of foundations to control corporate and other properties.
4. Financial transactions unrelated to charitable functions.
5. Need to broaden foundation management.
6. Foundation involvement in business activities.

It is this last finding, "foundation involvement in business," that particularly concerns the American Business Press, as well as any other group of businessmen. Business activities of foundations and other tax-exempt organizations are not isolated phenomena. On the contrary, many of these organizations are deeply involved in active business, which creates serious difficulties.

First, tax exemption gives them a sharp competitive advantage over regular businesses.

Second, the exempt status provides opportunities and temptations for varied forms of self-dealing.

Third, the management of these exempt organizations is diverted to concentrate on commercial operations rather than the stated purposes of the organization which gave rise to tax exemption. To use the words of the Treasury report: "Business may become the end of the organization; charity, an insufficiently considered and mechanically accomplished afterthought."

The competitive advantages of tax-exempt organizations are great. At the outset, they are free of the normal demands of investors for profits and dividend distributions. Instead, free of tax, they can reinvest the greater part of their profits in expansion and modernization. These organizations are not subject to the tax rules which prohibit unreasonable accumulations of income for the purpose of avoiding the tax on shareholders. Thus, their capital buildup can be accomplished on a sustained basis, augmented by such items as dues and other deductible contributions; dividends, interest, rent and other types of passive income; and by a type of income referred to as related business income.

In evaluating the business advantages of tax-exempt organizations, the Treasury pointed out that these advantages "contribute materially to the ability * * * to subsidize its businesses during periods of difficulty, and to expand them during periods of growth." Regular businesses, in turn, "must pay for their acquisition, finance their operations, and support their expansion programs with the funds which remain after taxes have been paid."

Many businesses conducted by tax-exempt organizations can cut prices and still have a normal profit return. Is it reasonable or equitable to ask a fully taxed business to function in the marketplace against this type of unfair competition? Does this type of special tax preference meet President Johnson's standard of tax equity and of sound economic policy?

The answer readily suggests itself: Tax-exempt organizations competing side by side with regular business enterprises should pay their way. They should not be able to trade on their tax exemption or other tax benefits. They should meet competitors on an equal tax footing, and carry their fair share of the Nation's tax burden. This applies to all tax-exempt organizations, foundations or otherwise, as well as to those with other tax privileges.

TAXATION OF UNRELATED BUSINESS INCOME

In 1950, Congress attempted to cope with certain aspects of business competition from exempt organizations. Congress provided for taxation of the income derived from any unrelated trade or business covering, for example, such items as the income earned by New York University from a macaroni business, as well as other types of unrelated activities. The statutory language used was "any trade or business the conduct of which is not substantially related (aside from the need of such organization for income or funds or the use it makes of the profits derived) to the exercise or performance by such organization of its charitable, education, or other purpose or function constituting the basis of its exemption."

Although this tax on unrelated business income has been on the statute books for over 15 years, the law has been slow in developing on the exact meaning of this term. What are the outer limits of unrelated business income?

One thing is clear: Congress was seeking to correct an abuse and to eliminate unfair competition from tax-exempt organizations. As the tax-writing committees indicated in their 1943 studies, they approached the problem "with the view to closing this existing loophole and requiring the payment of tax and the protection of legitimate companies against this unfair competitive situation." It is plain that the concept of unrelated business income should be broadly interpreted and that there should be brought within its broad sweep (1) any regularly conducted business activity of a tax-exempt organization (2) which competes side by side with an ordinary taxable business entity, and (3) which carries out its affairs much in the same manner as its taxable competitors.

PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO TAX ADVERTISING INCOME

Today the Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department are at the crossroads in reaching an important decision on the taxability of unrelated business income. The pending issue relates to the taxability of the advertising revenue of otherwise tax-exempt publications.

Many organizations, in the name of education or charity or otherwise, have published and distributed magazines and other periodicals under the claim that the income therefrom is related to their principal purpose and therefore is not subject to tax. Further, these tax-exempt organizations urge that the advertising revenue derived by them in connection with these publications is similarly not "unrelated" business income, and is similarly not subject to tax. For some time the IRS and Treasury have been considering the advisability of publishing proposed regulations which would make it clear that this advertising revenue—aggressively pursued by many of these tax-exempt organizations—is not substantially related to the exercise or performance of charitable, educational or similar purposes.

The advertising revenue received by tax-exempt publications is sizable. It is estimated at over $70 million a year. The content of the advertising is often totally unrelated to the purposes of the magazine. These publishers frequently are in a position to cut their advertising rates, passing along to their customers part of the benefits of tax exemption. At times this is done without fanfare, with the fact speaking for itself; on other occasions, tax-exempt publications have engaged in active solicitation of advertising revenue, baldly stating that they were able to cut rates only because of their tax-exempt status.

Need I say more about the unfairness of this type of open competition? Need I say more about the sharp adverse reaction which emanates from the fully taxable businessman, who is forced to compete in this setting?

In my view, the Treasury would be fully justified and would be on sound legal grounds in proposing regulations which would impose a tax on the advertising revenue of otherwise tax-exempt publications. Such regulations would be entirely consistent with the major premise of the 1950 tax on unrelated business income. And I believe the Treasury should follow the policy written into the law and fashion regulations consistent with the viewpoint of eliminating this unfair competition of so-called nonprofit organizations.

LEGISLATION TO TAX "RELATED" BUSINESS INCOME

Beyond this, it is my hope that after the pending House Ways and Means Committee study of foundation abuses, Congress will see fit to propose legislation to tax the related business income—as well as the unrelated business income—of tax-exempt organizations. Some 15 years of history under the 1950 corrective legislation proves the inadequacy of this distinction in curbing abuses and unfair competition.

Today, for example, the publication of magazines or books might be considered related to the tax-exempt purposes of an organization created to foster education or the literary arts. If so, the organization could enter the publishing field in sharp competition with private business. The consequences are clear; for the problem of related business can be even more serious than that posed by unrelated business. Unrelated business income, despite other unfair competitive aspects, is at least subject to tax; profits from related business may be completely tax exempt.

To the private businessman actively competing with businesses controlled by tax-exempt organizations, it is inconsequential whether such business is related or unrelated to the tax-exempt purposes. As a minimum, his plea for equity asks that those entering the marketplace be placed on an equal tax footing.

Many exempt organizations are making a major contribution to our society. Most of them shy away from anything approaching active business functions. They rely primarily on passive income, such as contributions, dues, dividends, interest, rent, royalties, and the like. To them, the operation of a business would be regarded as incompatible with the traditional view of tax exemption, and altogether inappropriate and diversionary from their basic charitable purposes.

Tax exemption is a great privilege in our society; it is a privilege which should be respected and handled with care. With it goes a large measure of responsibility.

To merit this privilege exempt organizations must retain public confidence. They should get out of active business and stick to their charitable or educational purposes. For their financing they should rely on passive income of the types discussed above.

Our governmental leaders are becoming more and more sensitive to the growing problems created by business activities of exempt organizations. Positive action at this time can help cure the resulting distortion and inequities which serve only to weaken our free, competitive enterprise system.

It is my hope that, as a part of the action on foundations called for by the President, this entire issue will be met head on, both by the Treasury and the Congress, and that the result will be full taxation of all income of business activities conducted by exempt organizations—whether related or unrelated to their educational, scientific, or charitable purposes.

McNamara Farewell: "Thanks for Use of Hall"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from Michigan, Pat McNamara, will not be forgotten in his retirement.

Senator McNamara has eschewed pretense and fancy public relations during his two terms as U.S. Senator. With a brevity and terseness of expression that was truly refreshing, he went to the heart of issues and we are the better for it. Indeed, his legislative contributions in education and medical care for the aged have been historic.

I am proud to have served in the Michigan delegation under his leadership.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the Record a recent informal testimonial written by the distinguished syndicated columnist, Edwin A. Lahey. The article follows:

McNamara Farewell: "Thanks for Use of Hall"

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

Washington.—It can be truly said of Senator Pat McNamara that Washington never got to him.

Pat quits public life at the end of this session of Congress. And his valedictory to the people of Michigan who sent him to the U.S. Senate for two terms will be as moving, in its own way, as Washington's farewell address.

The Senator tried the valedictory on me at lunch the other day. When he walks out of the Chambers of the greatest deliberative body on earth, he will just say:

"Thanks for the use of the Hall."

It takes a pretty good man to leave this town with the same modesty and sense of humor that he had when he was sworn in to high office. Senator McNamara and his wife Mary both have been untouched by Washington. Mary is probably the only Senate wife in modern history who does her husband's shirts.

McNamara has had the greatest respect for the office of Senator, and for his powerful posts on the Senate Labor and Public Works Committees. This respect for the office he occupies has given Pat a fierce spirit of independence. The White House, the labor leaders who grew up with him, have all felt the impact of the McNamara independence.

The real secret of McNamara's stature is that he has never confused himself personally with the office. He has never lost the sense of agency, the feeling that he represented the people of Michigan. He always knew that intrinsically, Pat McNamara was a steamfitter who got lucky.

The sense of agency and the humility that has gone with it during his 12 years in the U.S. Senate now make it possible for Pat McNamara to walk off the world stage without tears.

"What the hell," says Senator Pat gruffly, munching away at a Senate dining room steak with a gusto that would shock his physician, "People like you and me never had anything in life, and it isn't so hard to step out for younger people.

"These purple robes of office never overwhelmed me when I came here, and putting them off isn't going to fracture me when I go away."

Pat McNamara did not have to quit the Senate. The respect for him would probably have made reelection for a third term easy, despite his age. (He will be 72 on October 4.)

The greatest tribute that could be paid to McNamara is that not for one moment has he ever entertained the desire to remain in the spotlight, or to have another term in the Senate for reasons of personal glorification.

For months it has been in the cards that the Senator would announce his intention to retire this year. For those hoping to succeed McNamara in the Senate, the announcement seemed a long time coming.

But I can testify personally that Senator Pat's timing for his announcement was at all times dictated by concerns other than his own career.

Pat and Mary McNamara will return to Detroit late this year as rare examples of people in high places who were never touched by the temptations of the Washington atmosphere. They will return owing nobody anything, with nobody owning them, and with the freedom and sense of independence that gives such an appropriateness to Pat's farewell address:

"Thanks for the use of the Hall."

Why U.S. Viet Policy Lacks Friends—Our Credibility Destroyed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion of late as to the derivation of the term "credibility gap."

I personally do not believe it is important to pinpoint the term's derivation. I do, however, believe it is important to the future of our Nation to recognize that there is a problem of credibility today.

I submit the following article from the December 5, 1965, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times, in which Thomas B. Rose discusses the credibility rating of the U.S. Government:

Why U.S. Viet Policy Lacks Friends—Our Credibility Destroyed

(By Thomas B. Ross)

Washington.—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has offered an unusually frank explanation of why the United States is having such difficulty winning friends for its Vietnamese policy: "The trouble is our credibility was destroyed."

McNamara was referring specifically, in an interview last week, to the disclosure that the United States, despite repeated denials, had rejected a peace feeler by Communist North Vietnam in the fall of 1964.

The United States, as this reporter recently learned during an extensive trip through Africa and the Middle East, is suffering from a crisis of credibility.

Not only doctrainaire leftists and neutrals but even those who consider themselves friends of the United States have come to suspect the official statements of the U.S. Government.

And the suspicion, as this reporter learned at a White House conference here last week, now has spread to sizable portions of the American public, particularly in the academic community.

Persistently, conference participants demanded to know why the United States did not stop its bombing of North Vietnam in an effort to promote negotiations.

Repeatedly, Government spokesmen replied that North Vietnam constantly had rebuffed diplomatic appeals by the United States that it indicate some willingness to make a peace gesture in return for a halt in the air raids.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk delivered probably his most eloquent explanation of U.S. policy in an attempt to convince the critics. But despite a standing ovation for his impassioned efforts, it was evident that he had made few converts.

Many of the Vietnam protesters of course, have closed their minds. But others have reluctantly fallen into a state of disbelief under the impact of a long string of misleading statements by the leaders of their Government.

Those who work for the Government, in other nations as well as here, have devolped a protective sophistication in such matters. (Diplomats at the United Nations reportedly dismissed the disclosure about the North Vietnamese peace feeler as a commonplace example of governmental truth shaving.)

But the earnest, sometimes innocent, people who are attracted to the Vietnam policy protests find it difficult to tolerate such practices. They are not close enough to the sources of information to read between the lines, nor close enought to the seats of power to sympathize with the problems of Government officials.

They have followed the news closely enough, however, to recall that high government officials have been caught repeatedly in the last few years in erroneous statements about Vietnam, the Bay of Pigs, the U-2 spy plane, and the Cuban missile crisis.

They have developed an uneasy feeling that information about Government policy is being manipulated in such a way that even the conscientious citizen is being deprived of the rudimentary material upon which to base an informed opinion.

Government officials, of course, have protested that this is grossly unfair. They have insisted, as did Rusk in his speech last week, that the American people are given more information about their Government than any other citizens in the world.

Misleading statements, they have declared, are issued only at rare intervals and only to protect vital national interests. In short, they have tended to dismiss the problem out of hand as an affront to their honesty and integrity.

But now thousands of Americans are being asked to give their lives in Vietnam on faith that their leaders have told the truth to them about the war they are fighting. The crisis in credibility is no longer a personal problem for officialdom. It has become a national problem of the first magnitude.

Federal Meat Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record an editorial from the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle which comments on the pending legislation to shift the cost of Federal meat inspection from the Government to the meat industry.

I join the Press-Chronicle in opposing this proposed legislation.

The following editorial offers some food for thought, and I pass it along to the readers of the Record:

Keep It as It Is

A bill has been introduced in Congress to shift the cost of Federal meat inspection from the Government to the meat industry. It has met with strong criticism from industry leaders.

A statement by the American Meat Institute, the National Independent Meat Packers Association, and the Western States Meat Packers Association goes to the heart of the matter. In their words, "In 1906, Congress established the principle that the cost of meat inspection should be borne by the Government as an essential public health service. This principle was reaffirmed by the Congress in 1948.

"It is wrong in principle and contrary to the public interest when a regulatory agency of the Government is paid for by the industry it regulates."

Meat inspection is not a voluntary service. It is mandatory for products moving in interstate commerce and currently covers about 85 percent of all commercial livestock slaughter in this country. Meat inspection is a public health activity. It is administered by a Government agency, the Department of Agriculture. It is a proper obligation of the Government.

Fifth District of Kansas Responds to Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the response to my questionnaire for the residents of the Fifth District of Kansas has been overwhelming this year. The returns have not been coming in by the hundreds—they are coming in by the thousands, and our mail is delivered by the bag these days.

A great many of the questionnaires have been accompanied by letters from concerned constituents. One can judge by the remarks in the letters how well this form of communication is being received by the people.

Recently I received a letter from a constituent in Chanute, Kans., explaining how the people in her township plan to hold a meeting to discuss the questions raised in my questionnaire. With the consent granted I want to share this with those who might be interested. The letter follows:

Dear Friend Joe: This evening we have a township meeting for Duck Creek and Talley-Rand at La Fontaine School to discuss your questionnaire and get the opinions of all who will come. Don Olenhouse will M.C. the meeting, have a short program, and refreshments after.

I'm on a slow train to Kansas City—seems slow—and will catch a jet there for Omaha which won't take long. My mother hasn't been very well and went to the hospital Tuesday and then last night we got a call she had a coronary heart attack and that today and tomorrow will be the crucial time.

I did so want to be at the meeting but had worked up some facts on the issues you mention and Mary Compton will take my place. Last night about 11 we took the cookies I baked and the chocolate cake (door prize) and punch ingredients and coffee to their house and talked with Don. He said they'd do their best to get their opinions and would attempt to draw questions and answers from the audience and also to acquaint those who aren't too "interested in politics" with your good record, etc., for the fifth district.

I must go home—had planned to go Monday—then Friday, but after last evening's call felt it was urgent. I'm praying she will get along OK and enjoy a few more years with her family. She is 74 which isn't so old these days, but she has other things which complicate matters—very poor kidneys. Guess I'd never be ready to lose her, so will pray for her recovery and that she might not suffer great pain.

I don't know when I'll be back. Bob will be here on the job unless we need him there and plans to go to the meeting to help clean up after, etc., and help in any way.

We had discussed the questionnaire and are sending it in and will send the opinions of those there tonight within a week. Hope we get a good crowd, but if even 25 come, I'll feel it was worth every bit of effort.

Sincerely yours,

—— ——.

Clear Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the President now has what he needs—a clear authority to proceed to a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

This is the editorial opinion of the Charleston Daily Mail, which believes it has been made clear to all that the people and their representatives fully support the administration policies in Vietnam.

The paper states:

The choice is fairly simple, the United States can disengage. Or it can continue to apply the pressure until the Communists recognize that they, too, are confronted with the hard facts.

Believing that others will want to read this editorial in full, I herewith insert it in the Record.

The article follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, Mar. 3, 1966]

On a Show of Hands, Mr. Johnson Wins Full Authority To Proceed

As much as anyone can, President Johnson has won the great debate over Vietnam. And he has won it fairly, handily and with a margin of safety which should dispose of, for the time being, any impression that the United States is joined in a war its people and their representatives do not support.

In the House of Representatives, the vote on a $4.8 billion appropriations bill, was 392 to 4, or just about as unanimously as the House ever acts. In the Senate, on a companion measure, the vote was 93 to 2. And to make it perfectly clear, the Senate also defeated a motion by Senator Wayne Morse to repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution—92 to 5.

This is still short of a declaration of war and does not meet the objections of those who wish they could erase the history of the past 10 years. But this aside, it clears the air and reestablishes a sound basis for a continued war on or negotiation with Hanoi.

The Morses, the Gruenings and the Fulbrights have had their chance. With history to guide them, they are wiser now than they were then, and on points, at least, they are often right. The American policy in Vietnam has not been marked by much foresight. The fact remains that in Vietnam the United States is confronted by a condition, not a theory, and the President must deal with the realities, not with the regrets that they induce.

The choice is fairly simple: The United States can disengage. Or it can continue to apply the pressure until the Communists recognize that they, too, are confronted with the hard facts.

How much damage has been done by encouraging them to believe that the President might yield under pressure on the home front is problematical. In any case, they can scarcely misread the rollcall or draw from it any encouragement.

As always, the dissident and fractious minority makes the most noise. In their way, they, too, perform a service. But on a show of hands, the President has what he needs—a clear authority to proceed to a negotiated peace.

How L.B.J. Is Running the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our President is a past master at the art of politics: he is not a man who makes hasty or snap decisions and his conduct of the war in Vietnam is an excellent demonstration of that fact.

The following article by Roscoe Drummond points out the salient features of this policy. The article appeared in the March 13, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune and follows:

HOW L.B.J. IS RUNNING THE WAR

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—I would like to say a good word about President Johnson's management of the Vietnam war.

Obviously there is a great risk of timidly doing too little to arrest the aggression.

Obviously there is great danger of recklessly doing so much that Red China enters the fighting.

With these two opposite perils in mind, I cannot escape the feeling that many more Americans will come to see that the President is bringing to bear on the conduct of the war wisdom, caution, and determination.

What is the touchstone of wisdom in our role in Vietnam? Surely it is to do whatever is needed to secure South Vietnam from conquest and to use our massive military power in such a prudent and measured manner that Peiping is given no legitimate reason to enter the war.

Such a course will not get the easy plaudits of those who want to win quickly at any cost by bombing North Vietnam to bits.

Such a course will not get the praise of those who want to quit at any cost by pulling out.

Such a course will not get a high Gallup rating from those who suggest we haven't the resources to defend South Vietnam and that, anyway, a little aggression in southeast Asia is no concern to the United States.

As these conflicting views find their level in public opinion, I believe that the Nation, on reflection, will feel even more reassured that Gen. Curtis LeMay is not deciding the bombing over North Vietnam, that WAYNE MORSE is not managing the defense of South Vietnam, and that Senator FULBRIGHT is not deciding where aggression concerns the United States and where it doesn't.

During the period when he was determining how the mounting attacks directed from Hanoi should be met, President Johnson—as reported by Charles Roberts in his book, "L.B.J.'s Inner Circle"—remarked to his intimates: "I'm not going north with Curtis LeMay and I'm not going south with WAYNE MORSE."

Fortunately, the President is not easily pressured either by events or by extremist advice.

He did not act hastily; he acted deliberately.

He did not act recklessly; he acted with great care.

He did not act timidly; he committed the United States to do whatever is necessary to defend South Vietnam successfully—but no more.

These are the ingredients of mind which have marked the President's course in Vietnam—deliberateness, prudence, and determination.

What they have produced is a very clear and properly limited objective: To keep South Vietnam from being taken over by force.

And how is he acting to make it least likely that Red China will enter the war?

He is not using U.S. air power to bomb cities in the north.

He is not sending U.S. ground troops to occupy any part of North Vietnam.

He is not seeking the downfall of the Hanoi regime.

He is not asking for the unconditional surrender of Hanoi. He is asking only for an unconditional end to aggression against its neighbor.

Few Americans want to desert South Vietnam.

Few Americans want to wage the war so recklessly as to tempt Peiping to enter it.

The ingredients of President Johnson's conduct of the war—deliberateness, prudence, and determination—are the best assurance we can win without spreading it.

Uncle Stingy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular newspaper columnists in Santa Clara County in my congressional district is Mr. Frank Freeman, who writes a daily column in the San Jose Mercury entitled "Here 'Tis." Frank is well known by everyone, is highly respected, and his column, which usually deals with local personalities, is widely read. In a recent column, he made some points which concern national policies and I feel that they are so well done they should be brought to the attention of the entire House:

HERE 'TIS: UNCLE STINGY?

(By Frank Freeman)

Mrs. J. T. Bryant, of 1009 Corvette Drive, read it in her old hometown paper which picked it up from the Union County Leader of Clayton, N. Mex., so here's passing it along again—a sort of open letter to one Uncle Samuel, like so: "Hey, Uncle, how much does it cost to rear a child? You allow us taxpayers only $600 a year to feed, clothe, house, and train a youngster. Yet to feed, clothe, house, and train a youngster in your Federal Government Job Corps you spent $7,000 a year. Now, which is the correct figure? Either we're allowing you too much or you're not allowing us enough.

"You allow taxpaying parents a $600 deduction for the care and feeding of each child—yet under the Cuban refugee program you assume minimal upkeep requires $1,200 a year—and if the Cuban boy or girl is attending school, an extra $1,000 a year. How come you shortchange the homefolks? In the austere environs of a Federal prison, you have discovered that it costs—to maintain one persons, with no frills, no luxuries, and no borrowing Dad's car—$2,300 per year. By what rule of thumb do you estimate that Mom and Dad can do it for one-fourth that amount? Under social security, you will pay $168 a month to maintain the elderly. What makes you think we can maintain our young'uns on $50 a month?

"And, Uncle, your VISTA program (Volunteers in Service to America) spent $3.1 million this last fiscal year to turn out only 202 trainees. That indicates that the cost of maintaining and training one youth for 1 year is more than $15,000. Then how come we taxpaying parents get an exemption of only $600 to maintain and train one youth for 1 year?

"Or let's see how much you spend upkeeping one youngster in military uniform. House, $55.20 a month. Food, $30.27 a month. Clothing upkeep, $4.20 a month. That comes to $1,076.04 a year. How in the world do you expect parents to provide all these things, plus clothes, recreation, books, medicine, for $600 a year? With your own figures you admit it can't be done. With all our prosperity, you, Uncle, are still spending per year $2.9 billion more for relief than during the depths of the depression. So it may be that you are uncommonly extravagant. However we try to rationalize and explain you and excuse you, it is still a hurtful affront when you allow us hard-working, dues-paying homefolks only $600 a year to rear a legitimate child—while you, under ADC, will pay more than $800 a year to upkeep an illegitimate one."

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the peoples in the Balkan Peninsula is most characteristically marked by their subjugation to Ottoman Turkish despotism until the late 19th century. For more than 400 years these peoples, among the stanchest defenders of their freedom in Europe, lived under the ruthless regime of the sultans. The Bulgarian people suffered the same fate, and not until the 1870's were they able, with the effective aid of czarist Russia, to free themselves. This was accomplished during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78. Then Turkey was defeated, and as one of the conditions of the ensuing peace Russia secured Bulgaria's freedom. Thus the peace treaty signed on March 3, 1878, terminating that war, marked Bulgaria's liberation from Ottoman Turkish tyranny, and since that day March 3 has become a Bulgarian national holiday.

Today when the Bulgarian people are deprived of their freedom once more and are suffering under Communist totalitarianism, which in many ways seems more callous and ruthless than the regime of the sultans, that memorable day of 88 years ago naturally looms large in their modern history. They rightly think of it as the day which ushered in a new era for them, marking an important turning point in their national political history. Since that epoch-making event the Bulgarian people have endured much suffering and misery. They went through the two World Wars, and in neither of these wars were they the gainers. Although they were the losers in both, their loss at the end of the last war was the more tragic because they expected, at the very least, to retain their freedom. The rudest shock they experienced was in 1945, when they found themselves imprisoned in their homeland, sealed off from the free world, and kept behind the Iron Curtain.

Since 1945 the Bulgarians have lived under a Communist regime imposed and maintained over them by the Kremlin. Sad and tragic as their lot has been for more than two decades, they have not given up their hope for freedom, their goal of national independence. On the 88th anniversary observance of Bulgarian Liberation Day, let us all hope that soon they will again attain their goal and live in peace in their homeland.

Kansas Extension Service Adjusts to the Changing Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. James A. McCain, president of Kansas State University, which discusses the important contributions of the Cooperative Extension Service to the people of Kansas. This article by President McCain was published in the February 19, 1966, issue of the Kansas Farmer.

The importance of Dr. McCain's observations regarding increased demands upon extension services take on added significance in view of the President's budget recommendations for fiscal 1967.

The proposed budget now under consideration would reduce existing extension funds available in Kansas by $183,112. The varied services provided by the Cooperative Extension Service in Kansas and elsewhere have contributed to a better life, not only for people on the farm, but for those who reside in suburban and urban areas.

Dr. McCain's article follows:

[From the Kansas Farmer, Feb. 19, 1966]

KANSAS EXTENSION SERVICE ADJUSTS TO THE CHANGING TIMES

(By Dr. James A. McCain)

For more than half a century the Cooperative Extension Service at Kansas State University has contributed enormously to the economic and intellectual progress of Kansas people.

Through these years, Extension—working cooperatively with university research—has helped make Kansas agriculture a miracle of production. The Extension 4–H Club program has developed admirable qualities of character, service, and leadership in successive generations of farm youth. And most recently Cooperative Extension, through its services to the agri-businesses, has contributed significantly to industrial growth.

Cooperative Extension, as our society grew more complex during this half century, has adapted and adjusted its activities to changing conditions. Now Extension is on the threshold of another transition in its task of carrying university knowledge to Kansas people.

Two developments are pointing the way: First, the increasing size and specialization of farms, coupled with population shift from farm to city, challenge the effectiveness of the traditional county organization.

Secondly, the mechanism of Cooperative Extension may soon be enlisted for programs of industrial service designed to assist small businesses and in other ways stimulate general economic development. The tremendous potential for such a program already has been shown in the services of Cooperative Extension to various agri-businesses.

Land-grant university administrators throughout the country agree that the Cooperative Extension Service must broaden its base to tap more of the total university resources. We can soon expect Extension to draw on the more than three score departments at Kansas State University.

To alter the local organization for Extension will require greater specialization on the part of personnel. Doctors, automobile mechanics, and lawyers, long ago saw the wisdom and advantages of specialization. The county agricultural agent should be no exception to this trend. Today, he is being called upon for many new technical services requiring the skills of a variety of experts.

Education is another factor which has stimulated the need for greater specialization. Rural families of today have a high level of scientific understanding. Consequently, they demand more professional competency in Extension personnel. In response to this demand, more of the Kansas county agricultural agents are pursuing advanced study for higher degrees.

However, Extension still faces the problem of how to provide such specialized professional competence in each of our 105 Kansas counties. One promising solution is to replace the county extension unit with an area organization encompassing several counties. Changes in rural living patterns and the growing urbanization in traditional agricultural sections of the county support such a reorganization.

Under this area plan, Extension specialists with talents fitted to the requirements of a particular multicounty area would be housed in a central office within the area. These specialists would be members of the university faculty trained in the specific fields related to the area they would serve, such as beef cattle nutrition, marketing, horticulture, agricultural engineering, public affairs, or child development.

These area extension centers would be designed to give all the people access to all university resources. In addition to making specialists immediately available for field problems, the centers would provide facilities for meetings and classes covering a wide range of subjects and would house libraries and the latest teaching equipment.

Many advantages might be expected from this new type of extension organization. A group of southwest Kansas counties employing irrigation, for example, could profit from the services of a resident irrigation engineer.

A dairy specialist might be stationed in east central Kansas to serve the multimillion dollar dairy industry there. Crop and livestock specialists would, of course, be required in many parts of the State as would specialists in food, clothing, family health, and youth programs.

Kansas State University, with a notable record of pioneering in extension, already has pilot area projects underway with highly encouraging results.

An area horticulturist to be located at Ulysses, and Dean Dicken, an agronomist at Hiawatha, illustrate how area specialists can perform. The onlocation work of these two men, supported by university research and nearbly county agents, is effectively promoting the agricultural developments of counties in the southwestern and northeastern areas of Kansas.

Southwest Kansas, for example, has the potential to produce profitable horticultural crops. A Kansas State specialist is working with farmers in such a program.

Cantaloups grown in the area are now being marketed in such distant points as New York, Chicago, and St. Louis.

In a six-county area of northeast Kansas, Dicken is concerned primarily with weed control and soil fertility. In 3 years, Dicken and his farmers have made northeast Kansas an agricultural showplace.

Achievements in Brown County are typical. In November 1962 Brown County farmers initiated an intensified soil fertility program in cooperation with extension. Examinations of some 1,600 soil samples demonstrated need for more fertilizer to correct soil deficiencies which, in turn, were depressing crop yields.

About 65 percent of the farmers of the county took corrective measures, resulting in an increase of 145 percent in the use of nitrogen, 100 percent in phosphate, and 360 percent in lime. Corn, grain sorghum, and soybean production soared to new heights. The Brown County farm income for 1963 showed an increase of almost $2 million over 1962.

A pasture improvement program is underway in northeast Kansas. Tests show that bromegrass production can be increased 275 percent with only 53 pounds of added nitrogen an acre. This treatment has resulted in an average net profit of $17.76 per acre to the participating farmers. Tree, brush, and weed control demonstrations also have shown profitable results.

Thus, an area extension program has proved its capacity to achieve striking economic gains and thereby serve more effectively the specialized requirements of modern agriculture. The area program will be designed to transmit research results promptly to the various areas of the State.

Kansans can take deep pride from the fact that their cooperative extension service has been prompt to recognize and adapt to change. As agribusinesses have expanded in scope and variety, for example, extension has developed programs and appointed specialists in such new fields as feed manufacturing, farm machinery, marketing, and food retailing. We now have public affairs specialists who help farmers and rural people acquire a better understanding of public affairs and issues that involve agriculture. Kansas State economists, sociologists, and political scientists are participating in statewide redevelopment programs.

As families have moved from farm to city, extension has moved with them and today operates thriving 4-H Clubs and home economics units in towns, cities, and suburbs and assists urban families with their lawns, evergreens, shade trees, home gardens, flowers, and ornamental plants.

Of course, the demands for the services of home economists in extension work are growing. The need is increasing for specialists in such fields as child development, foods and nutrition, clothing, and family relations. The area extension program will require increasing numbers of such specialists.

The Death of Rabbi Morris Adler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the State of Michigan this week mourns the death of Rabbi Morris Adler, who died March 11 of a gunshot wound inflicted 28 days earlier by a mentally disturbed member of his congregation.

Rabbi Adler was a great humanitarian and religious leader who was known far beyond the boundaries of his congregation Shaarey Zedek, the largest conservative Jewish congregation in Detroit. In Israel, where he recently completed a sabbatical year, Rabbi Adler was regarded as one of the leading spokesmen of the Western World. He was one of the founders of the Detroit Round Table of Catholics, Protestants and Jews. During World War II, he served as a chaplain in the Pacific theater.

As a civic leader, he served on the State cultural commission, the Governor's Committee for Higher Education, the Governor's Commission on Problems of the Aging, the Fair Election Practices Commission and the Citizens' Committee for Equal Opportunity. He was chairman of the UAW Public Review Board, a final appeal board for union members.

With the death of Rabbi Adler, the world has lost a truly dedicated and inspiring leader, whose wisdom and guidance will be sorely missed.

The Detroit Free Press, on March 11, published an editorial on Rabbi Adler which summed up his life and accomplishments in a sensitive and heartwarming manner. I include it in the Congressional Record as a permanent tribute to this outstanding religious leader:

RABBI MORRIS ADLER

"My faith offers neither ease nor comfort, but imposes a task worthy of man's striving."
—RABBI MORRIS ADLER.

The task which Rabbi Adler bore passionately, effectively, and engagingly has been laid down.

The whole community mourns his passing. His human warmth and his wise counsel tended all our needs.

He was so alive intellectually that the end, after massive brain damage that kept him in a coma for 27 days, may have been merciful.

Words were his tools.

The words that inspired congregation Shaarey Zedek, one of the Nation's largest synagogs. The words that comforted a troubled individual. The words that helped resolve an endless collection of problems during his 28 years of service in Detroit.

It was with fraternal sympathy that we learned that the words did not flow easily. Fearful of repeating himself and wasting his listeners' time, Rabbi Adler toiled on his sermons late into the night.

These hard-fought words still speak to us.

"I believe because, linked to the universe about me through Him who is above me, I find myself drawn into closer fraternity with my fellow men, and I rise to an exalted sense of unity with all life."

Occasionally the words were a parable that could be traced back to his Russian childhood, such as this story of love and violence.

"In the days of the czar, a wild Cossack was in love with an even wilder Russian girl. When he asked her to test his love, she offered a truly savage proof.

"'Bring me your mother's heart,' she demanded.

"The savage Cossack killed his mother and cut out her heart. He was rushing to his sweetheart when he stumbled and bumped his head on a tree trunk. The heart, still beating, spoke up.

"'Did you hurt yourself, my son?' it asked."

While Rabbi Adler cared for the daily needs of his congregation and his city, he knew one continuing preoccupation. The prayer he recited most fervently was a prayer of peace for all mankind.

His hunger for peace was born of a horror of war. He carried with him the worn, waterproof prayer card he had used often as a chaplain in the Pacific theater of World War II. Printed on the card are the final prayers for Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish soldiers.

The first Jewish chaplain in Japan, he walked through the ashes of Hiroshima where science and education, his guideposts, had produced an atomic bomb.

"In Hiroshima," he said later, in words which have lasting meaning, "I felt a sense of disaster, of doom trembling over the world. The happy future does not lie in education. Somehow it rests in brotherhood. It must come in the correction of human nature itself."

Sokol Square in Passaic, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the January 1966 issue of the Fraternal Monitor, affiliated with the National Fraternal Congress of America representing some 10 million members, published an interesting editorial under the title "Sokol Centennial."

The article deals with the Sokols in general and the Sokol Square in the city of Passaic, N.J., which is in the congressional district which I represent.

The year 1965 was a centennial year of the first Sokol, which is a physical fitness organization in the United States. However, only in one city, that of Passaic, N.J., was there a dedication of a Sokol Square. This dedication took place on Saturday, November 13, 1965, in connection with the 2-day celebration of the 60th anniversary of the Slovak Catholic Sokol organization. There were impressive ceremonies and Governor Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey and Mayor Pauly G. De Muro proclaimed the Slovak Catholic Sokol Week.

Tribute was paid to the founders, one of whom, Andrew Klukosovsky of Clifton, N.J., was present for the ceremonies. Right Reverend Monsignor Andrew J. Romanak, P.A., said the invocation and celebrated mass for the founders. The present and former supreme officers visited Passaic on this occasion, coming from many cities.

On Sunday, November 14, 1966, Right Reverend Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, OSB, of Cleveland, celebrated pointifical mass at St. Mary's Church and Right Reverend Monsignor K. M. Mlynarovic of Valparaiso, Ind., and the present supreme chaplain, Right Reverend Monsignor Emil R. Suchon of Rockaway, N.J., a native son of Passaic, preached. A large banquet was held with Paul C. Fallat, supreme president, as principal speaker and Joseph G. Prusa, supreme secretary, as toastmaster. Messages of felicitations were read from many Governors and Pope Paul VI bestowed his papal blessing on the organization.

The Credibility Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of the administration, which is a fundamental policy set by the White House and faithfully copied by various departments and agencies, is slowly but surely being exposed.

The policy of using a deliberate lie, producing the credibility gap, is very properly and pointedly discussed by Chicago's American in an effective editorial Tuesday, March 8.

THE CREDIBILITY GAP

The "credibility gap" is a new name minted in Washington that focuses on the old problem of how much the Government should tell its citizens without compromising national security or tipping some military or diplomatic hand

Previous administrations have suffered from this gap: John F. Kennedy's during the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion and President Eisenhower's at the time the U-2 plane was shot down over Russia. Now the Johnson administration is reported to be concerned that its credibility may suffer from public doubts.

Part of the problem can be traced to President Johnson, who appears obsessed over keeping things to himself, even to the point of guarding names of minor appointments as if they were State secrets until he is ready to announce them.

A high Johnson official, however, made a good arguing point when he said, "The American people have a right to know, but they also have a right to have dangerous problems handled properly by responsible officers and not by the press."

On the other hand, as Historian Henry Steele Commager says, "The habits of deception carry the danger of self deception; you can begin to believe your own propaganda."

The Johnson administration tried to close this gap when, some time prior to its celebrated peace offensive, it released details of a North Vietnam bid for negotiations passed through Italian sources, acting after a newspaper had printed a vague report of the feeler. This raises the question of whether the United States might have been able to get closer to the conference table if there had not been premature disclosures which the Government felt compelled to explain in full to retain the confidence of the public.

National security should certainly be protected. Unfortunately, this has to be weighed against a tendency among government officials to cover blunders and embarrassments by classifying them as "security" matters.

The House freedom of information committee, headed by Representative JOHN E. Moss, Democrat, of California, is charged with finding ways of improving these situations. The Democrat-controlled committee, however, which was so vocal during Eisenhower's Republican administration, has been performing its function like a toothless watchdog lately. Perhaps it should be reminded, as it used to delight in telling Eisenhower officials, that the Government's business is the people's business.

Young Republicans of Washington & Lee University Present Resolution on Vietnam to Representative Melvin R. Laird

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, it was my privilege to receive in my office here in the Capital of the United States four representatives from Washington & Lee University who presented to me a resolution on Vietnam.

The resolution was prepared and circulated by the Clarence J. Brown Young Republican Club of the School of Law, Washington & Lee University and the Washington & Lee Young Republican Club as a joint venture.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that the resolution was signed by over one-third of the student body of Washington & Lee. The signatories, I am told, included large numbers of Republicans, Democrats, and independents. All told, there were 406 signers of the resolution which was presented to me in my office.

The four representatives who presented this resolution to me were:

Mr. Raymond J. Lajeunesse, Jr., chairman, Clarence J. Brown Young Republican Club of the School of Law, Washington & Lee University.

Mr. Kearons Whalen III, secretary-treasurer, Clarence J. Brown Young Republican Club of the School of Law, Washington & Lee University.

Mr. Donald O'Sullivan, program and planning chairman, Clarence J. Brown, Young Republican Club of the School of Law, Washington & Lee University.

Mr. Arthur M. Love III, freshman representative to the executive board, the Washington & Lee Young Republican Club.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the text of the resolution at this point in the RECORD.

The resolution referred to follows:

We, the undersigned, believe that to secure unconditional freedom for the people of South Vietnam, to repeal Communist aggression, to minimize American and Vietnamese casualties, and to bring about a swift and stable peace, the United States should, as suggested by members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and both Houses of Congress:

1. Impose a Kennedy-type quarantine on North Vietnam;

2. Carry the war to North Vietnam by maximum use of American conventional air power against significant military targets—supply routes, industrial complexes, powerplants, and port facilities; and

3. Allow no privileged sanctuaries along the main routes of infiltration, particularly the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Speech of Hon. Paul R. Ignatius, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installation and Logistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1966, the Honorable Paul R. Ignatius, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, was the principal speaker at the banquet held on that evening at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D.C., by the National Association of Supervisors, DOD, during the 28th annual convention of the association. Secretary Ignatius made an outstanding and timely address and I want to take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

The speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am honored to participate in your 28th annual convention and banquet.

The members of the National Association of Supervisors play a key role in defense management—particularly in logistics. This is the twofold role of accurately communicating Department of Defense objectives and policies to thousands of employees, and converting blueprints into reliable hardware for our Armed Forces. In our different ways, you and I are working toward the same objective—supporting the men who bear arms. It is, therefore, a particular pleasure for me to be with you.

This evening I want to talk to you about that objective—about the policies that guide us in logistics and what you can do to make our logistics operations as effective as possible.

Our first and overriding obligation is, of course, to provide the armed services in Vietnam with the supplies and materials they need—promptly and efficiently. More than 200,000 Americans are now fighting for freedom in Vietnam. It is our job—yours and mine—to make sure, in the words of the President, that "these men shall have whatever help they need and that their cause—which is our cause—shall me sustained."

Vietnam is one event among many others that, collectively, make up what General Wheeler recently called the "longest war." As General Wheeler said, we have been in a state of conflict since 1945. Locales have constantly changed—Berlin, Korea, the Formosan Straits, Cuba, and now Vietnam. But the bedrock situation has not changed—we have been repeatedly probed and challenged. This is a probing of our determination to protect the cause of human freedom. This determination is not solely a matter of military action. Not all of us can be in the jungles and swamps of Vietnam. No less essential is determination in the every day jobs of fabricating, maintaining and furnishing supplies and equipment to those who bear the heat and burden of the day. That is the job of logistics. We are determined that the job will be done effectively.

I am particularly encouraged and happy that you share this determination. This is evidenced to me again and again from the many reports, papers, and correspondence that cross my desk each day.

For example, you know that our forces in Vietnam have a voracious appetite for parachute flares. When shortages of flares appeared imminent a year ago, the Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane, Ind., increased its production threefold in 8 months. Crane also upgraded the burning time of these flares from 2 to 3 minutes without sacrificing the 2-million candlepower illumination. By relentless attention to production efficiency, the cost for these flares has also been substantially reduced. A cost reduction of $8 million was realized by Crane over the past 2 years. This depot, in the hills of southern Indiana, is only one example of the alertness and effectiveness of our industrial activities in responding promptly and vigorously to national need.

The Journal of the Bureau of Ships reports innumerable "well dones" from ship captains for the on-schedule repair and overhaul accomplished at naval shipyards around the country. Pudget Sound Naval Shipyard, to mention just one example, was cited by the Chief of Naval Operations last year for its performance in the modernization and overhaul of the U.S.S. *Banner*. The CNO's dispatch contained the following excerpts: "Although earlier estimates of required time had been in the range of 4 months after receipt of detailed plans and all materials, a maximum effort by all concerned has compressed this interval to only 11 weeks."

I need not tell this audience that ship captains don't hand out "well dones" every days. They have to be earned.

I am sure that the men who fly our aircraft and operate our tanks and vehicles are no less appreciative of equally good work at arsenals, maintenance and supply depots.

But, as you well know, logistics is not all "wine and roses." We have encountered and continue to encounter sizable logistics problems in supporting Vietnam. That these problems should be sizable is suggested not only by the remoteness and the topography of Vietnam, but also by the awesome dimensions of moving large numbers of men and mountains of material in a short timespan. When the Vietcong buildup and the monsoon offensive demanded a prompt response, we moved 100,000 men 10,000 miles in 120 days. That is a historic feat. Right now we are operating and supporting over 1,500 helicopters in Vietnam. This is more than the total Army worldwide inventory of helicopters 2 years ago.

One of the most difficult problems was getting the ships unloaded. During the initial phases of the buildup, Saigon was the only major port that could handle deep-draft ships. There was only a very narrow pier at Cam Ranh Bay. The rest of the so-called ports could not handle anything but small, shallow-draft vessels. With the amount of supplies we had to ship, port congestion became inevitable. By mid-November some 122 ships with military cargo were in Vietnam waters or in holding areas awaiting to be called forward. But a lot of good people were working on the problem and we began to get results.

The ports themselves were improved, and floating piers installed. LST's (landing ship tanks), barges, and lighterage were provided to permit off-shore unloading of ships and over-the-beach discharge. The number of ships began to go down. By February 19 there were only 41 ships with military cargo in Vietnamese waters and none in the holding areas. These 41 ships represent a normal backlog for the tonnage being shipped.

I have said that our first and foremost obligation in logistics management is to give our men in Vietnam the best support possible. But Vietnam is not an episode—an event—separate from the broader problem of total national defense. In broadest perspective it is essential that we maintain a vibrant and healthy domestic economy to support our objectives throughout the world and to meet the expanding needs of the American people. President Johnson suggested this last Wednesday on receiving the National Freedom Award. He said that at home "we are pitting the resources of the law—of education and training—of our own vision and of our compassion"to end violence against the human mind and body so that "the work of peace may be done and the fruits of freedom won." On the other side of the earth "we are no less committed to ending violence against men who are struggling to be free."

On this side of the earth—here at home—our economy is in excellent shape. We want to keep it that way. We are enjoying 96 percent full employment. The war in Vietnam has been prosecuted so far without the callup of a single man from the Reserves. We have been able to avoid wage and price controls, and the allocation of materials. In relation to the gross national product, our defense budget is lower now than in 5 of the past 6 years. And in the words of the men who know—General Westmoreland and Admiral Sharp—we have done all of this without causing our forces in Vietnam to lack for necessary supplies, either for their operations or for their personal wartime welfare.

The cause of freedom demands that we use our resources prudently. This means, among other things, that we have to procure, produce, maintain and transport material at the lowest possible cost. This leads me to enlist your support of two basic objectives of good logistics management, namely, cost control and quality improvement

First, I want to solicit your continuing support for the Department of Defense cost reduction program. Last summer the Secretary of Defense reported to the President that savings amounting to $4.8 billion had been achieved. It is quite evident that without the cost reduction program, Defense expenditures would certainly represent a larger slice of the gross national product than they presently do. The cost reduction program is one of Secretary McNamara's primary weapons for carrying out the instructions given to him by President Kennedy and later reaffirmed by President Johnson. These were:

> First, to determine the military force structure required to support our foreign policy without regard to arbitrary budget ceilings.
>
> Second, to procure and operate this force at the lowest possible cost.

These are fundamental mandates—beacon lights, so to speak, of Defense management. How can you help? One important way is to pay close attention to what might be called the "little things"—the overspecification of technical requirements—tight tolerances that serve no useful purpose—what Secretary McNamara calls "goldplating". By eliminating unnecessary frills, we saved $327 million during the last fiscal year. DOD industrial organizations, particularly those under the Bureau of Ships, were pioneers in the development and application of the value engineering techniques by which these savings are made. Opportunities for applying value engineering are very great. Among those cited last July by President Johnson and Secretary McNamara for distinguished accomplishments in cost reduction through value engineering was Mr. Charles D. Edmunds, Jr., a quarterman electronics mechanic at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard. Mr. Edmunds developed a method by which burned-out sonar transducers are salvaged and restored. This method enabled the Department of the Navy to save over $195,000 in fiscal year 1965. Mr. Edmunds is one of many employees of the Department of Defense who have shown imagination and inventiveness in cutting costs by reexamining old ways of doing things.

Mr. Edmunds' achievement is a good example of what President Johnson had in mind when he said:

> "Most of the opportunities to increase efficiency and to find less costly ways to do business occur in the work that you do every day. I want every supervisor, every employee, to continually ask himself: 'What is it costing to do this work? Is there a way to do it as well or better that would cost less?' "

The challenge of Vietnam requires even greater emphasis on the prudent use of resources. This point was emphasized by Secretary McNamara last summer when he said, "This achievement of the revised cost reduction goals will depend on the continued support of the concepts of the cost reduction program by all levels of management with the Department of Defense. These concepts are more important today than ever before. With the increased support and expenditures required in Vietnam, it is essential that our resources be applied in the most efficient manner possible."

Now let's consider quality for a moment. Defective quality and low reliability are costly; costly in lives and costly in money. Given the time, I could recite a long series of failures that collectively represent serious problems to the military. You are well aware of many of these problems. They range from such things as dimensional errors, wrong materials, loose nuts and bolts, missing parts, defective soldering, incorrect wiring, omission of required inspections, to less-than-precise practices in various forms of nondestructive testing.

We had a case recently, for example, where a fin assembly for a high explosive antitank projectile cartridge was double threaded. When the projectile was fired, the fin remained in the weapon causing a kick that injured the gunner's eye. If it had happened in combat, it might have cost the gunner's life.

The Department of Defense maintains an extensive quality assurance program to make sure that military materiel we procure, maintain, and store satisfy user requirements. But we recognize the need for stronger motivation at all levels of industrial management to prevent defects due to human error, oversight, or just plain carelessness. Therefore, more than a year ago we mounted a major program called zero defects. I recommend this program to your attention.

> Zero defects has as its objective improved quality through purposeful recognition of the contributions of the person—the individual.

People respond to the message of zero defects by doing better—more precise work. For example, Frankford Arsenal reported an improvement in brazing operations on the 2.75-inch rocket warhead from 89.9 percent acceptance per month to 99.2 percent acceptance. At the Boston Naval Shipyard, the pipe welding defect rate was 2.4 percent during the 3 months prior to initiation of the zero defects program. After zero defects, the rate decreased to only 0.04 percent. At an Air Force Logistics Command installation, the aircraft flight test defects dropped from an average of 106 to only 22 per flight.

If the industrial operations of the Department of Defense are to play their proper role in the Defense Establishment, fresh and inventive approaches must be devised for our many problems—whether new or old. Cost reduction, zero defects, value engineering—and other new programs—are not panaceas. They are useful, however, in confronting the oldest of industrial problems—making a good product at least cost.

For reasons I have already discussed, cost reduction and improved quality are essential to the support of both Vietnam and to the prudent use of the resources entrusted to us. We must work together to achieve these aims. As supervisors who must lead, teach, and inspire the men and women under your direction, you have a particularly important contribution to make.

Pinch of Salt: A Guaranteed Income? I'll Take Vanilla

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Pinch of Salt column written by Eileen K. Davis, in the Santa Clara Journal, is always worth reading. The author has an unusual knack for delivering a message with great impact in a manner which is always good reading. On February 9, 1966 the Pinch of Salt column discussed the latest Great Society gimmick—the guaranteed income. I believe it is worth the time of all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PINCH OF SALT: A GUARANTEED INCOME? I'LL TAKE VANILLA

(By Eileen K. Davis)

Correct me if I'm wrong, but it has always been my understanding that the function of democratic government is to write laws that protect the citizens against encroachment by one another or by the government itself, and then enforcing them, to the end that everybody gets a fair shake.

Thus, if I get into a beef with a neighbor over the the heighth of his fence or the bark of my dog the government, through the courts, interprets the law as it applies to my beef and if it finds me in the right punishes my adversary and if it finds him in the right punishes me.

Or if the government, through its police, charges me with shoplifting or child neglect, again the same government has a responsibility to see to it that all my rights under the law are observed and I am given a fair and impartial trial.

There's the key word—impartial. Nobody is to be singled out for special treatment, either for him or against him. The government is supposed to be a disinterested party. At no time was it ever intended that the government concern itself with how the citizens made a living (so long as they didn't break any laws) or with how successful or unsuccessful they were at it.

If a Henry Ford wanted to tinker with some visionary contraption in his barn, that was his business. And if, doing it, he starved to death or became a multimillionaire, that was how the cookie crumbled. Either way, the government scarcely glanced in his direction, being preoccupied with running the country and not authorized to run its people.

So much for childlike simplicity.

Today all sorts of people and activities are singled out for special treatment, from agriculture to automation and from zebra fanciers to Zen Buddists. For law we are substituting "public policy," and if the public policy doesn't fit the law, we make the law fit the public policy.

Thus, as a matter of public policy, failure is frowned upon. Where once old Henry Ford could have drowned in a sea of useless crankshafts and never been missed, today the fortunes of the would be novelist or the Appalachian tobacco grower, if he's not succeeding to the tune of at least $3,000 a year, are of priority interest in Washington, and the latest scheme to come puffing out of the big white opium den is a federally guaranteed minimum annual income.

Well, heck, it's public policy to encourage religion, too. Shall we also set minimum standards for that, like you have to at least believe in God? It's public policy to encourage the arts. Shall we set a minimum standard there too—say, one painting in every home?

Remember the old days, when if the people didn't like what the government was doing, they changed it? Well, the government got tired of that. So now if it doesn't like what we do, it changes us.

Question is, into what?

H.R. 13508

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 10, 32 distinguished Members of the House and Senators Robert F. Kennedy, of New York, and Harrison A. Williams, of New Jersey, joined me in introducing the following bill:

H.R. 13508

A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the Hudson River and its shores are a resource of immense economic, natural, scenic, and recreation value to all the citizens of the United States; that the States of New York and New Jersey (hereinafter referred to as the "States") are now working toward a joint program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and have requested the aid and participation of the Federal Government; and that it is in the best interests of the citizens of the United States that the Federal Governmen lend all possible aid and assistance to the States, their political subdivisions and agencies in developing legislative proposals for cooperative action to assure the development, preservation, and restoration of the resources of the Hudson River and its shores.

Sec. 2. As used in this Act, the term—

(a) "The Hudson River" means the Hudson River from mouth to source, including tributaries, related waterways and New York Harbor.

(b) "The Hudson Riverway" means the Hudson River and its shores comprising all lands within eye view of any part of the Hudson River.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is directed to cooperate with the Governors of the States of New York and New Jersey in preparing and proposing a program of legislative action for the States and Congress, and to submit to Congress and the States at the earliest possible time, but no later than March 1, 1967, recommendations regarding legislation necessary and desirable to achieve the development, preservation, and restoration of all the resources of the Hudson Riverway.

Sec. 4. Where necessary and desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to represent the United States in negotiations with the States regarding proposals for legislation to protect and develop the resources of the Hudson Riverway and shall make a report to the President and the Congress regarding the proceedings and any agreements entered into as a result of any such negotiations.

Sec. 5. In making recommendations as required in this Act, the Secretary shall be guided by, but not limited to, the following considerations:

(a) the need to encourage all beneficial uses of the lands and waters of the Hudson Riverway including, but not limited to, commercial, industrial, and other economic development consistent with the preservation and rehabilitation of the natural, scenic, historical, and recreation resources of the Hudson Riverway.

(b) the need to encourage and support local and State autonomy and initiative in planning and action to develop, preserve, and restore the land and waters of the Hudson Riverway, insofar as such planning and action is consistent with comprehensive development, preservation, and restoration of the natural, scenic, historic, and recreation resources of the Hudson Riverway;

(c) the need to abate water pollution, protect clean water, and develop the water resources of the Hudson Riverway for beneficial use;

(d) the need to preserve, enhance, and rehabilitate the scenic beauty of the Hudson Riverway;

(e) the need to preserve, enhance, and develop archeological and historic sites, shrines, or structures along the Hudson Riverway; and

(f) the need to protect and enhance the fish and wildlife and other natural resources of the Hudson Riverway.

Sec. 6. (a) In order to avoid any decision or action by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States which could unfavorably affect or alter the resources of the Hudson Riverway until such time as the States and the Congress shall have had an opportunity to receive the Secretary's recommendations and act:

(1) For a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act, all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States shall inform the Secretary of any plans, programs, projects, grants, licenses, or applications for licenses under their jurisdiction within or affecting the Hudson Riverway and in order to carry out the provisions set forth in section 5, shall cooperate with the Secretary's recommendations regarding such plans.

(2) For a period of three years following the date of enactment of this Act—

(i) the Secretary of Commerce shall not approve for the purposes of sections 106 and 117 or any other sections of title 23 of the United States Code, any survey, plan, specification, or estimate for the inclusion in any Federal-aid highway system of any highway in the States which would be located within one mile of the mean high water line of the navigable portion of the Hudson River without first obtaining the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

(ii) the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, and the Atomic Energy Commission shall not hereafter authorize, license, or otherwise undertake to approve the construction of any projects within one mile of the mean high water line of the navigable portion of the Hudson River without first obtaining the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

(iii) the Federal Power Commission is hereby directed not to issue any license for any project within one mile of the mean high water line of the navigable portion of the Hudson River.

(b) Upon the adoption by the legislatures of the States and the Congress of the United States of legislation which, in the opinion of the Secretary, assures proper development, preservation, and restoration of the resources of the Hudson Riverway and achieves the purposes of this Act, the provisions of this section shall thereafter be of no force and effect.

(c) The President, by Executive order, may suspend any or all of the provisions of this section where he deems the national interest to be adversely affected by their application.

I am pleased to report that 7 new Congressmen have now joined this effort bringing the total to 39.

Palmer Junior College Has a Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, knowing of the great concern we all share for the education of our young people, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a fine new institution of higher learning in the First District of Iowa, Palmer Junior College. This junior college, which earlier this year celebrated a birthday, has shown an outstanding growth since its inception a few years ago. I know that all of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives will be interested in the following article attesting to the great success this school has shown in meeting the needs of the community it serves and in preparing its students for productive and satisfying lives in the future.

The article follows:

PALMER JUNIOR COLLEGE HAS A BIRTHDAY

Whereas the mayor and city council of the city of Davenport encourage and support educational opportunity for the youth of our community, and

Whereas Palmer Junior College is a privately endowed nonprofit institution that is providing an excellent educational facility to the community without public tax support, and

Whereas Palmer Junior College is now beginning its second year of service to the greater Davenport and Scott County area: Be it here

Resolved and proclaimed, That the mayor and city council of the city of Davenport, Iowa, expresses gratitude to the administration, faculty, and founders of Palmer Junior College for having the courage and foresight to establish this college for the benefit of our community and further, that the week of January 17, 1966, be proclaimed as "Palmer Junior College Week."

This proclamation by Davenport's Mayor Jebens is attestation to the fact that Palmer Junior College is on the move. It has probably had the biggest "population explosion" of any similar institution anywhere. Dr. Orville D. Adams, dean of the college and consultant to Dr. D. D. Palmer, recalls that the idea of such a school was first expressed at a meeting 5 years ago in which Dr. Palmer participated and Dr. Adams was acting as a management consultant. The idea seems to have lain dormant until the fall of 1964. By this time Dr. Adams had joined Dr. Palmer as one of his staff. Shortly thereafter Dr. Palmer brought up the subject again, and this time they took the lion by the mane, so to speak, and by February they were ready to open the doors of the new Palmer Junior College.

The specific objectives of the college, as stated by Dr. Palmer in the first catalog are:

"To provide first and second years of liberal arts and preprofessional training for those who wish to transfer to other institutions.

"To provide terminal education in business, general and technical fields for those needing special training.

"To provide a broad program in general education during the late afternoon and evening.

"To provide college credit evening classes for adults or those who cannot enroll in the usual day program.

"To serve as a cultural center for community by providing resource personnel and assistance in community projects."

The motto of the college, Collegium Pro Populo (college in behalf of the people) is an indication of the desire of the school to serve the whole community. Dr. Adams observes that the tuition rate was set up in such a way as to make the school available and attractive to out-of-State students as well as Iowa residents and it is hoped that prospective students in all areas of the Quad Cities will explore the opportunities available here.

In addition to regular liberal arts and academic subjects the school has set up four separate categories of semiprofessional courses which include: Introduction to radio and television, hotel-motel-institutional management, library technology, and theater arts.

School officials are anxious that the public be informed of the opportunities available for training in these fields. They stress that they have the facilities for training cooks, bakers, and others who are much in demand in the area fór the hotel-motel-institutional industry.

Mayor Jebens, in an interview with your reporter, expressed satisfaction with the rapid growth of the school, and gratifications and amazement that such an institution could be projected without the use of public funds. He sees the school as a valuable asset to the community in its role as a stepping stone to the larger institutions to which many of our students will transfer. He also recognizes the need for special semiprofessional training in certain fields, notably the hotel-motel-restaurant industry, and observed that in many cases these can be better served by a small local college of this type than by the larger schools.

John W. Goudy, assistant dean, sees the beginning of each new semester as not only the biggest highlight of the term, but also the biggest headache. We can all agree and sympathize with him with the beginning of the new semester just behind us. Just a year ago the school opened its doors with a staff of 14 teachers and 23 full-time and 20 part-time students. Already we are approaching the 400 mark in students and the staff has more than doubled with 30 teachers. Last fall we had 369 students and officials feel certain the number will go beyond 420 by the time this semester ends. The aim of the administration is to continue to fulfill the needs of each individual student. For this reason new classes can be organized at any time there are a sufficient number of student requests to warrant it. This system of open registration adds a burden of constant paperwork and recruiting to the duties of the personnel. Another burden of paperwork has been the preparation of quantities of forms and other materials in connection with accreditation procedures.

The fastest growing department is the English section with six classes. Of special note in this connection is the start of a tutoring program to give special attention to specific problems that students may encounter. This has already been implemented in the English department and is operated in such a way that the student has special help in addition to his regular English class. It is expected that this type of program will be available to other departments as the need arises for it. Mr. Goudy regards the opening of a new chemistry class as one of the highlights of the current semester. He also sees the publication of our own newspaper as one of our most valuable assets, since it will be a source of communication between the students and at the same time allow our voice to be heard "throughout the land." Already he states that in the many meetings officials of the school have attended in all parts of the State on school matters and accreditation proceedings, the word is abroad that Palmer Junior College is a "going" institution and has met with a tremendous response from the public.

The school is set up with a student council which represents the voice of the student body in planning many phases of the program. A series of four college assemblies are planned each year, which have been labeled the "President's Convocation," two "Student Convocations" and the "Dean's Convocation." It is the aim of the administration that these be carefully planned and executed to include program material worthy of the support of the student body and, in some cases, the general public as well. The extracurricular program is constantly being expanded to include both athletic and social activities. At this time we have athletic teams in baseball, basketball, bowling, and swimming. The Palmer Parliamentary Club is taking serious its future role as a community force by studying Roberts' Rules of Order.

One of our most exciting assets is the development of the spacious library facilities. When school started in September 1965, the library was opened with, admittedly, a mere handful of books, literally several arm fulls, (as the group of students who helped transport them know), but the newly created facilities with many study tables, comfortable lounging equipment, periodicals of all kinds, and beautiful appointed surroundings should make the library one of our most popular spots before and between classes. Dr. Adams informs us that one new shipment of $5,000 worth of books is currently being cataloged and added to the shelves, bringing our total now to 6,000 volumes.

The art department is another rapidly expanding section, a new art class for studio work having been instituted this semester and the humanities group having doubled in size. This group took on added impetus with the procurement of the new projector and slides covering all periods of art history which are used for regular classroom teaching and discussion. History 251 had to be divided into 2 groups last fall when about 70 students bulged the walls of the first class session, and this seems to be becoming fairly normal procedure as each new semester begins.

Certainly from the student's point of view it is a privilege and an inspiration to be in on the ground floor of such an undertaking as this. New books, new classrooms, new equipment (the most modern and best obtainable) in every area, the best teachers all of whom have master's degrees plus extra graduate hours, all of these things plus the spark of personal interest found only in small schools such as this should stimulate all of us to set our sights on the stars and attain the highest each of us is capable of in reaching our common goal of becoming responsible citizens in a competitive American society.

Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NEWSLETTER

MARCH 20, 1966.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am writing to give you personally the dates on new U.S. laws, and deadlines that are really important to each U.S. citizen and our families.

1. March 31, 1966: Deadline for application for new voluntary Federal health insurance program for our people 65 or older. If your older relative or friend can't make the application, make it for him. Get applications at Pittsburgh Social Security Office—915 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh. Benefits begin July 1, 1966.

This excellent economy program costs only $3 a month with good coverage for hospital and doctor bills. Sixteen million people have already applied out of 19 million eligible. The next chance will not come until October 1967, then protection won't start until July 1968 and premiums will be higher. If you have health insurance or Blue Cross already, sign up anyhow. Don't cancel Blue Cross or your health insurance policies. These are now being revised to fit the new law so no overlapping. Remember new law does not cover everything. Even if you have already sent in to the Social Security Office your choice as "no" on this program, you can now change your mind until March 31.

Note: For this voluntary program people can apply who are not retired or have never worked under social security system in any job. Whether you are working or retired under social security or not, railroad retirement, or Federal, State or local government, or company pension, sign up. Applications mailed and postmarked on March 31 are okay. If you are nearing 65, apply for the voluntary health insurance program in the period 90 days before your 65th birthday.

BENEFITS INCLUDE

(a) Doctor's bills: Program pays 80 percent of all doctor's bills (no maximum). Patient pays only first $50 cost each year (not each month and not each illness).

(b) Prepaid hospital care: For each illness, 90 days in semi-private room. Patient pays first 40 dollars for all costs and after 60 days patient pays $10 a day of his bill.

(c) Outpatient services covered for 20-day period. Patient pays $20 plus one-fifth balance.

(d) Home care covered (after 3 days hospital stay) up to 100 home visits, including part-time nurses, interns, physical therapists, etc.

This voluntary Federal prepaid health program is originally a Republican proposed program, and is now law through support of both parties and the unanimous support of all Pennsylvania Congressmen. It is approved by doctors and hospital organizations, as well as the Scranton administration. I opposed original "medicare" bill, but voted for this compromise.

I urge all people 65 and over to take advantage of this program.

As an extra service to my district, I have studied this program, consulted with officials, and have prepared this outline (not at Government expense) to make sure my friends know what it is.

P.S.—Birth certificate: Regardless of your age, be sure you get your birth certificate if you are not now getting benefits under social security. You will later have to prove your age and it gets harder to do each year for older people.

My advice: First write Office of BioStatistics, City County Building, Pittsburgh. If no record there, write Division of Vital Statistics, Post Office Box 90, Harrisburg, Pa. If you were born out of Pennsylvania, write to Governor of your State or mayor of town of birth for form of application. Or write your church pastor where you were baptized—a copy of your baptismal certificate certified by the pastor will help.

2. April 15, 1966: Final date for filing personal income tax returns. Do not let this slip as penalties are high—must be filed if you made $600 or more during 1965 if you are under 65, or $1,200 or more if 65 or older. Personal income tax return must be filed even if you had a loss from individual business operation, accident, or on sale of stock.

3. April 1966: New GI bill applications to be filed by veterans.

Vets discharged after January 31, 1955, make application for education benefits under new GI bill (which I cosponsored). Education benefits go into effect June 1, 1966, for 8 years, if vet discharged on or after June 1, 1966. Time limit for vets discharged before June 1, 1966, is May 31, 1974. First checks mailed July. GI bill covers vets (men and women) of all U.S. armed services with 6 months' active duty (but not including special 6-month Reserve programs). Vets can get applications at all VA offices, colleges, schools, etc.

Benefits calculated: 1 month benefit for each month service up to 36 months.

Amounts: $100 month—single vet; $125—one dependent; $150—more than one dependent.

Parttime training—can get part of benefits.

TELL YOUR U.S. SERVICE FRIENDS AND RELATIVES

(a) While still in service, men and women with 2 years' active duty can qualify for immediate benefits where they are stationed.

(b) Although no benefits for past schooling, there are graduate study benefits. A vet can take new courses.

(c) Home loan programs—for 10-year period. Vets can get VA guarantee for home loans up to $7,500 through banks, building and loans, etc.

(d) Veterans' Administration medical and hospital care are put on same basis as for all U.S. wartime veterans—including burial benefits.

(e) Veterans' preference for Federal employment renewed.

TO FAMILIES AND FRIENDS OF MEN IN UNIFORM

As a World War II vet myself, I am opposing administration proposals for deferment of hospitals and housing for military, in favor of Great Society spending programs. Also as the administration has forgotten U.S. military personnel in the current recommended Federal employee pay raise, I am insisting on equal treatment for our U.S. armed services for pay raises and increase of family housing and quarters allowances. Count on my full support.

TO PARENTS OF SCHOOLCHILDREN, SCHOOL OFFICIALS, AND TEACHERS

I have cosponsored the bill to block the Johnson administration's budget plan to cut back the Federal special milk program for schoolchildren from $103 million to $21 million this year, a cut of $82 million. This would be tragic as 806,253 Pennsylvania children in 4,855 schools are served milk each day under this program. I believe billions can be cut from the Federal budget, but clearly this is false economy in the wrong place. I believe that we in Congress can and should restore the program in full.

My advice: Do not cut your local school budget now as Federal funds are available to June 30, 1966. Wait to see how this fight turns out before next fall.

TO COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Make your plans to stay in school, do not plan to drop out because of the recent announcement that the President is terminating Federal loans to students under the national defense student loan program. I believe we in Congress will be able to block any action that cuts off your loans this fall under the present program until the new guaranteed loan program can be worked out.

I oppose strongly the policy that will give outright billions as handouts to "dropouts" from high schools and grade schools, when the administration then pulls tight its purse strings when it comes to lending college students a few dollars to get an education. We must be fair to both groups.

U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity states that the cost of keeping each boy in Job Corps camp is $9,120 a year, and $8,400 for each girl in camp (all free and 17 times price of regular schools). So much for so few.

I voted against increase this year of $1 billion in such programs.

Taxes: This month I have voted against President Johnson's proposal to raise excise taxes on cars, and telephones, which will be used on increased spending programs at home.

Spending: I am opposing $750,000 for building a new home for the Vice President (in addition to land value of several million). No wonder the budget is so high.

Present emergency: We are in a real war in Vietnam, as I reported on my return in December from my investigation and study trip in Vietnam and the Pacific area. So we must be very careful of the Federal budget to keep a sound U.S. economy and to back our men in the armed services with the most modern equipment, ammunition, and supplies. But we must be intelligent in using economy in the right places and cutting down strong on the inefficient and needless nonmilitary and subsidy programs, and just plain boondoggles.

Personal regards,

JIM FULTON.

Thy Brother Hungers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Agriculture Committee of the House, I want to emphasize the extremely high priority we must give the war on hunger program.

The food population crisis of the world is here today, and will be catastrophic tomorrow, unless massive worldwide efforts are used to alleviate the situation.

A low death rate coupled with a population explosion creates the problem.

The cruel, naked facts show that the world is rapidly facing its worst famines in history. Our world leaders are jittery over the bleak prospects of an early easing of the problem unless the complete resources of all nations are used. Experts estimate it will take 15 to 25 years just to slow down the rate of starvation.

The world food shortage has been growing since World War II. The population explosion is the heart of the problem. By 1980 the world's population will be 4.6 billion—today it stands at 3.4 billion. These 1.2 billion additional people will require a minimum of 200 million tons of grain per year; plus other agricultural products—over and above what is being produced in the world today.

Two-thirds of the world's people live in countries with nutritionally inadequate diets. These areas are: all of Asia, except Japan and Israel, all except the southern tip of Africa, the northern part of South America, and almost all of Central America, and the Caribbean. These people average 900 calories per day below the level of the one-third of the world living in countries with adequate national average diets; and 300 calories below the average nutritional standard for the food-deficit areas. The daily consumption of protein is less than two-thirds of the level in the food-adequate countries; and the fat consumption rate is less than one-third.

Red China's main interest today is food. She has as one of her goals the capturing of the vast fertile lands of the rice bowl of Vietnam. The full production from these lands could materially ease her critical food needs.

The food-deficit countries are poor and food shortages merely reflect the low level of living in general. Per capita income is only $97 compared to $1,074 in diet-adequate countries. These food deficit countries are already densely populated with 53 persons per 100 acres of agricultural land compared to 17 persons per 100 acres in the diet-adequate countries. And the population is increasing faster in the food-deficit countries.

The hard-core problem of the food deficit countries is one of productivity. The people are unable to produce enough food for themselves or produce enough other products to enable them to buy the food they need.

Throughout the world's history, the area of agricultural land has increased with population. New lands are no longer available at a reasonable cost in heavily populated food-deficit countries.

To produce more food on the same amount of land then, is to increase yields per acre. This is difficult to do when workers are illiterate, and lacking in capital, technical, and management skills for using modern farming practices.

The job becomes even more difficult. Not only is the extra capital for agriculture needed, but capital is also needed for the nonagriculture sectors of the economy.

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

The nations of the world are made up of the "haves" and the "have nots." The gap in living standards between these two groups is increasing. This broadening gap creates the most colossal social, economic, and political problem of our times.

There are two approaches to the problem: reduce the birth rate, and increase agricultural production.

In the next 5 to 15 years both of these avenues will have to be used if population and food supplies are going to be kept in balance. These developments will be slow. Reducing the birth rate and increasing agricultural production are basic social changes, and they change slowly.

Family planning alone cannot do the job, and a more productive agriculture alone cannot do the job. Both avenues must be used effectively. If you look at the minute hand of the world's clock—the next 10 to 15 years—birth control cannot have a major impact. Therefore, a highly productive agriculture must be the all-important partial solution to the food-population problem during the next 10 to 15 years.

Birth rates could drop significantly during this period; but it will not have a major effect on food needs. However, after 1980, family planning will have to become the major factor, because agriculture cannot possibly keep up with the population increases.

Large increases in agricultural production can be achieved in most of the countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Crop yields are low in these areas; in many cases yields per acre are one-fifth to one-half the yields of North America, Europe, or Japan.

To get higher crop yields in these "have not" areas is a slow and difficult process. Several factors are involved: illiteracy of the people—they cannot read or write or do simple arithmetic, or understand plant biology; and vast shortages of capital and technical manpower are needed. The organizational problems involved in disseminating the knowledge, materials and equipment needed is a gigantic job.

The food production in Africa, Asia, and Latin America can be improved. The time factor can be shortened if the "have" nations are willing to put money, materials, and manpower into a crash program.

Here are some recommendations:

First. Increase shipments of food under the food-for-peace program on a stopgap basis. There are only about 10 food-surplus countries in the world today. The United States produces about 60 percent of the total world food surplus.

Second. Send fertilizers and other agricultural production needs to food-deficit countries. This includes needed fertilizers, improved seed varieties, pesticides and farm equipment. One ton of plant nutrients will produce about 10 tons of additional grain.

Third. Help food-deficit countries to produce their own agricultural needs. This means helping these countries to build factories, manufacture pesticides, and build equipment. The countries must be shown how to develop and produce improved seed varieties. Their irrigation, drainage, land clearance, and conservation problems must also be given a hand.

Fourth. Supply technical manpower. To get this extra agricultural production much technical manpower will be needed besides money and materials. It has been estimated that some 10,000 agricultural specialists would be needed to accomplish this herculean task of getting the world fed. There are less than 1,000 such specialists now in all of the "have not" countries from the "have" countries.

Fifth. Step up research on agriculture in the food-deficit countries. This means more research on agriculture in the tropics. Ninety-five percent of the research has been in temperate zones, and less than 5 percent on tropical agriculture.

ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Most would agree that:

It is true that man cannot live by bread alone, but he must have bread first, before he can aspire to things more venturesome.

Inadequate food supplies for people in underdeveloped countries are the primary cause for their political instability and social unrest.

A livable world cannot long exist where two-thirds do not get enough to eat and one-third are overfed.

During the past 20 years American foreign policy has been shaped by two rugged forces, namely communism, and the nuclear arms race.

Now the food-population situation is rising as a third major force. And as time moves on it may become the most powerful of these major forces.

Americans have a Christian trait of compassion for fellow human beings in need. Ten years ago the Congress enacted a food-for-peace program which is one of the most successful and imaginative efforts ever made by a nation to help less fortunate nations.

We must now help on even a more massive effort if we are to have well-being in this Nation in the years ahead.

It is paradoxical, but by helping the underdeveloped countries to increase their own productivity we help ourselves. This extra productivity translates itself into an extra demand for the products from our farms and factories.

The United States, with the help of other developed nations must assist the underdeveloped countries to increase their food production, through technology, capital, and equipment.

The challenge that faces us is to duplicate within the next 35 years everything that mankind has achieved since time began. The all-important word in this challenge is time—for the race is against time.

The United States cannot falter in this war on hunger. The whole situation is really a systems problem. All the factors are needed at the same time if the food production effort is to be fruitful.

These are the factors: Water, seeds, fertilizers, soil practices, insecticides and pest control, management, capital investment, credit, storage facilities, roads and transportation, communications, and education.

To help the underdeveloped nations to produce their own food is the most important facet of the overall problem. This will take a minimum of 15 years. And in the next 15 years the world will need a 50-percent increase in grain production just to keep even.

It has been estimated to accomplish this, a capital investment of $80 billion is required. A third of this would have to come from foreign aid from the developed countries.

The most critical problem of all is neither capital or foreign exchange—but managerial talent. This must be trained here and abroad.

To help close this food-gap, we are going to have to increase food production in this country. The food surplus problems we have been wrestling with for the last 20 years will be a thing of the past. Farmland that has been in conservation reserves will be gradually taken out and placed into production for the war on hunger. This will be done in an orderly manner, so that the marketing system will function properly.

The Callan strategic food reserve bill will be considered in this session of the Congress. This bill provides for basic food reserves for our country. In an all-out war on hunger, the reserves would assure us protection from basic food shortages in this country.

It is not enough to look at the world's food deficit only in terms of calories per person. The quality of food is very important. A shortage of protein for example in the diet weakens the body so that it easily falls prey to other diseases.

In the war on hunger we must gear some of our extra acres to the production of higher protein foods, as soybeans, and animal products.

How about more protein from the sea? The strange fact is that the oceans do not contain unlimited quantities of fish. Nations are now fishing actively in the better fishing areas. Man still depends on basic agriculture for 99 percent of his food.

While the agricultural program is being developed we must also help the underdeveloped nations in their family planning program—if there is a fighting chance to win the war on hunger.

We cannot neglect public health in the underdeveloped countries in favor of family planning. There is a direct relationship between birth rate and death rate, particularly in infant and child mortality.

In many countries a son is the only social security a couple has in their old age. The son provides for their well-being. This is the accepted custom in underdeveloped countries. Because of the high child mortality the average couple needs to produce many children, so that a son will survive. Whenever infant and child mortality can be decreased to a low enough level, the chances in an individual family that a male child will survive becomes very much greater. This would decrease the pressure to have more children. To win the war on hunger, the battle will have to be waged on two fronts—agriculture and population.

If thy brother hungers, feed him—for this is Biblical.

Reflections on the Uses of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Ralph McGill is a reflective and perceptive analysis of our situation in the world today. As Mr. McGill points out:

> The use of power—and national security—are a part of being in Vietnam.

Mr. McGill's column appeared in the March 13, 1965 edition of the New York Herald Tribune and follows:

THE USES OF POWER

(By Ralph McGill)

In the autumn of 1863, during the Civil War, the Union was worried and weary. Two Russian fleets of six vessels each appeared suddenly, and almost simultaneously, in the harbors of New York and San Francisco.

The general opinion was that the Russians had appeared to make it plain to Britain and France that if they intervened on the side of the Confederacy in order to topple the United States, the czar would fight with Lincoln and the Union.

A few years later, Oliver Wendell Holmes was to celebrate that visit and the emotions aroused with a poem.

"Bleak are our shores with the blasts of December,
Fettered and chill is the rivulet's flow;
Throbbling and warm are the hearts that remember
Who was our friend when the world was our foe."

Picklock historians, digging into the visit by the czar's fleet, emerged with a conclusion that indicated another motive. Russia was then about to go to war with Britain and France over Poland. Winter was coming. Ice would soon immobilize ships in the Baltic. Based in friendly, warm ports they could harass British and French shipping.

The two fleets did help keep the peace. The French were eyeing America. They put an emperor in Mexico. The British had wavered about "recognizing" the Confederacy. There was a threat of war over Russia and Poland.

The czar, by putting two navies on the flanks of the European powers, exercised a balance of power that was effective.

This is but one example taken from many such available in any reading of history. The European wars went on for so many years that we know of "The Thirty Years' War," "The Hundred Years' War," and others that lasted for a decade or so.

The United States, confronted now with a necessary exercise of power in Vietnam in order to prevent an eventual tipping of the scales against us, will not be finished with the uses of power when an armistice is attained. We are, unhappily, the only Nation that now can maintain a world balance.

The balance of power in Europe began to change after World War I. It was almost abruptly altered after the conflict the soldiers called "World War Deuce."

The rather rapid dissolution of the British Empire had, and will continue to have, a profound effect on the United States and its policies. It will be painful and costly. But since our own national survival depends on it, we will do well to grow used to it.

We did not make a protest when it became necessary for us, after 1945, to replace Britain in Greece. The Truman plan for Greece and Turkey saved those countries. Some of us grumbled at the cost of the Marshall plan. But it saved Europe. It prevented Soviet power from extending itself, within a brief span of time, to the Pyrenees or beyond. What, then, would have been the national security problem of the United States?

We went to war in Korea for a moral reason. There was aggression and violation of agreement. But more than that, Japan would quickly have been overrun and lost to China and/or Russia. The two Communist powers were not then in a rift. Had Japan fallen, all of Asia would soon have gone. What then would have been the national security problem of the United States?

France was defeated in Indochina in 1954. When the Geneva agreement failed and there was aggression from North Vietnam into the South, this Nation alone could respond. Had we not, we long ago would have gone to the aid of a beleaguered and, perhaps, occupied Australia.

Power that isn't used when need demands soon loses its muscle.

The uses of power—and national security—are a part of being in Vietnam.

NATO Must Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial entitled "NATO Must Survive," the Hartford Courant says:

> President Johnson has quite properly, and swiftly, rebuffed another attempt by General de Gaulle to split NATO.

It adds:

> The French President is reported to have pressed for bilateral talks with us and the other NATO nations. But Mr. Johnson reminded him that NATO is a matter of one for all, and all for one.

The paper points out that while the original threat—which prompted the creation of NATO—has vanished, "the principle remains, and we must keep the cold war won."

The editorial, an objective look at matters of worldwide concern, is offered for the RECORD, where others may want to peruse its contents:

[From the Hartford Courant, Mar. 10, 1966]

NATO MUST SURVIVE

President Johnson has quite properly, and swiftly, rebuffed another attempt by General de Gaulle to split NATO. The French President is reported to have pressed for bilateral talks with us and the other NATO nations. But Mr. Johnson reminded him that NATO is a matter of one for all, and all for one.

Nevertheless President de Gaulle, inflexible as ever, continues his plan to knock NATO apart. Though he insists he welcomes the spirit of NATO, his intention remains to withdraw French units from NATO's integrated forces, and to eject American and other troops and headquarters from French soil unless he can control them.

NATO's 20th anniversary comes in 1969, when France or anyone else desiring it may withdraw. Today it is made up of 15 nations whose own future depends upon the security of the entire North Atlantic region. It is founded on the lessons learned, at vast cost in blood and suffering and treasure in two world wars. It was only after the United States came in, and the Allies had achieved a single command under Marshal Foch, that they won World War I. The same lesson had to be learned all over again, at still greater cost, in World War II. Hence SHAPE headquarters outside Paris today, and hence the NATO Forces integrated at the top at least.

Another advantage of a Euroepan defense thus united is that it subordinates Germany's formidable military strength in a single Western force. For Germany, after three wars within a single century, is still feared by many in Europe. But the crucial factor in NATO's united defense is the advance guarantee that the United States will help defend Europe. We turned our backs on this need after 1918, only to go through it all again in World War II.

There can be little doubt that the United States which for a century and three-quarters grew up in isolation, has learned its lesson and remains committed to it. The turning point came with the Vandenberg Resolution of 1948, which made us as one with the nations of Europe in our common defense. President de Gaulle argues that the United States might not again come to the defense of Europe, because this time our own cities might be the targets of a Soviet nuclear onslaught. But this country knows that rockets and planes have made the Atlantic but a lake. And we showed in the Cuba crisis of 1962 that, when our own safety is at stake, we are willing to face Soviet missiles no matter what the cost.

Where General de Gaulle may be right is in thinking that the West has actually won the cold war and doesn't know it. The original inspiration for NATO was the need for keeping Russian infantry from sweeping to the Channel. That threat has vanished. But the principle remains, and we must keep the cold war won. Only if we maintain a common defense with Europe will we forestall some future change in the power balance of the world. And this we shall do, whether Mr. de Gaulle believes it or not.

If President de Gaulle withdraws France from NATO, we shall just have to move NATO headquarters to Belgium, even if it costs $700 million and leaves a vital gap where France splits the alliance. Indeed, plans for such a move are already being made. But we can be fairly certain that some day, whether Mr. de Gaulle serves out the new 7-year term he has just begun or not, France will be back. It was first of all leaders of post-war France who saw the need to bury the hatchet with the ancient enemy, Germany, and to found the future on a united Europe. If we can keep the flames of a great war from flaring up on the Asian mainland, it will yet be done that way.

John Baldwin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, John Baldwin, another of our beloved colleagues, has left us. He was a gentleman in every sense of that great word. Calm, steadfast, true—a shining example of integrity at work. His word was his bond.

We mourn his passing and extend to his loved ones our deepest sympathy in this, their hour of sorrow.

Miss Andrea Adams Winner at North Carolina Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker I am pleased to advise my colleagues that North Carolina's winner in the 1966 VFW–VFW Auxiliary voice-of-democracy contest is Miss Andrea Adams, of Route 4, Sanford, N.C.

This competition and similar programs designed to encourage our young people to give deep thought, study and consideration to the real meaning of democracy and our American way of life serve a purpose which is valuable beyond measure.

In these days of beatniks, beatles, and bebop, it gives us real encouragement to have youngsters like Miss Andrea Adams to remind us that all of the younger generation is not gone to the dogs and that we still have young people capable of serious thought. It is a pleasure to place in the RECORD Andrea's winning speech which follows:

DEMOCRACY

Freedom, security, and a way of life is what democracy means to me. Freedom, itself, seems to be the most vital necessity for all men. Treacherous battles have been fought throughout history and even I fight daily battles for the same reason—freedom.

Freedom comes in many forms. Religion was and is one of freedom's most driving forces. Inner satisfaction stems from my freedom to believe what I want to believe through my own judgment. I possess the freedom of speech today, what I want to say the way I want to say it. During the Dark Ages, Europeans were in a state of profound fear because of what might happen to them if they spoke their minds against the government. I do not have to be afraid. Democracy gives me this freedom.

Democracy means the right to publish whatever I feel is right or wrong. Alexander Hamilton turned a nation to accept a governmental document by means of a few pamphlets and a book. Since the acceptance of that document, the Constitution, the Nation has survived with great prosperity. People would be ignorant of pro's and con's if we did not have this freedom. Twice I have written to the local newspaper editor commending and criticizing his opinions. Democracy gives me this freedom.

Petition is an indulgence which should have a high seat of honor for it gives me an opportunity to secure from the Government what I want and expect; yet benefits us both. I expect to be able to criticize my Government, for democracy thrives on criticism. Our right to have a voice in the Government was fought for over 150 years ago. We are the generation in which freedoms have been handed down to us. The diamonds of democracy have been in our hands so long, we no longer notice their luster. I do not believe the value of democracy has decreased, but perhaps our values have. These freedoms of religion, speech, press, and petition are part of citizenship—the most rewarding gifts democracy has ever given to me.

Democracy means security. Security of knowing who I might put in office. It is every voters duty to investigate what each candidate plans to contribute to his government. It is every voter's duty to say 'yea' or 'nay' for what he wants to accomplish through his candidate. I am not old enough to vote; yet I am old enough, and do, observe what policies are best for my conutry. I voice an opinion and take pride and an interest in my Government. These are my precious privileges as well as my responsibilities. Democracy gives us what we give it.

Democracy means freedom, security, and a way of life; which is a Government in which man can satisfy himself—the ultimate goal of life.

Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, once again as our country finds it necessary to bolster our Armed Forces, Selective Service—the draft—has had to increase inductions to supply the men we need. Throughout our history—in colonial times, in the Civil War, World War I, World War II, and in the troubled times since 1948—the country has had to call its young men to service through some form of selective service. It is a method vital to our survival. It is the only democratic and sure method we have been able to devise to insure that the Armed Forces have the manpower they need when they need it, without disrupting essential industry and agriculture.

The present system is not an experiment. It has evolved over many years and the lessons of the errors of the past, often painful ones as in the Civil War, are reflected in the present legislation, the regulations and the policies which guide the present operation.

However, no agency or institution acquires a character of its own. Its success and its philosophies and polices are those of the people who guide it. The Selective Service System over the years has carried on a vital national program which is not popular but has won and kept the confidence of the American people. No scandal has touched the System. On December 20, 1965, a poll taken by the Washington Post showed that the draft is favored by 90 percent of the public.

The Governor of each State and territorial possession is the nominal head of the Selective Service System in his State. The State director, local board members, medical advisers, appeal agents, and State appeal boards are recommended by the Governor and appointed by the President.

The various Government agencies could well take a lesson from the Selective Service System. They operate over 4,000 local boards with over 40,000 dedicated Americans who serve without compensation. They donate many hours of their time each month from their business, rendering service to their communities, State, and Nation, for which they receive a certificate of appreciation when they have served 5, 10, 15, 20, or 25 years. Many of these dedicated uncompensated local board members have served since the beginning of the System in 1940.

Because of the existence of Selective Service, the Armed Forces, with the cooperation of the Selective Service local board clerks and members, are able to maintain their authorized strengths. Since 1940, the Selective Service System registered and classified over 83 million men, inducted over 14 million and over 10 million volunteered, a total of 24 million who have served their country.

The Selective Service System provides the compulsion and many young men volunteer for the service of their choice when they are sent up for preinduction physical or just before being reached for induction by their local boards. Many local board clerks have been awarded certificates of appreciation by the various services for their assistance in recruiting.

The Selective Service System is blamed for many misunderstandings for which they are not responsible, such as the rejection of Cassius Clay and others. The Armed Forces establish the physical, mental, and moral standards and conduct the examinations. The Armed Forces examining and entrance stations determine whether a registrant sent by Selective Service is accepted or rejected for physical, mental, or moral reasons.

General Hershey is an administrator and carries out laws and regulations prescribed by Congress and the President. History will record General Hershey as the greatest manpower stabilizer of our time. He has provided necessary manpower for the Armed Forces, industry, agriculture, education, and research. I know of no man with a better appreciation of the individual's, the family's, and the community's deep concern with the way Selective Service operates; nor with a clearer insight into the demands of the national interest which the System must serve. Over the years, many Members of the Congress have come to know General Hershey and to appreciate his qualities and his wisdom which have been indispensable in the administration of the Selective Service System. The Congress and the public are fortunate to have this great American citizen still at the head of Selective Service in these uncertain days.

I commend General Hershey, his staff, local board clerks, and the uncompensated patriotic citizens for a job well done and at little cost to the Government.

The 48th Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, Americans of Lithuanian descent gathered at Cobo Hall in Detroit, Mich., to observe the 48th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. It is my pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the program of that day.

Program

1. Iskilmingo minejimo atidarymas: Ralp J. Valatka, DLOC valdybos pirmininkas.
2. Garbes prezidiumo pristatymas ir veliavu inesimas.
3. Programos vedejas: Dr. Kestutis Keblys.
4. Jungtiniu Amerikos Valstybiu Himnas.
5. Invokacija: Kun. Michael J. Kundrat.
6. Zuvusiuju uz Lietuvos laisve pagerbimas.
7. Michigan valstybes gubernatoriaus George Rommey: proklamacijos skaitymas: Danduole Majauskaite.
8. Detroito miesto burmistro, Jerome P. Cavanagh; proklamacijos skaitymas, Viktorija Ciunkaite.
9. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, G. Mennen Williams kalba.
10. Garbes sveciu pristatymas ir sveikinimai.
11. Dr. Tomo Remeikio kalba.
12. Rezoliuciju skaitymas ir priemimas, Algis Zaparackas.
13. Menine programa: Atlieka Sv. Antano parapijos misrus choras, vadovaujamas, Muz. A. Mateikos.
14. Lietuvos Himnas.
15. Eisena i miesto rotuse (city-county building) veliavos nuleidimui.

Electorial College Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Des Moines Register for March 7, 1966, carried a perceptive editorial commenting on a proposal by my colleague from Iowa, BERT BANDSTRA, dealing with electoral college reform.

Since this editorial may be of interest to my fellow Members, I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Electoral College Reforms

U.S. Representative BERT BANDSTRA, Democrat, of Iowa, has appeared before a Senate subcommittee to raise an important point concerning President Johnson's plan to abolish presidential electors. The electoral vote of the States would be retained, under Johnson's plan, but cast automatically for the presidential and vice-presidential candidates getting the highest popular vote in the State.

This would prevent the running of uncommitted electors, or the occasional case in which an elector bolts the ticket on which he was elected. Such devices might permit a minority to deadlock the electoral college, since a candidate must have a majority to be elected, and throw the choice of President into Congress for decision.

BANDSTRA favors the principal features of the Johnson plan, but he believes the requirement of an electoral college majority for election should be dropped. The candidate getting the highest electoral vote for President or Vice President should be declared elected whether he gets more than 50 percent of the electoral college vote or not, BANSTRA argues. Congress would be called on to decide the election only in case of a tie under this suggestion.

The requirement that a candidate for an office have a clear majority to be elected usually is made to assure that the winner will have substantial support in office. This is desirable, but has no meaning when a candidate can get a majority of the electoral votes without getting a majority of popular votes, as has happened in connection with the Presidency. It is popular support that is important in this case, not electoral votes.

Since the requirements for an electoral vote majority does not assure majority popular support, BANDSTRA seems to be correct in arguing that it serves no purpose and could be dropped, allowing the candidate with the highest electoral vote to win.

It also has the merit of reducing the electoral rôle of Congress to the lowest possible minimum. There is reason to fear and avoid as much as possible the chance of a presidential election by Congress.

The danger that the public desire may be thwarted by fractional interests is too great to allow the legislative power to name the Chief Executive any more often than is absolutely necessary.

A Tribute to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul Brindle, chairman of the International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast here in Washington, is loved and admired by many of our colleagues who have been guest speakers at the Central Y.M.C.A. throughout the years.

It has been my pleasure upon several occasions to address the International Crossroads Breakfast around the birthday of George Washington. This year, Dr. Luther A. Smith, sovereign grand commander of 330 Scottish Rite Freemasonry, southern jurisdiction, United States, addressed the International Crossroads Breakfast on the subject "The Continuing Impact of the Life of George Washington." Dr. Smith made an excellent address.

Mr. Paul Brindle's sister Dr. Ether A. Brindle, wrote the following poem especially for this occasion:

A Tribute to Washington

February twenty-second, seventeen hundred thirty two,
There came into the loving home, a wee, dear baby, new;
George was the given name, you know, and Washington, surname;
How could any know that cold day, of his future life and fame?

He grew up much like any boy, in his day, of privileged class;
In home and school and plantation, much of his time he'd pass.
"Let truth abound" his father said, and live it by the rule.
So 'twas natural to speak the truth, at work, at play, at school.

Surveying was his chosen work, as a young man he'd pursue,
Which took him to the wilderness, of this beloved land so new.
When oppression became unbearable, then freedom must be won;
Thus the uniform of an officer he gallantly did don.

His heart bled within, at Valley Forge, as he saw upon the snow
The blood-stained prints of frozen feet; upon his knees he'd go
To implore God Almighty, His blessings to bestow; thus all can see
The hard-earned victory of freedom, the birth-pangs of liberty.
Yes, 'twas for liberty and freedom, this nation he did sire;
He's "The Father of his Country," one all Americans admire!

—Dr. Ethel A. Brindle.

Will the Loss of Abba Schwartz Take Our Immigration and Travel Policies Back to 1952?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal voiced the apprehensions of many of us when it commented in its March 12, 1966, editorial that:

> Our immigration and travel policies were liberalized and humanized under Abba P. Schwartz. It would be most regrettable if this loss now should allow those who favor harsh and unreasoning policies to prevail again.

These policies are of primary concern to us here in Congress and I urge your consideration of this Journal editorial as well as a certain watchfulness over the direction our immigration and travel policies take in the future.

The article follows:

The Case of Abba Schwartz

When John Kennedy became President, one of his desires was to liberalize passport and travel policies. To that end, he named Abba P. Schwartz as head of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Now Schwartz is out of a job.

The administration says that he resigned. He says that he is the victim of a plan to reorganize his bureau in such a way as to abolish it. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch quotes a Washington official as saying that Schwartz's removal is being disguised as reorganization. But more disturbing is the comment of another official: "Now we have gone right back to 1952." Those were the days when Senator MCCARTHY intimidated Government until it adopted restrictive and vindictive travel policies.

From the start, Schwartz has battled with his subordinate, Mrs. Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office. She objected to his policy of refusing to withhold passports from suspected Communists without allowing them to face their accusers. She called the policy "dangerous"—although the right to face accusers has been upheld by the courts in these cases. He has fought bans on travel to Communist China and Cuba and as result faced stern opposition in the State Department.

Schwartz was the principal architect of the long overdue changes in the immigration laws last year which abolish the unfair national origins quotas. He played a leading role in getting some 10,000 Cubans to this country recently. He has worked on the Vietnamese refugee problems and was engaged through the International Red Cross in trying to obtain release of some 200 Americans held by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

Our immigration and travel policies were liberalized and humanized under Schwartz. It would be most regrettable if his loss now should allow those who favor harsh and unreasoning policies to prevail again.

We Protest the National Policy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the March 7 issue of Christianity and Crisis succinctly outlines those issues which deeply trouble many of us who oppose escalation of the war in Vietnam. This article offers a brief and concise statement of main points which deserve the most searching kind of examination. For example, a recent newspaper reported that Red China's nuclear capacity is growing at a much more rapid rate than previously estimated. In view of our own national interests, it is a legitimate question then to ask if past and present U.S. policy toward Communist China is designed to diminish that hostility which makes nuclear power so dangerous. Does our policy of isolating China from the leavening influences of the world community really contribute to our own security? The article raises this question.

It may, perhaps, be inevitable that policies will become associated with the individuals who espouse them, and thus give those individuals a vested interest in defending policy rather than examining it. Yet, in terms of the Nation's future, it is of no consequence who is right and who is wrong—only what is right and what is wrong. None of us are infallible, and it is with this in mind that I ask simply that these basic issues be considered on their merits in as dispassionate and rational a way as possible—divorced from the increasingly bitter atmosphere of attack and defense.

The article follows:

WE PROTEST THE NATIONAL POLICY IN VIETNAM

(NOTE.—The hardest strokes of heaven fall in history upon those who imagine that they can control things in a sovereign manner, as though they were kings of the earth, playing providence not only for themselves but for the far future—reaching out into the future with the wrong kind of farsightedness, and gambling on a lot of risky calculations in which there must never be a single mistake.)

(By Herbert Butterfield)

The U.S. involvement in southeast Asia has become a case study in Herbert Butterfield's thesis. In the last decade Christianity and Crisis has frequently appealed for a change in American policies in Asia. Now we must register our emphatic protest against the policies and acts that are leading to increasingly portentous war.

Nobody planned this war. Neither brute malice no innocent miscalculation brought it about. It is the result of a series of fateful decisions in which human fallibility, accentuated by moral insensitivity and pretension, turned a brush-fire war into a major conflict. In the process the nature of the initial U.S. commitments has changed beyond recognition.

Beneath all the immediate perplexities is the deep confusion in our Government's aims. Sometimes the stated policy is to prevent any gains for communism. At other times it is to give the people of Vietnam their free choice of a government—and that, everybody knows, may be a Communist government. Talk of unconditional readiness to negotiate is mixed with adamant unwillingness to concede anything. These contradictions may not be confusing the enemy, but they are certainly confusing the American public and our allies.

We would like to assume the best, although much that the administration does makes this difficult. Let us acknowledge that Washington has engaged in a dramatic peace offensive that has drawn scornful rebuffs. Let us grant that the national leaders have told the world and particularly the U.N. that we want a solution based on the Geneva accords of 1954, a solution that will offer self-determination to the people of Vietnam. Let us point out that we see slender clues of willingness to modify the refusals, previously adamant, to give the Vietcong a place in negotiations.

Even if this best possible case is made, the United States still finds itself engaged in a war that is destructive to the people whom we claim to be helping, to the peace of the world and to our best interests.

The burning of villages, the killing and maiming of civilians, area bombing and the use of napalm and chemical destruction of crops inflict immediate human suffering that makes incredible the official promises of pacification and remote benefits. Repeatedly such tactics alienate and harm the very people we purport to save.

The United States is concentrating on one dubious battleground the brainpower and resources needed for meeting a world that bristles with unsolved problems. Constructive acts in Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East get little attention because of the hypnotic preoccupation with east Asia.

Contrary to the evidence of history and the wisdom learned in Europe, our leaders still treat Asian communism as a single enemy. Instead of promoting diversity within it, their acts drive Ho Chi Minh to greater dependence on China (despite the traditional feelings of his people). Thus American policy creates the monolithic Communist unity that it fears.

The war in Asia aggravataes irritations between the United States and the Soviet Union at a time when the two share more common purposes than in any period since World War II.

Our Nation is becoming increasingly lonely in the world, losing or embarrassing European, African, and Asian allies, and building a legacy of hatred and resentment for "neocolonialism."

The Government is neglecting or deferring its attacks upon urgent needs of American society needs that the President has heretofore met with impressive resourcefulness.

By continuing to isolate China from the world of nations, U.S. policy reinforces the Chinese paranoia and isolation that a wiser policy would seek to overcome. A look at a map of American bases near China makes obvious some reasons for Chinese fear and distrust.

Our society is letting the specific struggle in Vietnam blind us to the nature of the world revolution, which calls for far greater understanding and appreciation that we have yet shown.

Thus we find the American nation deeply committed to a self-defeating course of action. Every intensification of the war makes the ultimate resolution more difficult.

We do not pretend that there are ideal solutions. Rather than look for painless ways out, we need to compare various possibilities with the present grim realities. for example:

We are told that American prestige is at stake and that we cannot settle for anything less than victory. We answer that our country has shown in Korea that a strong people can afford to value peace above victory. We believe that a stubborn vanity, provoking continued hostility, is more damaging to prestige than is a wisdom that seeks peace.

We are told that only our military power can protect our allies from vengeance at the hands of their enemies. We do not deny that all factions in Vietnam have a capacity for vengeance. Any settlement should make all possible provision for the protection of people. But we also know that our present policies inflict great cruelties on our friends as well as our enemies.

We are told that any concession will start dominoes falling throughtout Asia. We do not accept this simplistic theory, especially when, as in Vietnam, the United States must both create and support the domino. (At the same time, we endorse efforts to strengthen viable governments and economies that afford alternatives to communism.) But we readily grant that a settlement in Vietnam will have consequences elsewhere. These must be compared with the evident effects of the present perilous course.

Our Government has sufficient political, military, and diplomatic ingenuity to work through these very real difficulties. What is lacking so far is the willingness to look at realities and the moral imagination to seek better methods than the present contradictory mixture of peaceful rhetoric and stubborn policy. If the President and the Secretary of State find the will and insight, they can devise the precise maneuvers that hold most hope.

Such maneuvers must show "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind"—to use a phrase from a more glorious time in our national history. They must involve a greater concern for the well-being of people than for ideological abstractions. They must include some sense of proportion in relating means to ends.

The shape of such a settlement may include a convening of the Geneva powers under the persuasion of the United Nations. More likely will be a series of steps of deescalation, disengagement, multilateral diplomatic efforts, and economic reconstruction. Alternatives can be found to the present bitter impasse, but only if policymakers will give up the dogmatic illusions that lead to a fixation on rigid ends regardless of the costs.

Scripture warns that "where there is no vision the people perish." The failure of vision in our time is a blindness to realities no less than to ideals. The threat of this moment is a preoccupation with the enemy that destroys our society's power to understand itself or its foes. In such a time the greatest service to the society comes from those voices—in church, politics, and press—that risk the displeasure of the powers that be in order to challenge dogmatisms that imperil ourselves and our world. To these voices we again add our own.

Signed:

The Editorial Board: John C. Bennett, Richard T. Baker, M. Searle Bates, Waldo Beach, Robert McAfee Brown, Wayne H. Cowan, Harvey Cox, Tom Driver, Johannes C. Hoekendijk, James Kuhn, Robert W. Lynn, John D. Maguire, Stephen C. Rose, Roger L. Shinn, Frances S. Smith, Robert W. Spike.

R. T. Swilling, Construction Contractor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the March 1966 issue of the management magazine of the construction industry, Constructor contained an article written by one of my constituents, Mr. R. T. Swilling, of Whitney, Tex. It is entitled "How To Make Money in Utilities Construction" and I believe it makes interesting reading.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the article below.

HOW TO MAKE MONEY IN UTILITIES CONSTRUCTION

(By R. T. Swilling)

During the last two decades, the utilities contractor has come into his own as an identifiable figure in the diversified field of construction. His workload has increased. His problems have become more intricate. Consequently, there is a much greater need for organization and representation among contractors who perform work for municipal and county governments.

The AGC recognized this need and has acted on it.

I was, I suppose, fortunate to have been born into the utility construction business. My father was in that business long before my birth and I followed him in the construction field when we dug ditches with one horse in the ditch and one on top. So you see that was quite a while ago.

I do not consider myself in the prosperous bracket; however, I am very frank to admit that I made a living for quite a few years out of the utility construction.

What is a contractor? A contractor is an individualist with experience and education, capable of interpreting and analyzing a set of plans and specifications for a project, estimating the quantities and cost of all labor, material, equipment, overhead and profit necessary to construct the project in a given length of time for a set contract price.

HOW TO MAKE MONEY

At every gathering of contractors I have attended, the main item of discussion has been "How to make money," which is my subject here. The reason most often given is: "Let's quit throat cutting and bid the job as it actually should be bid instead of bidding the competition. In doing this, we can all be assured of a fair profit and an equal distribution of the work." However, there is a great difference in knowing how to make money and being able to get results from this knowledge.

I have given considerable thought to the subject and have attempted to break it down and earnestly discuss it to the best of my ability. In so doing, I have come up with five categories:

1. Management. 2. Experience. 3. Personnel. 4. Equipment. 5. And last, but far from least, that of public relations.

MANAGEMENT

Management, in my personal business in Texas is, I think, the most important item. The distribution and scheduling of bids and work so that I can best utilize my forces and equipment are very important. Of course, the last few years we have had a great deal of construction work throughout Texas and we have been able to keep our construction crews pretty busy. If we do have a slack period, we do sometimes take work cheaper than we should. At the same time, we try to bid each job so that we can make a profit.

We have yet to take a job with the thought in mind of keeping our construction crews busy at a loss. I think we would rather pay keymen than knowingly underbid a job. At the same time we realize that we can overexpand and any time we get more work than we can properly supervise we stand a chance of our profit margin going down. Proper scheduling of work wherever possible is, therefore very important.

For the contractor, good management boils down to one thing, know your operating cost and bid accordingly. With competition as keen as it is today, it's impossible to stay competitive and make a profit with inefficient machines, men, or methods. No matter how you slice it, high operating cost and low bid prices can't live together for long. That's a basic law of business life and it won't be repealed. Economists say one of the biggest reasons for business failures is poor management. My guess is that this is especially true in the construction field, where net profits average less than one-third of the profits for all industry.

The year 1964 was close to a record year in work volume for the United States, but it was also close to a record breaker in the bankruptcy rate among contractors. But the well managed, efficient outfits, are going to wind up this year stronger and healthier than ever before.

EXPERIENCE

There is absolutely no replacement for experience. I might reach out and take the most promising young men who have graduated from colleges around the country and are at the top of their classes in theory. These men, when thrown into the construction field without experience, very often are dismal failures.

Book knowledge and theory alone cannot ordinarily be successful in construction. Of course, this to some extent is changing with the advent of the critical path method, IBM sytsem, and what have you in the advanced fields of education. However, whatever you might say, there is nothing like actual field construction experience.

Some of the best men I have and some of the best I have known in the construction industry have not been college graduates and some have not even completed high school. By this I do not mean that education is not important. Some of these very men I have talked about could today be industry leaders had they had a complete education. However, some with the highest college degrees will never be successful in this industry.

One of the things I most vividly remember was something my father told me very early in the construction business, and I quote: "There are two very important things to remember—one, never get to the point that you will not experiment, or that you think you know everything there is to know about the construction business, but always be on the alert for new and improved methods of construction. The second was: never perform a job in such a manner so as not to be welcome back in the same area of future construction."

PERSONNEL

The next item, that of personnel, is, I think, just as important as the management at the top. Without proper personnel, no one can be successful in the competitive business. The selection of competent personnel in all places of your construction is very important. Long before the word "discrimination" was heard of, we found it to our advantage to use the man best qualified, regardless of the race, for the particular phase of construction we were performing.

We have long looked at our personnel with thoughts of advancement from within the ranks wherever possible. We have encouraged our men to become competent in whatever activities they were performing. We have tried to recognize competence and advance that man who shows possibilities.

In my business, I have six superintendents. These men all have worked for me for a number of years. These six men, at one time, didn't know the spigot end of a pipe from the bell end and today they are top superintendents. They were raised, as we call it, up through the ranks. We have found this to be the best method of acquiring good superintendents.

Heretofore we have in all field construction work employed only males. I have not read the paper today, or the latest correspondence from the Government agencies, but I might upon my return home find that we will have to put women to digging ditches, placing the pipe, etc.

I do not need to tell you what this might do in future advancement of personnel. This might also create some other diversions that would not work toward the profit angle.

With some of the other Government regulations, it might be that we will not always be able to promote upon the basis of merit and skill, but until that time comes, you can best keep the morale of your employees up by close supervision and promotion whenever the man is qualified and indicates the willingness necessary to perform better and more work. By following this practice, you can keep your personnel and not lose qualified employees to competitors.

A personal inspection of your job and a knowledge of your personnel is very important. At the same time you must remember that there are instances where too close a personal relationship can be detrimental to your organization. It is the easiest thing in the world, where you have a close-knit organization, to create jealousy among your own employees. If you associate outside of your business with an employee to too great an extent, he may begin to think that he is entitled to more privileges. In your absence he may take advantage of your relationship by implying that he has more authority than is actually his.

Believe me, I know this to be true from actual experience. This goes back to the old Army theory where the officers are not allowed to fraternize with the enlisted men. I cannot say that this is entirely right, but too much of it can, in some cases, be detrimental to your organization.

Misarranged personnel, how good or how bad, can be very costly. An operator at $3 per hour using a shovel or a laborer trying to run a $30,000 ditching machine can be very costly, too. It is a daily task to see that the right personnel is in the right position. You need to be close to your personnel; however, as I have heretofore said, you can be too close.

EXPERIENCE

Remember that sometimes it is necessary to bid construction work that you are not thoroughly familiar with and to really be successful, you must sometimes step into other fields, but don't do so blindly. If you decide to step over into work that you have not previously performed, don't take the attitude that my father warned me against and think that you know it all. Seek advice and personnel qualified for the type of construction you are undertaking.

I would rather be thought foolish by asking questions than to lose money by my "know it all" attitude. Sometimes help can be gained from one of your competitors simply by asking. You certainly have nothing to lose. You might want to disregard the advice he gives you, but it does not hurt to seek that advice.

EQUIPMENT

All of you know without my making the statement that the necessary equipment without having a surplus of idle equipment is very important. If you don't have the proper equipment for the job, rent it, borrow it, or if you see a future, buy it.

Competent operators and the proper maintenance of the equipment are also of the utmost importance. An unskilled operator, or an incompetent one, or a careless one can cause more damage in a day's time than you can possibly make with that piece of equipment in several weeks. We have competent mechanics who continually inspect our equipment and at the first sign of needed repairs, the equipment is pulled out, overhauled, and repaired. Small items that need repair will grow into large costly items.

In rapid progress of construction equipment new items are continually being brought on the market that can outperform older equipment; however, some of the pieces of equipment we now have, such as ditching machines, backfillers, etc., we have had for a number of years and cannot be replaced and, in my opinion, cannot be very much improved upon.

The days I mentioned earlier of following the mule along the trench are, of course, passed, but some of the pieces of equipment that we used in the years not too long ago after that have been replaced with similar equipment and is yet today serving its purpose. You cannot make a profit with worn-out or outmoded equipment. It must be kept in repair and in top shape and an inspection from time to time eliminates costly breakdowns and repairs.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

The other piece of advice my father gave me early in the game—"Never to perform a job in such a manner so as not to be welcome back in the same area on future construction"—relates to the public relations field. This can be one of the most important items in your items in your whole construction project.

An antagonistic inspector or engineer can mean the difference in profit or loss on the job. By this I don't mean to let the inspector or engineer run your job and tell you what to do, but don't go out of your way to antagonize him. Try to perform the job as it is set out in the general conditions and specifications with the least of inconvenience to the public and citizens in the area in which you are working.

Don't move in and open a long stretch of street, completely blocking the residents of the area from access to their homes and businesses when you can, with proper followup and proper scheduling of your work, eliminate to a great extent the inconvenience of those people fronting upon your project.

I have found that it is very effective either by letter or personal contact to notify the people that they are going to be inconvenienced and will possibly not be able to drive their cars into their own garages that night or that their water might be shut off for a short period of time. In other words, warn them of any inconvenience that your construction work might put them to.

This can mean a great difference in your insurance rate and claims for damage—either real or imaginary. The proper approach will, in most instances, eliminate any claims for damage, unless actual damages have been created.

By all means if a city official or one who thinks he is important in the area comes out and asks why you are doing it this way or why you are scheduling your work in this manner or why he can't go home that night, try to explain it to him, but your best method is to forewarn him of the inconvenience anticipated.

If you find that inspector or engineer trying to run your job, telling you how to perform your work, don't, except as a last resort, go to his superior, but try to reason with him. Tell him that you have found it best to perform the job in the manner in which you are performing it and do the work as it should be done in compliance with the specifications.

If you see a way that it can be done better, ask if you might do it that way. If you find a better material, make the suggestion that it be used. In other words, don't be afraid to innovate and use new methods and materials if they will do the job and you can get permission to use them.

This leads us back to the question "How does one become a successful contractor?" It is not simple or certain, but I feel if we live by the motto of our association, skill, responsibility, and integrity the question might be solved to a great degree.

Freedom's Sole Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, prominent newspapers throughout the United States on March 11 carried an exceptional editorial advertisement sponsored by A. N. Spanel, president of International Latex Corp. It concerned the worsening relationship between the United States and France, and proposed a personal discussion between the Presidents of these two great sister Republics at the earliest possible date.

This is a course of action which members of the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community have been advocating publicly and repeatedly for nearly a year. It is gratifying to see this eloquent statement so widely publicized.

Here is the text of the editorial advertisement:

FREEDOM'S SOLE HOPE

(By A. N. Spanel, founder-chairman, International Latex Corp.)

Our world of freedom is today being eroded from within by creeping disunity and self-delusions. The strength of genuine Western alliance, which has been and remains the only effective deterrent to Communist ambitions, is being dissipated through recriminations and go-it-alone threats.

This menace to our common cause and common safety is too grim to be treated lightly. The margins of time for restoring the disciplines of mutual trust and support are shrinking. The compelling immediate need, therefore, is not to apportion blame but to undertake repair and reconciliation before it is too late. We stand at a crossroads in history where we dare not, for the survival of our civilization, allow considerations of short-term advantage or pride to take precedence over common sense and common prudence.

The best hope for healing the widening breach between France and the United States, we believe, lies in an early and serious meeting between Presidents de Gaulle and Johnson. There is the risk that the American President's natural warmth and exuberance might be misinterpreted as "American salesmanship" or worse, misconstrued as weakness. But it is a risk that can be minimized if, warned in advance, the well-known French genius for reason and logic is objectively encouraged and met.

Ever since his election to power it has been clear that French foreign policy has been almost entirely in the hands of General de Gaulle. For this, of course, he has a valid mandate from his people, and surely his place in history cannot be denied. But since the general sometimes speaks in enigmas and appears less concerned with the present than with the distant future, clarification of the immediate situation can no longer be postponed.

COLD FACTS ESSENTIAL

It is vital that President Johnson convey to General de Gaulle directly, as between traditional friends, our purpose and determination in freedom's cause, a dedication totally free from material gain. At such a meeting the unvarnished truth must prevail—a truth geared to the realities of Communist expansionism and the certainty that the destines of all free nations, especially of France and the United States, remain inseparable.

General de Gaulle has given the world a blueprint of his decision for what amounts to the substantial withdrawal of France from NATO. If such a calamity is not averted, we shall face the abyss. This gives a special dimension of urgency to the proposed meeting.

The tensions between the two great, mature nations can and must be relaxed. In the din of public polemics let us not, on both sides of the Atlantic, forget or discount the ties that bind America and France. French blood and valor helped us establish the American Republic. In two world wars, American blood and valor helped to save the French people from defeat and servitude.

BLOOD AND POWER POLITICS

Cynics may dismiss such things as cliches, but they are the kind of cliches by which men and nations live. We continue to believe that this mingled precious blood is thicker than politics. We continue to believe, therefore, that a renewed and even more fruitful accommodation can be worked out. The attempt of any free nation to go it alone in a shrunken world, to act divisively, can be made only at the peril of freedom for all. And this is especially true of the United States and France. Exclusivity, isolationism, and nationalism simply cannot be squared with the nuclear age.

Let us be clear on fundamentals. Despite surface changes and tactical moves to confuse us and to disarm us psychologically, the Communist commitment to one Communist world has remained inflexible. Their strategy remains what it has always been—to subvert, divide, and conquer.

The supreme delusion nurtured in our camp is that a species of an enduring "separate peace" by one or another free nation is possible. But this notion that world communism can be placated, tamed, or bought off with concessions is pure fantasy. It is the bait on the trap and can be fatal for everything we hold sacred, whether the nation tempted to bite be the United States or France. Our freedom is indivisible, and history will not forget or forgive those who now act divisively.

The commonsense imperatives of common danger demand an honest reappraisal. Out of this the two great Presidents can achieve a successful reconciliation. This is the moment of decision for freedom or slavery, peace, or war. It demands candor on both sides and rules out self-righteousness on both sides.

INFORMED AMERICANS KNOW

Informed Americans are aware that since 1945 our country often failed to support British, Dutch, and French efforts to bring stability in the Far East, Africa, and the Near East. With respect to France, our errors have been especially large and tragic.

American policymakers, confronted with the French problem in Indochina, chose to label as a "colonial war" what was in fact a struggle to stave off the spread of communism in the Pacific world. In North Africa we gave military and dollar aid to Tunisia and Morocco, knowing that it would be diverted to support the rebels in Algeria. Finally, there was what Washington did—in cooperation with Moscow—to frustrate France, Britain, and Israel in the Suez crisis. The memory rankles and an unhealed wound continues unhealed in the Near East.

But these are the mistakes of yesterday. None of them justifies the deadly errors of divisiveness and unilateral decisions today, whether by France, the United States, or any other ally. This planet is doomed if dominant leaders of our world fail to mobilize their aggregate physical, intellectual and spiritual resources for unified organization and policy.

The immediate enemies are complacency and procrastination, since these allow suicidal trends to take an unimpeded course. Nobody wants a nuclear showdown between the two worlds, and that includes the Communists. They may be ruthless fanatics but they are not mad. A divided and brawling free world, however, by raising illusions in the citadels of world communism, may produce the miscalculations and over-confidence that could touch off the showdown nobody wants. Hence our unity, in depth and breadth, now and in the long run is our best, our only guarantee against universal holocaust.

OUR ONLY HOPE

We must, on both sides of the Atlantic, renounce cynicism and skepticism which block the road to understanding. We need, more than ever, true Western solidarity, resting on shared strengths and purposes—not merely an "alliance" in the technical, legalistic sense; we need a unity that compasses even the sacrifice of immediate self-interest for the long-term self-interests of our indivisible destiny.

It is in this spirit that the two Presidents should meet without delay. One hopes that Americans do not underrate the maturity and national aspirations of France; and that the French people do not dilute or destroy their contribution to the community of the free and, in particular, do not misjudge American anxieties over the deepening fissures in the structure of true alliance.

The last and best hope for the free world is to be found in the unshakeable solidarity of the United States, France, and their allies. Less than that would bring chaos, danger, and ultimately nuclear destruction. Isolationism has become an anachronism in our interdependent and menaced world. Let us be clear on the hard truth that it is no less anachronistic for France than for the United States.

Benefits Under the Cold War GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, since World War II, many American men have been called upon to serve in our Armed Forces to fight the cold war and protect the free world.

Like many of my colleagues, I vigorously supported enactment of the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act and was heartened when the President signed what is now referred to as the Great Society's cold war GI bill.

I recently received from the White House a letter pertaining to the application of the act to the Third Congressional District of Maryland, and I place the information in the Appendix of the RECORD, so Maryland veterans will be informed of their rightful benefits.

The letter follows:

Approximately 5,500 veterans in Maryland's Third Congressional District are potentially eligible for benefits and services under the new GI bill just signed by President Johnson.

The new GI bill provides education and training programs generally patterned after the highly successful GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict.

In the first year alone over 690 veterans are expected to take advantage of the educational benefits, according to statistics from the Veterans' Administration. This educational provision is expected to provide the veterans in the district almost $443,000 in direct benefits in that first year.

The educational provisions of the new bill go into effect June 1, 1966, giving the veteran ample time to plan his schooling program.

In addition to the educational benefits, the program is expected to provide VA guaranteed loans totaling $598,000 to some 35 veterans in the first year.

The veterans covered under this bill are also eligible for hospital benefits, and 875 patient-days at a cost of $22,500 are expected to be made available to applying veterans in the first year.

All veterans are eligible for educational and guaranteed home loan benefits who were on active duty more than 180 days after January 31, 1955, and honorably discharged, or who were discharged with less than 180 days service because of a service-incurred disability.

Under the education and training sections, monthly payments for full-time training are: $100 for veterans without dependents, $125 for veterans with one dependent, $150 for veterans with more than one dependent.

Veterans eligible can receive up to 36 months of schooling or training on the basis of 1 month for each month spent in uniform.

The veteran must complete his program of education within 8 years after discharge.

The GI home loan provisions of the bill would increase activity in building and real estate activity throughout the country.

The formula for eligibility of the veteran to participate in the GI home loan program is the same as that already in existence; that is, 10 years from the date of discharge, plus 1 year for each 3 months served.

Entitlement shall not continue beyond 20 years, nor shall it expire before 10 years.

Guaranteed or insured loan ceilings remain at $7,500.

Medical and hospital care is available on the same basis as for wartime veterans.

Other benefits include burial benefits, employment assistance, and veterans' preference in Federal employment.

A Military Secret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the complete failure of the administration's foreign policy is seen in the total disregard which the Canadian Government has for the complications in southeast Asia. While the Johnson administration commits American troops to battle and loss of life in Vietnam, Canadians reap a profit in sales to Red China, secure in the knowledge that the U.S. military defense is protecting them from a sneak Communist attack. The Chicago Tribune, in a very timely and appropriate editorial, illustrates this situation:

A MILITARY SECRET?

The question was a routine one. Our correspondent in Ottawa, Eugene Griffin, asked the appropriate Canadian official how many dollars were spent in Canada last year by the U.S. Defense Department. The answer had always been readily forthcoming.

But not this time. "The sensitivity at the American end is very great," the official explained. The Canadian Government had promised Washington that it wouldn't make the figures public.

Sensitivity? We doubt that any of Ho Chi Minh's agents are snooping about trying to find out what we spend in Canada, especially when the total figures are readily available in the budget and elsewhere. The national security is hardly at stake.

The sensitivity here, we suspect, is of a different nature. The Johnson administration has been blaming private business for the persistent deficit in our foreign payments, and has called on businessmen to reduce the number of dollars they spend abroad. Administration spokesmen have even threatened formal controls if the "voluntary" method fails.

Meanwhile the United States was spending about $600 million a year on defense material from Canada before 1965, and last year the figure no doubt went up substantially. Whatever it was, it was large enough to make any businessman sit up and take notice, especially when his own spending was restricted.

If all of this money is being spent on essential military supplies that cannot be obtained in the United States, no businessman is likely to complain. By trying to keep the figure secret, therefore, the Government seems to be inviting the suspicion that its spending is open to criticism. Secrecy on matters like this is hardly going to create confidence in businessmen or encourage their cooperation.

The Untold Story: Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, March 4, 1966:

THE UNTOLD STORY: REPORTING

(By Joseph Alsop)

It is against custom; but it is an unfortunate necessity to end this series with a warning. Everyone should now be warned to suspect some of the most important reporting from Vietnam.

Consider for example, a very great newspaper's two successive stories, sent from Saigon on February 17 and 18. Both concerned the big spoiling operation General Westmoreland mounted not long ago in Binhdinh Province. The operation's aim, according to the first story, was to find and destroy four regiments of enemy regulars, half Vietcong and half North Vietnamese.

In reality, the original aim was to strike only two enemy regiments, the 18th Regiment of the North Vietnamese 325th Division and the 2d Vietcong Main Force Regiment. Almost at once, however, a third, predominantly northern regiment with the enemy code name of "Quyet Tam" was discovered by our troops. All were operating under a temporary divisional headquarters with the code name "Sau Vang." None of this matters much, compared to the following flat, unqualified assertion, in the first of these two stories:

"Not one of these (enemy) regiments has yet been drawn into battle."

The story did not stop there, either. Both the Binhdinh operation and General Westmoreland's basic strategy were roundly condemned as failures, on the ground that the target regiments were not "drawn into battle." An accompanying editorial all but crowed over this report of failure of American troops in the field.

Hence it was a bit bewildering to learn from the second story, by another reporter, on the same paper, that our troops had captured a very high-ranking Vietcong officer, Lt. Col. Dong Duan, commander of the 93d Battalion of the 2d Vietcong Main Force Regiment. This story also repeated that our troops had "not made contact" with their four target-regiments; but now these regiments were differently described, as entirely North Vietnamese.

This change of description was wholly incorrect; for the 2d Vietcong Main Force Regiment had been one of the target-regiments from the very outset, as implied in the first story. But as this was the perhaps inconvenient fact and if Dong Duan's outfit was never "drawn into battle," how the devil did a battalion commander get himself captured on the battlefield?

These fairly lurid inconsistencies led to consultation of this reporter's Vietnamese notes, and far more important, to telegraphic inquiries to Westmoreland's headquarters in Saigon. In summarizing the results, one must begin by pointing out that a lot depends on what you mean by "contact" and "battle." The Binhdinh fighting certainly did not resemble the Iadrang fighting last October.

The regular troops of the target-regiments were instead brigaded, in battalion and even in company strength, with units of the Vietcong local forces and even with guerrilla bands; and all were supported by press-ganged groups of peasant porters. Thus in any engagement, the regulars were likely to be encountered in a mixture with the other listed elements.

Even so, before this reporter left Saigon, General Westmoreland gave the considered judgment that two of the target-regiments of enemy regulars had suffered losses that would put these outfits out of action for another 3 months.

By February 26 (for the operation in Binhdinh continued defiantly, despite its stern condemnation as a sad failure on February 17) the U.S. field headquarters was reporting the possible indications of the "complete collapse" of a third target-regiment. These signs of lapse were the continuous increase in numbers of weapons abandoned on the battlefield, plus numbers of defecting enemy troops without precedent in previous experience.

Thus three of the target regiments, though allegedly never drawn into battle, were at least very gravely damaged; and one of the three may well have been scrubbed right off the order of battle. As of February 26, Westmoreland's headquarters talley of the enemy troops killed in action had reached 1,799 by body count, with another 1,700 estimated as killed but not counted.

There are three things to be said about this. First, duplications in body counts sometimes occur in the heat of combat. Second, these duplications are normally trifling, compared to the enemy losses that are uncounted because of the Communist habit of running extreme risks to remove their dead from the battlefield. Only a very rare body count will include victims of our air power, for instance; yet this is the arm the Vietcong fear the most.

Third, it is highly conservative to assume that severely wounded enemy troops were at least double the number of those killed. Add that to more than 400 enemy troops have been captured, and defecting enemy soldiers to date have totaled 470. Thus the enemy's losses of all categories, including guerrillas as well as regulars, must clearly have run far above 7,000 men.

It can be seen, then, why General Westmoreland's headquarters now estimates that 11 enemy battalions, or the equivalent, have been put out of action in the Binhdinh fighting, which is proudly characterized as "the most successful combined operation to date." The characterization is justified, unless Westmoreland's staff is playing ducks and drakes with the facts.

And who is more likely to play ducks and drakes with the facts—reporters rather obviously reflecting the outspoken preconceptions of a great newspaper, or General Westmoreland, who is one of the soberest and most brilliant field commanders in U.S. history?

Extortion, District of Columbia Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial appearing in the Lynchburg News, Lynchburg, Va., of a recent date and reprinted in the Union Star, Brookneal, Va., on Thursday, March 10, 1966. This editorial constitutes a very poignant statement of the horrendous conditions existing in the District of Columbia.

The Federal Government should give consideration to protecting the citizens of the Nation's Capital and leave to the States and localities the enforcement of law and order and the suppression of public mischief. On the contrary it seems that the Washington government tolerates the unspeakable evils existing here in the District of Columbia while sending its agents into every nook and corner of the country, particularly the Southern States, who, whether intended or not, harass and impede the law enforcement officers of those areas in protecting the citizens in their right to pursue their normal and lawful avocations.

The editor of the Union Star is Mr. Herman Ginther whose father before him published this extraordinarily useful weekly newspaper. Young Mr. Ginther is an outstanding citizen, possessing sterling qualities of character.

It will be interesting, I am sure, to the Members of the Congress and others to know that the publishers of the Lynchburg News, Col. Carter Glass III, and Hon. Thomas R. Glass, are the grandsons of the late Honorable Carter Glass, one of the outstanding Americans of this century who served as a member of the Cabinet of the late President Woodrow Wilson, and who represented Virginia with distinction in the U.S. Senate from 1919 to 1946.

The editorial hereinabove referred to is as follows:

EXTORTION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STYLE

The evidence has been piling up through the years: some of those so-called civil rights organizations are nothing more than fronts for rackets operated for the personal profit of their leaders. Still the Justice Department and the Internal Revenue Service look the other way. Any crime, it seems, can be committed in the name of civil rights—even cheating the tax collector, and robbing others of their civil rights.

But give 'em enough rope. At last one of these rights groups—the far-left Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which, incidentally is none of those things—has overreached itself.

Under the pretense of fighting for home rule in Washington—last year it was advocating an African-style revolution in Mississippi—SNCC is demanding that all Washington, D.C., merchants and businessmen sign petitions for home rule, send telegrams to the President and Congress, buy and display "Free D.C." emblems and contribute to a $100,000 fund to campaign for home rule.

SNCC has laid it on the line; it won't waste time begging the merchants, says SNCC Washington Director Marion Barry, Jr. Either they sign up and fork over the money or their names go on the boycott list. They also run the risk of having their display windows bashed in, being picketed, harassed, and otherwised intimidated.

Such tactics, as U.S. Senator Robert Byrd, of West Virginia, told the Senate last week, amount to "extortion, intimidation, and coercion."

The members of this newly formed committee, Senator Byrd snapped, "loudly proclaim themselves the self-styled liberators of the city from political slavery, and, in the same voice, announce their intentions to crush, by resorting to an economic boycott, the individual merchant's right to his own viewpoint."

What next? If the SNCC gets away with this extortion scheme, it will be able to extract money from merchants and individuals on any pretext.

Where will this money be spent? Upon whom? And for what? What books will be audited and who will do the auditing? Are those who were forced to contribute against their will to have a voice in determining how the money will be spent? Senator Byrd asked all these questions and more.

Only the Justice Department and the IRS can supply the answers, after a thorough investigation. For what this bogus "committee" is doing is no different than what Al Capone did a generation ago—on a much smaller scale—in Chicago.

Scarface Al might have had more success if he had had the allies SNCC has in Washington. None other than the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Suffragan Episcopal bishop, has joined SNCC in demanding tribute and support from the Capital's 7,000 merchants.

"We are sorry this kind of militancy (!) is necessary to bring to people the right to vote," Bishop Moore declared, "but all other methods have failed."

People must be robbed, threatened, coerced, and intimidated so they can have the right to vote? As a matter of fact, Washingtonians can vote in Federal elections, which is as it should be, for Washington is a Federal City—owned by and supported by all 50 States.

What this bishop is saying—and many other churchmen today echo these sentiments—is that the ends justify the means. So, he is ready to sanction extortion, intimidation and worse to gain those ends. This is called the "new religion"—but it isn't new. The first bully, the first robber, the first thief practiced this religion, and the Communists and Socialists practice it today. Look at any country where they are in power. Any of them.

If these blackjack tactics pay off and the Congress is bullied into giving Washington home rule, who do you think will rule? The people? Don't be silly. The same pressure groups, the same extortion rackets that dominate the city today, will rule. Either the people do as these organizations say, or there will be demonstrations, picketing, threats, harassment, boycotts, and worse.

The Nation's Capital, with a Negro majority, top-heavy welfare programs and relief rolls, where crime is so prevalent that it is unsafe to walk the streets in daylight in many sections, whose schools are deteriorating, where teachers are mugged, slapped, stabbed and insulted by the students, where civil rights groups can extort, rob, threaten and not only get away with it, but do so with the blessing of a bishop—and the tacit encouragement of those liberals in the Congress who refuse to raise their voice in defense of individual libertes.

The Nation's Capital—symbol and soul of the Great Society.

Address by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago ti was my privilege to hear a brief speech delivered by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, on the occasion of what is known as the Frank S. Land DeMolay Memorial Breakfast under the auspices of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine.

Those of us who were there demonstrated by our presence our belief in the Order of DeMolay and the youth of our land. We, therefore, listened enthralled to Mr. Hoover's brief but extremely important words.

If you will read them, you too will find yourself filled with new faith and confidence and you will share with me the conviction that when we can turn our jobs over to the new generation those jobs will be in capable hands:

REMARKS OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, BEFORE THE FRANK S. LAND DEMOLAY MEMORIAL BREAKFAST, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C. FEBRUARY 23, 1966

INTRODUCTION OF DIRECTOR BY MR. GEORGE STRINGFELLOW

I present the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, a native of Washington, D.C., who entered the Department of Justice 49 years ago. Seven years later he become Director of the FBI and he has held that position with honor and built great prestige ever since. On invitation of our imperial potentate, this great American, and I mean that in every sense, will speak to us for a few moments on the subject of his choice. Mr. Hoover.

REMARKS OF THE DIRECTOR

It is indeed a real pleasure for me to be able to attend the Frank Land DeMolay memorial breakfast and to honor one of the great men of Masonry and a great American. I had the unusual privilege of being escorted to the Temple by Frank Land on the evening I received my 33d degree. Frank Land's name is etched in the hearts and the souls of thousands of fellow men because of the great achievements he attained. He was a man who not only had great dedication of soul, but also great nobility of purpose. And that is represented by the great order of which he was the founder and to which he gave his life.

I think that the Nation today is a greater nation because of the Order of DeMolay. This large organization commands the respect of all law-abiding citizens and is an example that may well be followed by millions of other young Americans to make this country a better and safer place in which to live. I honor the friendship of Frank Land because of his mighty deeds and because of the nobility of purpose with which he founded the organization represented by this magnificant group of young men.

The Order of DeMolay, in my estimation, has contributed materially to the strengthening of our Nation. Its young members are exemplifying the ideals of integrity, of loyalty and of courage. It is indeed a group that puts country ahead of self, and there are some elements in this country today that might well adopt that particular tenet of the DeMolay Order. Rather than the vicious and carping criticism directed against our great President in his burdensome duties of carrying out the foreign policy and the operation of our troops in Vietnam, our Nation would better be served by putting country ahead of self. The young men of DeMolay stand forthrightly for honor, for justice, for love of fellow man and for loyalty to country. They are ideal examples for millions of young Americans today who could become better Americans and make this country a better country.

We are living in a period of great crisis throughout the world. Evil, vicious, and godless forces such as communism are endeavoring to destroy the institutions of democracy not only in the United States but in the far-off paddy fields of Vietnam, in the hills of the Dominican Republic and in other areas of the world where this country has extended a helping hand to the depressed and to the underprivileged. The Communist Party of America is doing everything in its power to steal the minds and the souls and the hearts of our young people. They have never worked so feverishly as they have in the last few years in some of our colleges and institutions to enlist the youth of this country in behalf of a foreign power, the Soviet Union.

Therefore, we today need the young men of DeMolay, young men who will stand up and be counted, young men who are deeply loyal and deeply faithful to their oaths. And you gentlemen who go back to your various communities, I hope that you carry back the urge for all of these young men to really around the stars and stripes and to stand up and be counted and say: "Here we are, you can count upon us."

That is the policy and that is the principle of Frank Land, the principle of DeMolay and it's the principle of America. You should be very thankful in this country that a man was raised such as Frank Land—a man who brought to everyone with whom he came in contact a feeling of humility and a feeling of inspiration. He was one of the great men of the century, and his name will forever be inscribed on the rolls of great Americans. We should thank God that he has made each of us a better citizen and, in the end, a better American. I thank you.

CLOSING REMARKS BY MR. STRINGFELLOW

Brother Hoover, I am confident that I reflect the sentiment of everyone within the sound of your voice when I say your remarks have edified us and your conduct and example have made good citizens better citizens. I believe it was Aristotle who in his wisdom once said: "There's no greater compliment one man can pay to another than to say he is a good citizen." You have paid us that compliment this morning by your presence here. Thank you, sir.

Food for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. MACKIE
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1966, I was privileged to present to the chairman and members of the House Committee on Agriculture, a citizen of my State of Michigan, Mr. E. Lee Feller, president of Fellman & Alliance Associates, Inc.

His vast knowledge and understanding of the complexities of food aid programs enabled him to deliver—what I consider—impressive testimony relative to the proposed food-for-freedom programs, a matter in which I am very concerned, as evidenced by my bill, H.R. 11122.

I am pleased to commend this testimony to the attention and interest of my colleagues:

Hon. HAROLD COOLEY and members of the committee, I am E. Lee Feller, president of Fellman & Alliance Associates, Inc., of Michigan. Alliance Associates handles private label food supply and developmental problems for major regional food chains throughout the Middle West and East whose combined retail volume is in excess of $400 million. Fellman Associates is a research, developmental, and consulting firm with considerable experience in dealing with retail and wholesale food distribution problems throughout Western Europe, Latin America, and Australia. It was in this connection that I had the opportunity to head up the program planning and the first Office of Food Distribution Development within the Economic Development Administration of the Puerto Rican Government. In addition, our company has conducted food distribution development studies and development efforts for private clients, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris, and the U.S. State Department, in various developing nations throughout the Western World.

I am a former member of the board of directors of the American Food for Peace Council and presently program chairman and a member of the board of directors of the Michigan Freedom From Hunger Council, of which Gov. George Romney is honorary chairman, as well as a national director of the Committee on the World Food Crisis which was organized on December 9, 1965.

I am here before you this morning to express my personal concern with the general failure on the part of various AID agencies and food AID programs to recognize that if we seriously want to develop the capacity of food-short countries to feed themselves, we must not only provide adequate technical and financial assistance to primary agricultural producers, but also we must provide adequate technical and financial assistance to the distribution sector of the food economy. Such aid is necessary to secure the revolutionary changes in distribution which are vital to the need to lower consumer food prices and to provide organized and large volume markets to primary agricultural producers. Without revolutionary changes in the distribution structure of most developing nations, attempts to radically increase primary agricultural production will be sharply curtailed by the bottleneck of vastly inefficient retail and wholesale channels that serve to hold consumer prices high and primary agricultural prices low regardless of the supply and demand relationships. Without major changes in the food distribution structure of most developing nations, farmers will not have the necessary financial incentives to sharply increase their production.

To demonstrate this, let me cite this example, which is so often the case where major efforts are made to increase primary agricultural production without comparable efforts to change wholesale and retail distribution patterns. * * * Presume that, through technical and financial assistance in a given developing area, a farmer is taught to grow two crates of lettuce where he formerly grew one. Presume further that the secondary trucker or other similarly unorganized and inefficient wholesaler was prevailed upon to attempt to mass distribute this 100 percent increase in productive efficiency. In a typical developing nation the average grocery store is about 10 feet by 12 feet in size and is one of unnumbered thousands serving the food needs of the urban areas. The wholesaler goes into this small shop and tells the retailer his story that the production of lettuce has been doubled and that the wholesaler price has been sharply reduced from 25 cents a head to 15 cents a head. He asks of the retailer: "How many heads do you want?"

The retailer replies, "Give me six heads."

"How many did you sell last week?" the wholesaler asks.

"Six heads," replies the retailer.

"What price did you sell the lettuce for last week?" asks the wholesaler.

"At 40 cents a head," replies the retailer.

"And how much are you going to sell lettuce for this week?" asks the wholesaler.

"At 40 cents a head," replies the retailer.

"Why?" ask the wholesaler. "The wholesale cost has dropped sharply. Why not double your purchases of lettuce, drop your retail price, and really sell lettuce?"

"Why?" asks the retailer. "There are only six people in my neighborhood who eat lettuce and the net effect of my buying more lettuce and cutting my price would be that half of it would rot, and I would end up making less money. * * * Thank you, no. * * * Just give me six heads, but I do appreciate the lower price to me."

The sad part of this story is that, from a pragmatic and very personal point of view, the retailer is absolutely right. Because of the smallness of his shop, he cannot mass display and merchandise lettuce. Because he is not a member of a retailer cooperative or voluntary chain of retailers, he cannot advertise lower prices and thus increase his total volume. Because he is a subsistance operator himself, he cannot afford to gamble on modern theories. He had rather sell six heads of lettuce at 50 percent markup than risk the chance of selling 12 heads at 30 percent markup. Big volume—low markup marketing theory is not part of his thinking. He has learned the hard way to believe in the limited market concept and, besides, as many merchants in many developing nations will tell you, with a limited market anyway, it is ungentlemanly to cut a price.

I have told this long story to make the point that, just as it is difficult but vital to teach farmers to use modern fertilizers and seeds, it is equally difficult but vital to provide the technical and financial assistance to the wholesale and retail food distribution sector of developing economies in order that mass agricultural producers will have the necessary financial incentives of a modern marketplace to market ever greater quantities of agricultural produce at ever lower prices to consumers and ever increasing income to the primary producer.

It is this failure in most food AID programs and in agency technical and financial aid programing and staffing that is my primary concern in this testimony.

While speaking as an individual, I think I am expressing the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the members of the Michigan Freedom From Hunger Council when I say that I endorse the objectives of the bills before this committee, both of which are aimed at broadening our food AID efforts to more fully enlist the power of American agriculture in our political struggle to get at the root causes of communism and not just military containment.

I endorse not only the world political objectives of sharply expanded food-for-freedom and food-for-peace programs and the attendant economic advantages to American farmers, but I endorse the simple fact that it is a humanitarian necessity to come to the assistance of the millions who are starving in a world of potential abundance.

Our sense of political expediency as well as our sense of human values is out of balance when we can justify the expenditure of $20 billion to put a man on the moon and leave a billion starving people on earth.

We must dry up the swamps that breed mosquitoes like Castro who has said, "I will rise to power in Latin America on empty bellies." We must redouble our efforts to put out the fire under the boiling pot of economic and social unrest in the world that stems in large measure from sheer hunger for an adequate diet. We cannot long hold the lid on this boiling pot with military containment alone. The fact that we are now spending over $50 billion for military containment and only $1½ billion for the food-for-peace program is a sad commentary on our sense of political, economic, and humanitarian judgment.

I commend the members of this committee on these hearings and the apparent desire to more fully enlist the power of American agriculture in the battle for freedom and against hunger in the world. Not only must the present food AID and developmental efforts be greatly expanded, but I think we should take note of the fact that, along with a larger program that will provide more and better weapons to fight hunger, we need a new sense of urgency and commitment among the administrators of such AID and developmental programs. Based on my own experience with various line personnel within our AID programs, I can say that, while we do have many highly dedicated and competent people staffing our AID efforts, the fact remains that there apparently is lacking among many, a sense of urgency and an "It can be done" attitude. The same dedication, sense of urgency, and "It can be done" attitude that is so strong within our space and military programs must be developed more fully within our economic and political aid programs which are so heavily supported by food-for-peace shipments and the counterpart funds thus generated.

Having strongly endorsed this committee's efforts to come up with a food-for-freedom bill capable of more fully meeting world humanitarian and political needs, I would like to go back briefly to my original statement that I hope this committee will spell out specifically the need not only for technical and financial assistance to help primary agricultural producers in developing nations to grow more food but also the need for technical and financial assistance to help modernize the distribution sector of these same developing nations. Primary production is 50 percent of the problem. Inefficient distribution methods remains as the other 50 percent of the same coin.

During the administration of our late President Kennedy, he sent this message to the Boston Conference on Distribution: "In view of the efforts we are making through the Alianza para Progresso and in our foreign aid program to establish a long-term basis of economic development. * * * We must find more efficient ways to distribute the goods we produce * * * we can and must do better * * * and help the people in developing nations accomplish, through democratic means, their revolution of expectations."

Thirteen years earlier Teodoro Moscoso, then head of the Puerto Rican Economic Development Administration, attended an earlier Boston conference on distribution. Senor Moscosco attended this conference at the request of Gov. Muñoz-Marin who was concerned over Puerto Rico's antiquated food distribution system and its negative effects on the entire Operation Bootstrap program.

Moscoso returned from this conference bringing to Gov. Muñoz-Marin these words of David Lilienthal:

"U.S. progress, economically, can be told in considerable measure by the advance in the techniques in distribution. The unhappy condition of the Middle East, or Latin America, is attributable in substantial measure to a debilitating and static system of distribution. The terrible toll of the poor man's substance that their miserable distribution system exacts, is one of the saddest commentaries on the lives of at least half of the people of the world today."

In Puerto Rico, Moscoso had observed the tragedy of people being hungry in San Juan with farmers throughout the island with unused productive capacity and a desire to grow and sell more food to the urban population. It became apparent to trained observers that, in large measure, high food prices and limited markets and low income to agricultural producers was in large measure the fault of an antiquated, inefficient, and high cost distribution structure.

Studies were made and programs adopted providing for a task force of technical personnel coupled with adequate loan capital programs aimed at stimulating the private enterprise development of a balanced competitive situation among modern channels of food distribution.

There is no time here to go into detail regarding the specifics of the Puerto Rican aid effort aimed at modernizing their food distribution system. It suffices to say that, for the first time in history, an antiquated distribution structure was assisted in going through a rapid free enterprise revolution that resulted not only in a sharp reduction in food prices to consumers but sharply increased consumer purhasing power for food which was reflected in larger and more profitable markets for agricultural producers.

Puerto Rico's attack on a vastly inefficient retail and wholesale structure should be a model for aid efforts in the distribution sectors of developing nations throughout the world. The Puerto Rican effort was prompted by their concern with this problem, as stated by C. D. Jackson, publisher of Life magazine: "Slow productivity and insufficient equipment in the methods of distribution tend to neutralize in large part the reduction in prices brought about by increased industry and to maintain an excessive spread between the retail prices of certain agricultural items and those that are paid to the producer." Puerto Rico's attack on their distribution problems was also motivated by these considerations as stated by J. C. Abbott, Chief of Marketing Branch of FAO, Rome:

"The marketing of agricultural products is vitally important in any campaign to free the world from hunger for two main reasons. Most of those who go to bed hungry do so because the food they need costs more than they can afford. Since the large part of the price is often made up of marketing costs, it is clear that high marketing costs are an important reason why some people have not enough food. The more these costs can be reduced, therefore, the easier it will be for poor consumers to get the food they want. * * * The main reason for stressing the significance of marketing is its impact on production. * * * Effective marketing is critical for the success of development programs designed to uplift a population as a whole. * * * any plan of economic development that aims at diminishing the poverty of the agricultural population, reducing consumer food prices, earning more foreign exchange or eliminating economic wastes, has, therefore, to pay special attention to the development of efficient marketing for food and agricultural products."

No reasonable man aware of not only the vastly inefficient methods of primary agricultural production in most developing nations and familiar with urban marketing methods will seriously dispute the observations and conclusions referred to above. However, it is a sad commentary on our present aid programing and personnel staffing to find out that, for practical major effect and impact, we simply do not now have any major programs operative within our food aid or foreign aid programs which attempt seriously to come to grips with the problem of food distribution modernization in developing nations. We have many programs and many agronomists working on the problem of increasing primary agricultural production. Unfortunately, we have practically no programs and little or no staff of trained urban distribution specialists in our aid programs and on our aid agencies staffs.

As a means of correcting this very unfortunate situation, I do hope this committee will make it a point to stress in the proposed new legislation that not only should major efforts be expended to help farmers in developing nations grow more food, such efforts should be coupled with major efforts to aid the food merchants of developing lands modernize their methods.

In conclusion, I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the committee for this opportunity to appear before you to express my opinions on this very important legislative matter. I would be very happy to provide this committee or any of its individual members with any further documentation that might be required relative to the importance of distribution productivity to overall economic development and any further materials bearing on the Puerto Rican food distribution development program that might be of interest. Thank you.

Tribute to Two Outstanding Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to two outstanding American citizens, Mr. James G. Patton, retiring president of the National Farmers Union and Mr. Glenn Talbott, who is stepping down as vice president of the Farmers Union here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Patton is retiring from the presidency after 25 years of faithful and loyal service, and is not seeking reelection to the post.

When these two men began their careers, the traditional scene of American rural life was very difficult and farmers endured many hardships. But, through efforts of men such as Mr. Patton and Mr. Talbott, great advances have been made in rural life. The spirit and values made and contributed by these men, have given much to the people and for the betterment of rural life in the United States.

I send felicitations, as Congressman from the First District of Iowa, and from the citizens of southeast Iowa, to these fine gentlemen and heartiest congratulations for their years of dedicated service.

Reorganized CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned about the criticism of our Central Intelligence Agency by certain individuals and editorial writers. I, along with other Members of the House and Senate have endeavored to come to their defense.

One of our better editorial writers, Mr. William S. White, has written an article on the CIA and has also come to its defense, and I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD.

REORGANIZED CIA: MAKING USE OF OUTSIDE SKILLS

(By William S. White)

The highly secret Central Intelligence Agency is broadening its communication with Congress, with private American scientists and with American industry.

Almost, indeed, it might be said that CIA is for the first time gingerly entering ordinary American life—or as much of that ordinary life as its unavoidably clandestine basic cast can possibly permit.

This, the most sensitive of the instrumentalities of the American Government in the cold war has not, of course, dropped and cannot drop its inherent cloak-and-dagger covering for some operations.

Within the limits of bedrock and unalterable security precautions, however, Adm. W. F. Raborn, its Director, has reorganized its whole inner structure and approach to make a wide use of outside skills and talents—and information—never before so widely available to CIA.

The production of scientific and technical intelligence, in consequence, has been immensely increased. This has been principally through the cooperation of world-famous American men of science who have been brought in as cleared consultants. Some American industrial concerns have made large direct contributions of their own.

That Raborn, a professional admiral yet, has become the chief of the CIA in order to liquidate some of its old passion for extreme apartness is not without its irony. When he took over "the Agency" there was much expressed fear that with a "military mind" at its head it would more and more tend to operate in darker and darker alleys.

The simple truth is that this has not happened. Nor has Raborn put in some GI system requiring endless saluting of the boss. In truth he has gone to the reverse. CIA was never so little a one-man operation as it is now. The admiral has given to the professional operative who is his deputy, Richard Helms, a degree of power never before held by any man other than the Director himself.

Helms, in truth, actually conducts the day-by-day operations of the Agency. He sits as the CIA representative on the United States combined Intelligence Board. He, as well as Raborn, briefs Members of Congress. The admiral, in short, cheerfully acknowledges Helms' superior savvy as a career intelligence operative. Raborn's simple purpose has been to merge his own executive managerial experience with the intelligence expertise of Richard Helms.

The intelligence community is a small and at heart a closed community and the introduction into CIA of a seadog outsider undoubtedly did not sit well as first within the ranks. But the best information available now is that professional morale is high and not low. This, at any rate, is the estimate of men not involved in the Agency but with certain supervisory powers over it.

The admiral seems to have found a way of running a taut ship without making it also a martial one—and a ship, moreover, which can take on outside and purely civilian passengers occasionally with no harm to them or to the professional crew.

One other fact is perhaps worth noting: Not once in Raborn's regime has CIA been caught napping in any major outbreak of trouble for us around the world.

One of his creations, a new form of special intelligence task force for "special needs," involving senior operations officers from all arms of American intelligence, is on 24-hour watch in every critical area of the earth. The busiest at the moment is Task Force Vietnam—but Task Force Vietnam is not alone.

These special forces serve with far more coldly objective minds—as does the CIA collectively—than is commonly thought by eager critics. Still, nobody is naive enough to suppose that the best possible work will totally free CIA of the instinctive skepticism and sometimes outright hostility of a public which has a healthy suspicion of secret establishments and an immense appetite for melodramatic spy fiction.

One of Raborn's central efforts is to reduce this skepticism, this hostility, by what in CIA language would be called the optimum possible.

Textiles Go to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, as is customary whenever our Nation becomes involved in martial conflict—whether it is called an emergency or war—the American textile industry's essentiality becomes pronounced.

Once again we see this industry responding wholeheartedly to the demands and needs of our Military Establishment.

Therefore, it is with a large measure of pride I invite the attention of my colleagues to a report on the subject, "Textiles Go to War Again." Under unanimous consent I place in the Appendix of the RECORD the following report which has appeared in a number of newspapers:

TEXTILES GO TO WAR AGAIN

As the buildup in Vietnam continues Uncle Sam is calling once more on the Nation's textile industry to provide the basic materials for everything from underwear to tents. But the problems—and the fabrics—are not always the same as they were in France and Korea.

Sheets, towels, uniform cloth, nylon netting: For the third time in little more than 20 years, America's textile industry is turning its efforts and huge capacity to meet the demands of a stepped-up U.S. military situation.

Plants in such diverse places as Fall River, Mass.; New York City; Enoree, S.C.; Trion Ga.; Cooleemee, N.C., and Danville, Va., are among those where people, looms and dyeing ranges are working overtime to help clothe and equip the tens of thousands of American fighting men now in Vietnam.

It's necessary labor. The Office of Emergency Planning (OEP) says it regards the textile industry as an essential part of the Nation's mobilization base. Col. Robert A. Pearson, director of procurement and production at the Defense Supply Agency in Philadelphia, considers the textile industry "extremely vital to national defense."

Ponchos, mosquito nets, pistol belts, regimental flags: The textile industry supplies the basic material for thousands of items used by the Armed Forces in peacetime as well as more urgent periods.

The Defense Supply Agency computes its average annual peacetime procurement of textile goods at about $90 to $100 million. This normally amounts to about one-third of all defense personnel procurement activities. During fiscal 1966, though, as more and more manpower is mobilized for the southeast Asian fighting, direct purchases of textiles have accounted for about 40 percent of all dollar purchases. Additional money was spent for textiles by defense clothing and equipment contractors who manufacture the needed end products from the fabrics provided by the textile industry.

Cotton-nylon jungle boots, mattresses, blankets, cook's jackets, tents, caps and hats of all kinds: Textiles have gone to war in record numbers before. It is estimated more than 10,000 different textile items were used by U.S. Armed Forces during World War II.

Just prior to World War II, military needs took 6 percent of all textile production. By 1944 the figure was 37 percent. Ninety-four percent of all cotton broadwoven fabric made in 1941 was sold in the domestic market. By 1944, 61 percent of these cotton goods were going toward the war effort.

At one point during the war the cotton textile segment of the industry produced 11.1 billion yards of broadwoven cloth in a single year, an alltime high.

Parachute cloth, twill, sateen, denim, cotton-synthetic blends, gloves, helmet bands, name tapes, sergeants' stripes, fatigue pants, socks: Again, during the Korean emergency in the early 1950's, textiles met the challenges of sudden mobilization. For example, one of the critical shortages was in cotton duck cloth, a canvas used by the military for tents, bags, cots, rucksacks and more than 100 other purposes. In fiscal 1948, the entire industry produced only 68 million yards of military-type duck for all its customers. But with close cooperation between the industry and the military, the industry furnished almost 188 million yards of duck to the Defense Department alone during fiscal 1952. More than 60 plants—designed for producing carpets, tire cords, and the like—had converted to the production of cotton duck to supplement 31 regular producers and meet the demand.

Today, duck is in demand again to meet the needs of expanded forces in Vietnam, where warehouses are scarce and tents are required for storage as well as direct military use. During the January-March quarter this year the Government will purchase approximately 33.6-million yards of 9¼ and 8¼ ounce duck.

There were other instances where a flexible industry geared quickly to a demanding international situation and as rapidly thereafter retooled to meet the "normal" demands of relative peacetime.

Face protectors, parkas, nylon hose, hospital gowns, bandages, scarves, raincoats: The coming of age of synthetic fibers and blended fabrics brought a new dimension to military textile purchasing.

Research and development brought about such military uses as nylon parachutes and rainwear, nylon or rayon underwear for servicewomen, rayon twill for lining caps, jackets, and coats. The textile industry kept pace with the changes.

And they were complex. In 1957, Army regulations listing and describing the various types of military clothing and their arrangement covered 300 pages. Military fabrics are subjected to rougher and more varied use than civilian fabrics, requiring different approaches to production.

In fact, reports an official of the Defense Supply Agency, "Goods made to order for the military comprise 90 to 95 percent of the textiles we buy. Very little of the major items we buy are off the shelf."

Airplane wing coating, helicopter propeller deicing fabric, bedspreads, canteen covers, pillowcases, napkins, rifle slings. Textile firms currently are working with the Government on the biggest military procurement program since the Korean war, and are doing their utmost to meet the demands of a beefed-up effort in Vietnam within the time limits imposed. Total estimated requirements, as of mid-January, for textiles in the first quarter of 1966 amount to about 114-million yards.

Again, the military needs millions and millions of yards of duck or canvas, even larger supplies of cotton sateen for fatigue uniforms. But it's also calling for such items as swim trunks, women's dresses, sandbags, and operating gowns.

Just one invitation to bid in January, for example, called for 1,608,156 handkerchiefs. Another asked for 16.7 million yards of cotton poplin. Another called for 19 million sheets—and sheets are one of the few finished end products which the textile industry makes.

The industry is aware that in a full-scale national emergency textile requirements would change drastically and it is mindful of its responsibilities. In 1961 the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (now OEP) listed what textile industry requirements would be in event of all-out emergency attack: all luxury apparel (such as suits) would be eliminated; use of work gloves, overalls, rainwear and other work clothes would increase 200 to 300 percent; tent fabric would be used at the rate of 242 million pounds annually; hospitals would require 186,100,000 pounds of fabric the first year.

Essential civilian needs in case of nuclear attack, the OCDM said, would be gloves, mittens, underwear, diapers, bedding, sleeping bags, surgical cloth, sutures, webbing, masks, tents, and fire hoses—the basic material for all of which would have to be supplied in huge quantities by the textile industry.

Handkerchiefs, signal flags, water bags, gas mask covers, "hash marks" and mattress covers: The boost in military spending comes at a time when textile purchases are at their highest levels in years, with inventories at relatively low levels.

A meaningful example of the industry's progress has been its response to military needs and its ability to meet both military and civilian demands, one textile leader feels.

J. Burton Frierson of Chattanooga, Tenn., president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, central trade organization of the textile industry, said, "Military needs have increased considerably because of the action in Vietnam. Quite often the military requirements are for special constructions, some of which are not ordinarily produced for civilian trade, and this fact may pose problems of change as well as delivery. The textile industry will do its utmost to meet calls and delivery schedules of the Defense Department's supply organizations."

Flight suits, tire cord, stretchers, green berets, T-shirts, the Stars and Stripes.

Policies for School Desegregation Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1966, the U.S. Office of Education issued its "Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

As custodian of most Federal funds dispersed to the Nation's schools, and under the authority granted to it under title VI of the Civil Rights Act, the U.S. Office of Education has the responsibility to see that no Federal funds go to schools that have programs or activities that discriminate as to race, color, or national origin.

The guidelines, as the statement of policies is known, are designed to bring an end to the dual school system that this Nation's highest Court declared illegal more than 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this time the revised 1966 school desegregation guidelines issued by the U.S. Office of Education:

[From the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education]

REVISED STATEMENT OF POLICIES FOR SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PLANS UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, MARCH 1966

(Superseding the general statement of policies issued in April 1965—45 CFR, part 181)

SUBPART A—APPLICABILITY OF THIS STATEMENT OF POLICIES

Section 181.1—Title VI and the HEW regulation

Section 601 of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides that "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

As required by section 602 of title VI, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued a regulation to assure the elimination of discrimination in Federal aid programs it administers. The HEW regulation was published as part 80 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR pt. 80).

Section 181.2—Compliance by school systems eliminating dual school structure

To be eligible for Federal aid, a school system must act to eliminate any practices in violation of title VI, including the continued maintenance of a dual structure of separate schools for students of different races. The HEW regulation recognizes two methods of meeting this requirement: (1) a desegregation order of a Federal court; or (2) a voluntary desegregation plan.

Section 181.3—Purpose of this statement of policies

This statement of policies applies to public elementary and secondary school systems undergoing desegregation to eliminate a dual school structure. It sets forth the requirements which voluntary desegregation plans must meet for the Commissioner to determine under the HEW regulation that a plan is adequate to accomplish the purposes of title VI. This statement supersedes the "General Statement of Policies Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 Respecting Desegregation of Elementary and Secondary Schools," issued in April 1965 and published as 45 CFR, part 181.

Section 181.4—Initial demonstration of compliance

To be eligible for Federal aid, a school system must first assure the Commissioner that it will comply with title VI and the HEW regulation. It must submit the form of assurance that meets its circumstances, under sections 181.5, 181.6, or 181.7 below.

Section 181.5—Systems without dual school structure

(a) Submission of form 441. A school system which does not maintain any characteristic of a dual school structure may initially demonstrate compliance by submitting HEW form 441. This is an assurance of full and immediate compliance with title VI.

(b) Resubmission not required. A school system which has appropriately submitted HEW form 441 need not submit a new copy with subsequent requests for Federal aid, but need only affirm when requested that the assurance submitted continues in effect.

(c) Supplementation of assurance. The Commissioner may require supplementation of HEW form 441 when he has reasonable cause to believe that there is a failure to comply with any provision of title VI or the HEW regulation.

Section 181.6—Systems under Federal court order for desegregation

(a) Submission of order. A school system under a Federal court desegregation order which meets the requirements of the HEW regulation may submit, as evidence of compliance with title VI, a copy of the court order, together with an assurance that it will comply with the order, including any future modification.

(b) Resubmission not required. A school system under a court order accepted by the Commissioner need not submit another copy, but must submit any modification not previously submitted.

(c) Revision of court orders. A school system under a court order for desegregation which is not in accord with current judicial standards is subject to legal action by the Department of Justice, or by the parties to the original suit, to modify the order to meet current standards.

Section 181.7—Systems with voluntary desergegation plans

(a) Submission of form 441-B. A school system with a voluntary desegregation plan must provide an assurance that it will abide by the applicable requirements for such plans contained in this statement of policies. Such assurance may be given by submitting HEW form 441-B to the Commissioner. After April 15, 1966, commitments of funds for new activities will be subject to deferral for school systems which have failed to submit HEW form 441-B.

(b) Changing type of plan. A school system may change from one type of desegregation plan to another if such action would eliminate segregation and all other forms of discrimination more expeditiously. A school system planning to change the type of its plan must submit a new plan meeting the requirements of this statement of policies, together with HEW Form 441-B, for a determination by the Commissioner as to the adequacy of the plan to accomplish the purposes of title VI.

(c) Retaining present type of plan. A school system with a desegregation plan accepted by the Commissioner need not resubmit its plan if it intends to continue under the same type of plan. If a plan accepted by the Commissioner fails to meet any requirement under this statement of policies, the submission of HEW Form 441-B will be deemed to amend the plan so that it will meet such requirement. Amendments to the plan are not to be submitted unless requested. However, certain supporting materials must be submitted, as provided in subparts B, C, D, and F below.

(d) Initial submittal of plans. If no desegregation plan has been submitted or accepted for a school system, HEW Form 441-B and a plan meeting the requirements of this statement of policies must be submitted.

SUBPART B—BASIC REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL VOLUNTARY DESEGREGATION PLANS

Section 181.11—Various types of desegregation plans

It is the responsibility of a school system to adopt and implement a desegregation plan which will eliminate the dual school system and all other forms of discrimination as expeditiously as possible. No single type of plan is appropriate for all school systems. In some cases, the most expeditious means of desegregation is to close the schools originally established for students of one race, particularly where they are small and inadequate, and to assign all the students and teachers to desegregated schools. Another appropriate method is to reorganize the grade structure of schools originally established for students of different races so that these schools are fully utilized, on a desegregated basis, although each school contains fewer grades. In some cases desegregation is accomplished by the establishment of nonracial attendance zones. Under certain conditions, a plan based on free choice of school may be a way to undertake desegregation. In certain cases the purposes of title VI may be most expeditiously accomplished by a plan applying two or more of the foregoing procedures to certain schools or different grade levels. Based on consideration of all the circumstances of a particular school system, the Commissioner may determine that its desegregation plan is not adequate to accomplish the purposes of title VI, in which case he may require the adoption of an alternative plan. In any case where the State education agency is pursuing policies and programs for expediting the elimination of the dual school structure, the Commissioner will consider this factor in determining whether a particular type of plan is adequate for any given school system in such State.

Section 181.12—Student assignment practices

Title VI precludes a school system from any action or inaction designed to perpetuate or promote segregation or any other form of discrimination, or to limit desegregation or maintain what is essentially a dual school structure. Any educational opportunity offered by a school system must be available to students without regard to race, color, or national origin. In particular, any academic tests or other procedures used in assigning students to schools, grades, classrooms, sections, courses of study or for any other purpose must be applied uniformly to all students without regard to race, color, or national origin. Curriculum, credit and promotion procedures must not be applied in such a way as to penalize or hamper students who transfer from one school to another pursuant to a desegregation plan.

Section 181.13—Faculty and staff

(a) Desegregation of staff. The racial composition of the professional staff of a school system, and of the schools in the system, must be considered in determining whether students are subjected to discrimination in educational programs. Each school system is responsible for correcting the effects of all past discriminatory practices in the assignment of teachers and other professional staff.

(b) New assignments. Race, color, or national origin may not be a factor in the hiring or assignment to schools or within schools of teachers and other professional staff, including student teachers and staff serving two or more schools, except to correct the effects of past discriminatory assignments.

(c) Dismissals. Teachers and other professional staff may not be dismissed, demoted, or passed over for retention, promotion, or rehiring, on the ground of race, color, or national origin. In any instance where one or more teachers or other professional staff members are to be displaced as a result of desegregation, no staff vacancy in the school system may be filled through recruitment from outside the system unless the school officials can show that no such displaced staff member is qualified to fill the vacancy. If as a result of desegregation, there is to be a reduction in the total professional staff of the school system, the qualifications of all staff members in the system must be evaluated in selecting the staff members to be released.

(d) Past assignments. The pattern of assignment of teachers and other professional staff among the various schools of a system may not be such that schools are identifiable as intended for students of a particular race, color, or national origin, or such that teachers or other professional staff of a particular race are concentrated in those schools where all, or the majority, of the students are of that race. Each school system has a positive duty to make staff assignments and reassignments necessary to eliminate past discriminatory assignment patterns. Staff desegregation for the 1966–67 school year must include significant progress beyond what was accomplished for the 1965–66 school year in the desegregation of teachers assigned to schools on a regular full-time basis. Patterns of staff assignment to initiate staff desegregation might include, for example: (1) Some desegregation of professional staff in each school in the system, (2) the assignment of a significant portion of the professional staff of each race to particular schools in the system where their race is a minority and where the special staff training programs are established to help with the process of staff desegregation, (3) the assignment of a significant portion of the staff on a desegregated basis to those schools in which the student body is desegregated, (4) the reassignment of the staff of schools being closed to other schools in the system where their race is a minority, or (5) an alternative pattern of assignment which will make comparable progress in bringing about staff desegregation successfully.

Section 181.14—Services, facilities, activities, and programs

(a) General. Each school system is responsible for removing any segregation and any other form of discrimination affecting students in connection with all services, facilities, activities, and programs (including transportation, athletics, and other extracurricular activities) that may be conducted or sponsored by or affiliated with the schools of the system.

(b) Specific situations.

(1) A student attending school for the first time on a desegregated basis may not be subject to any disqualification or waiting period for participation in activities and programs, including athletics, which might otherwise apply because he is a transfer student.

(2) If transportation services are furnished, sponsored, or utilized by a school system, dual or segregated transportation systems and any other form of discrimination must be eliminated. Routing and scheduling of transportation must be planned on the basis of such factors as economy and efficiency, and may not operate to impede

desegregation. Routes and schedules must be changed to the extent necessary to comply with this provision.

(3) All school-related use of athletic fields, meeting rooms, and all other school-related services, facilities, activities, and programs, such as commencement exercises and parent-teacher meetings, which are open to persons other than enrolled students, must be open to all such persons and must be conducted without segregation or any other form of discrimination.

(4) All special educational programs, such as preschool, summer school, and adult education, and any educational program newly instituted, must be conducted without segregation or any other form of discrimination. Free choice desegregation procedures normally may not be applied to such programs.

Section 181.15—Unequal educational program and facilities

In addition to the changes made in student assignment practices under its desegregation plan, each school systems is responsible for removing all other forms of discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin. For example, some school systems still maintain small, inadequate schools that were originally established for students of a particular race and are still used primarily or exclusively for the education of students of such race. If the facilities, teaching materials, or educational program available to students in such a school are inferior to those generally available in the schools of the system, the school authorities will normally be required immediately to assign such students to other schools in order to discontinue the use of the inferior school.

Section 181.16—Attendance outside school system of residence

No arrangement may be made nor permission granted for students residing in one school system to attend school in another school system in any case (1) where the result would tend to limit desegregation or maintain what is essentially a dual school structure in either system, or (2) where such attendance is not available to all students without regard to race, color, or national origin.

Section 181.17—Official support for desegregation plan

(a) Community support. School officials must take steps to encourage community support and acceptance of their desegregation plan. They are responsible for preparing students, teachers, and all other personnel, and the community in general, for the successful desegregation of the school system.

(b) Information to the public. Full information concerning the desegregation plan must be furnished freely to the public and to all television and radio stations and all newspapers serving the community. Copies of all reports on student and staff assignments required under section 181.18 below must be available for public inspection at the office of the superientendent of the school system.

(c) Protection of persons affected. Each school system is responsible for the effective implementation of its desegregation plan. Within their authority, school officials are responsible for the protection of persons exercising rights under, or otherwise affected by, the plan. They must take appropriate action with regard to any student or staff member who interferes with the successful operation of the plan, whether or not on school grounds. If officials of the school system are not able to provide sufficient protection, they must seek whatever assistance is necessary from other appropriate officials.

Section 181.18—Reports

(a) Anticipated enrollment. By April 15 of each year, or by 15 days after the close of the spring choice period in the case of plans based on free choice of schools, each school system must report to the Commissioner the anticipated student enrollment, by race, color, or national origin, and by grade of each school, for the following school year. The report submitted for the 1966–67 school year must also include the comparable data for the 1965–66 school year. Any subsequent substantial change in anticipated enrollment affecting desegregation must be reported promptly to the Commissioner.

(b) Planned staff assignments. By April 15 of each year, each school system must report to the Commissioner the planned assignments of professional staff to each school for the following year, by race, color, or national origin and by grade, or where appropriate, by subject taught or position held. The report for April 15, 1966, must also include the comparable data for the 1965–66 school year. Any subsequent change in planned staff assignments affecting staff desegregation must be reported promptly to the Commissioner.

(c) Actual data. As soon as possible after the opening of its schools in the fall, but in any case within 30 days thereafter, each school system must determine and promptly report to the Commissioner the actual data for the items covered in the reports called for under (a) and (b) above.

(d) Attendance outside system of residence. The reports called for under (a) and (c) above must include a statement covering (1) all students who reside within the boundaries of the school system but attend school in another system, and (2) all students who reside outside but attend a school within the system. This statement must set forth, for each group of students included in (1) and (2) above, the number of students, by race, color, or national origin, by grade, by school and school system attended, and by school system of residence.

(e) Consolidation or litigation. A school system which is to undergo consolidation with another system or any other change in its boundaries, or which is involved in any litigation affecting desegregation, must promptly report the relevant facts and circumstances to the Commissioner.

(f) Other reports. The Commissioner may require a school system to submit other reports relating to its compliance with title VI.

Section 181.19—Records

A school system must keep available for not less than 3 years all records relating to personnel actions, transportation, including routes and schedules, and student assignments and transfers, including all choice forms and transfer applications submitted to the school system. The Commissioner may require retention for a longer period in individual cases.

SUBPART C—ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR VOLUNTARY DESEGREGATION PLANS BASED ON GEOGRAPHIC ATTENDANCE ZONES

Section 181.31—General

A voluntary desegregation plan based in whole or in part on geographic attendance zones must meet the requirements of this subpart for all students whose assignment to schools is determined by such zones. The general requirement for desegregation plans set forth elsewhere in this statement of policies are also applicable.

Section 181.32—Attendance zones

A single system of nonracial attendance zones must be established. A school system may not use zone boundaries or feeder patterns designed to perpetuate or promote segregation, or to limit desegregation or maintain what is essentially a dual school structure. A school system planning (1) to desegregate certain grades by means of geographic attendance zones and other grades by means of free choice of schools, or (2) to include more than one school of the same level in one or more attendance zones and to offer free choice of all schools within such zones, must show that such an arrangement will most expeditiously eliminate segregation and all other forms of discrimination. In any such case, the procedures followed for the offer, exercise, and administration of free choice of schools must conform to the provisions of subpart D below.

Section 181.33—Assignment to school in zone of residence

Regardless of any previous attendance at another school, each student must be assigned to the school serving his zone of residence, and may be transferred to another school only in those cases which meet the following requirements:

(a) Transfer for special needs. A student who requires a course of study not offered at the school serving his zone, or who is physically handicapped, may be permitted, upon his written application, to transfer to another school which is designed to fit, or offers courses for, his special needs.

(b) Minority transfer policy. A school system may (1) permit any student to transfer from a school where students of his race are a majority to any other school, within the system, where students of his race are a minority, or (2) assign students on such basis.

(c) Special plan provisions. A student who specifically qualifies to attend another school pursuant to the provisions of a desegregation plan accepted by the Commissioner may be permitted, upon his written application, to transfer to such other school.

Section 181.34—Notice

(a) Individual notice. On a convenient date between March 1 and April 30 in each year, each school system must distribute, by first class mail, a letter to the parent, or other adult person acting as parent, of each student who is then enrolled, except high school seniors expected to graduate, giving the name and location of the school to which the student has been assigned for the coming school year pursuant to the desegregation plan, and information concernnig the bus service between his school and his neighborhood. All these letters must be mailed on the same day. Each letter must be accompanied by a notice, in a form prescribed by the Commissioner, explaining the desegregation plan. The same letter and notice must also be furnished, in person or by mail, to the parent of each prospective student, including each student planning to enter the first grade or kindergarten, as soon as the school system learns that he plans to enroll.

(b) Published notice. The school system must arrange for the conspicuous publication of an announcement, identical with the text of the notice provided for under (a) above, in the newspaper most generally circulated in the community, on or shortly before the date of mailing under (a) above. Publication as a legal notice is not sufficient. Whenever any revision of attendance zones is proposed, the school system must similarly arrange for the conspicuous publication of an announcement at least 30 days before any change is to become effective, naming each school to be affected and describing the proposed new zones. Copies of all material published hereunder must also be given at that time to all television and radio stations serving the community.

(c) Maps available to public. A street or road map showing the boundaries of, and the school serving, each attendance zone must be freely available for public inspection at the office of the superintendent. Each school in the system must have freely available for public inspection a map showing the boundaries of its attendance area.

Section 181.35—Reports

(a) Attendance zones. The report submitted under section 181.18(a) by April 15 of each year must be accompanied by a map, which must show the name and location of each school facility planned to be used during the coming school year, the attendance zones for each school in effect during the current school year, and any changes in the attendance zones planned for the coming school year. The map need not be of professional quality. A clipping of each newspaper announcement and any map published under section 181.34 (b) or (c) above must be sent to the Commissioner within 3 days after publication and, in the case of proposed revisions, must be accompanied by data showing the estimated change in attendance, by race, color, or national origin and by grade, and in the racial composition of the professional staff, at each school to be affected.

(b) Attendance outside zone of residence. Whenever a student is permitted to attend a school other than that serving his zone of residence, and whenever a request for such attendance is denied, the school system must retain records showing (1) the school and grade applied for, (2) the zone of the student's residence and his grade therein, (3) the race, color, or national origin of the student, (4) the reason stated for the request, and (5) the reason the request is granted or denied. Whenever the total number of transfers permitted from any school exceeds 2 percent of the student enrollment at that school, the relevant facts must be reported promptly to the Commissioner.

SUBPART D—ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR VOLUNTARY DESEGREGATION PLANS BASED ON FREE CHOICE OF SCHOOLS

Section 181.41—General

A voluntary desegregation plan based in whole or in part on free choice of schools must meet the requirements of this subpart for all students whose assignment to schools is determined by free choice. The general requirements for desegregation plans set forth elsewhere in this statement of policies are also applicable.

Section 181.42—Who may exercise choice

A choice of schools may be exercised by a parent or other adult person serving as the student's parent. A student may exercise his own choice if he (1) is exercising a choice for the ninth or a higher grade, or (2) has reached the age of 15 at the time of the exercise of choice. Such a choice by a student is controlling unless a different choice is exercised for him by his parents, or other adult person acting as his parent, during the period in which the student exercises his choice. Each reference in this subpart to a student exercising a choice means the exercise of the choice by a parent or such other adult, or by the student himself, as may be appropriate under this provision.

Section 181.43—Annual mandatory exercise of choice

Each student must be required to exercise a free choice of schools once annually. A student may not be enrolled or assigned to a school without exercising his choice, except as provided in section 181.45 below.

Section 181.44—Choice period

A period of at least 30 days must be provided for exercising choice, to commence no earlier than March 1 and to end no later than April 30, preceding the school year for which choice is to be exercised. The Commissioner may require an additional period or different dates for a particular school system. No preference in school assignment may be given on the basis of an early exercise of choice during the choice period.

Section 181.45—Failure to exercise choice

A failure to exercise a choice within the choice period does not excuse a student from exercising his choice, which may be done at any time before he commences school for the year with respect to which the choice applies. However, any such late choice must be subordinated to the choices of students who exercised choice during the choice period. If by a week after school opens there is any student who has not yet exercised his choice of school, he must be assigned to the school nearest his home where space is available. Standards for determining available space must be applied uniformly throughout the system.

Section 181.46—Letters to parents, notices, and choice forms

(a) Mailings. On the first day of the choice period, each school system must distribute, by first-class mail, a letter, an explanatory notice, and a choice form, to the parent or other adult person acting as parent of each student who is then enrolled, except high school seniors expected to graduate, together with a return envelope addressed to the superintendent. The texts for the letter, notice, and choice form to be used must be in a form prescribed by the Commissioner.

(b) Extra copies. Extra copies of the letter, the notice, and the choice form must be freely available to parents, students, prospective students, and the general public, at each school in the system and at the office of the superintendent.

(c) Content of choice form. Unless otherwise authorized or required by the Commissioner, each choice form, as prepared by the school system for distribution, (1) must set forth the name and location of, and the grades offered at, each school, and (2) may inquire of the person exercising the choice only the name, address, and age of the student, the school and grade currently or most recently attended by the students, the school chosen, the signature of one parent or other adult person serving as parent or, where appropriate under section 181.42 above, the signature of the student, and the identity of the person signing. If necessary to provide information required by sections 181.18 and 181.19 above, or for other reports required by the Commissioner, the choice form may also ask the race, color, or national origin of the student. No statement of reasons for a particular choice, or any other information, or any witness or other authentication, may be required or requested. No other choice form, including any pupil placement law form may be used by the school system in connection with the choice of a school.

(d) Return of choice form. At the option of the person completing the choice form, it may be returned by mail or by hand to any school in the school system or to the office of the superintendent.

(e) Choices not on official form. Exercise of choice may also be made by the submission in like manner of any other writing which sufficiently identifies the student and indicates that he has made a choice of a school.

Section 181.47—Prospective students

Each prospective student, including each student planning to enter the first grade or kindergarten, must be required to exercise a free choice of schools before enrollment. Each such student must be furnished a copy of the prescribed letter, notice, and choice form, by mail or in person, on the date the choice period opens or as soon thereafter as the school system learns that he plans to enroll. Each must be given an opportunity to exercise his choice during the choice period. A prospective student exercising his choice after the choice period must be given at least 1 week to do so.

Section 181.48—Choice may not be changed

Once a choice has been submitted, it may not be changed for the school year to which it applies, whether during the choice period, after the choice period, or during that school year, except on request (1) in cases meeting the conditions set forth in section 181.50 below, (2) in case of a change of residence to a place where another school serving the student's grade level is closer than the school to which he is assigned under these provisions, and (3) in case of a compelling hardship. A student who cannot enter the school of his choice because the grade he is to enter is not offered at that school must be promptly notified as soon as this is known and must be given the same opportunity to choose another school as is provided a prospective student under section 181.47 above.

Section 181.49—Assignment according to choice

No choice may be denied in assigning students to schools for any reason other than overcrowding. In cases where overcrowding would result at one or more schools from the choices made, preference must be given on the basis of the proximity of schools to the homes of students, without regard to race, color, or national origin. No preference may be given to students for prior attendance at a school if such preference would deny other students their free choice of schools under the plan. In cases where this provision would result in unusual difficulty involving, for instance, students not being able to finish their senior year in a particular school, or students being unable to attend school with other members of the same family, or at a school having special courses required by a student, the relevant facts may be brought to the attention of the Commissioner for consideration of alternative procedures. Any student whose choice is denied under these provisions must be notified in writing promptly and given his choice of each school in the system serving his grade level where space is available. Standards for determining overcrowding and available space that are applied uniformly throughout the system must be used if any choice is to be denied. Each student and his parent, or other adult person acting as parent, must be notified in writing of the name and location of the school to which the student is assigned hereunder promptly upon completion of processing his first or any second choice. A school system may, at its option, give preference to any student whose choice is for a school at which students of his race are a minority.

Section 181.50—Transfers for special needs

Each student must attend the school to which he is assigned under the foregoing provisions, except that any student who requires a course of study not offered at that school, or who is physically handicapped, may be permitted, upon his written application, to transfer to another school which is designed to fit, or offers courses for, his special needs.

Section 181.51—No limitation of choice; transportation

No factor, such as a requirement for health or birth records, academic or physical examinations, the operation of the school transportation system, or any other factor except overcrowding, may limit or affect the assignment of students to schools on the basis of their choices. Where transportation is generally provided, buses must be routed to the maximum extent feasible so as to serve each student choosing any school in the system. In any event, every student choosing either the formerly white or the formerly Negro school (or other school established for students of a particular race, color, or national origin) nearest his residence must be transported to the school to which he is assigned under these provisions, whether or not it is his first choice, if that school is sufficiently distant from his home to make him eligible for transportation under generally applicable transportation rules.

Section 181.52—Officials not to influence choice

No official, teacher, or employee of the school system may require or request any student or prospective student to submit a choice form during the choice period other than by the prescribed letter, notice, and choice form. After the choice period, the school system must make all reasonable efforts to obtain a completed choice form from any student who has not exercised a choice. However, at no time many any official, teacher, or employee of the school system, either directly or indirectly, seek to influence any parent, student, or any other person involved, in the exercise of a choice, or favor or penalize any person because of a choice made. Information concerning choices made by individual students or schools to which they are assigned may not be made public.

Section 181.53—Public notice

On or shortly before the date the choice period opens, the school system must arrange for the conspicuous publication of a *notice describing the desegregation plan* in the newspaper most generally circulated in the community. The text of the notice must be in a form prescribed by the Commissioner. Publication as a legal notice is not sufficient. Copies of this notice must also be given at that time to all radio and television stations serving the community. Any other announcement published by the school system concerning enrollment, such as might be made in connection with scheduling preenrollment procedures for prospective first grade students, must (1) state clearly that under the desegregation plan a choice of school is required for each student whose choice has not yet been exercised, (2) describe and state where copies of the prescribed letter, notice and choice form may be freely obtained in person, or by letter or telephone request, and (3) state the period during which the choice may be exercised.

Section 181.54—Requirements for effectiveness of free choice plans

A free choice plan tends to place the burden of desegregation on Negro or other minority group students and their parents. Even when school authorities undertake good faith efforts to assure its fair operation, the very nature of a free choice plan and the effect of longstanding community attitudes often tend to preclude or inhibit the exercise of a truly free choice by or for minority group students.

For these reasons, the Commissioner will scrutinize with special care the operation of voluntary plans of desegregation in school systems which have adopted free choice plans.

In determining whether a free choice plan is operating fairly and effectively, so as to materially further the orderly achievement of desegregation, the Commissioner will take into account such factors as community support for the plan, the efforts of the school system to eliminate the identifiability of schools on the basis of race, color, or national origin by virtue of the composition of staff or other factors, and the progress actually made in eliminating past discrimination and segregation.

The single most substantial indication as to whether a free choice plan is actually working to eliminate the dual school structure is the extent to which Negro or other minority group students have in fact transferred from segregated schools. Thus, when substantial desegregation actually occurs under a free choice plan, there is strong evidence that the plan is operating effectively and fairly, and is currently acceptable as means of meeting legal requirements. Conversely, where a free choice plan results in little or no actual desegregation, or where, having already produced some degree of desegregation, it does not result in substantial progress, there is reason to believe that the plan is not operating effectively and may not be an appropriate or acceptable method of meeting constitutional and statutory requirements.

As a general matter, for the 1966–67 school year the Commissioner will, in the absence of other evidence to the contrary, assume that a free choice plan is a viable and effective means of completing initial stages of desegregation in school systems in which a substantial percentage of the students have in fact *been transferred from segregated schools.* Where a small degree of desegregation has been achieved and, on the basis of the free choice registration held in the spring of 1966, it appears that there will not be a substantial increase in desegregation for the 1966–67 school year, the Commissioner will review the *working of the plan and will normally require* school officials to take additional actions as a prerequisite to continued use of a free choice plan, even as an interim device.

In districts with a sizable percentage of Negro or other minority group students, the Commissioner will, in general, be guided by the following criteria in scheduling free *choice plans for review:*

(1) If a significant percentage of the students, such as 8 percent or 9 percent, transferred from segregated schools for the 1965–66 school year, total transfers on the order of at least twice that percentage would normally be expected.

(2) If a smaller percentage of the students, such as 4 percent or 5 percent, transferred from segregated schools for the 1965–66 school year, a substantial increase in transfers would normally be expected, such as would bring the total to at least triple the percentage for the 1965–66 school year.

(3) If a lower percentage of students transferred for the 1965–66 school year, then the rate of increase in total transfers for the 1966–67 school year would normally be expected to be proportionately greater than under (2) above.

(4) If no students transferred from segregated schools under a free choice plan for the 1965–66 school year, then a very substantial start would normally be expected, to enable such a school system to catch up as quickly as possible with systems which started earlier. If a school system in these circumstances is unable to make such a start for the 1966–67 school year under a free choice plan, it will normally be required to adopt a different type of plan.

Where there is substantial deviation from these expectations, and the Commissioner concludes, on the basis of the choices actually made and other available evidence, that the plan is not operating fairly, or is not effective to meet constitutional and statutory requirements, he will require the school system to take additional steps to further desegregation.

Such additional steps may include, for example, reopening of the choice period, additional meetings with parents and civic groups, further arrangements with State or local officials to limit opportunities for intimidation, and other further community preparation. Where schools are still identifiable on the basis of staff composition as intended for students of a particular race, color, or national origin, such steps must in any such case include substantial further change in staffing patterns to eliminate such identifiability.

If the Commissioner concludes that such steps would be ineffective, or if they fail to remedy the defects in the operation of any free choice plan, he may require the school system to adopt a different type of desegregation plan.

Section 18155—Reports

(a) Supporting materials. Each school system must submit to the Commissioner a copy of the letter, notice, and choice form, all as prepared by the school system for distribution, within 3 days after their first distribution, and must submit a clipping of all newspaper announcements published in accordance with section 181.53 above within three days after publication.

(b) Data on choices not being honored. In any case, including the case of conflicting choices under section 181.42 above, where a student chooses a school where he would be in a racial minority, and (1) he is to be assigned to a school where he would be in a *racial majority, or (2) the school system proposes* not to process his choice for any reason, the relevant facts must be reported promptly to the Commissioner.

(c) Transfers for special needs. Wherever a student is permitted, under sections 181.48 or 181.50 above, to attend a school other than the school to which he is or would be assigned under the other applicable provisions hereof, and whenever a request for such attendance is denied, the school system must retain records showing (1) the school and grade applied for, (2) the school and grade to be transferred from, (3) the race, color, or national origin of the student, (4) the reason *stated for the request, and (5) the reason* the request is granted or denied. Whenever the total number of transfers permitted from any school exceeds 2 percent of the student enrollment at that school, the relevant facts must be reported promptly to the Commissioner.

SUBPART E—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 181.61—How to submit reports

Each report to the Commissioner required under this statement of policies must be sent by first-class mail addressed to the Equal Educational Opportunities Program, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 20202.

Section 181.62—Alternative administrative procedures

If an administrative procedure provided for under this statement of policies is not administratively feasible in a particular situation, the Commissioner may accept an alternative procedure if he determines that it will accomplish the same purpose.

Section 181.63—Revision of statement of policies

The Commissioner may modify this statement of policies as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of title VI.

Section 181.64—Copies of documents for State agencies

Each school system submitting any plan form or report to the Commissioner under this statement of policies must also submit a copy of such form or report to the appropriate State education agency.

Section 181.65—Choice period already begun

In the event that any school system with a desegregation plan based on free choice has begun or completed its free choice period for the 1966–67 school year prior to the date of issue of this statement of policies, the school system must immediately report to the Commissioner its proposals for adapting its free-choice procedures in such a way as to make them substantially conform to the provisions of this statement of policies.

Section 181.66—Definitions

As used in this part,

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the U.S. Commissioner of Education or any official acting under assignment or delegation from him to carry out any of his functions under this Statement of Policies.

(b) The term "discrimination" means discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin.

(c) The term "dual school structure" means a system of separate school facilities for students based on race, color, or national origin.

(d) The term "HEW Form 441" means the printed document provided for the use of certain school systems by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "Assurance of Compliance With the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Regulation Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

(e) The term "HEW Form 441–B" means the printed document provided for the use of certain school systems by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Assurance of Compliance With the Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

(f) The term "HEW Regulation" means the regulation issued pursuant to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (pt. 80, of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations).

(g) The term "parent" means an adult individual who exercises parental control over, or is otherwise acting as parent of, a student or prospective student.

(h) The term "school official" shall include, but is not limited to, any person who serves on the governing board of a school system, or attends meetings of such board in an official capacity, and all administrative and supervisory personnel of a school system.

(i) The term "school system" means, as the context may require, either (1) a legally constituted school authority (such as a local board of education) which has administrative control of one or more elementary or secondary schools, (2) the geographic area over which any such school authority has administrative control for school purposes, or (3) the schools and facilities over which any such school authority has administrative control.

(j) The term "statement of policies" means this revised statement of policies for school desegregation plans under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(k) The term "title VI" means title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–352, 42 U.S.C. 2000d to 2000d–4).

SUBPART F—DESEGREGATION PLANS NOT REACHING ALL GRADES FOR THE 1966–67 SCHOOL YEAR

Section 181.71—Opportunity to transfer in grades not reached by plan

In any school system in which, for the school year 1966–67, there are grades not yet reached by the desegregation plan, the school system must arrange for students to attend school on a desegregated basis in each of the special circumstances described in (a), (b), (c), and (d) below. This opportunity must be made available in such a way as to follow, to the maximum extent feasible, the desegregation procedures in grades generally reached by the plan, according to the type of plan in effect.

(a) Transfer for a course of study. A student must be permitted to transfer to a school in order to take a course of study for which he is qualified and which is not available in the school to which he would otherwise be assigned on the basis of his race, color, or national origin.

(b) Transfer to attend school with relative. A student must be permitted to transfer in order to attend the same school or attendance center as a brother, sister, or other relative living in his household, if such relative is attending a school as a result of a desegregation plan and if such school or attendance center offers the grade which the student would be entering.

(c) Transfer for students required to go outside system. A student must be permitted to transfer to any school within the system which offers the grade he is to enter if he would otherwise be required to attend school outside the system on the basis of his race, color, or national origin.

(d) Transfer for other reasons. A student must be permitted to transfer to a school other than the one to which he is assigned on the basis of his race, color, or national origin if he meets whatever requirements, other than race, color, or national origin, the school system normally applies in permitting student transfers.

Section 181.72—Students new to the system

Each student who will be attending school in the system for the first time in the 1966–67 school year in any grade not yet generally reached by the desegregation plan must be assigned to school under the procedures for desegregation that are to be applied to that grade when it is generally reached by the desegregation plan.

Section 181.73—General provisions applicable

A student who has transferred to a school under section 181.71 above, or entered a school under section 181.72 above shall be entitled to the full benefits of section 181.14 above (relating to desegregation of services, facilities, activities, and programs) and to any and all other rights, privileges, and benefits generally conferred on students who attend a school by virtue of the provisions of the desegregation plan.

Section 181.74—Notice

Each school system in which there will be one or more grades not fully reached by the desegregation plan in the 1966–67 school year must add a paragraph describing the applicable transfer provisions at the end of the notice distributed and published pursuant to section 181.34 above or sections 181.46 and 181.53 above, as is appropriate for the type of plan adopted by the school system. The text of the paragraph must be in a form prescribed by the Commissioner. The school system must make such other changes to the notice as may be necessary to make clear which students will be affected by attendance zone assignments or free choice requirements.

In addition, for the letter to parents required in section 181.46, school systems with free choice plans which have not desegregated every grade must use a letter describing the plan and will enclose with the letter sent to parents of students in grades not desegregated a transfer application instead of a choice form. For the letter to parents required in section 181.34, school systems with geographic zone plans must send to each parent of students in grades not desegregated a letter describing the plan and a transfer application. The text for these letters and the transfer application must be in a form prescribed by the Commissioner.

Section 181.75—Processing of transfer applications

Applications for transfer may be submitted on the transfer application form referred to in section 181.74 above or by any other writing. If any transfer application is incomplete, incorrect, or unclear in any respect, the school system must make every reasonable effort to help the applicant perfect his application. Under plans based on geographic zones, and under plans based on free choice of schools, the provisions of section 181.42 as to whether a student or his parent may make a choice of school, shall also determine whether a student in a grade not yet generally reached by desegregation may execute a transfer application.

Section 181.76—Reports and records

In each report to the Commissioner under sections 181.18, 181.35, and 181.55 above, the school system must include all data, copies of materials distributed, and other information generally required, relative to all students, regardless of whether or not their particular grades have been geneally reached by the plan. Similarly the system must retain the records provided for under sections 181.19, 181.35, and 181.55 above with respect to all students.

San Leandro, Calif., Surmounts Many of the Problems That Plague Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, San Leandro, Calif., an important community in my congressional district, has recently been focused upon in a special article written by Lewis Phelps in the March 4 issue of the Wall Street Journal. This community has the unique distinction of setting a record during the past 18 years of steadily reducing local taxation. This has been done in the face of ever-increasing tax rates by municipal, State, and local governments throughout our country.

At the same time the people of San Leandro have benefited from local taxes, they have also benefited from increased municipal services. These have included a marina and beach development, which is second to none along the Pacific coast; a $2 million library; a new civic center complex; a city hall; a courthouse; added park and recreational facilities; and a downtown revitalization program.

These achievements have been made possible through a balanced working relationship between industrial, commercial, and commercial interests. The dynamic mayor of this community, the Honorable Jack Maltester; his progressive city manager, Wesley McClure; the vice mayor, William Swift; and the city council deserve a high degree of praise for what is being done in this community of 73,000 people.

The downtown revitalization program is being carried out without Federal support. San Leandro was doing its own beautification program before the Federal Government decided to sponsor such a commendable activity nationwide.

I believe that the Wall Street Journal article is an excellent compliment to the leadership and people of San Leandro and I am pleased to insert it in the Congressional Record. I also insert in the Record a story from the San Leandro Morning News, which is the daily newspaper for the city, in which a report is given concerning the aforementioned article.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 4, 1966]

Model Municipality—San Leandro, Calif., Manages To Surmount Many of the Problems That Plague Cities

(By Lewis Phelps)

San Leandro, Calif.—It's almost an urban dweller's dream. New city facilities spring up like mushrooms, yet property taxes decrease. The city refuses to expand the police force, yet the crime rate drops. The city rejects Federal aid, yet the downtown face-lifting that aid would have paid for proceeds apace. And somebody builds a municipal golf course free of charge.

It's all happening in this prosperous little city (population 72,000) just south of Oakland on the eastern side of San Francisco Bay. While most cities suffer the seemingly unending cycle of bigger budgets, rising taxes, and still bigger budgets, San Leandro has somehow managed to get all the benefits of lavish public spending while putting a surprisingly small bite on the local taxpayers.

It's true the effort has included wooing a little more industry to town than some of the local citizenry would like to see—but most cities would envy such success. Equally important, this growth has been accompanied by some inventiveness in holding down costs. Furthermore, the city has engaged in some of the long-range planning critics say many of the Nation's cities continue to lack.

The planning started way back in 1947, when San Leandro was a semiagricultural community of 20,000 population. The key step was passage of a bond issue to finance installation of sewer lines. Where? Through acres of otherwise undeveloped cherry orchards and tomato fields on the city's outskirts. With land still cheap and the sewers already in, industry came flocking from Oakland and San Francisco, where land was already dear.

San Leandro has added other attractions aimed at luring industry—but all stopping short of the outright financial aid that some city industrial development authorities have resorted to.

"We moved our plant to San Leandro because we needed some room for expansion, and did not have it where we were before," says Russell L. McGinnis, plant manager for International Harvester Co. "We've found other benefits. Besides lower tax rates than any other city in the area that could provide utilities, San Leandro has a city government that really works with industry. For instance, they've been holding off tract development and saying a lot of their available land for industry, to keep the tax base strong and taxes low."

INDUSTRY HELPS ON COSTS

Since 1947, some 600 companies have moved to town, adding about $200 million in property to the tax roles. Industry now pays more than a third of the cost of government in San Leandro, 57 percent of the sales taxes and 45 percent of the property taxes.

With such growth, and the tax revenue potential that has come with it, it's all the more surprising that the city fathers have kept such a tight rein on costs. They've avoided borrowing—there's been only one bond issue, for a library, since the 1947 sewer bonds. And typical of the close watch they keep on expenses are these moves:

When a new public safety building is completed early next year, the city will pool the dispatching teams for police, fire, and general communications. Compared with present separate facilities, this will cut the communications staff to 6 men from 10.

When an addition to the 30-year-old city hall was built in 1964, offices were arranged so that clerks and typists could work in several departments rather than being pigeonholed in one. The saving: "Several" jobs, a city official says.

To revise the city's comprehensive land-use data, the city eschewed hiring another full-time city planner in favor of a college graduate student in city planning who wanted a summer's experience. His salary: $469 a month compared with $782 for a full-fledged planner.

To get a second public golf course, the city struck a deal with a rubbish disposal firm, allowing the firm to dump for free on useless bayside tideland. The disposal firm is even compacting the fill and contouring the area to golf course design. "All we'll have to do is put on a little topsoil and plant some grass," says Mayor Jack Maltester. "Otherwise, we'd have had to buy all that fill, and dirt cheap isn't cheap at all these days."

San Leandro has even saved money by appearing to spend it. The salaries it pays its police and firemen are among the best in the State. The top minimum for police is $693 a month, compared with $615 for Bakersfield, and $678 for San Mateo, towns of roughly comparable size. At the same time, San Leandro's police force numbers only 47, roughly two-thirds the average for cities of its size. "We find that we can get a job done better with a few highly qualified men than with a flock of mediocre ones," explains Mr. Maltester. The city had only one policeman quit all last year. Too, the city uses lower paid clerks for many police department desk jobs instead of uniformed officers.

The acid test: San Leandro's crime rate, already below State averages, fell 10 percent in fiscal 1965 while the statewide rate increased by about the same amount.

What all this means is that the city has managed to keep its spending well within what the city's population and industrial growth can support. While real estate property taxes are rising in all of Alameda County, which embraces Oakland as well as San Leandro, San Leandro's share of that tax has been declining steadily for 18 years. One typical middle income homeowner is paying $51 in property taxes to the city now, compared with $66 back in 1947. This 23-percent decline includes a 3.6-percent drop in the last year alone.

WHERE THE MONEY GOES

The city's budget in the current fiscal year is $5.7 million, a far cry from the $613,000 of 1947, but still slightly below the record $5.9 million of 1962 and only slightly above last year's spending. The spending is going for such things as city parks, development of all the city's San Francisco Bay waterfront into beaches and a marina, a $2 million library, and a new civic center complex, including the police and fire station, a new city hall, a courthouse, and headquarters for the chamber of commerce.

San Leandro even has afforded itself the luxury of turning down $2.5 million of Federal funds. Back in 1959 the city started planning a federally financed urban renewal project. But local citizens got up in arms about it—they didn't want land condemnation power in the hands of nonelected officials—so the city gave Washington back its money.

Then Wesley McClure, the city manager since 1947, came up with a new plan, locally financed. The city invested $1 million in the five-block renewal area, but it is utilizing a little-known California statute called the tax increment law. This allows the redevelopment agency to recover its investment by keeping any increased tax revenues stemming from the increased value of the face-lifted buildings. The law hasn't been used much elsewhere in the State because of the availability of Federal funds, local officials say.

To help keep the project costs down, San Leandro also has been persuading property owners in the area to pay for modernizing their own buildings. Using a carrot-and-stick approach, the city promises to install new pastel-colored sidewalks in front of the stores that comply. "It's become a sort of honor badge," says Mr. McClure. And private property owners have already invested more than $1 million in their buildings as a result.

A GOOD CIVIC SPIRIT

San Leandro citizens insist its their spirit that has kept things humming—spirit that's sufficient to provide volunteer help to staff the library, for one example. How does such a spirit develop? One secret: "We've formed a citizens' committee for everything we've done around here," says Mr. McClure. "They really pave the way for getting things done."

In some respects, San Leandro has been lucky. Unlike some cities, it hasn't been forced to absorb a heavy influx of minority groups and unskilled workers. Combined with rapid growth in industry, jobs have been plentiful and the city's welfare load well below average. Too, officials of some neighboring cities see San Leandro facing more problems in the future than it has in the recent past.

"Nobody thinks badly of San Leandro," says a city administrator in Oakland. "It's a very progressive city." But, he contends, sooner or later San Leandrans are going to run out of land for industrial expansion. "Then they'll be facing the same problems everybody else does," he says. "I remember when you could buy land in San Leandro for $5,000 an acre. Now it's $30,000 and still going up. They don't have any sites left for large industrial plants."

But San Leandrans think otherwise. "We've only used 40 percent of our land," contends Frank King, manager of the active chamber of commerce. "And while we don't have many really large industrial locations left, that's not the type of business we want. We're after white-collar industry—clean, middle sized and beneficial to the economy."

[From the San Leandro (Calif.) Morning News, Mar. 5, 1966]

In Wall Street Journal: "The San Leandro Story" Becomes Nationwide News

"The San Leandro Story" made nationwide news yesterday as the Wall Street Journal told it in a feature article on its editorial page.

The story came out of a series of meetings held not long ago with Mayor Jack Maltester, City Manager Wesley McClure, San Leandro Chamber of Commerce President S. L. Feener, Jr., last year's president of the San Leandro Manufacturers' Association, R. L. McGinnis, and other business and industrial leaders assembled by the chamber.

The Wall Street Journal article, written by Lew Phelps of the San Francisco office, places great importance on the industrial growth of the city since 1947. Advantages to industry are clearly detailed—ample space, sound and efficient city government, favorable tax rates, and a community spirit that "has kept things humming," as Phelps phrased it.

The 18 annual reductions in the city's tax rate come in for favorable attention and many of the techniques for financing city government projects to keep the tax rate coming down are discussed. Mayor Maltester and City Manager McClure are given substantial credit for the civic accomplishments such as a beautiful new library and community center, civic buildings recently constructed or underway, the new marina, a golf course now in existence and one in preparation, the low crime rate, and a major do-it-yourself downtown revitalization project.

Incidentally, the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce reports that within the first hour after the story appeared, an industrial firm studying possible locations for a 10-acre, million-dollar-plus operation, picked up the phone and said, "San Leandro looks good to us."

Water for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's recent announcement of water-for-peace program drew applause at the U.N. and around the world, an article in the New York Journal-American states.

The writer, Pierre J. Huss, points out:

> Virtually all industrial nations are faced with the job of preventing majestic rivers and lakes from degenerating into cesspools.

He lists the steps which have been taken in West Germany, which seems to be ahead of us in coping with pollution, and predicts that 10 years from now the Hudson and Mississippi, along with our lakes, will have been restored to healthy conditions.

Since the article deals with an issue of urgent concern to us all, I am offering it for the Record, where it may be read in its entirety:

[From the New York Journal-American, Mar. 10, 1966]

Huge Cleanup Job: "Water for Peace"

(By Pierre J. Huss)

President Johnson's recent announcement of water-for-peace program drew applause at U.N. and around the world, primarily because virtually all industrial nations are faced with the job of preventing majestic rivers and lakes from degenerating into cesspools.

In fact, the pollution of water resources in the United States and abroad has reached such dangerous proportions that special efforts are underway through U.N. and governments in the major industrial countries to clean out and purify poisoned streams and lakes and make it at least nearly possible for man to drink the water.

At U.N., our delegate James Roosevelt drew the Economic and Social Council's attention to President Johnson's massive program and said that U.N. cooperation in stimulating this program around the world is essential. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall journeyed to West Germany to consult with the experts there who seem to be ahead of others in restoring polluted rivers and lakes. But even in this preliminary stage, it is recognized that each government must spend billions of dollars if the job is to succeed.

Since West Germany proportionally seems to be ahead of us in coping with pollution, let us see what Secretary Udall learned by his German excursion.

First of all, German experts have figured that by 1990, the equivalent of $10 billion will have to be spent in West Germany alone to do the job of cleaning and safeguarding the rivers and lakes in that land. Stack that up against the polluted rivers and lakes in the United States and figure how many billions it will cost in the United States.

Although public and industrial waste is still pouring into German rivers, enough checking and purification measures are in operation that water pollution in general has been reduced to normal levels. This was accomplished by combining legislative action with technical procedures. Heavy offenders like the chemical industry were ordered to produce so-called soft cleansers that undergo biological decomposition of at least 80 percent. Since the law was passed, clouds of foam that used to cover the river surfaces from detergents have diminished noticeably.

The broad Rhine River was so contaminated from shipping and industrial abuses that five countries adjacent to the Rhine—France, Holland, Germany, Luxembourg, and Switzerland—banded together into a single depollution group. Many water-purification plants consequently are springing up along the banks of the Rhine, along with a demineralization plant, to remove from those waters 30,000 to 40,000 tons of chemical compounds that flow into it each day—plus 300 tons of oil.

In the great Ruhr steel basin, over 100 water-purification stations pump the water clean. So much progress has been achieved along the Main River that fish abound where not too many years ago they died within hours of drifting into the Main. The same happy story goes for other German lakes and streams, with the exception as yet of the Elbe. One reason for laggard operations here is that part of the Elbe flows through Czechoslovakia and Communist East Germany.

But the great port of Hamburg is the worst offender. Large-scale construction is underway to restore the Elbe there to a healthy condition and German experts hope to accomplish that by 1970.

Ten years from now, the Hudson and Mississippi, along with our lakes, may have a similar happy story to tell.

President Johnson Receives the Order of AHEPA Socratic Award for 1966, the 145th Year of Greek Independence; Harold Harper, of West Springfield, Mass., Newly Elected Governor for Massachusetts District, Order of AHEPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 145th anniversary of the Greek War of Independence against Ottoman rule. Greek independence began on March 25, 1821, when Archbishop Germanos of Patras unfurled the national flag of Greece.

Since 1821 the people of the United States have followed the course of Greek history with keen interest. We have been intensely concerned with the safety and security of Greeks in their homeland and have helped them on more than one occasion to strengthen democracy in this birthplace of democracy. I am indeed glad that we have been able to do this, and on the 145th anniversary of Greek independence we are proud to have Greece as our loyal ally in defense of freedom in the world.

Mr. Speaker, last night I joined with my other colleagues in the House and Senate as an honored guest at the 17th national banquet in honor of Members of the 89th Congress, sponsored by the Order of AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, and held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel here in Washington. Joining me at the dinner were two of my good friends from Springfield, Mass., Harold Harper, who is the governor of the Massachusets district of AHEPA, and James Mazarakos, a longtime member of Altis chapter No. 85, Order of AHEPA, of Springfield.

The Order of AHEPA Socratic Award and Scroll this year was presented to President Lyndon B. Johnson "for contributions and services during a lifetime to country and humanity; as a teacher in early years; as a young Congressman and a Senator from the great State of Texas; as a leader of men, learned in the ways of human nature and persuasive in complex idiosyncracies; as a world leader, with a clear mind, a stout heart, and a deep compassion for the underprivileged, the underfed, and the oppressed; as the organizer of the Great Society for humanity's sake; as the defender and the protector of all human liberties inscribed in blood and tears on the pages of history; as the husband and father and friend of loyalty and sincerity; for all these virtues and objects, which are basic in our Hellenic heritage and our American culture and fundamental in the life and record of the Archontic Order of AHEPA."

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey spoke at the banquet and thanked the members of AHEPA for the important role they played through the years in gaining support for the immigration amendments sponsored by our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and President Johnson, and enacted into law last year, which eliminates the heretofore offensive national origins quota system.

The word "Ahepa" itself explains the organization of Greek-Americans founded on July 26, 1922, at Atlanta, Ga., as follows: A—American, h—Hellenic, e—educational, p—progressive, and a—association. As an organization devoted to 40 years of programs and accomplishments in the fields of American citizenship, educational projects, and charitable endeavors, the AHEPA fraternity takes the opportunity at these national banquets to pay tribute to the Members of Congress for their devoted services to the welfare and progress of the American people and government.

Mr. Speaker, with permission I include with my remarks the salute to Congress by AHEPA, President Johnson's letter to AHEPA, the banquet program, and the head-table guests.

The Order of AHEPA 17th National Banquet in Honor of the 89th Congress of the United States

OUR SALUTE TO CONGRESS

The Archontic Order of AHEPA, this American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, founded in Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922, has over the years established an enviable record of good citizenship and public service. Never forgetting our blood ties with immortal Hellas, where our civilization was born, we, the members of the Order of AHEPA, the Daughters of Penelope, the Maids of Athena, and the Sons of Pericles, remain forever loyal and faithful to this young but universally respected country—the United States of America—where Western civilization has found its most ardent and sincere exponent and practitioner.

Every 2 years the members of the AHEPA family hold a grand banquet at which we render homage and respect to the honorable Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

This is our 17th banquet. The first in the series was held February 6, 1929. The then Supreme Governor George C. Vournas was its founder and first chairman.

Some 2,500 years ago, Pericles said to his fellow Athenians: "In a democracy there is not only an equality amongst all men in point of law for their private controveries, but in election to public office neither class nor rank is considered; each man is preferred according to his virtue or to the esteem in which he is held for some special excellence and so long as he renders good service to the commonwealth."

We hold the Members of our U.S. Congress to an esteem commensurate with their excellence and so long as they render good service to this—our blessed land.

And, 100 years later, Aeschylus wrote that "the pleasantest of all ties is the tie of host and guest."

And so, we invite you, Honorable Members of Congress, to let us be your hosts so that we may have the pleasure and the privilege to salute you and to entertain you as our guests.

We are looking forward to meeting with you around the banquet table in the "pleasantest of all ties of hosts and guests." We shall greet you warmly and wish you well.

Kimon A. Doukas,
Supreme President.
Anthony E. Manuel,
Chairman, National Banquet Committee.

The White House,
Washington, March 3, 1966.

In honoring the 89th Congress, the members of the Order of AHEPA are extending well-deserved tribute. And as you acknowledge America's debt of gratitude to her forward-looking legislators, I want to acknowledge my appreciation for your alert and responsible membership.

The laws of any progressive government must be formed and directed to improve the life and objectives of all of its citizens.

They must be designed to assure equal opportunity for personal achievement—and they must stimulate the development of each man's talents to their fullest capacities.

Ancient Greece recognized these foremost principles of a democratic society. And Americans in 1966 sustain the legacy of your forefathers.

As an American society dedicated to these principles, the Order of AHEPA has adhered to the highest traditions of democratic citizenship.

I hope that your 17th national banquet will be an enjoyable one.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

THE ORDER OF AHEPA SOCRATIC AWARD PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

For contributions and services during a lifetime in country and humanity.

As a teacher in early years.

As a young Congressman and a Senator from the great State of Texas.

As a leader of men, learned in the ways of human nature and persuasive in complex idiosyncracies.

As a world leader, with a clear mind, a stout heart and a deep compassion for the underprivileged, the underfed and the oppressed.

As the organizer of the Great Society for humanity's sake.

As the defender and the protector of all human liberties inscribed in blood and tears on the pages of history.

As the husband and father and friend of loyalty and sincerity—

For all these virtues and objects, which are basic in our Hellenic heritage and our American culture and fundamental in the life and record of the Archontic Order of AHEPA.

This 1966 Socratic Award is presented with a scroll.

Kimon A. Doukas,
Supreme President.

Done, this 14th day of March 1966 in the city of Washington.

PROGRAM

Rendition: The Star-Spangled Banner, Ode to Liberty, O Canada.

Invocation: Anthony E. Manuel, chairman; the Honorable Gregory G. Lagakos, toastmaster.

Speakers:

Miss Elizabeth Athanasakos, grand president, Daughters of Penelope.

His Excellency Alexander A. Matsas, Ambassador of Greece.

The Most Reverend Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

The Honorable Donald M. Fraser, U.S. Representative from Minnesota.

The Honorable Philip A. Hart, U.S. Senator from Michigan.

Presentation: Presentation of the AHEPA Socratic Award for 1966 to the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States of America. Acceptance in behalf of the President by Mr. Mike N. Manatos, Administrative Assistant to the President.

Response: Kimon A. Doukas, supreme president, Order of AHEPA.

Benediction.

DAIS

The Most Reverend Archbishop Iakovos.

His Excellency Alexander A. Matsas, Ambassador of Greece.

Madame Alexander A. Matsas.

The Honorable Philip A. Hart, U.S. Senator from Michigan.

Mrs. Philip A. Hart.

The Honorable Donald M. Fraser, U.S. Representative from Minnesota.

Mrs. Donald M. Fraser.

Mr. Mike N. Manatos, Administrative Assistant to the President.

Mr. Kimon A. Doukas, supreme president, Order of AHEPA.

Mrs. Kimon A. Doukas.

Mr. Gust J. Herouvis, chairman, AHEPA supreme board of trustees.

Mrs. Gust J. Herouvis.

The Honorable Gregory G. Lagakos.

Mr. Nicholas D. Chotas, Mother Lodge, Order of AHEPA.

Mrs. Carmen Chotas Demos.

Miss Elizabeth Athanasakos, grand president, Daughters of Penelope.

Miss Cleopatra Notarides, grand president, Maids of Athena.

Mr. Louis N. Strike, supreme president, Sons of Pericles.

Mr. Anthony E. Manuel, chairman, AHEPA national banquet.

Mrs. Anthony E. Manuel.

Salute to St. Patrick Honoring Hon. Frank D. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 10, 1966, at the National Democratic Club in New York City, the Honorable Frank D. O'Connor, president of the council, city of New York, was the guest of honor and gave the principal address. The address was so outstanding I want to call it to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress. Mr. O'Connor was introduced by New York State Supreme Court Justice Hon. James A. Roe, Jr., and Mr. E. Richard Hoffman, Jr., president of the National Democratic Club presided.

The remarks of Mr. O'Connor follow:

Yesterday, when I spoke before the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, I noted that my presence lent an ecumenical spirit to the gathering. And, just to broaden the base a little, I opened my talk with a quote from Dante.

Tonight with the Farleys, the Roes, the Murphys, and the rest of us up here, I am glad to see that Rabbi Polish is on the dais to help keep that spirit alive. I understand that Mayor Lindsay was also invited, but that he had a rehearsal tonight. He ought to ask for equity rates—he could balance the budget with the money. He's that good, believe me.

But I don't mean to make light of the ecumenical spirit, political or otherwise. Long before Pope John gave birth to this movement, among religions—America's heritage was formed by this spirit, among nationalities. Our country has prospered and grown strong because we have made room for men of every national, racial, and religious identity—and are still so dedicated. We are all Americans, but we are not all the same, nor should we be.

One of John Kennedy's dreams was to make the world safe for diversity. In this city, and in this country, we have seen how the diversity of our historical identity, and the freedom to preserve it, have been sources of strength.

For, historically speaking, we are all immigrants. Very few of us have parents or grandparents who were not newcomers to this country. Some of them had to fight for acceptance; and although some never achieved it, they lived to see their children gain it. So it was with my parents.

They immigrated to this country—my father from Sligo and my mother from Limerick. Today, the Irish are still coming. They have had a love affair with America for over 100 years and there are no signs of abatement. In fact, it finally seems to be becoming mutual.

It is just not possible to ignore the Irish. Whether being charming, witty, stubborn, or just plain cantankerous, Irishmen have made a contribution wherever they turn up, and have influenced many societies, both similar and different from their own.

From that distant day in 1603 at the dawn of the modern world, when the O'Donnells fled to Spain and to Austria, to the 18th century when the McMahons rose to prominence in France and the O'Higgins' to leadership in South America, down through the 20th century when John Kennedy gave us one of our proudest hours, that influence has been pertinent and pervasive.

We are not, as some have said, a vanishing race. We have merely been infiltrating.

Today, to face the challenges that have thrust themselves upon our society, we will need to prove ourselves worthy heirs of our tradition of involvement.

We are not a people who can stand aloof and divorced from our surroundings. Indifference is not in our nature. Though some might say we are just busybodies, I prefer to think it is our love of freedom and our revolutionary spirit that impels us to involvement.

In a sense, you might say that ours has also been a tradition of ecumenicism. We could be called examples of this.

The firm of Lindsay, O'Connor & Procaccino—limited partners in fusion government—will not fail if we are all equally dedicated to involvement and ecumenism in politics, in the best sense.

In this spirit, we have approached the problem of race and justice, with the idea that no matter how stubborn they seem, they can be solved if we remain calm men of good will.

We Irish have a tradition of tolerance and love that we cannot lose. Archbishop Ireland, in 1891, previsioned the civil rights bill that was enacted in 1964.

Irishmen are great lovers as well as great fighters. We would rather love than fight. But we do not dodge a battle. For as the poet once said: "The Celts are men that God made mad, for all their wars are merry, and all their songs are sad."

In this city, in this country, and in the most unlikely corners of the earth, the Irish will continue to play a vital role if we are true to our tradition of the great saints and poets and soldiers and scholars and statesmen bearing such Irish names as Patrick, Keats, Shaw, Swift, O'Casey and O'Fallan. It is a glorious and lilting roster.

I am reminded of Irish Ambassador Frederick J. Boland who, only a few blocks from here, was elected president of the United Nations General Assembly. And of the Irish soldiers who fought in the Congo and on Cypress for peace.

I am reminded of Eamon Devalara, who became the first president of the League of Nations. Remember, it was the Irish, not us Americans, who adopted Woodrow Wilson's ideal of world peace.

And of the maternal ancestor of Charles de Gaulle. And of Msgr. Thomas Ryan of Tipperary, aid to Pope John XXIII and the man who was teaching him English.

And, of course, I am reminded of John F. Kennedy, the first Irish Catholic President of the United States.

All of them, in the tradition of the Irish, were involved—with life and their fellowmen, with ideas and beautiful words, with God, with justice, and with freedom. With a keen eye and a sharp, true wit, the Irish have contributed to the councils of men.

But most of all I am reminded of that Irishman by osmosis Pope John XXIII who did for the world what John Kennedy did for America—inspire love and trust and confidence again in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

In this spirit I pledge to you as Irishmen and Americans and democrats that we shall seek the peaceful way, the quiet way, the loving way of making this city once again the finest place in which to live. We shall meet anyone more than halfway and walk the high road with him to that goal we all seek a great city in a Great Society.

That's a destiny royal enough to warm the heart of this proud descendant of the last great king of Ireland—who was a Rory O'Connor.

Jefferson Davis and His Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Elizabeth Renwick Baker, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Ralph Parr Baker, of Newberry, S.C., is a national winner in the historical essay contest cosponsored by the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Sons of Confederate Veterans.

I am very proud to represent, in this Congress, Dr. and Mrs. Baker and their talented and lovely daughter who is now a junior at Newberry High School.

Miss Baker's essay is a masterpiece. I commend this splendid essay to the attention of my colleagues and to historians throughout the country:

JEFFERSON DAVIS AND HIS ACHIEVEMENTS

(By Elizabeth Renwick Baker)

The achievements of Jefferson Davis are best shown by a review of the life and eventful career of this remarkable man. Born at Fairview in Christian [Todd] County, Ky., on June 3, 1808, he moved with his parents to Mississippi when he was 2 years old. Samuel and Jane Cook Davis, believing in the potentialities of their intelligent young son, sent him at the age of 7 to St. Thomas, a boys' school run by Dominican Friars near Springfield, Ky. From these British-born instructors he had the beginnings of a first-rate liberal education, and with his keen observation and gift of memory, Jefferson began to witness the making of a great America. He saw the need for roads, and acquired a background for surveying his country's possibilities. In time he was to use all his patriotic devotion to advance the Nation's industry.[1]

At the age of 13, Jefferson entered Transylvania University at Lexington, Ky. He became an omnivorous reader, and at the end of his third year was appointed junior orator. This was the first time that an audience acknowledged his especially beautiful voice and his convincing way of asserting himself. Here he was influenced by the great Henry Clay and Albert Sidney Johnston. On March 11, 1824, he received an appointment to West Point from John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War, and signed by President Monroe. Jefferson reluctantly signed the commission as he had planned to study law at the University of Virginia, which had been founded only 5 years before by Thomas Jefferson, the man for whom he was named. Although he was not enthusiastic about a military career; yet, few men in the history of this Nation have rendered more signal service for their country in war and in peace than did Mr. Davis.

The discipline at West Point gave Cadet Davis a dignity and supreme self-control that served him well when later in life he was all but overwhelmed by tragedy. He formed a strong attachment for Albert Sidney Johnston, and counted among his friends Robert E. Lee, Lenidas Polk, and Joseph E. Johnston. Upon his graduation in 1828, he was breveted second lieutenant of infantry, 6th Regiment, but soon transferred to the 1st Infantry. Until 1835, his service was on the northwestern frontier. During this time he participated in the Black Hawk war. When Black Hawk was captured, he was sent to Jefferson Barracks in custody of Lieutenant Davis, and from there to Fortress Monroe, Va. Little did Davis then realize that some 30 years later, he, too, would be a prisoner, shackled with ankle irons, in the same fort. Such was Davis' tack and courtesy that the Indians conferred on him the title of "Little Chief." Black Hawk in his autobiography gave an interesting appraisal of Lieutenant Davis saying that he was well pleased with the conduct of the young war chief who was good, brave, and kind. It was for his gallant service in this war that Davis was advanced to first lieutenant of the 1st Regiment of Dragoons and soon made its adjutant. This assignment was regarded as a well-deserved honor.[2]

In 1835, Lieutenant Davis resigned his commission, married Miss Sarah Knox Taylor who was the daughter of Gen. Zachary Taylor, and went to live on his plantation, Brierfield, in Mississippi. Three months after his marriage, his wife died of malarial fever. Davis' world had collapsed and the inspiration of his newly planned life was gone. The shock changed his nature, in fact, his whole life, for it brought a stoicism to his character, which was later to be translated by those who did not like him into disdainful coolness.[3]

For about 10 years, Mr. Davis lived in retirement, becoming a successful cotton planter, and occupying much of his time by reading. His later achievements were a direct result of these years of serious study of the history of government of all ages. His value as a statesman was increased by his thorough knowledge of military affairs, government, agriculture, and plantation life. His study of national and international law, political and social science, coming at a time when his mind was mature and his experience of life varied, gave him a distinct advantage. His excellent speeches show his broad democracy and his high ideals of citizenship. In 1843, he became interested in politics and actively campaigned, as a Democrat, for the election of James K. Polk to the Presidency. During this time, he met Miss Varina Howell, of Nachetz, whose family were Whigs. She wrote her mother about Davis saying, "He is refined and cultivated, and yet a Democrat."[4] They were married in the spring of 1845; and though much younger than her husband, she was a brilliant and charming woman, loyal and devoted to him through all the viscissitudes of a tragic career. In this same year, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. He was a believer in the strict interpretation of the Constitution and a stanch supporter of John C. Calhoun.

At the beginning of the Mexican War, he resigned his seat in Congress to take command of the 1st Mississippi Rifle Regiment which joined General Taylor on the Rio Grande. Davis distinguished himself for bravery in Mexico during the battles of Monterrey and Buena Vista. At the latter battle, he is credited with saving the army of General Taylor from serious disaster by promptly and gallantly throwing his regiment into the breach caused by the precipitate and cowardly retreat of an Indiana regiment. At the close of the war, he was offered a promotion to the rank of brigadier general of volunteers but he refused.

Davis returned to Mississippi and in 1847 accepted an appointment as U.S. Senator to fill the vacancy left by the death of Senator Speight. It was during this time that he became known as a zealous defender of slavery and an advocate of the doctrine of States' rights. He was elected in 1850 for the next term, but resigned his seat to canvass for the election of Franklin Pierce to the presidency. In Mississippi, he became a States' Rights Democratic candidate for Governor against Henry S. Foote. He was defeated in a close race. In 1853, President Pierce appointed him Secretary of War. His tenure in the war office was perhaps the peak of his career.[5] For 4 years, he placed the preparedness of this country on a basis of leadership and efficiency unapproached before. His constructive qualities of statesmanship, his candor in giving advice without attempt to please or flatter, his knowledge of men and questions made him a pillar of strength to Franklin Pierce, and won for him the highest formal expressions of praise as Secretary of War.[6] He enlarged the U.S. Army by four regiments, introduced an improved system of light infantry tactics made possible by substituting iron for wood in gun carriages, revised army regulations, experimented with camels in the Southwest, caused the manufacture of pistols, rifles, and muskets, and strengthened the sea coast and frontier defenses. Through his efforts, engineer companies were organized to study the proposed routes for a railway connecting the Mississippi Valley with the Pacific Ocean. He secured necessary scientific and geographical information for westward expansion.

Other noteworthy achievements were the magnificient aqueduct which still supplies Washington, D.C., with an abundance of pure water; the completion of the work on the Capitol which had dragged on for 40 years; the founding of the Smithsonian Institute; and the averting of a second war with Mexico by the Gadsden Purchase, which enlarged our country by about 46,000 square miles. He designed American commerce with the Orient, and continually advocated closer relations with South America.

In December, 1857, Jefferson Davis returned to the U.S. Senate to remain there

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

until January 21, 1861, when he resigned after Mississippi had passed the Ordinance of Secession. John C. Calhoun, who had been the great defender of the States' rights theory, had died; but the southern cause had been carried on by the capable and eloquent Senator Davis from Mississippi. Truly, he was the last of the Senate giants.[7] His farewell address to the Senate was full of patriotism and the highest ideals. His final words have been placed on his monument in Richmond, Va.:

"Not in hostility to others, not to injure any section of the country, not even for our pecuniary benefit—but from the high and solemn purpose of defending those rights, which we inherited and which it is our duty to transmit unshorn to our children."[8]

On February 18, 1861, at Montgomery, Ala., Davis was inaugurated provisional president of the Confederate States; and the following November was elected president for 6 years. Throughout the War Between the States, he acted with dignity, sincerity, and devotion to principle. His achievements during this critical period were over shadowed by the final outcome of the conflict. But, under great difficulties, he set up a government, procurred passage of a conscription law, organized an army, obtained supplies and provisions, contrived to manufacture cannon, constructed a navy in improvised yards, welded together the disjointed transport system of the South, financed the war on fiat money, and furnished the leadership needed during this bitter 4-year struggle. He had declared upon assuming the office of the President of the Confederate States of America that he would devote all that he had of heart, of head, and of hand to the duties ahead; and history records that, in every sense of the word, Jefferson Davis lived up to that pledge.[9]

At the close of the war, he was held prisoner in Fortress Monroe for 2 years. Humble and submissive to God, but uncringing to man, he typified noble southern manhood. Dr. Craven, his prison physician, respected and admired Mr. Davis for his splendid self-control.[10]

After Horace Greeley and other northern friends obtained his release from prison, Davis, ill, depressed, and short of funds, sought refuge with his wife and four children in Canada. They found a haven in John Lovell's home in Montreal. The following summer, still seeking some means by which to earn a living, he went to England. While there, he was offered the presidency of an insurance company in Memphis, Tenn. He returned to the States and accepted the job. Misfortune continued to plague the Confederate leader as the insurance company soon failed and his two sons died. Returning to Mississippi, he sought rest and a place where he might write his book.[11] Mrs. Sarah A. Dorsey, an old schoolmate of Mrs. Davis, sold him her beautiful plantation home, Beauvoir, on the Mississippi coast between Gulfport and Biloxi.[12] Here he spent his final years, devoting his time to writing a comprehensive history, "The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government," which was published in two volumes in 1881. This outstanding work ends with these words:

"In asserting the right of secession, it has not been my wish to incite to its exercise: I recognize the fact that the war showed it to be impracticable, but this did not prove it to be wrong; and, now that it may not be again attempted, and that the Union may promote the general welfare, it is needful that the truth, the whole truth, should be known, so that crimination and recrimination may forever cease, and then, on the basis of fraternity and faithful regard for the rights of the States, there may be written on the arch of the Union, 'Esto perpetua.'"[13]

His last public utterance to the young men of Mississippi shortly before his death on December 6, 1889, shows no bitterness and no regrets, only an earnest plea for loyalty:

"Men in whose hands the destinies of our Southland lie, for love of her, I break my silence to speak to you a few words of respectful admonition. The past is dead; let it bury its dead, its hopes, and its aspirations; before you lies the future, a future full of golden promise; a future of expanding national glory before which all the world shall stand amazed. Let me beseech you to lay aside all rancor, all bitter sectional feeling and to take your place in the ranks of those who will bring about a consummation devoutly to be wished, a reunited country."[14]

The New York World, commenting on his death, said that Jefferson Davis was proud, sensitive, and honorable in all his dealings and in every relation of life.

In recalling the achievements of Mississippi's beloved statesman, the South's illustrious leader, and America's true son, we pay reverence to the past and find inspiration for the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Mississippi," Chicago, the Goodspeed Publishing Co., 1891, vol. 1, pp. 629–632.

Catton, Bruce, "A Stillness at Appomattox," New York, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1953.

"Confederate States of America or Confederacy," Grolier Encyclodepia, New York, Grolier Inc., 1961, vol. VI, p. 116.

Craven, John J., "Prison Life of Jefferson Davis," New York, Carleton, 1866.

Davis, Burke, "To Appomattox Nine April Days, 1865," New York, Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1959.

Davis, Jefferson, "The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government," New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1881, 2 vols.

"Days We Celebrate," the Book of Knowledge, New York, Grolier, Inc., 1961, vol. VI, p. 2091.

Dodd, William E., "Jefferson Davis, Statesmen of the Old South," New York, the Macmillan Co., 1911.

Ferrabee, Jim, "Jeff Davis' Refuge in Canada," the Atlanta Journal & Constitution magazine, June 4, 1961, pp. 8–9.

Freeman, Douglas Southall, "Jefferson Davis," Encyclopaedia Britannica, Chicago, R. R. Connelley & Sons Co., 1951, vol. VII, pp. 84–86.

Hesseltine, William B., "Jefferson Davis," the World Book Encyclopedia, Chicago, Field Enterprises, Inc., 1959, vol. IV, pp. 1884–86.

"Jefferson Davis," Grolier Encyclopedia, New York, Grolier Inc. 1961, vol. VII, p. 32.

Kane, Harnett Thomas, "Bride of Fortune; Novel Based on the Life of Mrs. Jefferson Davis," New York, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1948.

McElroy, Robert, "Jefferson Davis," New York, Harper & Bros., 1937.

Miers, Earl Schenck, "The Civil War," the Book of Knowledge, New York, Grolier, Inc., 1961, vol. VII, pp. 2426–2443.

Spooner, Mrs. A. D., and Herron, Mrs. R. C. Compilers, "Historic Beauvoir," Beauvoir, Miss., 1932–33.

STENNIS JOHN, "A Reappraisal of the Life of Jefferson Davis," address at Fortress Monroe, Va., May 5, 1956, the United Daughters of the Confederacy magazine, June 1956, vol. XIX, p. 18.

Stephenson, Nathaniel W., "Jefferson Davis," Dictionary of American Biography, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930, vol. V, pp. 123–131.

Strode, Hudson, "Jefferson Davis," New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1955.

Tate, Allen, "Jefferson Davis, His Rise and Fall," New York, Minton, Balch & Co., 1929.

"The Statues of Jefferson Davis and James Z. George, Unveiled in the U.S. Capitol at Washington, June 2, 1931," Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1932.

West, Decca Lamar, "Jefferson Davis, American," Jefferson Davis National Highway, United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1933, pp. 11–15.

Woodbury, Mrs. John L., "Jefferson Davis," Jefferson Davis National Highway, United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1933, pp. 4–11.

---

[1] Hudson Strode, "Jefferson Davis" (New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1955), p. 19.

[2] William E. Dodd, "Jefferson Davis," Statesmen of the Old South (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1911), pp. 177–178.

[3] Hudson Strode, op. cit., p. 106.

[4] Robert McElroy, "Jefferson Davis" (New York, Harper & Bros., 1937), p. 55.

[5] Nathaniel W. Stephenson, "Jefferson Davis," Dictionary of American Biography (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1930), vol. 5, pp. 123–131.

[6] Pat Harrison, "The Statues of Jefferson Davis and James Z. George Unveiled in the U.S. Capitol at Washington, June 2, 1931" (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1932), pp. 33–40.

[7] Allen Tate, "Jefferson Davis, His Rise and Fall" (New York, Minton, Balch & Co., 1929), p. 15.

[8] Mrs. John L. Woodbury, "Jefferson Davis," Jefferson Davis National Highway (United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1933), p. 9.

[9] JOHN STENNIS, "A Reappraisal of the Life of Jefferson Davis," address at Fortress Monroe, Va., May 5, 1956.

[10] John J. Craven, "Prison Life of Jefferson Davis" (New York, Carleton, 1866), p. 371.

[11] Jim Ferrabee, "Jeff Davis' Refuge in Canada," the Atlanta Journal and Constitution Magazine (June 4, 1961), pp. 8–9.

[12] "Historic Beauvoir," compiled by Mrs. A. D. Spooner and Mrs. R. C. Herron, Beauvoir, Miss., 1932–33.

[13] Jefferson Davis, "The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government (New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1881), vol. II, p. 764.

[14] Decca Lamar West, "Jefferson Davis, American," Jefferson Davis National Highway (United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1933), pp. 11–15.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Save Your Vision Week, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the week of March 6 just ended the National Save Your Vision Week. I have a special interest in this observance. Two years ago I sponsored in the House the joint resolution which led to the President's declaring the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week. I might add that the then senior Senator of Minnesota, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, introduced the resolution in the Senate.

The first Save Your Vision Week took place in 1927 and since then the several States Governors have declared statewide Save Your Vision Weeks. My home State of Colorado proclaimed a State Save Your Vision Week to impress the public with the importance of preserving individual eyesight. Based on my State's program, I was anxious to have this important message brought to all our country's citizens and worked for congressional passage of the National Save Your Vision Week.

Promotion of this notable week was initiated by optometry and has been supported by the optometric profession ever since. During this past week millions of people heard and saw carefully prepared, instructive and educational material concerning visual care via radio announcements and television film clips as well as newspaper and magazine articles.

The most important educational material, however, was presented in personal or as group efforts by optometrists who took the time and made the effort to present the Save Your Vision Week message to local schools, safety groups, civic clubs, and other organizations concerned with visual care.

Our country is fortunate indeed that long ago some leaders in the optometric profession developed the idea for a Save Your Vision Week and continued their work until the idea became recognized and appreciated by Congress and all the capitals of our States and possessions. Through the years, the American Optometric Association has prepared and disseminated valuable educational materials to all communication media until today optometry is readily identified with the national interest in professional vision care.

In proclaiming the 1966 National Save Your Vision Week, President Johnson stated:

> I call upon the communications media, the medical, ophthalmological, optometric, and other health professions, and all agencies concerned with programs for the improvement and preservation of vision, to unite in public activities to impress upon the people of the United States the importance of good vision to their happiness and welfare, and to urge their participation in programs to improve and protect the vision of our people.

Furnished this official backing and fortified with excellent and well-prepared materials supplied by the American Optometric Association, optometrists across the Nation made much of the local news by their individual and collective information programs.

Thousands of schoolchildren in every State received vision screening, many for the first time; thousands of industrial people obtained literature and information designed to make them more aware of preventable hazards to their vision in the plant; thousands more learned of the need for perfect vision in driving; and many more thousands of adults saw and heard evidence which made them more aware of the need for professional eye care.

The week just ended completes the 1966 National Save Your Vision Week, but the value of the observance continues. Although we cannot now measure the impact of the program, I know firsthand of the long-term benefits to our citizens of the vision care information disseminated. I commend the members of the optometric profession and the American Optometric Association for their work in reminding all of us in this week just past to save our vision.

Cincinnati Jaycees Place Second in Nation in Governmental Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recognition received by the Greater Cincinnati Junior Chamber of Commerce during the U.S. Jaycees fifth annual governmental affairs seminar recently held in Washington, D.C. The Cincinnati chapter was rated No. 2 in the Nation in the area of governmental affairs.

Chester T. Cruze, president of the Cincinnati chapter, received the award in behalf of the chapter. The award is well deserved and I particularly commend Mr. Cruze for his outstanding service.

In large measure the award was based on the work done by the Cincinnati Jaycees in setting up a local chapter of the Robert A. Taft Institute of Government. This project was accomplished with the help of the University of Cincinnati and the social studies, economics, political science, and civic high school teachers of the Cincinnati public schools.

The local chapter's goal—

As expressed by Cincinnati Junior Chamber President Cruze—

> is to inculcate a working knowledge of government in our educators by merging practicality and realism with political theory to produce an intellectual treatment of the institution of government in our classes that is to the traditional civics course as integral calculus is to object counting.

The programs set up by Dr. R. Eric Weise, professor of political science at the University of Cincinnati, who is codirector of the institute with Mr. Cruze, are designed to contribute to the knowledge of social studies teachers in practical politics through seminars presided over by experienced government and party officials ranging from U.S. Senators, Congressmen, State legislators, city councilmen, National, State, and county party chairmen to precinct leaders.

The programs, held at the University of Cincinnati Student Union Building one Saturday a month, are nonpartisan, embracing leaders from both parties at each session, usually one another's counterpart in office. Dr. Dieter Dux, head of University of Cincinnati's political science department, and Mr. John DeCamp, director of public relations, are the University of Cincinnati's advisers to the Cincinnati institute.

The official U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce organ, Future magazine, has stated:

> Perhaps no program of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce is as important as its efforts to bring a maximum number of informed, conscientious voters to the polls.

Dr. Weise stated in the 1966 Taft Institute program, published by the Cincinnati Jaycees, that—

> This program is part of a continuing effort to realize the objectives of the Robert A. Taft Institute of Government.

The institute, an outgrowth of a foundation in memory of the late Ohio Senator from Cincinnati, was founded in 1961 as a nonprofit, nonpartisan national educational corporation under a charter granted by the board of regents of the State of New York. Its major objectives are: First, to stimulate among Americans an understanding of the problems and processes of government in a free society; second, to inspire more active citizen interest and participation in government at all levels, and third, to advance the art of government and thus help our citizens meet more effectively the great problems now confronting the United States and Western civilization. Its work is keyed to these words of Senator Taft:

> Widespread education is essential to the maintenance of liberty. Freedom and government by the people cannot long survive or be intelligently administered unless the people are educated and have the intelligence and the character which only education can provide. * * * Education is essential if a free people is to remain free. * * * No man can be free if he does not understand the opportunities which lie before him.

Surveys made by the Taft Institute indicate that many adults lack political understanding. The Taft Institute's figures show that the best time to reach the citizen who does not understand or participate in politics is while he is in high school. The surveys also show that school administrators are avidly interested in strengthening citizenship education requirements and opportunities.

Future magazine reported:

> Its success in a brandnew field is startling. A new dimension is being added to the citizenship education offered in the junior and senior high schools. This new dimension is a fresh, nontheoretical understanding of the workings of our two-party system. It is the kind of understanding that cannot come from books. It flows from the extended and candid discussions between the teachers and their governmentwise lecturers.

The future voters educated by these Cincinnati educators under the direction of Cincinnati public school's Dr. Robert P. Curry, associate superintendent; Miss Helen Yaeger, administrative supervisor of secondary social studies; Miss Jean Tilford, supervisor; and Mr. Dean Moore, supervising teacher, who have given their time and talent to realize Mr. Cruze's ideal of a treatment both theoretically intellectual and realistically practical cannot help but improve our great democratic institution.

In addition to Mr. Cruze and Dr. Weise, several other Cincinnatians have lent their support to make this institute the success it is. Dr. Walter C. Langsam, president of the University of Cincinnati, Hon. Neil McElroy, former Secretary of Defense, and Hon. Robert Taft, Jr., are members of the institute's advisory council, and Hon. C. A. Harrell, former Cincinnati city manager, is general chairman.

This partnership—business, political, and educational—is strengthening the political fiber of a free society by producing the sine qua non of that free society—good, politically knowledgeable, responsible, and active citizens.

Republic of Korea Now Paying Its Own Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Americans everywhere will be delighted to know, I am sure, that one of our stanchest allies to whom we have extended assistance under our foreign aid program is now on its economic feet and paying its own way.

A very keen observer of the Asian scene, Mr. Keyes Beech, recently reported that the people of Korea "have laid down their beggar's bowls and picked up their hoes" and "after more than 20 years on U.S. dole, Korea is paying its own way and looking the world in the eye."

The transformation from a war-ravaged country to a nation teeming with business activity has been phenomenal. The average GNP—gross national product—for Korea has shown an annual 8-percent increase during the last 3 years, and the total export in 1960 amounted to $180 million, as compared to only $30 million in 1960. The economic boom is further evidenced by the increase in the exportation of manufactured goods rather than of food and raw materials.

In full awareness of the fact that the present rate of economic growth is being generated by the conflict in Vietnam, a grateful South Korea is bravely fulfilling its military and political obligations. It has sent 20,000 troops to South Vietnam and is making plans to send another 20,000.

Having witnessed, firsthand, the rejuvenated economic activity during my recent fact-finding mission of the Republic of Korea, I can confidently say that the South Korean economy shows every indication of continuing its growth even without the temporary impetus brought on by the war in Vietnam. South Korea today is a shining example of the success of our foreign aid program.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Beech's informative article, which appeared in the March 9, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, follows:

KOREA FINALLY PAYING OWN WAY AFTER 20 YEARS ON AMERICAN DOLE

(By Keyes Beech, Chicago Daily News foreign service)

SEOUL.—Something pleasantly astonishing has happened in the land of the morning calm and afternoon demonstration.

Korea the accursed, nation of mendicants and slickie boys, pimps, and prostitutes, has come to life after a long sleep.

After more than 20 years on U.S. dole, Korea is paying its own way and looking the world in the eye. Its people have laid down their beggars' bowls and picked up their hoes.

It is hard to believe, but the evidence is overwhelming. This capital of 3,500,000 people actually looks more like a city than an army garrison town.

New buildings are going up everywhere, including modern 10-story structures with all the latest conveniences.

Ruddy-faced chestnut vendors, breaths steaming in the frosty air, hawk their product in front of department store display windows filled with smart-looking dresses, jewelry, watches, handbags, cameras, binoculars, and other luxury goods.

Factories in and around Seoul are turning out torrents of textiles, drugs, radios, and steel products.

Consider the growth statistics. They present too rosy a picture, because the country started from nowhere, but they are nevertheless impressive.

Industrial production has more than doubled in the last 5 years. The GNP (gross national product) has averaged an 8-percent increase for the last 3 years. Exports jumped from $30 million in 1960 to $180 million in 1965. Two-thirds of all exports are now manufactured goods, not food and raw materials.

The booming textile industry leads an industrial pack. The demand for Korean silk is so great that the industry can't meet it. The Thai silk you buy in Bangkok is often Korean silk, for Korea is exporting raw silk to Thailand. Last year Korea's raw silk sales alone amounted to more than its tungsten sales, and tungsten was once Korea's biggest single export.

The plywood industry, which didn't even exist 3 years ago, tops even silk as a foreign exchange earner. The clever Koreans are importing mahogany from the Philippines and Indonesia and processing it into paneling for export to the United States and elsewhere.

Korea is quite unabashedly cashing in on the war in Vietnam. And why not, Koreans ask, when Korea has more than 20,000 troops in South Vietnam and plans to double that number?

Congress Needs Computer Ability To Preserve Fiscal Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation to establish a congressional comptrollership, to preserve the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government to make sure the taxpayer gets a dollar's value for every dollar he contributes to the Government.

At this time there is no way for the Congress to make fully adequate decisions on the value or ultimate costs of huge multibillion programs suggested by the administration and Congressmen nor upon alternatives.

I believe my bill, H.R. 13445, which will give Congress a computerized analytical ability to match that of the executive department in some areas and put our operations in this field on a par with budget-minded businesses, will save taxpayers billions of dollars through the years.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD newspaper editorials and stories concerning this measure, which I hope will get speedy departmental reports and hearings:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union Mar. 12, 1966]

FISCAL ANALYST WOULD HELP CONGRESS DO JOB

A congressional committee may soon begin studying the feasibility of creating the post of congressional comptroller. Jacksonville's Congressman, CHARLES E. BENNETT, who suggested the comptrollership, says the office is needed to give the National Legislature the space-age capability of insuring that the taxpayer gets "his dollar's worth for every dollar he pays in taxes."

Anyone who has ever seen the annual budget as it is presented to the Congress by the President is keenly aware that the legislators really do not have the facilities or the time to adequately analyze the budgetary proposals as to their probable value to the Nation. Few Congressmen, even those of the fiscal bodies, ever have claimed to understand or know the probable effect of the budget.

The annual budgets will grow more complex and the probability that the Congress will be able to analyze them will be reduced unless some steps are taken soon to provide

Senators and Representatives with an agency that is staffed and equipped with professionally trained personnel and analytical machinery.

Each year, the Congress is asked to enact laws, programs, and special projects and to appropriate tax money for the same on the grounds that the activities will improve living standards, correct deficiences and so on. Quite often, there is no real supporting evidence for the contentions of the persons making the requests and they must rely on untried theories. Every taxpayer is keenly aware of the millions of dollars that have been wasted on unsuccessful programs.

Congressman BENNETT's proposal could do much to prevent the enactment of unsound programs and to enhance the chances for passage of sound bills that would promote fiscal responsibility and give the Federal Government an opportunity to do much good with less damage to the taxpayer's pocketbook.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Mar. 10, 1966]

As Fiscal Watchdog: Congress Comptroller Is Proposed by Bennett

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 2.—A measure to create a key U.S. legislative office of comptroller of Congress was offered today by Jacksonville Representative CHARLES BENNETT.

Sharp scrutiny is expected to be paid the Floridian's bill by both House and Senate Members who concede they have difficulty grappling with increasingly complex fiscal programs and problems.

The proposed congressional post is described by BENNETT as one aimed at promoting fiscal responsibility in Federal Government and to give Congress a "computerized, analytical ability."

SUGGESTED IN STUDY

BENNETT, in introducing the bill, was following up a suggestion made by Arthur D. Little Co., of Cambridge, Mass., which has completed an extensive study of the operations of Congress. The congressional comptrollership was one of a number of proposals in the firm's report.

The lawmaker said in a floor speech in support of his legislation today that there is a great need for in-depth study of fiscal proposals by the executive branch so Members of Congress can determine whether the ideas are economical and potentially effective.

The comptroller, BENNETT said, would have all the modern-day tools to do such a job and would report on all bills going to the floor of both Houses as to what effect they would have on the financial stability of the Government.

"What Congress needs in 1966 is an establishment to preserve fiscal responsibility so the taxpayer will get his dollar's worth for every dollar he pays for taxes," he declared.

"We need a space-age Congress to match the Great Society, one that uses the most modern equipment to handle its problems and analyze issues and proposals before they go into effect and after they are operating to determine their effectiveness. I am hopeful for a favorable report and early hearings," he said.

Congress now has under its wing the General Accounting Office, which studies expenditures by the administration only. It serves as a congressional watchdog over executive spending, but does not have all of the analytical duties sought by BENNETT.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Mar. 10, 1966]

Bennett Urges Creation of Congress Comptroller

WASHINGTON.—Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida, introduced a bill to permit Congress to move out of the quill and foolscap era of financial analysis and planning and into the age of the computer.

The 18-year veteran of Congress told the House: "I introduce * * * legislation to establish a congressional comptrollership, to promote fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government and to give the Congress a computerized analytical ability."

BENNETT noted that the Government is spending and taxing the people more than $100 billion a year. "But the 1966 Congress in the age of missiles and jets is attacking this problem with Continental Congress horse-and-buggy tools," he said.

The increasing growth and complexity of Federal Government and its budget and fiscal expenditures, BENNETT said, has created difficulties for Congress in the evaluation of ideas and untried plans.

"The Arthur D. Little Co., of Cambridge, Mass., has done an extensive study of Congress, and a congressional comptroller's office is one of the suggestions outlined in the study," he said. "There is a great need today to study proposals from the executive branch and from Members of Congress in depth, to determine whether planned programs will be economical and effective and what the consequences will be in the future.

"The congressional comptroller would have all the modern-day tools to do such a job and would report on all bills going to the floor as to what effect they would have on the fiscal integrity of our Government."

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, Mar. 9, 1966]

Comptroller Need Cited by Bennett

The Great Society has become so financially involved, Congress needs a comptroller and a computer to keep up. Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Jacksonville, said today.

The Jacksonville lawmaker, in a House speech, asked adoption of his bill establishing the post "to promote fiscal responsibility in Federal Government," and to improve the taxpayer's return on his dollar.

As BENNETT explained it, Congress still uses the legislative tools of the Continental Congress of 1789 while handling a $100 billion budget.

"The congressional comptroller," BENNETT said, "would report on all bills going to the floor and what effect they would have on the fiscal integrity of the Government."

"Using computers, the comptroller could determine the present and future cost, the efficiency and duplication of legislative proposals," he said.

The Arthur D. Little Co., of Cambridge, Mass., in an analysis of the Congress, recommended the comptrollership, he noted.

The Government Closes Its Fist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, many of us are deeply concerned about the accelerating trend of the Central Government to control more and more of our daily lives. An example of how the Government can use Federal projects to carry out its will is forcefully illustrated for the farmers in California's productive Imperial Valley who have been issued an ultimatum to sell land in excess of 160 acres or the Government will cut off their source of water.

This intimidation is characteristic of how the Government can close its fist to carry out bureaucratic policy. Under unanimous consent I include an ediorial from the March 2 Wall Street Journal in the Appendix of the RECORD:

The Government Closes Its Fist

Though some people appear to forget it, the Government's outlays give it both the right and the duty to oversee the money's use.

A case in point is the canal the Government built in 1942 to bring in Colorado River water to irrigate California's Imperial Valley. The valley's farmers, aware that Washington's policy was to help provide water only for farms of 160 acres or less, asked assurance that the limitation would not apply to them. Of course it won't said the Secretary of the Interior.

After the passage of more than two decades, however, the present Interior Secretary, Stewart L. Udall, decided to reverse his predecessor. Accordingly, Imperial Valley farmers have been told they must sign contracts to sell any acres they own in excess of 160.

Naturally enough, the farmers are disturbed, and not only because they believe the Government is breaking its word. The Imperial Valley is no exception to the national trend toward bigger farms; in fact, the Council of California Growers contends that the "high cost of land in California requires more than the normal capital investment," and that "larger operations are the only ones which can economically survive."

While both good sense and fairness seem to be on the side of the Californians, up to now they've made little headway. "Although the Federal Government does not blindly adhere to the idea of the yeoman family farmer," says an Interior Department spokesman, "we do not feel that large-scale farming is the only alternative—and that unbridled bigness is the only choice to the homestead ideal."

As Washington moves deeper into subsidies for education, medical care, and a lot of other things, the experience of Imperial Valley is worth remembering. No matter how openhanded and unquestioning the Government may say it is, sooner or later its hand is likely to become the firm fist of Federal control.

The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle—No. 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, the seventh article of a series on poverty written by Washington reporter of the Detroit News, Tom Joyce, follows:

Boon or Boondoggle—The Proud Slam the Door

(By Tom Joyce)

WASHINGTON, Mar. 5.—By anybody's standards, Cotton Reeves is a poor man.

He owns his own home, in the rolling hills outside Gainesville, Ga., and he has a steady job.

He also has 13 children and a wife to look after them.

But he can count little else in his inventory, except a fierce pride that won't tolerate "truck with the welfare."

There is no bathroom to share in the Reeves' home. There is not one outside, *among the trees and bushes, either. Water is carried from a stream some distance from* the house, an uneven structure assembled from unpainted lumber scraps.

NOT ENOUGH BEDS

There are windows only on one side. The tiny, round stove in the living room serves both for heating and cooking. There are *not enough beds—or even room for them—* for all the Reeves children.

School is 2 miles away, down a muddy road traveled by the schoolbus.

But most of the time the Reeves children prefer to walk.

With their ragged clothes and unwashed faces, it is less painful than insults from other children on the bus.

The children range from 1½-year-old twins to the oldest boy, 25, who has a $40 a week job.

Cotton Reeves, whose real name is Fred, is a gravedigger and handyman for an undertaker. The work is hard and he puts in long hours to earn about $55 a week.

HE'S NOT LAZY

And he is a living refutation of the myth that all poor are dumb, lazy or shiftless. It is true that he has had little schooling. But his employer flinds him a willing, reliable worker "with a good head."

Welfare workers, who used to try to visit from time to time, were greeted coldly, if at all, by the Reeves family.

"Welfare's not right," says Mrs. Reeves, a handsome woman with the pain of poverty etched on her face. "And all the welfare people want to do anyway is take away your kids."

The Reeves children who are still in school do not like it.

Their future is not a bright one in the shack where the wind whistles through big cracks, sometimes kicking up the film of soil that covers rough boards on the floor.

But something is happening to the Reeves family. It doesn't seem like very much at first look. No one can say now, however, what it is going to mean.

Into the Reeves' lives, unexpectedly and without invitation, has come 22-year-old Ronald Leavens, a member of Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), the domestic version of the Peace Corps.

Members of the Reeves family have never seen anything like him before. He's not offering any kind of a handout and he certainly does not want to take the children away from home. Cotton Reeves isn't really sure what he wants.

But he visits every day. The children like him. They used to scatter into the woods when a welfare worker's car pulled up out front. But, in bare feet through the snow, they excitedly run out to greet Leavens, a tall, husky graduate of Loyola University in California.

Nobody used to come to just sit down and visit. And, since he started calling, Leavens has noticed that Mrs. Reeves has started to keep the house a little neater.

FATHER WARNED OF SANITATION, GERMS

With other VISTA workers, Leavens is helping Reeves build an outhouse. The father had not given it too much thought before, but, without applying pressure, Leavens talked about sanitation and how some germs can live, even in the woods, up to 7 years.

There is the possibility that one of the older Reeves boys, who is out of school and out of work, may join the Job Corps. Leavens has been talking about it, casually.

There are a couple of houses in Gainesville that are scheduled to be torn down for an urban renewal project. Put together with a little lumber and paint, they wouldn't be at all bad on Reeves' lot. A house-moving company's officials told Leavens that maybe something could be arranged. Reeves' employer will help. So will other VISTA volunteers.

Cotton Reeves really hasn't made up his mind. But it's not really like welfare. Leavens is a friend and Reeves himself would be doing a lot of work. And it would be good for the kids.

HE VISITS THE FAMILY EVERY DAY

Why has the family accepted Leavens?

"I guess," he said, "because they know I'm *not a welfare worker and—and this is very* important—I go out every day, usually just to talk. Welfare workers, with official cars and all, don't have time to really get to know a family. They come once a month or so and they have to be off in a few minutes so they can get to all the people they have to see."

In Georgia there are 38 counties with a per capita income of less than $750 a year. In some counties up to 43 percent of the families receive welfare assistance.

And there are thousands of families just like the Reeves in rural America—scattered from the hills of Appalachia all across the land.

In its rawest forms, rural poverty presents a picture more grim than the worst city slum. It is hidden, however, from most Americans in more ways than one. A shack in the country, surrounded by wild grass and shaded by trees, conceals much of the misery —except for those who live in it without water, without enough food and amid squalor.

A LOT OF LITTLE, DIRTY FACES

Wouldn't a little more effort, a little soap and water and a broom help? Sure. But it is pretty hard when the water must be carried in pails and there are a lot of dirty little faces to scrub. And it takes more than a broom and a splash of water to overcome hopelessness and ignorance.

The thousands of VISTA workers who are now going out into the hills and the lowlands, the Indian reservations and the camps of migratory workers are trying to overcome hopelessness and ignorance.

Working with rural antipoverty programs —and there now are 308 rural community action programs underway in 690 counties— the volunteers are trying a new approach.

Marion McPherson is a 58-year-old retired Army major, a Negro with a degree in modern languages from Roosevelt University in Chicago. He lives in a shack among Negro poor in a rural slum village just outside Gainesville.

HE LIVES WITH THE PEOPLE

As a VISTA volunteer, he feels that the only way to get the confidence of the people in the neighborhoods is to live with them. A sign on the door of his hovel announces it is also a VISTA neighborhood center.

What can he do? He can talk to people about birth control. He can lead them to adult education courses that are available. And he can offer guidance to the young people who come to visit him.

VISTA volunteers, who are paid only a small living allowance and a daily stipend for incidentals, are at work in the big cities as well as in the rural areas.

They are living in the tenements of Harlem and Chicago.

In Atlanta there are 22 working out of the local antipoverty offices.

One is Eric Metzner, 25, of Tucson, who holds a psychology degree from the University of Arizona. His father, Charles Metzner, is associate professor of public health at the University of Michigan.

Young Metzner has rented an apartment in the middle of a Negro slum where there are few permanent adult males and a lot of transient ones.

PIANO, POOL TABLE AND MANY BOOKS

In the living room of his apartment he has a battered old piano and a miniature pool table. There is also a library with hundreds of books that Metzner acquired from various sources.

The children do not have to knock and the apartment house has become a social center. *And Eric has been accepted by the youngsters and their parents.*

Among the children, even 6- and 7-year-olds, glue sniffing is a serious problem. For 16 cents on the local airplane glue market, three of four of them can pool their resources and buy a single tube.

"This," says Eric, "is enough to get them all high. They take a small plastic bag, line *the inside with the glue and pull it right over* their heads, one at a time."

Eric knew it would be useless to try to tell the youngsters to stop sniffing because it was harmful. Instead, he went to a doctor and got a large photograph, in color, of a collapsed lung and hung it in the living room where the youngsters congregate after school and on weekends.

TRIPS TO THE ZOO AND COUNTRY

"What's that awful lookin' monster?" they began to ask.

"It's a collapsed lung," Eric told them without explanation.

Some of the younger ones wanted to know about a lung. And many wanted to know how a lung could look so ugly.

"From sniffing glue," Eric told them.

Many have kicked the habit.

A lot of the children had never been out of their squalid environment until Eric arrived. Now, sometimes using a borrowed garbage truck that the youngsters help scrub with water and detergent, he takes them to places like the zoo and the country. He takes different groups to different places so they will have experiences to discuss.

Some of the home experiences aren't the kind they want to talk about' In one of the apartments a mother was too busy with a bottle to pay any attention to her son, who was getting his own kicks in same room with a tube of glue. In another apartment the kids were using their father, passed out on the floor, for a card table.

Not all the VISTA volunteers are working out. Some have been expelled.

The new organization, in many ways overglamorized by some of the officials who run it, is attracting a lot of young people who come with the mistaken notion that its main function is to break down civil rights barriers.

"We get a lot of kids," said an official, "who want to join VISTA so they can parade and demonstrate, especially in the South."

In the beginning, screening was not adequate. Officials say it is getting better.

Other volunteers are just not cut out for the work. It is not every young college graduate, retired Army major, widow, or retired newspaperman who can go into a ghetto or a Reeves family and win acceptance.

THEY DON'T REGARD SELVES AS POOR

A sweat shirt and a pair of dirty sneakers are not enough.

It has been necessary to transfer volunteers who, for instance, walk into a country cabin and announce that they are there to "rescue you all from poverty."

Rural poverty is perhaps the hardest to fight, especially among southern white families. They are proud. And many do not regard themselves as poor.

In Kentucky, this reporter trudged a quarter mile through snow to a cabin he had spotted from the road. The idea was to talk to the occupants about the war against poverty.

A woman with deep wrinkles in the leathery skin of her face came to the door.

"I'm a reporter, and I wonder if I might talk to you about the poverty."

"We haint interested in any," she interrupted, slamming the board door on its wobbly hinges.

The reporter stumbled over a rusty washtub on the porch and trudged back across the field.

PEOPLE WON'T TALK ABOUT POVERTY

There are no built-in service organiza*tions in rural areas as there are in the cities for poverty fighters to work through.* The people themselves resist organization.

The poor might attend a meeting in their Detroit or Chicago neighborhoods. But try to get them together to talk about poverty in a valley in Appalachia.

One of the rural community action pro*grams is in Grayson in northeast Kentucky.* It serves the six counties of Carter, Elliott, Greenup, Lewis, Morgan, and Rowan. Morgan and Elliott are among the 82 counties listed by President Johnson as the poorest in the country. In the 6-county area there are 93,364 persons. Of these, 10,668 are poor according to the standards of the poverty war. In Elliott 64 percent are poor and in Morgan the figure is 67.

The houses, many of them never more than shacks, have gone to seed.

Most of the families have lived there for generations. Some of the farms were once fair-size units, providing a good life in days when the small farmer could make a decent living on a few crops.

But the farms have been split up from generation to generation, with descendants of the original owners each year getting smaller and smaller pieces.

The antipoverty project in the area was funded for $198,000. The director, Lee Taylor who has an independent income from a number of Kentucky oil wells, is paid an annual salary of $12,000.

HOW TO COOK SURPLUS FOOD

One of the programs is to teach recipients of surplus food how to make it palatable. Another involves busing poor youths who have demonstrated ability to a nearby junior college. There are 19 in the program.

As in the urban community action programs, there are paid doorbell ringers who go out to enlist the poor in self-selp programs, most of which are not really set up, and try to get them interested in doing things for themselves.

The rural poor are suspicious of such goings-on.

And, in some cases, so is Taylor. He discovered that nearly 20 of about 30 so-called subprofessional aid jobs in one county went to Democratic precinct workers. The pay is about $300 a month and the idea is to involve the poor themselves.

Taylor says most of the politically appointed aids have been fired. But there are similar stories in other anti-poverty programs where politicians find handy machinery for patronage.

It is far more the exception than the rule, however.

GOOD EXAMPLE HARDLY WORKS

Washington officials describe the Grayson operation as a "good example" of how a rural program works. Actually, at least so far, it is scarcely working at all.

And, according to Taylor, not a single representative of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which runs the war on poverty, has been there to have a look.

"Hell," he said, "most of those people up in Washington haven't any idea of what rural area looks like outside of a-golf course."

And he complains that the whole war is "urban oriented."

What does Taylor think about the possibility of success in the rural programs?

"I have grave doubts," he said.

One program popular in Kentucky and other rural areas has earned the nickname of "Happy Pappies."

Technically they are called Work Experience and Training Programs and they provide direct payments in poverty funds to unemployed fathers up to $250 a month.

SOME 23,483 BECOME HAPPY PAPPIES

To be eligible, a man must be out of work for 90 days, willing and registered to work, not eligible for unemployment compensation and have at least one child.

This year there are 59 approved projects for 23,483 persons at a cost of $44 million.

Taylor uses Happy Pappies in his program.

"Let's say I want some Happy Pappies for a few days," he says. I call Judge Roy Brown in Elliott County and the Happy Pappies appear for work."

Why does Taylor telephone the county *judge, really an exalted justice of the peace in the Kentucky system?*

"That's just the way you do it," says Taylor.

The judges, elected officials, have the job of certifying people as poor in Kentucky. So apparently they are used because they know who the poor are. And, in the county system, the judge is an important political figure, who, among other things, runs the county highway department.

What do the Happy Pappies do?

In one case, Taylor said they fixed up a room in a dilapidated house as a demonstration project to show "what a few dollars worth of paint can do."

What do the people in the area think, including the Happy Pappies?

"It's all political and the politicians run it."

RACE HOLDS UP PROGRAM SOME

In many areas the South is shortchanging itself, especially in connection with rural programs, by failing to set up antipoverty. Race is often a big factor, since involving the poor is tantamount to involving Negroes.

One of the most hopeful programs in the Deep South is just getting underway in Mississippi. It is called STAR (systematic training and redevelopment program) and is a child of the Catholic Church. It is a statewide program aimed at jobs, job training, and adult education. With headquarters in Jackson, the board has achieved outstanding racial balance.

In Mississippi, 48 percent of all the citizens over 25 have only an eighth-grade education or less. Four percent have never been to school. And 160,000 have less than a fourth-grade education.

Negroes, it is turning out, are more eager to participate in the education programs than whites. And herein lies a major problem. The illiterate and semiliterate whites are reluctant to go to classes with Negroes.

"But it is improving all the time" says Father Lawrences Watts, who the Natchez-Jackson diocese has assigned to the project full time.

There are other antipoverty programs for the rural areas—like loans to poor farmers to buy simple things like mules and machinery with which to form cooperatives.

But, in the end, the problems of the rural areas—with poverty often concealed by landscape and pride—might be the hardest to solve. There may not be a solution.

Few, however, are able to look at the children who are growing up dirty and neglected in an increasingly complicated and urban society and deny that some kind of effort should be made.

The Northern Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the readers of the RECORD will be extremely interested in Joseph Alsop's latest column on the Vietnam situation in which he discusses recommendations made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. His *article "The Northern Bombing," published in the Washington Post of March* 16, follows:

THE NORTHERN BOMBING

(By Joseph Alsop)

The cat is out of the bag. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been publicly revealed as *pressing the President to intensify the bombing of North Vietnam still further,* and especially to permit the destruction of the vital North Vietnamese oil fuel stores.

As usual in Lyndon Johnson's Washington, the whole problem of the northern bombing has been muddled and obscured as much as possible. So it may be as well to remove some of the muddle before analyzing the Joint Chiefs' recommendation.

To begin with, when the peace offensive and bombing pause came to an end, there was a report that the permitted bombing area in the north was much more limited, by the President's order, than it had been before the pause began. The report was officially denied. But it was also used as a lever for a spate of other reports that the President's post-pause policy was to "limit the war," which were not denied.

The realities behind all this were quite different from the public appearance. First, the military planners in both Washington and Saigon believed that the highest priority immediately postpause, should be given to bombing the bridges and other useful targets on the lines of communication directly feeding the Ho Chi Minh trail. These are in the most southerly provinces of North Vietnam. And in this manner, the initial bombing area was in fact temporarily restricted.

Second, however, far from "limiting" our effort against the north, the President has already authorized a major intensification. The approved sortie rate—the number of missions flown against northern targets—was tripled after the pause ended. Weather permitting, therefore, we are now dropping three times as many bombs on northern targets as we did prepause.

This earlier decision to triple the weight of bombing points, of course, toward just the kind of further intensification that the Joint Chiefs are now pressing on the President. Two things stand in the way.

One is the fact that the biggest fuel depot in North Vietnam is in the outskirts of Haiphong, and the second biggest is in the outskirts of Hanoi. The other is a hand-tailored intelligence analysis concluding that the truck movement over the Ho Chi Minh trail would not be seriously hampered, even if all the fuel depots in North Vietnam were completely destroyed.

The analysis in question rouses the unavoidable suspicion that its preparation was somehow linked to the President's invariable hankering to conserve what he calls his "options"—in this case the option of not bombing in the Hanoi and Haiphong areas. At any rate, those who reached the conclusion summarized above must clearly have been taking lessons from Alice in Wonderland's chum, the White Queen, who proudly boasted that she had often managed to "believe six impossible things before breakfast."

Notwithstanding the analysis, it is clear that the President will eventually discover he has no option whatever, except to follow the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs. The facts leave him none, and it is a bit shocking that the facts have not been faced and the key decision has not yet been taken.

Briefly, the revised intelligence estimates that caused such a panic in Washington and produced the vaudeville peace offensive, predict a buildup of enemy regular units in South Vietnam to a level equivalent to no less than 18 divisions. The estimates also predict a rise in deliveries over the Ho Chi

Minh trail to a level well above 6,000 tons a month.

The latter is the key figure in the estimates, for without tonnage coming in to sustain them, the addition of new enemy regular forces in the south would actually be counterproductive. Given the character of the Ho Chi Minh trail, the character of the terrain it traverses, and the distances that have to be covered, a huge truck movement, involving 2,000 or 3,000 vehicles, will be needed to lay down 6,000 tons monthly in South Vietnam.

Ammunition to be used against our troops will be the most important commodity carried by those trucks. How then can the President refrain from doing everything in his power to halt or at least to greatly diminish the truck movement?

For the need is most emphatically not for area bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. The need is for pinpoint bombing to destroy the fuel depots in the outskirts of these cities and elsewhere in North Vietnam. It is a purely military need.

The President constantly proclaims his worry about "pressure from the hawks." He ought instead to welcome a public demand to get on with the war by doing what needs doing. And in this case, he will surely have to do what needs doing in the end.

The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle—No. 8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, the eighth article of a series on poverty written by Washington reporter of the Detroit News, Tom Joyce, follows:

[From the Detroit News, Mar. 7, 1966]

AMERICA'S CULTURALLY DEPRIVED—TROOPS IN POVERTY WAR SAVE A LOST GENERATION

(By Tom Joyce)

WASHINGTON, March 7.—Poverty leaves its deepest scars on little children.

If there was ever any doubt about this, it was dispelled last summer when hundreds of thousands of preschool youngsters between 4 and 5 from poverty's streets embarked on a new and exciting experience.

It was Project Headstart, an experiment that has won much praise and very little criticism.

The idea was to give culturally deprived children from poor homes—the youngsters who begin school under a frightful handicap—a better chance by providing preschool experience.

The program, which is now becoming a major part of the war against poverty, did much more than this. It provided a deep—and often disturbing—insight into the children who come from the slums, the ghettoes and the country shacks of America.

SHOCKING NEGLECT

It has been known for years that these children, the 4-, 5-, and 6-year-olds, start school with anything but an equal chance for success.

The extent of the cultural neglect was shocking, even to educators who long had known of its existence. In thousands of cases, medical neglect was even more disturbing.

A child who had never spoken a word, presumed to be mentally deficient, did not talk because he could not hear. And he did not hear because of massive deposits of wax in his ears. He had never been taken to a doctor, despite the suspicion of mental abnormality.

In Tampa, Fla., nearly 10 percent of the children enrolled in a Headstart program had eye defects. About 50 percent suffered nutritional deficiencies. In Jacksonville, Fla., 52 percent were anemic.

In Detroit, examinations disclosed that out of 6,000 children, 80 percent required dental care.

THE DROPOUTS

It is among the children of the poor, who start school behind their classmates and keep getting farther behind, that there are so many school dropouts.

They are the children, like the millions of young men and women of today, who will be the out-of-school, out-of-work youngsters of tomorrow.

The Job Corps is finding out a lot about them. And much of the failure is being traced back to the handicap with which they began school, in first grade and kindergarten.

It is not so surprising when you look at some of the things discovered in Head Start.

A little girl in Georgia arrived at the classroom with only 20 words in her vocabulary. Simple symbols—at least simple in middle-class terms—-had no meaning to her.

The minds of most American youngsters respond almost immediately to allusions from Mother Goose.

But the little girl in Atlanta had never heard a nursery rhyme. Maybe nobody had bothered to tell her. Maybe nobody in her little circle knew one to tell.

A HANDICAP

Other children in her class affectionately hugged picture books, the kind that are under beds and stacked in closets of most homes. But they had never had one before.

It is much like the experiences learned in Prince Edward County, Va., where the public schools were closed for 5 years to avoid segregation. Children from sharecropper families there could not understand even the simplest picture books.

A 9-year-old boy who had never been to class until the Federal Government forced Prince Edward to reopen public schools, looked at pictures in a book and stared blankly. One of the pictures was of a pair of galoshes. The word was written underneath. But he had never seen a pair of galoshes so neither the picture nor the word had any meaning.

The case of the little girl in Atlanta was not an isolated one. Dr. Curtis Henson, coordinator of Atlanta's Metropolitan School Council, discovered many cases where children entering the program had vocabularies limited to 20 and 30 words. How do they communicate? By making sounds and pointing to objects. In frustration, they hit and kick.

Beyond this, in Atlanta, Chicago, Los Angeles and almost everywhere where there was a Headstart program, it was discovered that many of the children did not know how to live in a world in which adults participated.

LEFT ALONE

A lot of them simply had been left alone, among other children, to make their own way.

This reporter stopped inside dozens of such homes across the country. The scene repeats itself. A hopeless mother is surrounded by 4, 5, 6, or even 10 children in a crowded tenement. She is present, but not in spirit. The children have no toys or books or games.

They do not learn to sing songs.

When they are hungry, they eat, if there is any food. When they are tired, they go to bed, if there are enough beds.

They have no direction and their world is a negative one in which the word "no" is the one most often heard. No one ever says, "Johnny, would you like to hear the story of the 'Three Bears'?"

PRAISE PROGRAM

It is usually, "Johnny, shut up," or "Johnny, don't do that."

These children are not prepared for a world in which adults really take a part in their lives, and where they are asked to participate in decisionmaking processes.

In one Headstart class the children were asked:

"Do you want to have your picture taken?"

"No," they shouted in a loud chorus. But when they were told they were going to have their pictures taken, they screamed with delight.

School officials everywhere are singing the praises of Headstart.

And last fall, when the first children of the experiment headed into first grade, public school teachers reported that they "just couldn't believe the difference."

The poor children, based on experience with similar groups over a number of years, were said to be as much as 90 days ahead. And a lot of them were ready to begin school with something closer to an equal opportunity.

The summer program was a crash one. And the emphasis was on considerable individual attention. For the 561,000 children, there were 41,000 teachers, averaging out to 1 teacher for every 14 youngsters.

In addition, there were paid teacher aids and many volunteers, including teenagers, who helped with the serving of meals and the setting up of classrooms. Many of these were themselves poor.

In communities all over the Nation permanent Headstart programs have either begun or are now being planned.

REACH PARENTS

Among other things, the programs are turning up new ways to reach parents, many of whom distrust the schools as symbols of their own past failures. Now mothers are assisting in class and fathers are helping to prepare buildings and classrooms.

Many educators see Headstart as a possible way of getting adults involved in educational programs to improve their lives and their potentials.

Despite its achievements and its praise, Headstart was not spared its share of controversy in a war that rings with dispute and challenge. In some cases the South was a problem spot because of the traditional resistance to segregated school programs.

There was trouble in Mississippi. Senator JOHN STENNIS charged that Headstart funds were used to rescue civil rights demonstrators from jail. Nevertheless, the Office of Economic Opportunity only a few days ago approved a new $5.6 million grant to Mississippi for a 6-month program for 9,135 children. Last month a group from the State brought preschool children to Washington to protest delays in granting the funds.

FUNDS DELAYED

In some other southern areas funds were withheld, causing loud protestations, because Washington officials did not think local leaders really tried hard enough to solve segregation problems.

And, as in most large-scale program where large amounts of Federal money is involved, there were abuses.

Under the original plan, up to 25 percent of the preschool children in programs could be from outside the ranks of the poor. The idea was to give culturally deprived children a chance to have associations with youngsters from better families. Experts and school officials generally believe this was an excellent idea.

But because of pressure, in many cases resulting from abuses, the figure has been reduced to 10 percent.

In Lawrence County a rural area in southeastern Ohio and part of Appalachia, a number of citizens are up in arms over a Headstart program. They charge that some of the areas' leading citizens were "blackjacked" into sending their children to the program "just so officials could meet their quotas."

"They couldn't get enough poor families interested," said Larry L. Birch, a businessman, "so they pressured everyone in town so they could meet their quota and so the program would look good on paper."

"We finally gave in ourselves," Birch said. "And we even got a social worker out of the deal." He added sardonically:

"And our boy got a hot meal every day for 8 weeks."

A SNICKER

The county project for 931 children, cost $143,000. This figures out to more than $1,500 a child.

"That's quite a bit for a social worker and a hot lunch," snickered Birch.

Country School Superintendent George W. Webb admits that children of doctors, lawyers and well-to-do business men were in the program. But he denies the number exceeded the guidelines.

In a Kentucky area, however, a war on poverty official admitted that the guidelines were ignored, "so the number of seats allowed by the Government could be filled."

"We just could not get enough of the poor interested," he said.

And OEO officials in Washington acknowledge there were such cases. They contend, however, that there is now stricter supervision.

Moreover, the few irregularities that have been turned up have failed to dim the luster of one of the brightest spots in the poverty war.

Sound Opinions of Teenagers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, when the national focus seems to be centered on the wild antics of a small group of American youth, I fear we may sometimes fail to keep the problem in its true perspective.

In Bradley County, Tenn., a recent survey showed that local high school students had deep principled convictions and were serious in their consideration of national issues. Believing that this refreshing poll will be of interest to my colleagues in Congress, I include, under unanimous consent, a newspaper article by Mr. Beecher Hunter from the February 24 Cleveland Daily Banner to be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT'S ON TEENAGERS' MINDS? FIRM CONVICTIONS

(By Beecher Hunter)

What's on the average teenager's mind in Bradley County today?

Long hair or short skirts, the Beatles or souped-up cars, records or thick milkshakes?

Certainly all these elements and many more are included in a busy teenager's world. But the results of a recent project at Bradley High School will perhaps stagger the adult's estimation of the younger generation. They show that the teenager thinks deeply about life and the world around him.

Here's how 105 minds were bared:

Mrs. Arch Fitzgerald, English teacher, asked classes to "state your conviction about whatever is on your mind and support it in a paragraph."

The responses "amazed me how their thinking followed such serious lines," she said. The wholesome convictions expressed were gratifying, she added.

Most of the paragraphs dealt with the South Vietnam war situation, Mrs. Fitzgerald pointed out. "All of them, expressed in different ways, reached one conclusion: we must take our stand and seek victory," she said.

Here are some prominent ideas offered on the Vietnam war:

"We must stand," "There is no substitute for victory," "Our national policy is supported by most Americans," "It is the most vital issue threatening America," "The war in Vietnam is a puzzle to me," "Our activity must continue," "We must consider it a threat to our freedom."

Two of the most profound convictions of the southeast Asia affair were written by Marvin Hutson and Roy Baine.

Hutson said:

"I believe, as Gen. Douglas MacArthur once stated, that there is no substitute for victory. It has been a part of the national policy for the past few years that we not upset any world government by our actions in world affairs. Therefore, we allowed Communist China to invade Korea and to capture the northern portion. We also backed down in the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine in relation to Cuba. In these two conflicts we have negotiated settlements in which the American people have lost prestige. Nevertheless, we have a chance to regain this respect. This chance is our chance for victory in Vietnam. We must learn from these past mistakes and profit from them; for there is no substitute for victory."

Baine wrote:

"The United States has fought many wars, but none such as that of Vietnam. We have always been the last there and the first to leave. Well, that was so, but now we stand where Athens stood: whether to abandon some aim so that others might be accomplished or to pursue all at once.

"One will find very few men who enjoy war, but the time will come when patience must give way to broken egg shells. Such a time is now; we must give up things at home and abroad; we must give total commitment; we must either stand our ground or forever hold our peace. We cannot stand on the ground and walk the fence at the same time."

These are other ideas most often expressed by the students:

"The present method for electing the President (electoral system) is a harmful anachronism and needs revision."

"All men are created equal."

"Do Americans follow through with our motto, 'In God We Trust'?"

"The basis of my life is centered in my belief in God."

"We are openly condemning socialism in the Soviet Union, but are embracing it at home."

"America does not need to raise its standard of living; America needs 10,000 museums, 5,000 theaters and an overthrow of the television theocracy."

"The true vital concept of nonconformity is lost."

"There is a great need for individualism."

"My strongest conviction is my belief in God and the Bible."

"Foreign aid: Our money should not be spent for ink which is splashed on our own embassies."

"Individual freedom of the mind should not be tampered with."

"No man should become so involved in something that he cannot disengage himself."

"Young people should wait until the right time to marry."

"Prayer is as vital a part of my life as eating."

"Where would we be without the Almighty Hand of God?"

"Americans should be able to vote at 18 years of age."

"The spread of communism must be stopped."

"Many teenagers see no purpose in life."

"Capital punishment should be abolished."

"Our patriotism is being tested today."

"Birth control is a crime."

"The March of Dimes is one of the greatest organizations."

"Young people are not going to the dogs."

"Regardless of how much he rebels against it, a teenager craves parental authority."

"I am not prepared to step out into life."

"Our parents' strictness is for our protection."

"Why would anyone question the reality of God?"

"Life is man's most important possession."

"College places too much emphasis on the ACT."

"A person's reputation is a ticket to his success or failure."

"Demostrators and protestors are detrimental and are against our Constitution."

"God should be placed first."

"Teenagers are trying to be different."

"Religion should be foremost in our lives."

Distinguished Floridian Chosen by President To Head Emergency Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has chosen a distinguished Floridian, Farris Bryant, a resident of my hometown of Jacksonville, Fla., to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Mr. Bryant is a former Governor of the State of Florida and for the last three decades has been one of our State's outstanding public servants and leaders. The President could not have picked a better man in the Nation than Farris Bryant to head this important Office which touches the lives of all Americans. All Florida is proud of Farris Bryant, and we are certain he will do an outstanding job. I include newspaper articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning Mr. Bryant's appointment:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times Union, Mar. 13, 1966]

L.B.J. PICKS BRYANT FOR KEY POST

WASHINGTON, March 12.—Former Gov. Farris Bryant of Florida will become Director of the Office of Emergency Planning (OEP), President Johnson announced today.

Johnson made the announcement at the windup of a daylong series of conferences with State Governors. The appointment will require Senate confirmation.

The Governors applauded Johnson's announcement. Byrant formerly was a member of the executive committee of the National Governors Conference and participated in today's session.

Earlier, the only explanation given by the White House press office for Bryant's presence was that he had called to see the President on another matter and had been invited to stay.

Byrant will succeed former Gov. Buford Ellington of Tennessee who resigned some time ago to seek another term as Governor. Johnson said Bryant in his new post will sit on the National Security Council, manage the Government's stockpiles and serve as his representative to all the Governors.

Johnson said Bryant had served the State of Florida with distinction for many years and is making a sacrifice to take the Government post.

Johnson said Bryant is giving up his law practice and disposing of his various business connections and described this as a sacrifice.

In Jacksonville, a spokesman for Bryant's law firm said Bryant will "discontinue active participation in his business and professional affiliations in order to eliminate any question of conflict of interest." The spokesman stressed that Bryant will maintain his residence in Jacksonville and commute to Washington.

In addition to his other assignments, the Director of the OEP directs the Government's relief efforts resulting from natural disasters.

The post Bryant is being nominated for pays $28,500 a year.

Bryant, 51, is a native of Ocala, Fla. He attended Emory University and Harvard and has been a member of the Florida bar since 1938.

He practiced law in Ocala from 1940 until his inauguration as Governor in January 1961 except for the years 1943 to 1946 when he served in the Navy.

He began his political career in 1942 when he was elected to the Florida House of Representatives. He was elected to the house again in 1946 and served until 1956, and was speaker for 2 years.

He returned to private practice in Ocala briefly when his term as Governor ended in January 1965.

JOINED LAW FIRM HERE

Then he moved to Jacksonville and joined the law firm of Freeman, Richardson & Watkins.

Soon after moving to Jacksonville, he headed a group of 15 prominent Floridians who contributed $100,000 each to form National Life Insurance Co., of Florida.

Bryant and his wife, the former Julia Burnett, reside at 1870 Challen Avenue, Jacksonville. They have three children.

Bryant said Johnson had telephoned him in Florida at 7:45 a.m. on March 4 to offer him the position.

Although the conversation lasted for 20 minutes, the former Governor said it was not until March 10 that he told the President he would accept the job.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Mar. 14, 1966]

BRYANT PONDERED SACRIFICES BEFORE TAKING OEP JOB

(By Frank Young)

Obligations to professional and business associates were uppermost in the mind of former Gov. Farris Bryant before his decision to accept one of the top posts in President Johnson's administration.

"You not only have investments, you have obligations. You can get rid of your investments but not your obligations," Bryant said after returning to his Jacksonville home yesterday afternoon.

President Johnson Saturday named Bryant to head the important Office of Emergency Planning (OEP), succeeding former Gov. Buford Ellington of Tennessee.

Bryant said he would no longer actively participate in his business and professional affiliations to eliminate any question of conflict of interest.

The new job will be both a personal and financial sacrifice, he said.

"The President impressed upon me that in his judgment the position was very important to the national security and economy. And I just felt that when the President asked me to do this job that I had to do it," Bryant said.

Of the personal sacrifice, Bryant said, "We've been very happy in Jacksonville, the first time they've (his family) had a normal life in a long time. I've been in politics ever since I was married and they have very much enjoyed the freedom and lack of pressure and the increased amount of time that I could devote to my family. But they always support me in anything I do."

As OEP director, Bryant will sit on the National Security Council, manage the Federal Government's huge stockpiles, direct the Government's relief efforts in natural disasters and serve as President Johnson's representative to the Governors of the various States.

"The President wanted someone there to whom they [the Governors] could always turn. Governors always have a multitude of problems. I will be a liaison between them and the President," Bryant said.

Bryant added he personally knew many of the Governors as a former member of the executive committee of the National Governor's Conference.

Bryant will assist and advise Johnson on vital questions of national preparedness in the areas of available resources in stockpiles of strategic materials, manpower, civil defense, the civilian economy in general and other areas, particularly in emergency preparedness. He added the post probably will entail some foreign travel.

He also is expected to travel to the OEP's eight regional offices in different parts of the country.

Bryant said he will maintain his home here and will commute between Jacksonville and Washington.

Bryant said that because of his "obligations" to many persons in business affiliations and his law office associates it "took me a few days" before deciding to take the post.

"I'm going to give the job whatever it takes," he said.

Bryant now is awaiting Senate confirmation of the appointment to the OEP directorship.

Bryant said the confirmation could come in the next few days or it could come in a few weeks.

Bryant is a partner in the law firm of Bryant, Freeman, Richardson & Watson here.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1966]

EMERGENCY PLANNER: CECIL FARRIS BRYANT

When Cecil Farris Bryant declared himself a candidate for Florida's Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1956, the consensus of the back-room cognoscenti was: "He'll never make it, he's able and brilliant but the voters will never warm up to him." They were right; Mr. Bryant, a Harvard graduate with a reputation for eloquence, came in a poor third in the Democratic runoff. But 4 years later he was back, expressing views guaranteed to warm up Florida's voters: opposition to taxes and opposition to integration.

This tack was successful and Mr. Bryant moved from his home in Ocala to the Governor's mansion in Tallahassee.

Yesterday President Johnson submitted Mr. Bryant's nomination to the Senate as the new head of the Office of Emergency Planning. He will handle the Federal civil defense program and allocate Federal funds to States hit by disasters, such as storms, floods and tornadoes. He will also have charge of the Nation's critical stockpiles. The President has said that he will also sit in on meetings of the National Security Council.

PARTNER IN LAW FIRM

Since leaving the statehouse Mr. Bryant has been serving as chairman of three insurance companies and working as a partner of a Jacksonville law firm. He looks upon the $28,500 Federal post as a financial sacrifice.

"The President impressed upon me that in his judgment the position was very important to the national security and economy," Mr. Bryant said. "And I just felt that when the President asked me to do this job that I had to do it."

Mr. Bryant was one of the few southern Governors who actively supported President Johnson in 1964. Mr. Johnson took Florida by just over 40,000 votes.

Mr. Bryant's 1960 race for Governor began in embarrassment. Four years earlier he had temporarily withdrawn from the primary, charging that a man could not be elected without selling his soul because the "special interests" wanted $2 back for every $1 they donated.

But on his second attempt reporters learned that he had the backing of several influential figures in the State.

Shortly after his inauguration on January 4, 1961, Mr. Bryant said:

"As Governor, it will be my duty to provide the leadership to maintain segregation without violence, anarchy, or closing of schools. * * * But in the meantime we must not be turned aside from our goal of making facilities for Negroes equal as well as separate."

During his term he was instrumental in expanding the State university system. Two new State colleges were built, a third was authorized, and the junior college system was increased to 36 branches.

While still Governor, Mr. Bryant formed an insurance company in which he and a number of State officials invested $100,000 each. The company began selling annuities to public school teachers and hired the State superintendent of schools to handle this program.

Born in Ocala on July 26, 1914, Mr. Bryant was drawn to politics by an uncle, Ion Farris, who served as speaker of the Florida House. At 9 years of age he knew he wanted to become Governor.

He attended Emory University in Atlanta and the University of Florida, getting his degree in business administration in 1935. Three years later he took his law degree at Harvard.

SERVED IN THE NAVY

First elected to the legislature in 1942, Mr. Bryant resigned a year later to serve as a Navy lieutenant in Guam.

He is a physical fitness enthusiast who starts each day with 50 deep knee bends, 32 situps, and 40 pushups. He also does isometric exercises, tensing his muscles, while listening to dull speakers at dinners, he says. He is a teetotaler.

In 1940, he married Julia Burnett, a former schoolteacher. They have three daughters.

The Late Honorable Henry D. Larcade, Jr.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

(Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as the Congressman from the Seventh District of Louisiana, it is my solemn duty to announce the demise of one of my predecessors, the very able statesman and loyal American, Henry D. Larcade, Jr.

This gentleman distinguished himself as a Member of this Chamber representing Louisiana's Seventh District from 1943 through 1953. After a long illness, Mr. Larcade, at the age of 76, passed away on March 14 in the quiet of his home in Opelousas, St. Landry Parish, La.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that all Members be allowed 5 legislative days in which to prepare and insert into the RECORD remarks of sympathy and esteem relating to the life and service of our former colleague, the Honorable Henry D. Larcade, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The War on Poverty—Boon or Boondoggle—No. 9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, the ninth article of a series written by Washington Reporter Tom Joyce, of the Detroit News, discussing war on poverty, follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Mar. 8, 1966]

DISCOURAGED TEENAGERS CHARGE: CORRUPTION TURNS WAR ON POVERTY INTO CRUEL HOAX

(By Tom Joyce)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—There are a thousand teenagers in Chicago who think President Johnson's war on poverty is a cruel joke.

"It's a rotten trick," complained one. "They get you all built up to where you think there's some hope and bang, they pull the rug right out."

There are youngsters in Los Angeles and other places who are saying and thinking the same thing.

They are the disappointed and discouraged youths who have been dropped from the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) because they come from families that earn more than the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) allows under its guidelines.

The standard is $3,100 a year for a city family of four.

In some cities, like Boston and Providence, there were fullblown scandals involving the NYC—cases where teenagers from prosperous homes of politicians and government officials found part-time employment to help finance European vacations and flashy sports cars.

POVERTY IS REAL

But few of the Chicago youths have ever ridden in an expensive sports car and Europe seems as far away to them as the moon.

They are poor. And to them the war on poverty really does seem a cruel hoax.

Chicago poverty war officials regarded the $3,100 figure as patently low and unrealistic. So, with at least tacit approval from the Department of Labor, which administers the NYC program with OEO funds, higher figures were permitted.

In Chicago, where the cost of living is extremely high, the standard for city public assistance for a family of four is $5,200. And this was used as an NYC standard.

Last month, however, after congressional pressure in the wake of NYC scandals, the Department of Labor lowered the boom and ordered all local NYC programs to conform rigidly to the standard.

The Chicago teenagers were cut immediately from programs offering them a chance to stay in school, maybe return to school or perhaps hope for a better job. Their cries could be heard in Washington where OEO officials lamented that there was just no other choice.

The situation is similar in Los Angeles, where many of the youngsters come from the Watts area, scene of last summer's chilling racial convulsion. Watts is still an uneasy ghetto, only a few miles from downtown Los Angeles, and officials are concerned about the unrest caused by chopping youngsters from the NYC program.

THE PROGRAM

There are two sides of the NYC program. One is to give part-time employment to in-school children from poor families so they can remain in school.

The other offers part-time employment to out-of-school youths unable to find regular jobs. The idea is to develop work habits and experience.

The pay is $1.25 an hour, for youths from 16 to 21. The money often goes to help the poor family from which the youth comes.

In New York an attractive honor student, believed by her teachers to be a possible college scholarship candidate, was ready to quit school. Her clothes were mended and ragged. A guilty feeling gnawed at her because she wanted to be contributing to her family's meager income. A job as a teacher's aid has made the difference.

In Atlanta a number of girls who might otherwise rave quit school are working as clerks in board of education offices, where they meet secretaries and professional people.

At the beginning, they applied for the jobs in wild hairdos, sloppy clothing, and caked with makeup.

"But it is amazing to see what can happen in a few days," a school official said. "They see that this is not the right way. Nobody has to tell them. They just look around and see for themselves that the full-time secretaries are neatly dressed and wear only a moderate amount of makeup

"It's the same thing in terms of the way they react. At first they might answer a telephone and carry on a conversation full of 'yeas and uh-huhs.' But in very little time they are imitating the staff people.

"This is going to make a big difference in the way these kids look at the world. And it is going to help in their futures."

School dropouts are employed in city programs to improve and maintain parks, and help in many city departments.

In-school participants may work no more than 15 hours a week. Those out of school may put in as many as 32 hours.

SOME 500,000 IN IT

In this fiscal year NYC is spending about $255 million to provide part-time jobs for 280,000 youths. At the high point of last year's program, with an emphasis on summer work, more than 500,000 youngsters were involved.

And an estimated 200,000 have remained in school since the program began because of the assistance. Every day school dropouts are returning to school because of the NYC.

This is especially true in cities where progressive counseling programs are geared to programs.

A lot can be learned about a boy or girl who has dropped out of school under close supervision.

Experience so far has demonstrated that a large percentage of dropouts come to NYC programs in a rebellious mood and unready for any kind of employment. They show up late for their jobs and laugh at reprimands. A lot, especially at first, look at the program as a handout and think that all they have to do is appear now and then for their pay.

In normal work situations, such habits are not tolerated.

But they are in NYC—at least for a while.

A VIEWPOINT

It gives counselors a chance to look at problems and see what can be done about them.

One NYC program director put it this way:

"It would be easy to fire the school dropouts who don't want to work. But is that really what the program is trying to do? A lot of the kids have a good chance of ending up as juvenile delinquents and criminals later on. What we are trying to do is develop work habits and a sense of responsibility. And you don't have any chance with a kid you kick out. He's just more antisocial than when he came."

Some of the youths come from homes where no member of the family has ever had steady employment. And a lot do not want the responsibility that goes with it.

Most large cities have their "roosts." These are the corners where unskilled laborers gather every morning. They are picked up by construction companies, homebuilders and anyone else looking for menial labor.

THEY WORK

The people who populate the roosts are not afraid of work. If they were, they would not be there. But they do not want the responsibility of a steady job.

And, for reasons often deep rooted in their backgrounds, they want to get paid at the end of each day. They have had experiences where they have been cheated out of wages after a week or two of work.

They want to be paid not only at the end of each day, but in cash. It is no secret that in many areas it is difficult for a Negro to cash a check. Even in neighborhoods where he is known, a Negro might have to pay a high premium to get a check cashed.

The children who grow up in such families naturally have some of the same ideas about employment.

They cannot escape noticing that their roost-worker fathers can either work or not work on any given day. They may just work long enough to buy a few groceries and a bottle. And they might get away with a few days' pay that can be concealed from the welfare worker.

It is not easy to overcome this kind of home training.

But good NYC programs are having success, encouraging some youngsters to return to school and others to take advantage of job-training programs.

On the debit side, many communities indulge only in make-work schemes like raking leaves and lawn manicuring around city buildings. Youngsters who have lived by their wits in city slums do not have to be told they are boondoggles.

And such programs do more harm than good, adding to a youngster's negative attitude toward work and society.

Where they are successful, NYC programs are related to real work experience and tied to sound counseling projects.

In Detroit, a girl works in the City-County Building, copying old records. She has never had an opportunity for "real work" before and the chance has whetted her ambition.

CRIME DROPS

Detroit so far has enrolled nearly 3,000 youths in NYC programs, at a cost of about $2 million.

Where there are good programs working, such as in Chicago, there are figures to support a theory that they have reduced juvenile crime rates.

Cincinnati officials say that out of 1,500 youngsters enrolled in the out-of-school program, about 500 have gone back to school or are now at work in regular jobs.

In some cities, like Atlanta, where there are progressive all-around antipoverty programs, there is a real effort to steer NYC youngsters who might benefit into the Job Corps.

And, as you talk to the youths around the country involved in NYC projects, it seems that for every failure you turn up two successes.

But this cannot erase some of the gross irregularities and the frauds committed by city officials and politicians who took one look at the Neighborhood Youth Corps and saw in it a chance for personal gain.

Washington officials still have no real idea how much money was spent illegally in Rhode Island.

In one project, children of three State civil service employees with incomes of almost $10,000 a year were enrolled. So were the children of a dentist, a doctor and a bank vice president.

School teachers' children were at work too, as well as the children of political committee members from both parties.

In Kansas a pair of high school football coaches extorted $2 a week from 34 youths in a summer NYC program.

Boston's NYC funds were frozen after it was discovered that a number of city officials and city employees had found ways of getting their children into summer employment.

There were irregularities in cities across the country.

SPOT CORRUPTION

Federal programs where money is involved always invite local corruption.

And it is the poor, for whom the programs are designed and who can least afford the expense, who pay.

Most of the criticism of the Neighborhood Youth Corps has been directed at programs soiled by local politicians, local greed, bad local supervision and bad local planning.

For this, in a good many cases, the youths for whom the imaginative program was designed are being penalized.

But neither can officials in Washington escape criticism for failure to supervise the communities and keep close watch on the flow of money and jobs.

OEO officials do not deny this. And they are promising stricter controls, more for non-poor adults than poor youngsters.

Should School Lunches Be the Leadoff in an Economy Drive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard much in relation to the proposed cutback on school lunch programs, and, like all controversial issues, I know we are all anxious to determine how the people back home feel on this subject. In that connection, I insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Morning Call, a leading newspaper in Allentown, Pa., on March 10, on this subject.

The said article is as follows:

HOT LUNCH CALLED IN PERIL

The Federal Government has sounded the death knell for the 35-cent hot lunch program in schools, Allentown School District's food service supervisor said yesterday.

Mrs. Louise Early said the district may have to increase the price to 40 cents.

Speaking before the Allentown Lions Club in the Americus Hotel, Mrs. Early added: "President Johnson has requested his budget committee to cut subsidies and surplus commodities to the school lunch program by about 15 percent nationally.

"This will make it impossible for us to continue the program as it is now."

BOOSTED BY STATE

She noted that the State already has boosted the ceiling on hot lunch prices to 40 cents. "We have absorbed all the costs we can and if the Government takes away its subsidies, there will be no place we can go to absorb them."

Mrs. Early said the President said many schools have not had the advantages of hot lunch programs and the money should be used to assist their programs.

"In other words, this will become a welfare program for the needy," she continued.

"School meals must be completely balanced, and they have been. Youngsters have been taught how to eat properly through habits formed in school.

"This is what they're throwing out the window. It will break down the program we have spent 20 years building up."

Chicago's Human Resources Development Program Fights Hard-Core Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Chicago is involved right now in a human resources development program aimed at reducing hard-core unemployment which continues to persist in our expanding economy. It utilizes a person-to-person approach and early indications are that the program will be successful in cases where other approaches have failed.

Optimism runs high and chances are that St. Louis, Rochester, Houston, and Los Angeles will follow Chicago's example by instituting their own human resources development programs in the near future.

A report on Chicago's pilot project which appeared in the Wall Street Journal for March 10, 1966, follows:

(By Philip M. Boffey)

CHICAGO.—For a brief while, the fortunes of Herbert W. and his sister Rita, both Negro school dropouts here, seemed to be getting a little sunnier.

Herbert had a good chance for an electronics assembly-ine job at $1.69 an hour and Rita, at 18 the mother of two illegitimate children, was packing candy for $1.35 an hour. But Herbert muffed his chance, appearing a day late for his job interview, and Rita, after working for 2 days, didn't show up on the third and was laid off.

The cases of Herbert and Rita are being tackled by an unusual program here to reduce hard-core unemployment persisting in today's brisk economy. The experiment, called a Human Resources Development program, and largely financed by the Federal Government, relies heavily on person-to-person contact. Welfare workers seek out the unemployed and "underemployed" in depressed neighborhoods and offer them job training, medical help or whatever else is needed to help them land a job.

It is too early to ascertain how successful the new program, which is only a few months old, will be. Early returns indicate its cost will be high, but not as high as the eventual cost to society of not helping such people as Herbert and Rita, who have been on relief nearly all their lives.

SIMILAR PROGRAMS EXPECTED

Similar person-to-person programs are expected to begin shortly in at least four other cities. St. Louis has announced it will launch a program, perhaps in a few weeks, Rochester, N.Y., and Houston both expect to start interviewing the unemployed not later than April 1. And Federal officials report that Los Angeles is "actively considering" a program. Details will vary from plan to plan, but the person-to-person approach will be the same. Depending on progress in the first group of cities, Federal officials expect a second group to adopt the plan next fiscal year.

Chicago's campaign was sparked by Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, who suggested in a speech here in November "that there will be full employment in this country only as its communities get down to a case-by-case, person-by-person treatment of unemployment."

The program is run by local agencies, coordinated by Samuel C. Bernstein, State employment security administrator. The three agencies primarily involved—the State employment service, the county welfare department, and the Chicago antipoverty agency—have several-score persons canvassing, counseling and testing, plus numerous staff members who perform administrative work. As the program expands, the staff is expected to increase. Besides the three main agencies, numerous business, labor, civic, and other governmental organizations are participating.

It has become evident here that it will take a considerable effort to prod many of the unemployed out of their apathy, disillusionment and ignorance. Herbert and Rita, for example, come from a family which has been on relief most of the time since 1947. Their father deserted long ago. Their mother, 37-year-old Mrs. Lucile W., also a dropout, presides over a household containing seven of her own children plus Rita's two.

EFFORTS THAT FAILED

Efforts to find steady jobs for Herbert and Rita repeatedly have failed. When poverty fighters tried to help Herbert last fall, he hung up the phone and refused to answer a letter. But after the person-to-person program was launched December 10, Isadore Hicks, a public aid caseworker, went out to the W household in the Negro ghetto of Lawndale and persuaded Herbert and Rita to visit the neighborhood poverty war center for counseling and testing by State employment service workers. Job openings were found, but the teenagers failed to take advantage of them.

Both youngsters then were referred to training programs, but failed to show up. Finally Mr. Hicks went to their home and escorted them back for further counseling. Rita, a shy, frightened girl, was too nervous to take vocational tests, she is now with the Neighborhood Youth Corps, doing part-time filing work for the city's anti-poverty agency at $1.25 an hour until she calms down enough to be tested. Seventeen-year-old Herbert is headed for a welding and basic education course run by the county welfare department.

"If I can just get them in a program and keep them there, I'll have it made," says caseworker Hicks.

The time and effort spent on Herbert and Rita is by no means atypical. Door-to-door canvassers sometimes go back four and five times to make an initial contact. The canvassing is done by unemployed persons hired from the immediate neighborhood by the city's poverty-war agency or, in the case of relief recipients, by county welfare workers. Once contact is made, canvassers spend anywhere from half an hour to half a day explaining the program and completing a questionnaire on everyone 16 and older in the family. They then arrange counseling interviews for potential employables, escorting them to their appointment, if necessary.

Early results of the program, according to Labor Secretary Wirtz, "indicate the mammoth task the Illinois State Employment Service faces in furnishing hope and employment for the participants in the program." In the first 12 weeks, the canvassers interviewed and completed questionnairies on about 3,000 individuals, all on a face-to-face basis in the home. They referred 729 of these to nearby centers for job counseling, but 161, or 22 percent, failed to show up for their counseling interviews. Many of those who did missed their first appointments and only came in after they were contacted again and given a pep talk.

Only 33 job placements have been made ("That's more than we'd hoped for at this time," says an official) and only 58 have been referred to training programs, mostly in basic literacy classes financed under the Manpower Development and Training Act. More than 400 persons have been referred to "supportive services," primarily rehabilitation and health services.

Meanwhile, the State employment service and the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry have launched a cooperative effort to identify job vacancies, reduce unrealistic hiring requirements and stimulate the creation of new jobs. In the first 7 weeks of this effort, 322 job openings were reported available to persons processed by the program.

CHIEFLY LOW-LEVEL JOBS

The initial placements have been primarily in low-level jobs and have involved persons who either don't want training or are too old to benefit much from it. A 66-year-old retired Negro got a part-time job setting up convention booths at $11 a day. A 44-year-old janitor got a better janitorial job that pays $1.65 an hour, more than he had been getting. A 60-year-old Negro was placed as a janitor in a discount house, earning $1.25 an hour and his 50-year-old wife was placed as a maid in a private home at the same wage. There have been some placements in semiskilled jobs—a touchup girl in a photo lab, a hand driller, a trainee to an offset pressman.

Many other cases, however, seem to defy solution. One early registrant, a 48-year-old Negro woman on relief for 23 years, has only a sixth-grade education, a history of high-blood pressure and tuberculosis, and four daughters to support. If this woman is to hold a job, she probably will need medical help, literacy and vocational training, and someone to look after her youngest child while the others are in school.

Poor health is a widespread problem. About 80 percent of all persons enrolled in the early weeks of the program were in such precarious health they required a medical examination to determine what, if any, work they were fit to do. The percentage of persons needing a medical exam has been declining somewhat, but still is "more than half," officials say.

EMPLOYMENT FOR HUNDREDS

John S. McCauley, of the U.S. Employment Service, who heads Federal task force coordinating assistance to Chicago and other potential person-to-person programs, believes "hundreds and hunreds" of unemployed Chicagoans eventually will find steady work at minor clerical jobs or in restaurants, hotel, and other service industries.

"The jobs won't be spectacular," Mr. McCauley says. "But they'll be considerably better than no job." A few "diamonds in the rough" are expected to qualify for skilled apprenticeship programs or technician jobs. Chicago officials hope to have 10,000 persons either in jobs or in some kind of program to improve their employability by year's end.

The Chicago program, which is expected to run at least until June 30, 1967, obviously is costly. Preliminary budget proposale call for Federal grants of about $900,000 to local public and private agencies to carry out the campaign for the remainder of this fiscal year, though some of this money may carry over into next year. Most of the Federal funds are expected to come from the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

These figures don't include training expenses—"probably the biggest cost of all," according to Mr. McCauley—and other services to be provided largely through existing programs or by local groups on a nonreimbursable basis. However, as Mr. Wirtz noted in suggesting the personalized approach: "This is not a matter of molly-coddling. It is a matter of cutting * * * the alternative cost the community has to bear every time an untrained person attaches himself or herself as a parasite to it."

Snags in Back-Door Borrowing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], recently pointed out the serious problems of the Federal National Mortgage Association in borrowing from the U.S. Treasury to guarantee payment of principal and interest under its management and liquidating functions.

This unlimited back-door borrowing authority has permitted the FNMA to go beyond its role as a secondary mortgage market facility and finance other agency lending programs. Mr. WIDNALL has introduced legislation which would prevent abuses in back-door financing.

In the March 4 edition of the Daily Bond Buyer, Mr. John Gerrity succinctly outlines the dangers inherent in current programs and proposed changes in existing law. This article is worthy of the attention of all Members. Under unanimous consent the article will be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADMINISTRATION FACED WITH LEGAL SNAGS IN SALE OF $4.7 BILLION LOAN PARTICIPATIONS

(By John Gerrity)

WASHINGTON.—The Johnson administration's scheme to dress up the Federal budget next year by substituting private for public credit in an amount estimated now at $4.7 billion is running into snags.

Scrutiny of plans to increase sales of participations in a wide range of Federal lending programs to private investors indicates the President may run afoul of unanticipated legal and financing obstacles.

The 1967 budget, allowing for a six-fold increase in the sales of participations for Federal loan assets over a 2-year span, 1965–67, is set up to produce a modest deficit of $1.8 billion. Otherwise the deficit could jump to $6.5 billion, without taking into account additional unplanned outlays resulting from the prosecution of the Vietnam war or the rearing of the Great Society.

To sell approximately $3 billion of the projected participations the White House will need legislation broadening the functions of the Federal National Mortgage Association and to provide funds to cover the interest spread between what Fannie Mae may have to pay for money in the public market and the submarket rates affixed to those Federal loans that are now about to be refinanced in the public market.

The administration's bill is to go to Capitol Hill shortly; its reception is expected to be stormy.

CONTINUING SUBSIDY

One major objection to the administration program is that it will provide a continuing subsidy for loans yielding submarket rates.

The subsidy works like this:

The President's budget message states that Federal agencies pooling their loans "will be authorized to make supplementary payments to the trustee (Fannie Mae) which together with the interest on the loans in the pool, will make for a level of return adequate to attract private investment.

Congress will thus be asked to approve continuing authority for the payment to Fanny May of whatever amounts are necessary to make up the spread between the interest earned by securities held in the pool and the interest Fanny May earns from buyers of its own participations.

The appropriations must be large enough to cover whatever amounts Fanny May will borrow from the Treasury for interest costs or principal repayments.

ISN'T THIS A GUARANTEE?

The prospectus for the Fanny May sale of $410 million of participation certificates next March 16, carries an explanation of Federal financial backing, spelled out in a letter signed by Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler.

The letter states, "it is the opinion of the Treasury Department that the association may properly borrow from the Treasury for the foregoing purpose: interest and repayments of principal.

Accordingly, the Treasury stands committed to make loans to the association under the Federal National Association Charter Act, to enable the association to meet its guaranty of the payment of principal and interest on the participation certificates."

If this isn't a Federal Government guaranty of any agency issue, what is?

Fanny May could sell 5¼-percent debentures back by a pool of mortgage loans averaging yields of 3 percent. To finance the difference, 2¼ percent, Fanny May would simply borrow from the Treasury, with Congress committed to approval, the necessary amounts.

This feature is objectionable to Members of both the House and Senate. There may also be legal blocks.

TAXABLE OR TAX-EXEMPT?

Item two. Scheduled for sale next year are participations of $820 million of college housing loans.

About 45 percent of these loans were made to public educational institutions, and are, thus, tax free. The remaining 55 percent went to private colleges and universities and are therefore taxable.

The public debt acts of 1941 and 1942 abolished any Federal Government issues on a tax-free basis. If tax-free college housing loans were to form part of a pool to back Fannie Mae participations, a perplexing legal question might arise.

Would the Treasury, denied by law from issuing its own tax-free securities, be willing to act as the guarantor for interest and principal repayments on securities sold to private investors and backed by tax-free bonds?

Opponents of the President's plan to sell off parts of Federal lending programs also see a possible encroachment on the private municipal bond market.

Suppose the Community Facilities Administration, whose loans are eligible for pooling, should decide to make a series of 2- or 2.5-percent loans to a number of communities, squeezing out any possible private market competition in the financing.

LEND LOW, BORROW HIGH

There would be nothing to prevent Fannie Mae from issuing its own participation, backed by these 2- or 2.5-percent community facility loans and selling them at a market rate of 5¼ percent or more. The interest differential would be met either by Treasury borrowings or by congressional appropriations.

Assuming no legal limit on the amount of lending the CFA might be allowed to undertake under these most favorable subsidy circumstances, the private primary market for such public facility borrowings on a competitive low-cost, tax-exempt basis would dry up in short order, only to find offset later in emission of high-cost taxable debt securities of the selling department of the Federal agency apparatus.

Already introduced in the House of Representatives is a bill to limit the FNMA's operations in the mortgage and money markets and to restore the agency to the posture planned when it was first established. This bill was introduced by New Jersey's WILLIAM B. WIDNALL. Others are expected to follow.

Mr. WIDNALL's measure carries with it protections for investors who have already bought Fanny May participations, or who may so invest before the law is enacted.

"The guaranty authority is fully protected by Fannie Mae's right to borrow from the Treasury whatever it needs either for interest or principal repayments that might be required for outstanding certificates of participation," he said.

Mark Twain on Man and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the widespread concern about the administration's Vietnam policy has provoked a variety of commentary. An unusual and interesting part of that commentary is found in a brief article by Jesse Gordon in the Churchman, of February 1966, in which he quotes the writings of Mark Twain at the time of the Spanish-American War. Mark Twain speaks of man and his relationship to war and the process by which he converts his horror of it to comfortable acceptance.

Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain's comments are still very timely, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

MARK TWAIN ON WAR HYSTERIA

(By Jesse Gordon)

Recently an interesting vignette appeared in the New York Times (December 11) anent Winston Churchill's visit here in 1900, when New York's elite was host to this young nobleman (age 24) who was coming over to plead the British cause in their war against the Boers in South Africa. The newspaper essay revealed the vigorous protest movement in the United States, at that time, to the British war propaganda effort; the dissent sheds honor on William Dean Howells, Mayor Van Wyck, of New York, and others who not only refused to join the list of sponsors but also declined to meet Mr. Churchill.

Although the story mentioned that Mark Twain (who was chairman of the dinner committee for Mr. Churchill) was a man who "disliked war under any circumstances" this reference—standing alone—does the Missouri author an injustice, because it is altogether too mild a description of his thoughts on the subject of war. Mark Twain loathed war. I think it would be fairer and more accurate if writers would quote him on the recurrent pattern of war hysteria in the United States.

At the time of the Spanish-American War, Twain wrote:

"The loud little handful—as usual—will shout for the war. The pulpit will—warily and cautiously—object—at first; the great, big, dull bulk of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say, earnestly and indignantly, 'It is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it.' Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will outshout them, and presently the anti-war audiences will thin out and lose popularity. Before long you will see this curious thing: the speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers—as earlier—but do not dare to say so. And now the whole nation—pulpit and all—will take up the war cry, and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open. Next, the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them, and refuse to examine any refutations of them; and thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception."

After reading the above from Mark Twain's writings one can only reflect on the well-worn cliche: History repeats itself. Surely, we are witnessing the same "grotesque self-deceptions" in the United States today.

Tobacco Being Taxed to Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, everyone is aware of the difficult situation faced by this country with reference to marketing its products abroad. This is particularly true of tobacco.

Tobacco taxation is now reaching the point where it will soon be prohibitive for Americans to try to sell abroad—unless something is done to correct the situation.

The Southern Planter, in its March issue, has a most interesting editorial on this general subject, entitled "Tobacco Being Taxed to Death." The editor, Dr. Paul Sanders, cogently presents the scope of the problem and I would like to insert this editorial at this point in the RECORD:

TOBACCO BEING TAXED TO DEATH

If some way could be found to reduce the taxes paid on American-grown tobacco entering foreign countries, the export market would explode overnight. The confiscatory taxes exacted by some of these governments are fantastic—almost unbelievable.

Venezuela in South America, for instance, imposes a $12.56 tax on each pound of tobacco entering that country. The United Kingdom, our English-speaking friends across the Atlantic, tack an import duty of $12.23 per pound on all leaf moving from bond storage to manufacturers. This rate, by the way, was raised $1.40 last year. Tobacco revenue accounts for almost 35 percent of the British budget. Japan, our closest ally in the Orient, settles for a 335-percent duty. The major importing countries of continental Europe—West Germany, France, Italy, Netherlands, and Belgium-Luxembourg—average about 20 percent ad valorem.

Why is tobacco singled out around the world for punitive taxation? It isn't the health hazard scare. The tax on tobacco and its products has grown increasingly severe at home and abroad for over 40 years. The tax takers should not forget the warning of Thomas Jefferson: "The power to tax involves the power to destroy." Government tax in this country—local, State, and Federal—is already taking 13 cents out of an average pack of cigarettes that sells for 28.6 cents. The farmer's share is only 2.6 cents—about one-fifth of what the tax collector gets. If the trend continues, Government will destroy the tobacco industry and jerk the rug from under the $7.1 billion cigarette business.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a section of the Constitution guarantees the right of citizens to vote regardless of their race, color, or previous condition of servitude, the Chicago Sun-Times reminds us in a recent editorial.

The paper notes that the meaning of the Constitution should be clear to all—"the highest Court in the land has said that it means exactly what it says."

The comment on the Court's upholding the major provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 will interest many, and I therefore insert the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW THEY CAN VOTE

There are many conflicts in law, and the Supreme Court faced one of them Monday. One section of the Constitution guarantees the States the right to conduct their own internal affairs. Another section guarantees the right of citizens to vote regardless of their race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Since certain States have, undeniably, been denying that right on those grounds, something had to give, and what gave was States' rights. Actually, all the States lost on Monday was the right to rob people of their votes.

The Court upheld the major provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In effect this act suspends literacy and other tests in six southern States, and authorizes the Attorney General to send Federal examiners into areas that try to evade the law. One of the States, South Carolina, brought suit in the Supreme Court to enjoin the enforcement of the law. The five other States joined the litigation, and the Supreme Court hastened its consideration so as to rule before the spring primaries. Only Justice Hugo L. Black dissented, on a minor point. Civil rights attorneys now hope that the Court will soon eliminate the poll tax in the four States that still require it for voting in State elections.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, who delivered Monday's opinion, stated the question involved: "Has Congress exercised its powers under the 15th amendment in an appropriate manner with relations to the States?" He answered:

"The ground rules for resolving this question are clear. The language and purpose of the 15th amendment, the prior decisions construing its several provisions, and the general doctrines of constitutional interpretation, all point to one fundamental principle. As against the reserved powers of the States, Congress may use any rational means to effectuate the constitutional prohibition of racial discrimination in voting."

And he concluded:

"Hopefully, millions of nonwhite Americans will now be able to participate for the first time on an equal basis in the Government under which they live. We may finally look forward to the day when truly 'the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.'"

That is the language of the Constitution. Its meaning should be clear to all. The highest Court in the land has said that it means exactly what it says.

Milwaukee Versus Baseball Court Decisions Should Follow the Evidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the great and honored tradition of judicial reserve in withholding public comment on a matter which shall inevitably come before a court has been tarnished by the unfortunate statement in Chicago last week of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. In addressing the American Camping Association Justice Douglas alluded to his own recreational enthuasiasm for hiking and general conservation activities. The learned jurist further suggested that Milwaukee and Wisconsin Braves baseball fans should follow that example rather than being concerned over the move of the Braves from Milwaukee to Atlanta. In his most significant remarks, however, Justice Douglas is reported by the Chicago Tribune to have said:

> I don't foresee baseball losing its immunity to the antitrust laws. Baseball has had the benefit of an early decision and it will probably stand. I think we should be less concerned over a spectator sport and begin enjoying the outdoors. That is our greatest sport.

I have a deep appreciation of the right of every individual to choose his own form of recreation and sport activity. Justice Douglas happens to prefer hiking and similar "participating" activities in the out of doors. To each man, therefore, his own choice. And as the attendance figures in Milwaukee for the past 10 years clearly indicate, Braves fans do enjoy the great out of door recreation of watching their team play baseball. This does not mean, however, that they have any less an interest in eliminating the pollution of Lake Michigan or conserving the natural beauty of Wisconsin's northern forest areas.

It is for these many reasons that the baseball fans of Milwaukee and Wisconsin have a right to expect fair and impartial judicial consideration of their efforts to prevent the Braves from leaving Milwaukee. They have a right to expect that their case against the Braves will be heard—and judged—on its merits and only after the evidence has been presented.

In view of the strong likelihood that this case will ultimately be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court because of the constitutional issues involved, it would seem fitting under the circumstances that Justice Douglas would give serious thought to disqualifying himself at that time.

In his column of March 14, 1966, Milwaukee Journal Sports Editor Oliver Kuechle discusses this situation at greater length. Under leave to extend my remarks, for the benefit of my colleagues, I insert Mr. Kuechle's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

Are We Playing With a Stacked Deck?

(By Oliver E. Kuechle)

The U.S. Supreme Court may well be called upon eventually to review the State of Wisconsin's antitrust suit against the Braves and the National League. Constitutional issues are involved. The suit Monday went into its third week. Thus it was with dismay to read in Saturday's Chicago Tribune that Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas suggested that there had been entirely too much commotion over the case, that outdoor living, of which he happens to be a great advocate, should be substituted as an alternative to baseball, and that Braves fans should be more concerned with conservation of the Indiana dunes and with cleaning up Lake Michigan than with the move of the club from Milwaukee to Atlanta.

The learned jurist, 67 years old and a walker from 'way back ("I hike 15 to 20 miles every weekend around Washington") addressed the annual convention of the American Camping Association in Chicago.

A QUOTE

"I don't foresee baseball losing its immunity to the antitrust laws," the Tribune quoted him. "Baseball has had the benefit of an early decision, and it will probably stand. I think we should be less concerned over a spectator sport and begin enjoying the outdoors. That is our greatest sport."

What an unfortunate utterance by a man who in the immediate future may be called upon to help consider the fate of a spectator sport in which millions in the State of Wisconsin are vitally concerned.

The early decision he referred to, of course, was the one of the Supreme Court in 1922 (Federal League) in which the Court ruled that baseball was not engaged in interstate commrece. Oliver Wendell Holmes handed down the majority decision, and bewildered some of the finest legal minds in the country. In 1953 (Toolson) the Court reaffirmed this decision but with the suggestion that Congress look into the matter. And in 1957 (Radovich) it indirectly reaffirmed the decision but refused to give other professional sports, football, basketball, and hockey, the same exemptions that baseball had. It even hinted that if it were considering baseball for the first time it would not rule as the Court had in 1922.

APPLAUSE, BUT—

The Indiana dunes should be preserved. Lake Michigan should be cleaned up. So should the Chicago River. This column would like to join in the applause Justice Douglas undoubtedly got at the campers' convention with these observations.

But why drag in big league baseball in Milwaukee and the case now in progress here? Why even mildly prejudge something in which he will probably eventually sit in review? Why not let the merits or demerits of the case speak for themselves?

Can it be, if the Tribune quoted the jurist correctly, that we're playing with a stacked deck because of a decision back in 1922?

Gadsden, Ala., Honors Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, among the unsung heroes who daily do the Nation's work are the faithful employees of the Post Office Department who deliver the mail. While many are quick to complain when there is any falling off in mail service, few take the time to pay tribute to the letter carriers who plod the streets and avenues of our cities, in rain or shine, to keep the most important asset we have alive our communication with one another.

Last month the north Alabama members of the National Association of Letter Carriers held their meeting in my hometown of Gadsden and my city was proud to honor them. As a part of these remarks I include the proclamation passed by the Gadsden City Commission and signed by our good mayor, Les Gilliland, declaring February 19, 1966, Letter Carrier Day in Gadsden:

Proclamation

Whereas the diligent and industrious individuals who deliver our daily mail comprise an organization which performs a public service to the citizens dating back to the beginning of our Government, and

Whereas the public service which the letter carriers of the Nation perform is of great benefit to every individual in our country, and

Whereas the local branch No. 1047 of the National Association of Letter Carriers is sponsoring a meeting of the North Alabama Carriers to be held on February 19, 1966, at the United Rubber Workers Hall:

Now, therefore, I, Lesley L. Gilliland, mayor of the City of Gadsden, Ala., do proclaim the day of February 19, 1966 to be Letter Carrier's Day in the city of Gadsden in honor of the faithful and dedicated service which our letter carriers perform to all of the community. The letter carrier is truly one of those people who in the performance of his duty never lets rain or snow, excessive heat or bitter cold, deter him from the work which he so cheerfully performs. I urge all of the citizens of our city to give a special thought to the fine men who labor in order that we may receive a service which is of inestimable value to all.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city to be affixed, this 15th day of February 1966.

LES GILLILAND,
Mayor.

Industry and Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is constantly striving to provide opportunities for every citizen of this Nation.

Job Corps centers are performing tremendous feats in the fields of on job training, retraining, work while learning, and many forms of educational aid.

It is, however, not the sole responsibility of the Federal Government to eliminate poverty. That task must be a universal effort on the part of the entire Nation—business, agriculture, industry, professional, employees, and employers.

In a recent speech, Mr. Charles B. (Tex) Thornton, chairman of the board of Litton Industries, Inc., outlined industry's role in the Job Corps program.

Mr. Thornton's remarks are so eloquent and positive that I shall let them stand for themselves.

I, then, hereby insert into the RECORD at this point Mr. Thornton's remarks:

"PERSPECTIVES 1966"

(Remarks of Charles B. Thornton, chairman, Litton Industries, Inc., 35th National Business Conference, Harvard Business School Association, Mar. 4, 1966, New York, N.Y.)

The objectives of this conference are clear—namely, that education, business, and government must unite, and unite effectively, to tackle the tremendous job of elementary poverty, a task which no society in history has undertaken with any reasonable success.

That the businessman should be concerned about poverty, as he is about other problems of our Nation should be no surprise. Yet there are those who characterize the businessman as something less than patriotic and compassionate. For some unknown reason, the word seems to have gotten around that the businessman is for poverty—not against it. Such an absurdity too often goes unchallenged. If there is any responsible businessman or industrialist who believes poverty in our midst is good for this country, I don't know him.

There are many reasons why this Nation is great, and one of these is that it has a strong and ever-expanding industrial base. In the forefront of this Nation's growth are hundreds of thousands of businessmen and industrialists who are the visionary planners, the organizers, the innovators, and leaders in meeting the challenges of today, and forging the opportunities of tomorrow.

Most of you have built new enterprises, or expanded older ones on products that did not exist a few years ago. Still others of you have plans and projections based upon the anticipated development of presently unknown products and services, which will mean still more jobs and opportunities.

Over 72 million people are employed in America today, and 7 out of 10 are in jobs that did not exist at the beginning of this century. American industry is progressing at a furious rate in the creation of jobs, and this is the foundation of the overall economic health of our Nation. In just 16 years, the national output of goods and services, as measured by our gross national product, has doubled, and by 1980 it should double again.

Our Government can stimulate, our educational institutions can make great contributions, and labor will do its part, but it is crystal clear that it is the job of business and industry to provide the structural and economic base that will further strengthen this Nation and bring into reality the Great Society.

The problems of the poor will not go away. We should not think that burying them in the slums of our cities, or scattering them over the countryside will make them any less. They are problems, and real problems, and their solution requires an effective working relationship between government and business.

The President and the Congress saw this and provided in the Job Corps legislation for a direct business participation. In effect, they said that since free enterprise is based on the individual, all individuals must be developed to a greater potential if we are to get the best from our system. Further, as a principal element in the free enterprise system, industry should take an even greater part in this development process.

To be more specific, I would like to take a few minutes to share with you our own participation in the Job Corps.

As background I should say that our company, like most of yours, has training programs for its employees. During the last 10 years, we have given some form of training to over 15,000 of our employees. This has ranged from on-the-job training, retraining, work while learning, and many forms of educational aid, including scholarships in our Nation's colleges and universities.

Our training activities, however, have been directed primarily to upgrading and reorienting the skills of our own employees to keep pace with the rapidly changing technical context and complexity of our products. As late as 4 years ago, over 50 percent of our current 6,000 products either did not exist or have had major technological design changes. To make our training programs as effective as possible, we brought together professional teachers and specialists from the outside, and coupled them with our company's engineering, production, marketing, administrative, and management personnel.

As a result, we have and are continuing to develop training aids, equipments, and techniques which have resulted in even better training at less cost to our company.

Even though our efforts in this field were initially directed toward personnel in industry, we have found that many of our innovations were applicable on a broader basis. Consequently, when Mr. Shriver invited industry to participate in the Job Corps training program, our educational systems division decided to submit a proposal for a prime contract to create and run a training center.

In January 1965, we signed a contract to take over Camp Parks, an abandoned military installation in northern California, and in it we established a training program for boys to be selected by the Government.

I must admit this decision was made with some hesitation after considering the risks involved. We knew that these boys would come from a segment of our population which has been left behind. Few, if any, would have ever held a job. All would be school dropouts, and many would scarcely be able to read and write. These would be boys whom others had previously tried to help and had given up. The relief roles and sometimes the police blotter were their principal identification with our society.

But we believed that industry, as a responsible major institution in a free society, must accept a share of the job of bring forward that segment of our population. Further, we believe that industry can do this job better than any other segment of our society. So we accepted the challenge.

We worried about potential incidents which might be harmful to the reputation of our company and about embarrassing political criticism. But we determined to accept the risk. We also thought of stockholders who might be critical that our company would launch into such a venture, even though a small profit was involved.

The startup was encouraging. We agreed to get the camp operating in 90 days; it was functioning in 45. An adequate staff was required in 75 days; it was available in 30 days.

And then the boys began to arrive. They came from all the 50 States, in all sizes and shapes and conditions. They were school dropouts, from the first grade to high school. They were from cities, towns, and rural areas. All ethnic groups were represented. They ranged from the aggressive, belligerent boys who carried a chip on their shoulders and wanted to fight, to the passive, timid boys who had completely given up. They were all volunteers and had been processed by the U.S. Employment Services across the country, but in too many instances, they appeared to be boys that somebody just wanted to get out of town.

Fires and fights soon started. Since the boys could leave the program anytime they made up their minds to, our initial worry was who would leave first, the boys or the carefully chosen staff which we had placed in charge of Camp Parks. These worries were shortlived.

In the light of the burning buildings, our staff rolled up their sleeves and started to work with complete dedication and a determination to salvage these boys for America. With few exceptions, the boys wanted an opportunity. Even though most of them entered the program with skepticism, they began slowly to respond.

As our people came to see the problems firsthand, we soon learned that the budget was inadequate, and that many of our plans had to be revised and changed. The medical budget had been based upon the average for boys of this age group. However, few had ever had any kind of medical care, and even fewer had ever been to a dentist. The dentistry bill alone has overrun so far by $750,000, with another quarter of a million for other medical services.

The food budget was based upon the GI 3,500 calories a day. It has been running 6,000 calories a day. This adds up to $700,000 during the 2-year contract period.

The psychologists tell us that to these boys, food is a symbol. The ability to eat a lot is important to them, even though it runs beyond their physical needs.

We learned that instruction on a small-group basis had to be combined with individual learning. Even the boys who chose the same courses, though willing, could not progress equally together. This is understandable as their previous school levels varied so widely.

We also learned that the boys who couldn't read or write were the most sensitive and often the most belligerent. To learn the ABC's was considered kid stuff and they wanted no part of it. This was largely solved as they began to show interest in one or more of the training programs coupled with our staff's liberal use of an old American principle—the incentive system.

For example, those in electronic assembly were told that when they learned to read the instruction manuals, they would be given parts to assemble a small radio which they could keep if it worked. The learning aids and teachers in our reading facilities were soon overwhelmed. Once they started, the boys were determined to proceed rapidly, and these facilities are now open day and night. In addition to the regular hours during the day, many boys spend from 3 to 5 extra hours at night on their own learning to read and write.

Last week I visited one group using teaching aids in individual booths. They were all at different reading levels. I talked to one fine looking boy from Oklahoma—a first grade dropout—who could not even write his name 5 months ago. He has averaged 5 hours a day, including Saturdays and Sundays, learning to read. He already has his radio, and is now working harder than ever.

Another boy showed me a Life magazine, saying, "I used to just look at the pictures. Now you know I read the writing and I know what they're all about." His eyes were glistening.

Another boy in a booth seemed too embarrassed to talk. He was just starting and having difficulty writing simple words like "who" and "how," as he heard the words pronounced and displayed on a machine.

The instructor told me that the average accomplishment of this group of boys was now running at one elementary school grade per month. By the way, this teacher's name is Mrs. Riggs and she had taught in the second and third grades of the California elementary school system for over 20 years. She said that she had joined our staff at Camp Parks last year because she was curious about the program and also wanted to earn some additional income during the summer. Even though her pay now is the same for 11½ months as it was in the public school system for 9, she wants to continue at Camp Parks. She said, "It is the most rewarding experience that I have ever had."

Earlier in our Job Corps experience, we found many professional teachers lacking in interest and even critical of the Job Corps activity. Now some of the most enthusiastic on our staff are former teachers, and we have an average of 200 applications from professional teachers for every position available.

There are over 2,000 boys at Camp Parks, and the first ones are beginning to graduate. Depending upon their ages, their previous level of education, and the relative complexity of the course chosen, the training varies from 6 months to 2 years.

Upon graduation, each boy receives a general educational diploma from the Job Corps, and, in many instances, an accredited high school diploma. Of the few hundred who have graduated, about 15 percent have reentered the public school system, about 50 percent have found jobs in industry, and approximately 35 percent have entered the Armed Forces. Remember that these were boys not only below the entry level for jobs in industry, but also below the minimum level for military service.

The motivation supplied by a fellow corpsman getting a job has greater impact than all the words in the world from our staff, or other outsiders. They follow each other's progress with intense interest, as indicated by the Camp Parks' corpsman's newspaper edited and published completely by the boys themselves—"Plunkett Lands Job," "Eddie Kendall Hired by Telephone Company," and many more.

Speaking of graduates, I think you would like to know that as the boys arrive they are relieved of any switchblade knives, lead pipes, and even homemade guns in their possession. You should see the collection. Each boy is told that his name will be tagged to this property, and he may reclaim it when he leaves the camp. So far, not one single graduate—and I repeat—not one has asked for the return of his weapon.

As I said a moment ago, it is still too early to judge, but if we assume, based upon our experience at Camp Parks, any reasonable degree of success of the Job Corps program, it will be one of the best investments America could make.

The present cost of training a boy at Camp Parks is running between $3,500 and $4,500, depending upon his training period. Some critics have said that this is more costly than maintaining a student in many of our colleges and universities. To make the comparison comparable, however, remember the 6,000 calories and the million dollars spent on teeth and general health. Furthermore, these are boys with problems, and the training center has them 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

We in the business world consider economic payout in determining the merits of an investment. If we apply that measurement to the Job Corps, it becomes an investment that any prudent businessman would be willing for our Nation to make.

Remember that 70 percent of these boys came from families on relief. Furthermore, 40 percent of their grandparents were also on relief. If we can break that cycle and can make them tax producers instead of problem tax consumers, we have added greatly to the strength of America.

To keep a family on relief in California costs $5,000 a year, or $100,000 for one generation. To keep a man in prison costs $8,000 a year.

Camp Parks is not intended to be a boys camp nor a vacation outing. Its dropout rate has averaged 8 percent—not bad when you consider these boys were all 100-percent dropouts when they came here. It is in the deadly serious business of building citizens. How well this job is being done can only be measured by the performance of the boys during their long lifetime after they have completed their relatively few months in the Job Corps training program.

Any way we look at it, we'll find that the break even point of this investment will be far lower than any previous minimum that we as businessmen have ever used as a yardstick.

In closing, I would like to read just one of the many letters which Dr. Uslan, director of Camp Parks, has received. This one came after the boys returned from Christmas leave.

"Dear Sir: I would like to express my many thanks to you and your coworkers for the improvement I found in my son Paul. His conduct is much better, and his personality is wonderful. We enjoyed him to the high. He made our Christmas a perfect one. We just love him to death. Now I must say that he used to have ways we did not like. I am so happy to see that Paul is now growing up to be a real man. May God bless every one of you. As I close I will say thanks again and again and again.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record, an editorial that appeared in the Daily News, published in Huntingdon and Mount Union, Pa., and which shows the feeling of many people of our congressional district.

The editorial follows:

[From the Daily News (Huntingdon and Mount Union, Pa.), Mar 1, 1966]

The American Way

Milk producers and dealers supplying the Greater Philadelphia area understandably are agitated over the U.S. Department of Agriculture's announced intention to change the marketing arrangement under which they have functioned successfully for 23 years.

The Department states that it wants a change because it cannot enforce the minimum price provisions of its present marketing order in the face of chiseling by a handful of dairies which apparently pay kickbacks to brokers or other middlemen. Oddly, though, one of the principal offenders of the Philadelphia order is reported to be a huge New York-based cooperative which is in the forefront of those calling for a change.

The change they want, which the Department may order, would absorb the Philadelphia or so-called Delaware Valley area into their New York-New Jersey market order. At the very least the New York-New Jersey producers want to force abandonment of the handler pool arrangement in the Philadelphia area. This would result in a loss of 50 cents per hundredweight of milk for the 5,800 farmers supplying the Philadelphia area and an increase of 6 cents per hundredweight to those primarily supplying the New York market, or a loss of $10 million to the economy of the Delaware Valley area.

Bringing the loss closer to home, there are over 600 milk shippers in the Daily News circulation area who stand to lose about $840,000 annually if the handler pool plan is abandoned.

Over 90 percent of the Philadelphia milkshed dairymen have urged the Department of Agriculture to retain the order they have worked under since 1942. They have also asked that the Department amend the order to put the middlemen under the order's jurisdiction so that it can be enforced.

This sounds to us like honest, good sense. It sounds like the American way. The Department of Agriculture should no more think of abandoning an order because of infractions, at least not until it has made an all-out effort at enforcement, than we should consider abandoning laws against murder because some are still committed.

The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle—No. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, the 10th article of a series written by Washington reporter of the Detroit News, Tom Joyce, discussing the war on poverty, follows:

Our Agonizing Dilemma—Can War on Poverty Prevent a Greater Evil Later?

(By Tom Joyce)

Washington, March 9.—"We in America today are nearer to the final triumph over poverty than ever before in the history of any land.

"We will soon with the help of God be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this Nation."

The words ring with the optimism of President Johnson. But they are not his, any more than the war on poverty is really his war.

They were uttered more than 37 years ago by Herbert Hoover when he accepted the Republican Party's presidential nomination.

Only 15 months later the Nation was plunged into the darkest depression in its history.

It ended hope for conquering poverty—and sent the Republican Party into a political depression almost as dark as the economic one.

The depression gave political birth to Franklin Delano Roosevelt and a number of schemes to restore the country to prosperity. The best remembered is WPA, the granddaddy of pump priming.

It generated unrestrained praise, unbounded criticism, hope, and distrust. It also made a permanent contribution to Americana with countless humorous references to boondoggling. One was this little ditty:

"Dub-ya P.A., dub-ya P.A.,
 Sleep while you work, while you rest, while you play.
 Lean on your shovel to pass the time away.
 Three little letters that make life okay,
 Dub-ya P.A., dub-ya P.A., dub-ya P.A."

That experiment, the biggest antipoverty undertaking up to its time, has rightly been described as the spiritual predecessor to Mr. Johnson's war.

And history shows that it helped 38 million Americans, by coincidence a figure very close to the 34 million Americans judged poor by today's poverty war standards.

What distinguishes the war on poverty from all other attempts in history is its approach. In this sense it is certainly the Johnson administration's war.

NOT A DOLE

It is not a dole program. If it were, the administrative costs would not be as high as they are, with as much as 70 percent of funds for some projects going just for salaries.

Congressional criticism frequently has hit on this point. There also have been cases of corruption.

But the poverty war is an attack on the causes of poverty, a sociologically inspired experiment to help the poor pull themselves up.

The administrative costs of handing out welfare money in a well-managed program can be kept quite low, but the self-help programs of the poverty war require thousands of trained professional people.

It costs a lot of money to hire one teacher for every 14 culturally deprived children in the Headstart program, and it is not cheap to hire counselors, teachers and instructors of skills at the Job Corps centers.

An executive from industry does not go to a Job Corps camp for the kind of wages that a WPA work-gang boss might be paid today.

There must still be dole in America. The statement of the militant Negro in Watts who says the purpose of his community-action program is to make people ashamed to stand in welfare lines cannot be applied to a mother who has no means of supporting her five children.

But if the program works, the five children eventually will have no reason to stand in a welfare line.

If the war on poverty is an extension of WPA, emphasis has been completely reversed—away from make work and toward self-help through education, job training and motivation.

But emphasis on the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), which runs the antipoverty campaign and keeps public attention focused on it with the help of a well-oiled public relations machine, is misleading.

The battle against poverty and its causes has many fronts.

There is social security, which not only provides incomes for retired workers but payments to survivors of heads of households as well.

COST IN BILLIONS

It is expected in 1967 that Federal payments for health, labor, and welfare activities will jump to a total of $39.3 billion, with about 75 percent of this coming from trust funds financed through special taxes.

For years unemployment compensation, administered by Federal-State systems, has been a weapon against poverty.

There is the manpower development and training act of 1962. So far about 370,000 unemployed workers have been enrolled in training. More than 70 percent of these have been placed in jobs.

This year, emphasis has been shifted to the unemployables. Next year two-thirds of an estimated 250,000 trainees will come from people who have no skills, not even the most simple ones.

Moreover, the program will devote more attention to job placement.

Poverty war community action programs in places like Chicago, Atlanta, and Detroit are providing exciting new information about employment services.

ELEVEN-STATE BATTLEFIELD

The billion dollar Appalachia program cannot be separated from the Government's attack on poverty, even though it is not an official part of the war.

In the 11-State Appalachia area, where barefoot children are raised in squalor, roads are being built and natural-resource programs developed.

Similar regional approaches are being planned for other areas.

A weak spot so far seems to be a lack of coordination in Appalachia between other Federal programs and the war on poverty. Some rural antipoverty officials in Kentucky, West Virginia, Georgia, and neighboring States have never bothered to talk to officials of the Appalachia program. Some, in fact, have only a fuzzy notion that there is a program called Appalachia.

There are other programs aimed at the roots of poverty.

Expenditures for urban renewal are expected to go to $413 million in fiscal 1967.

Moreover, President Johnson has asked Congress to approve a $2.3 billion plan designed to wipe out whole slum neighborhoods in American cities.

Slum clearance has touched off a long and heated debate. What, for instance, happens to the inhabitants of the slum that is removed? Where do they go?

Critics in Detroit refer sardonically to urban renewal as "Negro removal."

Ocie Pastard, the militant young Negro who works in an antipoverty project in the Los Angeles Watts area, is an outspoken critic of slum-removal projects.

"Before you knock down a slum," he says, "you have to prepare the people who live in it for decent housing. If you tear down a slum and put all the people in public housing, without training them, you end up in a few years with just another slum."

Pastard's project, called Westminster, is directed at the kind of training he is talking about, dealing with simple problems like homemaking, home management and individual motivation.

Expenditures for public housing in fiscal 1967 are expected to increase from $249 million to $61 million.

In an inventory of the Federal Government's help-the-poor programs, the expanding role of education cannot be overlooked. Aid to elementary and secondary education is expected to increase from $730 million in 1966 to $1.5 billion in 1967.

MEDICARE A FACTOR

Medicare also cannot be ignored as a major weapon against poverty since it is designed for the aged who so heavily populate poverty's ranks. Beyond medicare, the same active Congress that approved it also enacted 11 other major health measures, including much improved health care for needy children.

So the war on poverty, directed from Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity, is just a part of the bigger war.

Nevertheless, it is the heart and the nerve center of the daring new idea that the poor themselves can play a major part in the effort to erase not only poverty but its causes.

Despite the other programs, the Shriver operation will decide whether the new approach is possible or whether it will end up as just another welfare operation.

Travel across the land and you will get the unmistakable impression that most Americans feel the program will not work—that poverty can never be completely erased.

"Really," most Americans seem to be asking, "won't there always be poor people? Isn't this just the way things are?"

It is not easy to ask these questions of blank-faced children in mountain shacks dirty beyond belief.

The chances are that their children and their children's children will be poor if this is really the ways things are. One of the demonstrable achievements of the poverty war so far is the uncovering of fresh evidence that poverty, like wealth, can be bequeathed.

THE HOPEFUL SIGNS

Critics charge that the program is not working. They point to San Francisco, where projects have bogged down in politics. They produce figures about high dropout rates in Job Corps camps. They offer irrefutable evidence of waste, mismanagement of funds, and public scandal.

Riots at a couple of Job Corps camps got big headlines in newspapers across the country. But few newspapers have been willing to spend either the time or the money it takes to find out about the other side of the Job Corps, a project on which some of the Nation's biggest industrial firms are gambling.

Moreover, there also are congressional critics who find it is easier to use old newspaper clippings than it is to conduct firsthand investigations.

The engineer you sit next to on the airplane does not think the antipoverty campaign will work. But he has neither the time nor the means to really look inside a Harlem project that is working.

Many, many other projects, some of them small and some of them large, are really working. Others are hopeless, sputtering failures.

And, if you stand inside an Appalachian hovel, talk to the poor themselves on slum streets from New York to Los Angeles and walk down the paths of ignorance, hopelessness and indifference, the odds look very long and the cost very high.

But there are hopeful signs. And it is hard to escape the ringing question of the industry man who runs a Job Corps center:

"What are the costs going to be tomorrow if the problems are not solved today?"

Congressman Quillen, Tennessee's Ombudsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, our outstanding colleague from the First District of Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is well known and appreciated for the fine manner in which he deals with constituent needs. As evidence of his effectiveness, the people he represents returned him to Congress with 71.7 percent of the vote—the largest margin of any Republican in 1964.

In a recent Kingsport WKPT radio editorial by William Freehoff, Congressman JIMMY QUILLEN was compared to a Swedish ombudsman, or citizen defender against government abuse. Mr. Freehoff's editorial is worthy of contemplation by us all and with unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[A WKPT, Kingsport, Tenn., Editorial]

WE HAVE OUR OWN OMBUDSMAN

(By William Freehoff)

Alfred Bexelius of Sweden has testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.

Mr. Bexelius was invited to appear before the Senate subcommittee because he is an ombudsman and the subcommittee is looking into the matter of ombudsmen.

And what is an ombudsman? Well, to put it briefly, an ombudsman is a sort of troubleshooter for the citizen who wants to get help from his government.

The office was established in Sweden in 1809 as a citizen's defender against government abuse. The post has since been created in Finland, Denmark, Norway, and New Zealand and has been proposed for Great Britain.

Now some Members of Congress are toying with the idea—hence, the appearance of Ombudsman Bexelius.

We will agree that the staggering bureaucracy of Washington is a fearful thing to confront for the average Joe Citizen.

Talk to one bureaucrat and you will be sent from one office to the next. You remember the old gag about the messenger boy that went into the Pentagon and came out a light colonel.

But if a Congressman is on the ball, his constituents don't need an ombudsman.

And here in the First Congressional District of Tennessee we already have an excellent ombudsman in Congressman JIMMY QUILLEN.

He has demonstrated many times that he can slash government redtape to shreds on behalf of a constituent, and his greatest triumph—getting land back for a mountaineer constitutent—was the lead article in a recent Reader's Digest.

So, if all Congressmen were as eager to assist their constitutents as JIMMY QUILLEN is, there would be no neeed to even think about creating an American version of the Swedish ombudsman.

Think about it.

Follow the Bouncing Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the ballpoint pen is now some 20 years old. Since the time of its invention few other than perfecting changes of minor character have taken place. Recently, however, a giant step forward was made by the Fisher Pen Co. by pressurizing the feed supply. Its usefulness as a space pen becomes apparent because of weightless conditions experienced by all orbiting astronauts. Perhaps more importantly, though, is the reliability increase for everyday use by millions of actual and potential users.

Following are the pens' test results and a history going back 20 years—all advanced by the space age:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., November 17, 1965.

MR. PAUL C. FISHER,
President, Fisher Pen Co.,
Forest Park, Ill.

DEAR MR. FISHER: As you are aware, our Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, Tex., has been testing your new model AG–7 pens which have aluminum pistons separating the gas from the ink reservoir. The results of these tests as reported to this office on September 22, 1965, were quite favorable, and I quote from the report the following statements:

"The modified pens were received, checked for oxygen compatibility, and subsequently used in a simulated spacecraft cabin environment.

"The oxygen compatibility was confirmed by rupturing the ink cartridge and placing the ink in a watch glass and exposing it to 100 percent oxygen. The oxygen soak was at various pressures from 3 to 15 pounds per square inch absolute for a period of 1 hour. At the end of the 1 hour soak, no noticeable oxidation has occurred. The ink, still in the oxygen, was placed in the presence of an open flame, and it was determined that it would not support combustion. The AG–7 pens were found to be oxygen compatible and submitted as a test article for the next manned test at reduced pressures.

"The test in which the performance of the AG–7 pens were used was a 48-hour test in 'Gemini ECS Boilerplate No. II' where the following conditions existed:

"(a) Cabin pressure controlled at 5.5 pounds per square inch absolute.

"(b) Cabin interwall temperature followed a launch profile of 100° to −40° F.

"(c) Cabin gas was 100 percent oxygen with 50 to 80 percent relative humidity.

"(d) The test subjects were in both launch and flight position during the test.

"(e) The AG–7 pens were used to fill out a workbook that was provided to keep the subject occupied during the test.

"The AG–7 pens performed excellently in all positions. The pens were examined after the test and no excessive oozing was apparent. The mechanics of the pen also performed very well. Both test subjects stated that the pens performed satisfactorily.

"The pens will be used in future tests and should any problems be noted, you will be advised.

"Sincerely yours,
"JAMES A. HOOTMAN,
"Executive Secretary,
Inventions and Contributions Board."

[From Office Appliances]

FOLLOW THE BOUNCING BALL

(By Paul C. Fisher, president, Fisher Pen Co.)

I didn't believe it then, and I can hardly believe it now.

What I'm talking about is the ball pen. It was introduced just 20 years ago, October 29, as the newest development of the oldest writing instrument, and changed the writing habits of a billion people.

I didn't think much of the pen at the time, but I have changed my mind considerably. And how I have changed by mind.

I've been in the ball pen business almost since its inception and I've made my share of mistakes, but also some important contributions—like the universal refill cartridge and now, on the 20th anniversary of the ball pen—a sealed pressurized cartridge making it possible to write in any position, even upside down.

On that October day, 20 years ago, Milton Reynolds put on sale through Gimbels in New York his miraculous new pen at $12.50 each, a fantastic price, but no more fantastic than the claims made for it. "It could write underwater. It would revolutionize writing. It would practically last forever."

Gimbels, with the help of extravagant advertising on that day, had some 5,000 war-weary consumers aching for new merchandise—waiting to buy pens, at $12.50 each.

By day's end, Gimbels had sold 10,000 pens, worth about $125,000 at retail. And if you think that's a paltry figure, considering the size and importance of the store, consider that this amount was about a third of the store's average daily volume at that time.

That was the start of the ball pen, and I did not share the general enthusiasm. In fact, just a few days before that wild selling event at Gimbels I had remarked to Julian Levi, son-in-law of Milton Reynolds and then general manager of the Reynolds Pen Co., that the ball pen was no good and never would be because the basic principle was unsound.

I was right—but only at the time. It was all too true that the early ball pens did not work. There were defects and there were failures and there was widespread dissatisfaction. While Gimbels was still selling all the pens it could get, long lines were forming in the back of the store to return pens that came nowhere near fulfilling the fantastic claims of the ballyhoo that preceded their introduction.

EARLY MODELS HAD PLENTY OF PROBLEMS

All their faults were showing—the oil base inks dried so slowly that writing would smear and signatures could be readily transferred even after weeks of aging; the ink cartridge leaked, sometimes from both ends, and few things are messier than ball pen inks. The cartridges stopped writing because of air bubbles or foreign particles in the ink, the ink dried or oxidized since the upper end of the ink column was always exposed to the atmosphere; the points wrote unevenly, left large globs of excess ink, wrote too lightly or the ball would freeze in its socket and stop writing completely.

The Reynolds innovation, despite the exaggerated price, the wildly imaginative promotion and the defects inherent in the product, did achieve a major objective, even though the pen itself was a monumental writing failure.

It called attention to the fact that there was indeed such a product. The net effect—with the pen itself going back to everybody's laboratories for essential improvements and refinements, and perhaps perfection—was to start an industry.

Now the ball pen is a staple item everywhere throughout the world, and it is widely used in the office, school, home, as a premium, as an advertising specialty and, in more elaborate gold or silver case and accompanied by a mechanical pencil, an executive gift. Sales are running close to $500 million in annual volume, on a worldwide basis.

Developments and improvements in the ball pen by leading manufacturers in the field, and—some of them my own doing, I am proud to say—have forced me to change my mind about the ball pen.

The major break was achieved in 1947 with the capillary cartridge, a straight tube with a 1/10 inch inside diameter, it was a tremendous improvement over the much more complicated original ink cartridges. One end is closed by the point and the other end is open to the air. This type of ink cartridge is still used in 90 percent of all ball pens.

The original smooth steel ball that rolled over the paper, leaving a trail of the same ink that stained pockets, handkerchiefs and hands, was replaced by tungsten carbide, one of the hardest alloys known. It is not used much to write under water, but it now even writes on some greasy, glossy, and glazed surfaces.

However, the big breakthrough in ball pen technology came in 1949 with Paper Mate's introduction of the first quick drying glycol-based ink. By this time the ball pen had such a bad reputation for performance that it had become a dying product. Paper Mate's quick drying ink first developed by Fran Seech brought new life to the ball pen and started it on its way to wide acceptance. When I first tested the Paper Mate pen, I was so impressed that I discontinued all sales effort on our pens to develop an ink of comparable quality. Other pen companies also intensified their ink research, while Seech successfully kept his secret for nearly 4 years by mixing ink in the basement bathtub of his Los Angeles home and not revealing his formulas to anyone. Paper Mate as a result earned a commanding lead over its competitors.

ORIGINAL PATENT ISSUED IN 1888

This marked the rebirth of the ball pen industry. Confidence in the product was restored. Major competitors intensified their research and development efforts that have resulted in the ball pen's present position of the world's most widely used writing instrument.

While the merchandising genius of Milton Reynolds is responsible for starting the industry, the actual credit goes to Laszlo Jozsef Biro, a Hungarian refugee living in Argentina, for kindling the commercial birth of the ball pen. There had been patents as far back as 1888 on the concept of a freely-revolving ball, set in a socket, that wiped a gelatinous ink onto a writing surface.

The Biro pen had three important advances—if the word is the correct one, considering the defects—over the conventional fountain pen. Instead of a nib there was a socket that held a ball bearing. Instead of ink it used a gelatinous dye with an oil base that was rolled onto the writing surface by the ball bearing. Third, it held enough of this unusual "ink" to keep writing for several months at a time.

There was another advantage. Ordinary pens leaked at high altitudes because changes in atmospheric pressures affect liquids. The ball pen was not subject to this annoying problem, and the immediate result was that the British rights were sold to a British aircraft company.

The U.S. Air Force—through fliers visiting Argentina—became interested, too, toward the end of World War II. It brought some and sent them to pen makers, suggesting they might buy a large quantity. Here was a product to be made, and a consumer waiting to buy it. It was no wonder that Parker, Sheaffer and Eversharp got into the act, only to find that Eberhard Faber, well-known pencil manufacturer, controlled the U.S. rights but had run into manufacturing difficulties.

Some extremely complicated agreements were worked out between Faber and Eversharp and production runs began, backed by "miracle-pen" advertising.

The advertising, as it turned out, was a boon to Gimbels which was just about to bring out the Reynolds pen. Reynolds had investigated the patent situation and had decided to go ahead, taking his chances on legality. Straus warned of a patent-infringement suit, but Reynolds was a step ahead. His pen had a gravity feed, something that represented an improvement.

There are now perhaps 200 ball pen manufacturers in the country, with quality and performance ranging from very good to very bad.

MANY IMPROVEMENTS ALONG THE WAY

Many of them get credit for various innovations and improvements. Among the major developments to cause significant changes in manufacturing methods and greater value to the consumer was the jumbo cartridge using a grease follower developed by Ernest Hendrickson. Sheaffer Pen Co. adopted it in 1952 after their unsuccessful efforts at marketing a jumbo cartridge with a sealed ink supply. Parker, Scripto, Venus and Wearever soon followed. This development allowed the use of a larger diameter tube, thereby greatly increasing the ink supply. However, the brass or bronze ball sockets then used wore out so quickly that the extra ink supply actually meant very little, until the successful development of the stainless steel socket using a tungsten carbide ball, in 1963.

The successful modern stainless steel point is the development of Sauro Albertini and Guido Bertoglio of Albe, S.A. of Lugano, Switzerland. This remarkable company developed a line of superb ball point manufacturing machines which are now being used all over the world. A few pen companies, including the Fisher Pen Co., developed their own excellent point manufacturing machines and with them a competitive advantage. Then the Albe Co. developed their superior machines and revolutionized the point quality of ball pens throughout the world by making their machines and their superior technology available to the entire industry.

Fisher's two basic contributions now widely accepted are the universal cartridge "one-for-all" refill, which fits most pens and thus reduces retail inventories, and now the first successful sealed pressurized ball pen cartridge. At the Fisher organization, with its plants and laboratories in Chicago, California and New York, we have solved the problem of ink flow. The new cartridge invented by me and two long-time associates, Herman Schub and Roger Kennedy using a thixotropic ink, will write under conditions impossible for ordinary pens.

Pressurized ball pen ink cartridges could not be made in the past because all previous ball pen inks would ooze out around the ball whenever pressure was applied to the ink. Our new thixotropic ink will not ooze even if pressure in excess of 100 pounds per square inch is applied because it is heavy and solid until it is stirred. The revolving ball liquifies the ink so that it flows freely to the paper.

The future indicates even greater growth, providing we are alert to scientific advances and are willing to share our knowledge. The first 20 years were the hardest, but as pioneers we should be proud that, out of the ashes of near-disaster, we gave to the Nation and to the world the ball point pen—the modern tool of education, business and communications—and are striving to make it better.

Address by Mr. Serafin G. Menocal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, Mr. Serafin G. Menocal, former vice president and general manager of the Cuban Electric Co., made an address before the Commonwealth Club of California at their Friday luncheon. I think it is important that we take into consideration the warnings and facts which Mr. Menocal presented to the Commonwealth Club.

Excerpts from his address, entitled "Havana Red Accords a Formal Declaration of Subversive War Against the Americas," published by the Commonwealth, follow:

HAVANA RED ACCORDS A FORMAL DECLARATION OF SUBVERSIVE WAR AGAINST THE AMERICAS

(From address by Serafin G. Menocal, former vice president and general manager, Cuban Electric Co.)

A most important event, in the struggle of democracy against the Communist invasion was the Tricontinental Conference (Asia, Africa, and America) of international Communist groups who met in Havana during January for the purpose of fomenting and carrying out subversion throughout the Americas. Immediate targets are Santo Domingo, Guatemala, Colombia, Venezuela, and Haiti—the Caribbean area—which can affect the United States in greatest measure.

The tricontinental meeting climaxed the efforts of four previous conferences: the first two at Bandung, in April 1955; the second at Conakri, Guinea, in April 1960, which created the Afro-Asian Organization of Newsmen to expand worldwide propaganda.

The third significant conference was held in Noshi, Tanganyika. It voted approval of financial and military aid to all liberation movements. For the first time (taking advantage of the passive attitude of Washington toward Cuba) it was resolved to extend full support to Fidel Castro and to advocate compliance with the five points drawn up by the Cuban Communist government. One was a demand that the United States immediately abandon its naval base at Guantanamo, Cuba, which, under the 1934 treaty secured the complete independence of the island.

COMMUNIST WAR COUNCILS

Cuba is the key to control of the Caribbean which, in turn, controls approaches to the Panama Canal.

The fourth conference, held in Accra, Ghana, in May 1955, ratified all agreements and resolutions previously adopted. It was decided to hold a fifth conference in Cairo in September of last year, to prepare for the Havana Tricontinental Conference.

The Havana Conference represents an open invasion of our hemisphere as a result of the passive attitude of the OAS and the agreement reached between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Khrushchev.

Analyzing all these developments, if immediate actions are not taken to recover lost ground, Castro will become the steel arm of communism through the indolence of the entire continent.

U.S.S.R.-RED CHINA AGREE

The Havana conference was attended by 483 delegates, 70 observers, 81 guests and 119 newsmen from the three continents.

Importance of the Havana meeting lies in the fact that the Soviet Union and Red China have openly committed themselves in the struggle to subvert the American peoples. Castro is no longer the instrument. It is the Soviet Union that acts directly. It is no longer being done in a clandestine manner but frankly, and brazenly, admitted.

The principal resolutions approved at the tricontental conference are explicit:

First. Creation of solidarity among the peoples of the three continents.

Second. Establishment of a general secretariat in Havana.

Third. Creation of a permanent committee of assistance and aid to all subversive movements.

Fourth. Formation of a specific committee for Latin America, with representatives of the various subversive groups from all nations.

Fifth. Training and guidance of guerrillas to invade America.

Sixth. Creation of a committee to assist and aid the Vietcong. The very same Vietcong whom some sympathizers in the United States wish to include in the Vietnam Government—a proposal which Vice President HUMPHREY has likened to putting a fox in the chicken coop.

OAS GIVES WEAK PROTEST

The importance of these resolutions is confirmed in statements made by the delegates from different countries, among them Pedro Medina of Venezuela, who urged coordination of guerrila movements to achieve broader support. The Vietnamese representative expressed himself in these terms: "One Yankee killed in Vietnam is one Yankee less that our Venezuelan brothers will have to kill in Venezuela." The Chilean Communist Party president stated harmonized activity to be the only way to attain power.

The OAS has limited itself to an academic protest against the Tricontinental Conference which is a flagrant violation of the principles and purposes of the U.N. Charter and a General Assembly declaration voted by 109 member States.

CHALLENGES NOT MET

It is time to admit openly that the Havana tricontinental meeting accords are a formal declaration of war, a subversive war; like those being everywhere financed by the Soviet Union and Red China.

Castro's regime has recognized the Vietcong and Puerto Rico as free countries. Narciso Rabel Martinez, a Communist Puerto Rican leader, has been appointed ambassador to Cuba although Puerto Rico is politically tied to the United States. This is another challenge that has not been contested.

At the time of the missile crisis in 1962, President Kennedy committed himself with Prime Minister Khrushchev not to invade Cuba, and not to allow Cuba to be invaded. This agreement has made Cuba a Communist sanctuary. It permits Castro to operate freely, secure in the knowledge that it is not possible to develop a Cuban counterrevolution in the United States which would liberate Cuba from communism and free Latin America and the United States from its threat.

In contrast, Washington, D.C., has denied us free Cubans establishment of a Cuban government-in-exile, or any other official status, which would lend moral support to our efforts to rescue our fatherland.

LOOMING THREAT

Even if we disregard inter-American treaties, a nonintervention policy at this times is not fair or intelligent if it leaves the Latin American peoples at the mercy of Communist infiltration.

If Castro and the Communists stay in Cuba exporting their revolution, the downfall of other governments and nations of Latin America will be only a matter of time.

Thousands of Latin Americans are being trained every year in Havana, Moscow, Peiping, and Prague in the techniques of sabotage, terrorism, and revolution.

The potential chaos cannot be suppressed indefinitely by the armed forces of Latin American countries, nor can their economies afford it. The cost to the United States of the Vietnam guerrilla war is more than the combined budgets of all Latin American countries.

It is impossible for me to understand the present U.S. position on a Communist Cuba under Fidel Castro. If the United States felt justified in throwing its weight against the Batista regime, it now would seem to be a matter of simple self-preservation to eliminate this cancer that is spreading throughout the hemisphere—not to mention American commitments under the inter-American juridical system and the Monroe Doctrine.

COMMITMENTS TO LATIN AMERICA

If the bombing of North Vietnam by American planes has not provoked a war with Red China or the Soviet Union, it is extremely unlikely any military action against Cuba would bring about such as conflict. The longer we delay elimination of Castro and his comrades, the greater the damage they can do.

If the United States is now carrying out in Vietnam the commitments it assumed under the treaty signed to defend southeast Asia, is it not equally bound to take similar action regarding Cuba—by the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, the Declaration of Caracas, the Declaration of the American Foreign Ministers' meeting held in Washington in 1964, and the Monroe Doctrine?

We may be taking the first steps toward a more constructive policy with relation to Communist Cuba: I refer to the September 20, 1965, resolution voted 312 to 52 in the U.S. Congress, which endorses the unilateral use of force by the United States, or any other Western Hemisphere country, to prevent a Communist takeover anywhere in this hemisphere.

The nations of Latin America want to aline themselves solidly against their common enemy, communism—but they look to the United States for leadership. Resolutions of this sort—while perhaps not very important inside the United States—are extremely important internationally.

If the United States vacillates in the face of the intensified subversion which will result from the Tricontinental Conference, Latin America will vacillate too—and the subversion will bear its bitter fruit in bloodshed and toppled governments. If the United States stands firm—so will Latin America stand firm—and the plans of the Tricontinental Conference will be thwarted.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. (J. C. Russell.) Cuban refugees wish to return to Cuba, or remain in the United States? Answer. Hope to get back—have to think of those left behind.

Question. (R. T. Durbrow.) Cuban Electric Co. assets all lost to Castro? Answer. Yes.

Question. (John Brickley.) Was Castro a Communist before gaining power, or was his coming into power a result of nonrecognition of him by the United States? Answer. Castro was Communist before, and ample proof exists; 1948—Communists planned riots in Bogotá, Colombia, thousands killed, $30 million damage. Castro was active there. He was caught in a radio station inciting people to riot. He was jailed and saved by Cuban ambassador to United States; 1955—Castro jailed again, but released in general amnesty. Went to Mexico to train guerrillas, Raul, Castro's brother, was trained in Moscow. Castro created a secret state police and declared he's a Marxist-Leninist.

Question. (C. J. Gray.) Missiles now being installed?

Answer. No proof. Have only information from U–2 planes which don't show up what is on ground. Soviets sending tons of concrete into areas where no Cuban is allowed. At a gate the Cuban truck drivers turn over their trucks to Russians who drive off, return with empty trucks, turn them back to the Cubans.

Question. (Dr. Ed Williams.) Cuba's future relations with Soviet Union and Red China?

Answer. At Tricontinental Conference both Soviet Union and Red China represented—both agree on course of action.

Question. (C. M. Avery.) Would Batista have supported democratic elections with U.S. support?

Answer. Main reason why people hated Batista—no political freedom. Also tremendous graft in government circles. Tremendous propaganda built up for Castro in United States. None of the information furnished the U.S. State Department as to Castro's Communist ties ever reached either Secretary of State or the President. Such information never got above the fourth floor of State Department.

Question. (R. Cathcart.) Castro sending agents to United States among refugees?

Answer. Of course. Offer no harm to security of United States. He may have a group give a show—for propaganda purposes—asserting they want to go back to Communist Cuba.

Question. Best course of action against Communist Cuba?

Answer. First, a completely enforced embargo. All nations should respect that embargo. (Remember, the United States backs a Rhodesian embargo.) Second, help the Cubans—give support. Third, coordinate efforts of hemisphere. Only United States can provide needed hemispheric leadership.

President's Vietnam Policy Supported by Representative Bob Casey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIGIO DE LA GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the President's policy in handling the crisis in Vietnam and southeast Asia. This is one of the most difficult problems in foreign policy our Nation has faced, and some of us believe the handful of critics have been given undue attention by the press.

Many of my colleagues have repeatedly expressed full support of our President's policy, but rarely does it get more than local attention. Because I feel the American people, and in particular my colleagues in Congress, should know that most of us have great confidence in our President, and stand with him on the difficult decisions he has had to make, it is my pleasure to bring to your attention the report of a speech made by my friend and colleague, Representative BOB CASEY, before the Houston Optimist Club.

The report is from the Southwestern Argus of March 3, 1966:

BOB CASEY STANDS WITH L.B.J.

Congressman BOB CASEY, who visited Vietnam in November, said in Houston Thursday that President Johnson's war policy has his full support.

CASEY was sharply critical of recent attacks in Washington on our policy in Vietnam.

Speaking before the Houston Optimist Club in the Rice Hotel, CASEY called the war "one of the dirtiest wars and also one of the most vital we have ever fought."

"I have often differed with the President, but I am in full accord with his Vietnam policy," CASEY said.

"The criticism in Washington adds fuel to the fires of criticism at home—the talk of withdrawal appeals to the mother whose son is about to go to Vietnam and to those who would have us withdraw into a shell."

CASEY said he had recently received a letter from a constituent, a woman, "who wanted to know what we are doing over there, why we don't pull out and why does the President refuse to sit down at the conference table."

"She and others like her are ignoring the President's every effort to mediate the the war, including the cessation of bombing, the many emissaries he has sent all over the world and his repeated invitations to the Vietcong to meet us at the conference table," the Congressman said.

"This lady is willing to take the word of three men who, against the laws of this country, visited Hanoi and came back as mouthpieces for the Communists. She is willing to take their word against that of the President of the United States.

"Let's consider what would happen if we did pull out.

"The coalition Government in South Vietnam would fall almost immediately; the Vietcong would take over and reap revenge on every man who opposed them. You would see the worst blood bath in modern history.

"Our presence in Vietnam encourages other Asian nations.

"Other countries, not as advanced as ourselves, gain encouragement to take on a more democratic government.

"We may not live to see it, but in time our sacrifices will bear fruit."

Congressman Casey said that he is sure that President Johnson is sensitive to the loss of American lives in the war, "more than any of us, I imagine, because he has to make the decision to send our boys over there."

"It would be easy for the President to dodge this grave responsibility and leave the problem for the next President," Casey said. "But with leadership comes responsibility—I don't envy the President."

Patriotism Rewarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Grimes-Kohl Post No. 1031 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Springfield, Ohio, sponsored a Vietnam Veterans' Day as a show of support for the estimated 70 men from the Clark County area who are fighting in Vietnam. The events included a parade through downtown Springfield in the afternoon, followed by a dinner honoring the fighting men and their families.

During the course of the observance Miss Sherrie Lynn Schneider, a sophomore at Springfield's North High School, was rewarded for patriotism as a result of a letter she wrote to the editor of the Springfield Daily News expressing her feelings about anti-Vietnam and draft protestors. Miss Schneider was designated by the VFW Post as "Miss Patriotism of Clark County" and was honored with a special presentation in recognition of this. In addition, she received a $25 U.S. Government savings bond from the Local No. 402 of the UAW-CIO. This local is made up of 4,000 employees of the Springfield Works of the International Harvester Co.

Such patriotism as expressed in Miss Schneider's letter certainly deserves reward, and the reward accorded it by the union and Grimes-Kohl Post certainly deserves recognition.

Under unanimous consent, it is my pleasure to insert Miss Schneider's letter in the Record:

To the Editor of the News:

Would you like to know what I feel about these misfits who protest the draft? Probably not, but I'll tell you anyway. These oddballs who think themselves very self-righteous are a bunch of lily-livered cowards. Anyone with brain one knows that Vietnam has gone beyond the talking stage.

I wonder if these dimwits realize that real live men—our neighbors and relatives—are out there spilling their precious blood to save their no good, stinking hides. They should be the ones to go over. Most of them aren't fit, however, for military service. The Army wants men, not pip-squeaks who don't have the nerve to fight for their country.

We really ought to deport them but that would be unfair battle tactics. I'd hate to see even a Communist having to put up with their atrocious behavior. It would take more than a psychiatrist to cure the Commies if the numskulls got to them.

Miss Sherrie Lynn Schneider.

Springfield, Ohio.

P.S.—I am 15, attending North High. Please excuse my writing, but I am so mad I can't see straight.

(An editor's note following Miss Schneider's letter read—Please excuse us, too. But it appears your vision is pretty good.)

Senate Committee Opens Hearings on Bank Holding Company Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency's Subcommittee on Financial Institutions today began hearings on legislation which would remove the exemptions to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

I congratulate the Senate committee and its distinguished chairman, Senator A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, who is also chairman of the full committee, for the work they are beginning on the bills before the committee, including H.R. 7371, which passed the House in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The bill, H.R. 7371, is a good bill and it is supported by the Federal Reserve Board, which has been trying to close the loopholes and exemptions in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 for the last decade. I am hopeful for positive and speedy action by the Senate on this important legislation. I include in the Congressional Record copies of my testimony before the committee and also the testimony of the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The statements follow:

Testimony of Congressman Charles E. Bennett, of Florida, Before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, March 16, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee in support of H.R. 7371 as it passed the House or of as much of it as you feel can be made law in this session of Congress.

In 1933 banks were prohibited by statute from also doing nonbanking business, the purpose of the statute being to eliminate conflicts of interest and the evils of monopoly. In 1956 bank holding companies were similarly prohibited; but many exemptions were allowed in the new statute. The Federal Reserve Board has recommended ending all of these exemptions and that is what the House bill before you does. It does nothing more.

The report on H.R. 6227, 84th Congress, which became the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, outlines the reasons for requiring bank holding companies to divest themselves of nonbanking businesses, and I would like to quote from that report:

"The reasons underlying the divestment requirement are simple. As a general rule, banks are prohibited from engaging in any other type of enterprise than banking itself. This is because of the danger to the depositors which might result where the bank finds itself, in effect, both the borrower and the lender. It is for this reason, among others, that statutes limiting the investments of banks have been passed by both the Congress and State legislatures.

"The bank holding company is under no such restriction. It may acquire and operate as many nonbanking businesses as it has funds and the disposition to acquire. There are in the country today, as has been pointed out previously, bank holding companies which, in addition to their investments in the stocks of banks, also control the operation of such nonbanking businesses as insurance, manufacture, real estate, mining, and a number of others.

"Whenever a holding company thus controls both banks and nonbanking businesses, it is apparent that the holding company's nonbanking businesses may thereby occupy a preferred position over that of their competitors in obtaining bank credit. It is also apparent that in critical times the holding company which operates nonbanking businesses may be subjected to strong temptation to cause the banks which it controls to make loans to its nonbanking affiliates even though such loans may not, at that time, be entirely justified in the light of current banking standards. In either situation the public interest becomes directly involved.

In the course of the Senate hearings, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin, Jr., testified that:

"Existing provisions of law, originally enacted in the Banking Act of 1933, have proved entirely inadequate to deal with the special problems created by bank holding companies."

Senate Report No. 1095, 84th Congress, 1st session, on this legislation, said of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956: "It represents a compromise."

In signing the act into law, President Eisenhower said: "As a result of the various exemptions and other provisions, the legislation falls short of achieving these objectives. * * * The exemptions and other special provisions will require the further attention of the Congress."

In every annual report to Congress since the passage of the 1956 act the Federal Reserve Board has recommended that the exemptions contained in the 1956 act be eliminated. My amendment to H.R. 7371 accepted by the House on a rollcall vote does exactly that and no more. Let me briefly discuss the exemptions that the House bill, as now amended, would remove.

1. First, of course, it would remove the exemption for the Alfred I. du Pont estate, the original sole purpose of H.R. 7371. This exemption is in general terms, applying to testamentary trusts and to community chests, funds, or foundations for religious,

charitable, or educational purposes; but, in fact, the Du Pont estate is the only known entity covered by the provisions of this exemption. My testimony, Mr. Chairman, is based on the principle of the banking acts passed in 1933 and 1956: It is not in the public interest to allow banks and nonbanking businesses to be under the same control and ownership and that it is desirable to remove all conflicts of interest and monopolies from banking businesses. Though the purposes for which the moneys of this estate are spent are worthy indeed, the public interest, as announced by the statutes in requiring separation of banking and nonbanking enterprises, applies as logically in this case as in any other. To hold otherwise would be as illogical as to say that all our antitrust laws would never apply when the profits go to charity. It is not that the recipients of the gains which are against the public interest but that the method of doing business is against the public interest, involving conflict of interests and monopoly.

The following are the exemptions eliminated by the amendment approved by the House by record vote before passage of H.R. 7371:

2. Where one bank is owned together with a nonbanking business. The logic of the principle of protecting the depositors from nonbanking involvements is just as applicable where there is only one bank as where there are two, the present number of banks required under the law. In fact, if a company controls only one large bank, that company's interests in extensive nonbanking businesses could lead to abuses even more serious than if the company controlled many small banks. An example of this would be a big rubber company such as Goodyear owning a bank or a big department store such as Macy's owning a bank. The Federal Reserve Board conducted a survey of organizations which might be covered under pending legislation and a large number of groups are included in a February 1966 report by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Moreover, it is not clear to me that without the adoption of this amendment there is not an open door in the statutes for a holding company to own a single large bank with many branches and with huge capitalization while at the same time engaging in extensive nonbanking business. This amendment would, by statute, close that door.

3. Where a company is a bank holding company which is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, and was so registered prior to May 15, 1955, or which is affiliated with any such company in such manner as to constitute an affiliated company within the meaning of such act, unless such company or such affiliated company directly owns 25 percent of the voting shares of each of two or more banks. There is no reason why an investment company should not be restricted from owning or acquiring bank holding companies in the same way other bank holding companies are. The exemption relates primarily to Financial General Corp.

4. Where a company has at least 80 percent of its total assets in the field of agriculture. I understand that this was designed for one company, Consolidated Naval Stores, which has now gone out of business. The exemption should not continue as an invitation to others to exploit in the future.

5. Where a company which is a bank holding company holds shares acquired prior to the enactment of the 1956 act. The Trust Co. of Georgia is at the present time under the exemption, and it is my understanding that this company owns over $38 million in the Coca-Cola Internatianl Corp. I can see no reason for the exemption.

6. Where a bank holding company is a labor, agriculture or horticulture organization and is exempt from taxes under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Several labor organizations, including the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, which I understand owns the controlling interest in the Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank in Chicago and the Amalgamated Bank of New York, and the United Mine Workers, which I understand owns a controlling interest in the National Bank of Washington, D.C., fall into this category. There is obviously no valid reason for such an exemption.

I remember, when I was a little boy, living a little bit in the country—part of my life in Kentucky, in a very rural area, with no electric lights—when I would go outside at night to the barn, or somewhere like that and I would carry an old kerosene lantern. It used to scare me to death, all the shadows that I would see around me. I told my grandmother about that and she said: "If you will hold that lamp in front of you and look at the light, you will have no trouble with the shadows."

So I believe in these hearings we ought to look at the principle; that is the light in this hearing and the shadows will go away.

The principle should be applied to all those organizations now exempt under the act of 1956. The Federal Reserve Board since 1958 has recommended that the exemptions be wiped out. The Comptroller of the Currency, commenting on September 20, 1965, about the original bill, H.R. 7371, dealing only with the Du Pont Estate, wrote:

"The proponents of this legislation are frank to admit that it is aimed at only one existing situation, the Alfred I du-Point Estate, a testamentary trust corporation.

"With regard to the intent of the bill as a whole, we do not believe it appropriate or desirable for Congress to amend a piece of legislation as important as the Bank Holding Company Act in order to take care of a single situation. The Federal Reserve Board and others have suggested amendments to the act of general application, having much greater importance in our opinion than the Du Pont Estate situation. Any unsolved problems of Government regulation inherent in the Du Pont Estate situation should, we believe, be handled only in the context of legislation which would have general application."

Some people say that it would be easier to pass this measure if it were directed at only one concern. They are clearly mistaken. In the first place, there is monumental opposition to a one shot approach in the House. It is led by the dean of the Florida delegation, Congressman ROBERT L. F. SIKES, and by the dean of the House, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York. The House debate shows this.

Although I would vote for the measure even if it covered only the Du Pont Estate, I believe that few in the Florida delegation would join me in that; and without that local support, usual procedures in the Congress would kill the bill automatically and immediately. Even a divided delegation might kill it. Moreover, the House has both in 1955 and in 1965 approved the elimination of the exemptions.

The record House vote on June 14, 1955, was 371 to 24; and the record House vote on September 23, 1965, was 199 to 178. There is no precedent for the one shot approach in either the House or the Senate. Finally, the entire elimination of all exemptions has already been passed by the House in this Congress; and if the Senate agrees on this measure there will be no conference between the Houses and the measure would become law immediately. Clearly, the broadest bill possible, within the framework of the amended House bill, has the best chance of passage.

The main headquarters for the Alfred I. du Pont estate are located in Jacksonville, Fla., in my congressional district. Mr. Du Pont died on April 29, 1935, and in his will he established a testamentary trust and directed his trustees to set up a corporation for charitable purposes to be designed and known as the Nemours Foundation.

At that time, 30 years ago, his widow, Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont, was 51 years of age, Edward Ball, Mrs. Du Pont's brother, trustee of the Alfred I. du Pont estate, was 47. Under the will, upon the death of Mrs. Du Pont, the entire income from the estate would go to the Nemours Foundation, after certain specific individual bequests were honored. Mr. Du Pont gave his widow an option, however. He said that if she chose to create the Nemours Foundation during her lifetime that with her authority the trustees of his estate could immediately pay over to the foundation the sum of $1 million to embark it on its charitable function. Mrs. Du Pont did that, and the foundation has been engaged in charitable works for the past 29 years.

In addition to the $1 million first payment to the foundation, Mrs. Du Pont has made an irrevocable assignment of 12-percent of her income from the estate to the Nemours Foundation. This 12-percent is tax free, under the law, as the funds go to charity, primarily to assistance and research in the prevention of crippling in children. The remaining 88 percent (approximately $8 million annually) of Mrs. Du Pont's income is taxable, and she annually pays some $5 million in taxes on this income. She has also made tremendous contributions to charities, particularly private colleges and universities.

The trustees of Mr. Du Pont's estate were given powes to engage in such business enterprises as they elected. Significantly, Mr. Du Pont envisioned the management of the estate as a going concern, and as the annuities established by Mr. Du Pont are fulfilled, 100 percent of the earnings of the estate will go to the Nemours Foundation.

The major enterprises in the Du Pont estate of Florida are 30 banks of the Florida National group of banks with deposits of $700 million, the St. Joe Paper Co., which employs over 1,300 persons with an annual payroll of $7.5 million in Florida alone, and the Florida East Coast Railway. The estate also owns a small railroad and telephone company in northwest Florida. A million acres of property both in rural and urban areas are owned by the estate.

The moving personalities behind these substantial enterprises and the Du Pont estate are Mrs. du Pont and her brother, Edward Ball. Their heritage included rich memories of dynamic Alfred I. du Pont, who pithily wrote on July 25, 1934: "My philosophy of life is exceedingly simple; be fair to everyone; do as much good as you can; be honest with yourself, which means, honest with everybody. * * * Competition is so bitter, and those who succeed have such a multitude of enemies that if one would keep one's head above water, one must struggle, and use such weapons as our Creator has provided."

The intelligent kindness and good works of Mrs. du Pont have been felt by millions of persons; while with independence, courage and intelligence Mr. Ball has given reality to the dual aspiration of Mr. du Pont to effectively assist in the building of a greater Florida and to provide for the charitable objectives of the will.

Mr. du Pont came to Florida as a permanent resident in the late 1920's. This was when Florida was suffering from an economic depression like that of which no other State in the Nation has ever gone through. He felt that the State had a great future, which many doubted at that time. He saw the bubble burst following the Florida land boom and he thought he could help shore up the faltering financial institutions in Florida and help the State through the deflationary period ahead. At this time half of Florida was insolvent. Not only individuals and corporations, but entire communities—municipalities, counties—eventually would be bankrupt and unable to meet interest on their obligations. Banks inevitably would go, one dragging down another.

During the summer of 1926, Mr. du Pont made up his mind to help rehabilitate Florida, and to spend the rest of his life at the task. He was 62 years old.

"We don't want any more money," Mr. du Pont said to Mrs. du Pont and to Ed Ball, "and we shall make none for some time. But in the long run the things we do, whatever they are, will have to pay. Profit is the water that turns the wheels of any sound economy. If what we do is to last it will have to be profitable for those who participate in it."

Mr. du Pont, as Marquis James pointed out in his excellent biography, "Alfred I. du Pont, the Family Rebel," was willing and ready to take the chance of building up Florida, and he quite plainly said: "We don't want any more money." When he died in 1935 he was reported to be worth between $55 and $65 million, and some $30 million went to Federal and State inheritance taxes. The Florida share of those taxes was paid ahead of schedule to assist the State in a financial emergency.

He was a rich man, but wealth was not an obsession. On January 15, 1935, he said: "It has been my firm conviction throughout life that it is the duty of everyone in the world to do what is within his power to alleviate human suffering. * * * It is, therefore, natural that I should desire after having made provision for the immediate members of my family and others whom I have seen fit to remember, that the remaining portion of my estate should be utilized for charitable needs."

At another time, Mr. du Pont told Mr. Ball and Mr. W. T. Edwards, a business associate: "Boys, we are now in Florida to live and work. We expect to spend the balance of our days here. We have all the money necessary for any reasonable effort to help Florida grow and develop. Our business undertakings should be sound, but our primary object should not be the making of more money. Through helpful works let's build up good in this State and make it a better place in which to live. In my last years I'd much rather have the people of Florida say that I had helped them and their State than to double the money I now have."

Mr. du Pont's intentions are well known; he and his estate have done much for Florida.

His primary interest in coming to Florida was banking. He gained control of the Florida National Bank at Jacksonville in 1929. At that time 80 banks of the 300 in Florida had failed. He acquired six other banks in Florida prior to his death in 1935: Lakeland and Bartow in 1929; Orlando, Daytona Beach, and St. Petersburg in 1930, and Miami in 1931.

Between 1929 and 1931, 119 banks closed in Florida and $30 million was lost. Mr. du Pont thought this was deplorable and that there should have been stronger restrictions on banks and bankers to insure against these failures in the future. He said in 1930: "Florida has lacked a conservative banking system. Banks are public trusteeships. Their primary object should be the safe custodianship of the money entrusted to them, not the making of money for their shareholders. If all Florida banks had had this in mind there would have been no failures."

Mr. du Pont was acclaimed far and wide for his banking intelligence. Winthrop W. Aldrich, president of the Chase National Bank, said: "I consider Mr. Alfred I. Du Pont's banking activities in Florida one of the finest phases of banking organization I have ever known."

Time magazine reported: "When about two and a half years ago Florida's banking structure was toppling a strong man came to save it. He was Alfred Irenee du Pont, stormiest of the great Wilmington family. * * * To Florida he brought new, sound banks, all with the name Florida National."

In 1931 and 1932 the rest of the country felt what Florida had felt in prior years: Six hundred and fifty-five depositories failed and frightened patrons withdrew $400 million from those remaining.

His banking philosophy was in line with those who called for more control of banks to protect the depositor. He was for placing banks under Federal Reserve Board authority; stricter regulation of private banks; divorcing Federal Reserve member banks from investment affiliates; interest on demand deposits to cease; officers barred from borrowing from their own banks.

Mr. du Pont said in strong language for a multimillionaire: "I have always espoused the cause of a much wider distribution of national wealth, and the use of gibbet and halter on men of wealth, who, by virtue of their basic acquisitions and by the power vested in their possessions, only build toward their own aggrandizement. The handling of all funds of others, as in the case of bankers, should be based on the acceptance of such funds as a sacred trust, and any thought of any violation of this principle should not be tolerated."

In the 1930's Mr. du Pont began to invest in land in northwest Florida, which was then a vast wasteland. He also bought a million dollars worth of urban property in Florida.

Without knowing what could be done or how it could be done. Mr. du Pont came to the conclusion that northwest Florida held possibilities as a laboratory for an experiment at bettering the lot of unfortunate people, living in some cases amid conditions socially and economically lower than those of the peasantry of Western Europe. He felt there was a real challenge to improve the life of that area. At one time in Mr. du Pont's life he had 466,747 acres of land in northwest Florida. In 1934 and 1935 he sold 186,747 acres to the U.S. Government for inclusion in the Apalachicola National Forest. At his death he had 280,000 acres, an investment of $1 million.

His interests in the Panhandle section of Florida have meant much to the people who live there. His organization of the St. Joe Paper Co. in 1935 and the purchase of the rundown Apalachicola Northern Railroad Co. and the St. Joseph Telephone & Telegraph Co. spurred the development of northwest Florida. He had a great deal to lose in this endeavor but he was interested in seeing Florida grow and its people live a good life. With private capital in the 1930's he was developing a depressed area, not unlike what the taxpayer's dollars are doing today through area redevelopment in other areas of our country.

I have gone into this detail because I think there are few parallels in history of a wealthy man setting out to use his wealth so constructively for an adopted State. Florida had another such benefactor known and admired by Du Pont but of an earlier vintage Henry Flagler, who built the Florida East Coast Railroad, now owned by the Du Pont Estate. Marquis James, Du Pont's biographer, felt that Flagler's deeds were a part of the inspiration of Du Pont to undertake what he did in Florida.

The Du Pont Estate was exempted from the Bank Holding Act of 1956 because of its special nature as a testamentary trust. Congress felt that the exemption was right in 1956. However, the Federal Reserve Board, having observed the workings of this law enacted in 1956, felt that no exemptions should be allowed; and I share this conclusion. To allow this exemption to continue is to violate the principle underlying the 1933 act and also the 1956 act, namely that it is not in the public interest to have banking and nonbanking business in the same hand because of conflict of interest and monopoly.

It is my belief that if Mr. Alfred I. du Pont were alive today he would approve of the divestiture of the financial empire which bears his name and which now includes 30 Florida National Banks, the St. Joe Paper Co., the Florida East Coast Railway and a million acres of rural and urban land. Remember that Mr. du Pont said: "I have always espoused the cause of a much wider distribution of national wealth, and the use of gibbet and halter on men of wealth."

The process of divestiture can be very helpful to the general and local economy and to all involved.

Generally speaking, divestment under the Bank Holding Company Act has been beneficial to those stockholders concerned, and is best illustrated by the cases of General Bancshares Corp., First Security Corp., Transamerica Corp., and Financial General Corp. All of these divestments show definite profit return or promise of profit return to all parties concerned.

On December 31, 1958, General Bancshares transferred to a new holding company, General Contract Finance Corp., all shares of its directly held nonbanking subsidiaries (consisting of finance, loan, and insurance businesses). At the same time, all stock of the new holding company was distributed to the stockholders of the General Bancshares Corp. on a share-for-share basis. In the 1959 annual report to the stockholders, Arthur Blumeyer, chairman of the board of directors, made the startling admission that "with our activities now confined to management of the banks, it is not unreasonable to predict increased effectiveness in promoting their growth and power," clearly demonstrating the soundness of prohibiting banks from engaging in any other type of enterprise than banking itself. Even greater strength is added to the chairman's comment when we see the elimination here of the danger to the depositors' funds, which results where the bank is in *effect both the lender* and the borrower.

At the time of divestment General Contract Finance Corp. stock was market valued at $9 a share. Thus, from receiving a share of General Contract Finance Corp. stock for each share of General Bancshares stock held, the *General Bancshares stockholder* made an immediate profit of $9 on each share owned. The banks themselves also profited following divestment. Net earnings in 1958 from banking by General Bancshares were $1,917,000, but only 1 year later, after divestment of nonbanking business, profits from these same banks rose to $2,340,028, an increase *of $423,028 over the previous year.*

To carry out divestment of its finance, investment and agricultural businesses under order of the Federal Reserve Board, the First Security Corp. changed its name to First Security Investment Co. on September 15, 1959, and transferred to First Security Corp. all of its stock in banking subsidiaries, and received in return all of First Security's common stock. All of the First Security stock was distributed among the shareholders of First Security Investment Co. on a share-for-share basis. Immediately following divestment First Security Investment Co. stock held a market value of $7 a share, and First Security Corp. stock remained at $61.50, netting the stockholder of the old First Security Corp. a profit of $7 a share for each share formerly held. Furthermore, net earnings from First Security Co. banks in 1959 were $5,351,033. Net earnings for these same banks in 1960, 1 year after divestment of nonbanking business, were $5,691,561, an increase in profits over 1959 of $340,534.

On August 31, 1958, Transamerica Corp. controlled 23 commercial banks, with 322 banking offices, located throughout 11 Western States. It also owned machinery manufacturing, food packing, loan, finance, and insurance businesses. On September 1, 1958, Transamerica transferred to First American Corp., a newly formed holding company (shortly thereafter to be renamed Western Bancorp—the name it presently holds) all of its bank stock, in exchange for which it received all of First America's capital stock. Transamerica then distributed all of the shares it had received to its stockholders on a share-for-share basis. On the day of divestment Transamerica stock held a market value of $24.50 a share. The next day of business by the New York Stock Exchange Transamerica had risen $1.15 a share, and the new holding company traded for $19.25 a share.

Thus, from the seemingly unfortunate compulsory divestment action, there resulted a direct and immediate profit to each stockholder of $20.40 for each share of Transamerica previously held by him. But not only the stockholders profited from divestment. Net earnings by First America banks in 1958, following their divestment by Transamerica, showed a spectacular profit of $1,799,781 over net earnings from the same banks the year before. The tremendous sudden growth in profits by these banks was due in large part to the increase of nearly 82,000 deposit accounts with First American in its first 6 months of operation. This amazing 10-percent increase in patronage of the former Transamerica banks certainly seems to indicate large-scale approval of the change in ownership, and vividly demonstrates divestiture in this case made a great contribution to the future growth of these banks.

Financial General presently owns 26 subsidiary and affiliate banks with deposits totaling over $1 billion. Principal nonbanking business consists of underwriting nearly all types of insurance, clothing manufacturing, consumer credit plans, and the manufacture of numerous types of packaging machinery.

Last year, in hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Gen. George Olmsted, chairman of the Board of Financial General Corp., stated that inclusion of Financial General under the Bank Holding Company Act, and application of the divestment provisions, would "have a harsh effect upon innocent investors" and "could have far-reaching repercussions upon Financial General's 16,000 common stockholders and its security holders." But in the same year, a few months later, General Olmsted predicted that forced divestment of nonbanking business would increase the value of the corporations common stock from its present value of $15.35 (up $1.35 following the announcement) to around $35 a share; a tidy profit for the stockholders at the time of divestment.

While these are only a few of the divestments that have occurred or will occur through passage of amendments to the Bank Holding Company Act, these cases clearly illustrate the general pattern showing divestment under the Bank Holding Company Act is not necessarily detrimental, and is usually a profitable undertaking.

From these illustrations, and knowing the business and profitmaking abilities of the Du Pont estate and the principal officers of the companies and banks its controls, I have little doubt that they could emulate the above illustrations. What we would then have, should the Du Pont estate exemption be eliminated, is a banking group run by the estate, or the other businesses being run by the estate.

The economy of Florida is sound enough to support the separate entities of the Du Pont Estate, and I would expect if other huge banking and nonbanking establishments like those mentioned previously can make huge profits from divestiture, then the Du Pont trust companies can also expect to profit by a split up. One reason they will be able to profit is because Alfred I. du Pont helped Florida to become the State it now is—the fastest growing large State in the Union. Without the umbrella of the Du Pont Estate, the banks, the railroad, the paper company, the telephone company, the land interests can expect to grow with Florida just as they have since 1930.

I believe that the Du Pont Estate is violating the underlying principle of the banking act; that allowing banking and nonbanking interests to be held together in the same ownership is against the public interest. We must keep that in front of us.

To the extent possible we should include in this legislation an end to all of the exemptions covered by the amended House bill, not only because this increases the chances of the passage of the law but also because fundamentally we are dealing with a broad and sound principle; and as Mr. Ball himself said in the House hearings: "Why not make a general application and put everybody under it?"

Statement of William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, March 16, 1966

The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 has two chief objectives. The first is to prevent undue concentration of control over banks in the hands of any holding company, and the second is to prevent any holding company from controlling both banks and nonbanking business. The act prohibits formation of a bank holding company without the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and prohibits existing bank holding companies from acquiring more than 5 percent of any bank's voting shares without the Board's approval. It also prohibits a bank holding company from engaging in any business other than banking, or acquiring more than 5 percent of the voting shares of any such business, and requires the holding company to divest any such interests previously acquired. In addition, it prohibits any subsidiary bank from lending to or investing in its parent holding company or any other subsidiary.

The principal issue presented by the bills before you this morning relates to the coverage of the Bank Holding Company Act. For every holding company now registered under the act, there are 10 or more that are exempt, chiefly because the act does not cover one-bank holding companies. The Board sees no basis in logic or equity for this exemption, and recommends its repeal.

While there would obviously be no need for the act to cover one-bank holding companies if its only purpose were to prevent any holding company from acquiring too many banks, it seems just as clear that coverage of one-bank holding companies is necessary to accomplish the act's second objective. In this connection, let me quote from this committee's 1955 report on the act:

"Bank holding companies should confine their activities to the control and management of banks and activities closely related to banking. They should not combine management and control of banking activities with management and control of nonbanking activities. The divestment requirements in this bill are designed to remove the danger that a bank holding company might misuse or abuse the resources of a bank it controls in order to gain an advantage in the operation of the nonbanking activities it controls." (S. Rept. No. 1095, 84th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 13–14.)

Abuses could come about "by requiring the bank's customers to make use of such nonbanking enterprises as a condition of doing business with the bank," as the committee report pointed out (p. 5), or they could take the form of denying credit to competitors of the bank's fellow subsidiaries. When a builder seeks a construction loan from a bank, the loan should be made or denied without regard to whether the applicant will buy his lumber from a supplier that is owned by the same holding company that owns the bank. When an automobile dealer seeks to discount his customers' paper at a bank, the bank's decision should not be complicated by questions of how it will affect the competitive position of another automobile dealership owned by the bank's parent company. If a holding company is a finance company, the bank's decisions as to whether it should make automobile loans directly should not be influenced by considerations as to whether its activities would take business away from its parent finance company.

If you ask whether the Board can cite specific examples of such abuses among the hundreds of one-bank holding companies in existence today, the answer is "No." Presumably, the organizers of these companies are neither more nor less scrupulous than their counterparts in other businesses. But for companies now registered under the act, no proof of actual abuses was required.

The Congress decided, and the Board agreed, that even in the absence of such proof, the potentiality for abuse in the relationships between holding company, bank subsidiary, and nonbank subsidiary was sufficiently great to require divestment of nonbank businesses. The Board believed then, and continues to believe, that this is just as true for one-bank holding companies as for two-bank companies. We subscribe to another principle laid down in your committee's report, that "in general all bank holding companies should be required to observe the same ground rules concerning formation and operation, insofar as Federal legislation is concerned" (id. at p. 14).

While it may be argued that multibank holding companies should be treated differently from one-bank holding companies because their operations have a greater impact on our economy, the facts are that a finance company with assets of $3 billion now controls a single bank with deposits of three quarters of a billion dollars; the total deposits of the banks shown on the list of one-bank holding companies recently published by this committee is about $15 billion compared with about $26 billion for the subsidiary banks of all registered bank holding companies. Moreover, about one-fourth of the one-bank holding companies on the list are found in one-bank towns. In such situations, it is particularly desirable that the bank's credit decisions be based solely on creditworthiness.

Let me turn now to questions of what kinds of organizations should be included in the definition of "company." At the outset, it may be asked why the act now covers only companies, and does not apply to control exercised by an individual. It is, of course, possible for an individual to achieve the sort of domination of a banking market that the act seeks to prevent a company from obtaining. The same conflicts of interest could be also arise where an individual controls a bank and a nonbanking business. But the need to regulate this kind of activity on the part of individuals is not as great as it is for corporations, because individuals generally are more limited than are corporations in their ability to attract capital for expansion, and because control by individuals generally is diffused when they die.

The decision to cover corporations but exempt individuals entails some difficulty in deciding whether to cover holdings by groups of individuals associated together in some form other than a corporation. The act now covers many such forms of association by defining "company" to include (with certain exceptions) "any corporation, business trust, association, or similar organization." It excludes partnerships, however. The Board is not aware of any need to disturb this exclusion. Admittedly, there are exceptions to the broad generalizations that corporations have longer lives, and obtain capital more easily, than partnerships. But the Board is inclined to believe that the same reasons that support an exemption for individuals also support—though to a lesser degree—the exemption for partnerships.

The next question arises when an individual extends his control over banks beyond his death, as is commonly done through testamentary trusts established for the benefit of a widow or children. The Board sees good reason to exempt the ordinary family trust which may be regarded as only a temporary extension of the control originally exercised by the individual who established the trust. But when a will creates a trust that is perpetual, with trustees who are not only replaceable but are authorized and indeed obliged to manage the trust's affairs so that it may grow and prosper, the Board believes that the line between control by individuals and control by corporations has been crossed, and that such a trust should be subject to the act just as a corporation should. Again, it is not easy to draw a line between trusts that should be exempt and those that should be covered. We believe, after further study, that the provision we originally suggested, which is now incorporated in S. 2353, would probably cover some family trusts that should be exempt, such as a trust for the benefit of surviving children who might not be named in the trust instrument. We now suggest, therefore, that the bill be amended to exclude from coverage trusts that must terminate within 21 years after the death of individual beneficiaries living when the trusts become effective.

By far the largest trust that would be covered by the bills before you is that established in 1936 under the will of Alfred I. du Pont. In testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee last year, Edward Ball, cotrustee of the Du Pont estate, described the effect of Mr. Du Pont's will as follows:

"In that will, after making some preliminary bequests, he established a testamentary trust, appointed trustees, and made his wife the beneficiary of the income from that trust as long as she lived. Mrs. Du Pont is 81 years old. Upon her death, all of the income from the trust properties will be paid to the Nemours Foundation, which is the beneficiary of the trust. The Nemours Foundation is a tax-exempt, charitable foundation and provides care for crippled children, for incurables, and aged men and women. * * * It is a trust in perpetuity, and it is a charitable trust" (hearings on H.R. 7371, p. 44).

According to Mr. Ball's 1964 testimony before the same committee, the Nemours Foundation is a corporation, created in 1937, which embarked upon its charitable function with $1 million paid over to it from the Du Pont estate. "Mrs. du Pont has made an irrevocable assignment of 12 percent of her income from the estate to the Nemours Foundation," Mr. Ball added. "Last year (1963) this amounted to $1,008,026.71. Upon her death, the additional 88 percent, which last year amounted to $7,384,862.57, will go to the foundation." (Hearings on H.R. 10668 and H.R. 10872, p. 227.)

The testimony further indicates that when the Bank Holding Company Act was enacted, the estate controlled 24 banks and 5 nonbanking enterprises, doing business in real estate, insurance, safe deposit box rentals, small resort operation, and the manufacture of paper and pulp products. One of the five nonbanking corporations, the St. Joe Paper Co., owned 100 percent of the stock of six other companies—including a railroad, a telephone and telegraph company, and a warehousing company—and 50 percent of the stock of a corporation that manufactured cardboard containers. It also owned 52 percent of the defaulted bonds of the Florida East Coast Railway Co., in receivership at the time. The railroad emerged from receivership in 1961, under the control of the estate. The banks in the Florida National gorup controlled by the estate expanded from 24 in 1956 to 31 last year; the number has now dropped to 30. These banks are listed on page 7 of the committee print of February 1966, listing the organizations covered by S. 2353.

A handful of other trusts are included in the published list. They include some employee-benefit trusts, which presumably are perpetual, and a few perpetual charitable trusts. We know very little about these trusts, and it is possible that some of them should not be on the list. In the survey we conducted at your chairman's request, on which this list is based, many other banks reported that 25 percent or more of their voting shares were held by trustees, but it is impractical to investigate each of these instances to determine whether the trust would be covered under the proposed amendment.

One of the bills before you, S. 2418, provides that where two trusts have a common beneficiary or trustee they shall be presumed to control each other unless the Board determines that the presumption should not apply. While this provision seems unnecessarily broad, the Board recognizes that coverage of trusts poses special problems in connection with the divestiture requirements of section 4 of the act, and that some provision may be needed to prevent a token divestment to a newly created trust controlled by the same trustees. We recommend that you consider amending section 4 by adding a provision to the effect that divestment to any trust having one or more trustees in common with the divesting trust shall not be considered as an effective divestment.

If the committee agress that long-term trust should be covered, conforming amendments will be required, as indicated in the attachment at the end of my statement.

The third principal change in coverage recommended by the Board is to delete the present exemption for registered investment companies and their affiliates. This exemption is now enjoyed exclusively by the the Financial General Corp., a company that is not, itself, registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, but is affiliated with Equity Corp., a registered company. The Board does not agree with the contention that because companies registered under the 1940 act are supervised by the Securities and Exchange Commission there is no need for regulation under the Bank Holding Company Act. The SEC has no authority to prevent an affiliate of a registered investment company from expanding its control over banks or combining banks with nonbanking businesses. SEC supervision of such affiliates is for an entirely different purpose, and is limited to dealings between the affiliate and the registered investment company.

Financial General now owns one subsidiary, Empire Shares Corp., which is a registered bank holding company owning three banks in New York. In addition, Financial General owns 18 other subsidiary corporations, each of which owns 1 bank; 2 of these banks are in the District of Columbia, 1 in Georgia, 4 in Maryland, 1 in Tennessee, and 10 in Virginia. Nonbanking interests of Financial General include firms engaged in life insurance, fire and casualty insurance, industrial and manufacturing activities, lease financing, and mortgage banking.

Financial General is exempt from the Bank Holding Company Act because of a provision in section 2(a) excluding from the definition of "bank holding company" any company "which is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, and was so registered prior to May 15, 1955 (or which is affiliated with any such company in such manner as to constitute an affiliated company within the meaning of such act), unless such company (or such affiliated company), as the case may be, directly owns 25 per centum or more of the voting shares of each of two or more banks." Under the Investment Company Act two companies are "affiliated with" each other if either owns as much as 5 percent of the other's stock. Financial General is "affiliated with" Equity Corp., because the latter owns approximately 15 percent of Financial General's stock. Neither Equity nor Financial General directly owns 25 percent of the stock of any bank, because in each case the bank stock is held by a separate holding company that is a subsidiary of Financial General.

This exemption has enabled Financial General not only to continue to operate banks and nonbank businesses, but also to expand its banking interests considerably since enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act. The company's latest annual report observed that it "is now the largest interstate banking group in the East, and sixth largest banking group in the United States." Of the 21 banks under its control, 15 have been acquired since enactment. This expansion took place in several different States, despite the fact that Financial General's principal place of business is in the District of Columbia. For companies covered by the act, acquisitions of a bank outside the holding company's home State are prohibited unless the acquisition is "specifically authorized by the statute laws of the State in which such bank is located, by language to that effect and not merely by implication."

Although only one company has thus far taken advantage of this exemption, it is available for use by others. Any company wishing to take advantage of this loophole may do so by acquiring 5 percent of the stock of any of the roughly 300 investment companies that were registered before May 15, 1955. The Board believes that this possibility for escaping regulation under the act should be eliminated by repeal of the exemption.

The Board also believes that nonprofit corporations engaged in charitable, educational, or religious activities should not be permitted to acquire banks free of regulation, or to combine banking and nonbanking businesses. We see no reason to assume that organizations of this kind are immune, because of their nature, from the potentialities for trouble that exist in the case of ordinary business corporations. The Board accordingly recommends repeal of the exemption for charitable, educational, and religious organizations now included in section 2(b)(2) of the act.

The original Bank Holding Company Act included tax provisions designed to make sure that those who are forced to dispose of property because of the divestment requirements of the act will not suffer unfavorable tax consequences. The Board believes that this same principle should apply to divestitures required as a result of the amendments now under consideration.

In addition to a broadening of the act to cover holding companies that are now exempted, the Board recommends changes with respect to dealings between subsidiary banks and their parent holding companies or fellow subsidiaries. Section 6 of the act prohibits any "upstream" or "cross-stream" loans or investments by a subsidiary bank—"upstream" meaning from the bank to the holding company, and "cross-stream" meaning from the bank to another subsidiary (which must, under the act, be another bank or closely related business).

The Board believes that this prohibition is too rigid, in that it prevents some portfolio adjustments between subsidiary banks that are legitimate and economically beneficial. We recognize the need for limits on upstream and cross-stream credit, and believe that this can be accomplished readily by applying section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act. Section 23A prohibits any bank that is a member of the Federal Reserve System from extending credit (through loans or investments) totaling more than 10 percent of its capital and surplus to any one affiliate, or more than 20 percent for all affiliates. We recommend that this limitation be applied to all insured banks (whether or not they are members of the Federal Reserve System) and that the definitions of "affiliate" be broadened to cover bank holding companies and their subsidiaries.

These are the principal changes involved in the bills before you. All three bills would cover long-term trusts and repeal the exemption for registered investment companies and their affiliates. In addition, all three bills would repeal the exemption for nonprofit charitable, religious, or educational organizations. S. 2353, introduced by your chairman at the Board's request, and H.R. 7371, which passed the House of Representatives last September, would also repeal an exemption for agricultural companies that is probably meaningless now although it was designed in 1956 to cover a special case, and would repeal two other special exemptions from the requirement that bank holding companies must divest their interests in nonbanking businesses. One of these exempts certain labor, agricultural, and horticultural organizations from the divestment requirement. The other allows a bank that is also a holding company to keep nonbank stock it owned before the act was enacted. In sum, the Board recommends, and the House of Representatives has approved, extending coverage under the act in seven respects. Three of these changes are incorporated in S. 2418. The different effects of the three bills as to coverage are shown on page 2 of the committee print published by your committee in November of 1965.

In addition, S. 2353 would, as I have explained, substitute limitations on "upstream" and "cross-stream" credit for the prohibitions now contained in section 6 of the act. S. 2353 also includes a number of other amendments which are largely technical. These are explained in the memorandum that accompanied my letter to your chairman submitting the legislation; this memorandum is reproduced in the November 1965 committee print. Rather than taking your time now to go through the technicalities of these changes, perhaps I can best assist you by responding to questions you may have regarding the three bills.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO S. 2353

On page 5, strike line 24, and on page 6, strike lines 1 through 4, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)) is amended by striking the words 'for the benefit of the shareholders of such bank' at the end of clause (i) and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'under a trust that constistitutes a company as defined in section 2(b)'."

On page 7, strike lines 20 through 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) shares held or acquired by a bank in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held under a trust that constitutes a company as defined in section 2(b);"

Explanation: Section 2 of S. 2353 would broaden the definition of "company" to include long-term trusts. The technical amendments above are conforming amendments, to make sure that the exemptions now contained in section 3(a) and section 4(c) of the 1956 Act for shares held by a bank in a fiduciary capacity will not be construed to exempt any long-term trust where the trustee is a bank. These exemptions are needed to permit banks to continue to hold shares of stock in banks and other companies in the course of their trust business, but they should be limited to short-term trusts, such as those established by will to take care of the spouse and children of the testator.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, I outlined to the House how the administration from various appropriations had set aside about $8 billion to try to buy the people's votes with their own money in the months preceding the elections this fall.

I now have a document which seems to me to offer proof this already has begun. It is a report sent all farmers in Jefferson County, W. Va., by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Presumably this follows a national administration program.

By unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD pertinent portions of this report, noting that payments obviously will be made before the fall elections:

[From the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service News of Jefferson County]

THE 1966 WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

In prior years the signup for the wheat program was in the fall and the feed grain signup was conducted in the spring. This year both signups are being conducted together. Farmers with a feed grain base and a wheat allotment may participate in either or both programs.

If you have wheat planted for harvest, within your allotment, you should at least check into the program. It is possible that you may be able to qualify for a payment of better than $100 per acre for the minimum acreage diverted. The minimum requirement is to divert 15 percent of your allotment. This is not deducted from the allotment but is added to it.

The feed grain program offers an opportunity for producers to cut down on the acreage of grains produced and still maintain an income from the feed grains. Come in and discuss this program with us.

The signup period for these programs will end on April 1, 1966.

CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

This is a new program for 1966. It is designed to take land out of crop production for periods of from 5 to 10 years. Cropland adjustment program applies only to a wheat allotment or a feed grain base. The only exception is tame hay, which is eligible under certain conditions. The payment rate per year for tame hay will average $4.50 per acre.

NOTE.—We have had numerous inquiries about a land retirement program, which is being referred to as soil bank. Cropland adjustment program is a retirement program, but is not the old soil bank program. Retirement of whole farms has been the big question. Pastureland and woodland is not eligible for retirement.

The signup is on a first-come, first-serve basis.

One-for-One Vote Not Infallible Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the March 4 edition of the New World the publication of the Catholic archdiocese of Chicago, Columnist Richard Pattee discusses in a most succinct fashion one of the great inconsistencies and complications in foreign affairs:

The article follows:

ONE-FOR-ONE VOTE NOT INFALLIBLE IDEA

(By Richard Pattee)

The essence of the current Rhodesian controversy is the matter of majority rule—the idea that has become prevalent that the only acceptable arangement is a mathematical one in which each person in the community has a vote and the majority rules.

The danger of this facile concept ought to be obvious to everyone. When applied in nations where the level of education is reasonably high, it may have a certain logic. In areas where the mass of the population is illiterate, it is clearly a principle that leads inevitably to tyranny and to the worst sort of demagogery.

Rhodesia has long had as part of its political practice the idea that a man becomes eligible for voting as a result of at least a minimum of education. There was never any formula in vogue which placed limitations on the black man simply because of his color. The whole thesis of the Wilson government is that unless a majority, no matter what it represents, comes into power, the situation in that central African country is wrong and must be rectified.

The curious thing is that many other lands which are even less favorably situated from this point of view than Rhodesia have discovered that the one man, one vote rule of political life is utterly unrealistic.

A constitutional commission appointed by President Ayub Kahn of Pakistan to discover the reasons for the failure of parliamentary democracy in that country concluded that: "In the circumstances, a person who cannot read or write and has no compelling necessity to acquaint himself with the merits of the various candidates cannot be trusted to discharge the functions of the voter merely because he may be shrewd in local matters."

The argument was raised in Pakistan that the Communists would undoubtedly exploit any restriction of the suffrage. The reply was that an ignorant, illiterate electorate was much more of a likely victim for Communist action than any other kind.

In 1965 a constitutional conference was held in the Fiji islands for the purpose of working out the basis of a future independence. The conclusion here was quite categorical: "It recognizes that elections on a straight common-roll basis are not practical for Fiji until a greater degree of integration of the communities has been achieved."

These islands happen to be divided between the indigenous population and a large number of Indians who have settled there. As long as ignorance prevails on a large scale, it seemed senseless to work out arrangements for the full participation of the entire population on a head-for-head basis.

The Charter of the United Nations recognizes clearly that there are levels of development and that it is impossible to propose identical solutions for every part of the world regardless of the stage of evolution it has attained.

One remembers vividly the tribes in New Guinea off the coast of Australia whose principal grievance is that they are not allowed to purchase Lyndon Johnson as their Chief. It is doubtful that the electoral process would work particularly well among those who are obscessed with this particular fancy.

The Rhodesian question involves many issues. But the one that is often singled out, that of absolute and immediate majority rule, ought to be submitted to a most careful examination before judgment is passed.

Taft Comments on Article

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the January 17 issue of Newsweek magazine carried an article on the choice of Robert C. Henry as mayor of Springfield, Ohio. Former Congressman Robert Taft, Jr., wrote a letter to the editor of Newsweek commenting on that article.

Inasmuch as the editor did not see fit to print the letter in the letters to the editor column, under unanimous consent I include Mr. Taft's letter in the Record.

January 17, 1966.

Newsweek Editor,
New York, N.Y.

Gentlemen: While I noted with interest your column of January 17 on Ohio and the happy choice of Robert Henry as mayor of the city of Springfield, your account of the history of race relations in the area in question is not entirely fair and accurate and may give a poor impression of the area.

Ohio prides itself as a State leading in the progress of the civil rights revolution, and this particular area of the State has long been involved in the civil rights movement, starting from the pre-Civil War days when it was a most important segment of the underground railroad of escaped slaves. For many years neighboring Greene County has been the site of two Negro (now integrated) institutions of higher learning. The area's Representative to the U.S. Congress for many years was the late Clarence Brown, now succeeded by his able son Clarence Brown, Jr., and he was a vital figure in Congress in passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Contrary to the impressions given by your article, there have been instances of political recogntion of Negroes in this part of Ohio. One example was the appointment by Clarence Brown in 1927 of Carl Jenkins as State statistician, a job Brown himself had first held.

None of this, of course, in any way detracts from the noteworthy and responsible progress being made in this part of Ohio, as exemplified by the election of Mayor Henry, Cincinnati Municipal Judge William Lovelace, Cincinnati Councilman Myron Bush in 1965, and of State Representative David Albritton during the last several years.

Hopefully we will continue and add to such progress. This area must be one where there will be no slackening in the search for equality of opportunity for all.

Sincerely,

Robert Taft, Jr.

San Leandro, Calif., Surmounts Many of the Problems That Plague Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, San Leandro, Calif., an important community in my congressional district, has recently been focused upon in a special article written by Lewis Phelps in the March 4 issue of the Wall Street Journal. This community has the unique distinction of setting a record during the past 18 years of steadily reducing local taxation. This has been done in the face of ever-increasing tax rates by municipal, State, and local governments throughout our country.

At the same time the people of San Leandro have benefited from local taxes, they have also benefited from increased municipal services. These have included a marina and beach development, which is second to none along the Pacific coast; a $2 million library; a new civic center complex; a city hall; a courthouse; added park and recreational facilities; and a downtown revitalization program.

These achievements have been made possible through a balanced working relationship between industrial, commercial, and recreational interests. The dynamic mayor of this community, the Honorable Jack Maltester; his progressive city manager, Wesley McClure; the vice mayor, William Swift; and the city council deserve a high degree of praise for what is being done in this community of 73,000 people.

The downtown revitalization program is being carried out without Federal support. San Leandro was doing its own beautification program before the Federal Government decided to sponsor such a commendable activity nationwide.

I believe that the Wall Street Journal article is an excellent compliment to the leadership and people of San Leandro and I am pleased to insert it in the Congressional Record. I also want to insert in the Record a story from the San Leandro Morning News, which is the daily newspaper for the city, in which a report is given concerning the aforementioned article.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 4, 1966]

MODEL MUNICIPALITY—SAN LEANDRO, CALIF., MANAGES TO SURMOUNT MANY OF THE PROBLEMS THAT PLAGUE CITIES

(By Lewis Phelps)

San Leandro, Calif.—It's almost an urban dweller's dream. New city facilities spring up like mushrooms, yet property taxes decrease. The city refuses to expand the police force, yet the crime rate drops. The city rejects Federal aid, yet the downtown face-lifting that aid would have paid for proceeds apace. And somebody builds a municipal golf course free of charge.

It's all happening in this prosperous little city (population 72,000) just south of Oakland on the eastern side of San Francisco Bay. While most cities suffer the seemingly unending cycle of bigger budgets, rising taxes, and still bigger budgets, San Leandro has somehow managed to get all the benefits of lavish public spending while putting a surprisingly small bite on the local taxpayers.

It's true the effort has included wooing a little more industry to town than some of the local citizenry would like to see—but most cities would envy such success. Equally important, this growth has been accompanied by some inventiveness in holding down costs. Furthermore, the city has engaged in some of the long-range planning critics say many of the Nation's cities continue to lack.

The planning started way back in 1947, when San Leandro was a semiagricultural community of 20,000 population. The key step was passage of a bond issue to finance installation of sewer lines. Where? Through acres of otherwise undeveloped cherry orchards and tomato fields on the city's outskirts. With land still cheap and the sewers already in, industry came flocking from Oakland and San Francisco, where land was already dear.

San Leandro has added other attractions aimed at luring industry—but all stopping short of the outright financial aid that some city industrial development authorities have resorted to.

"We moved our plant to San Leandro because we needed some room for expansion, and did not have it where we were before," says Russell L. McGinnis, plant manager for International Harvester Co. "We've found other benefits. Besides lower tax rates than any other city in the area that could provide utilities, San Leandro has a city government that really works with industry. For instance, they've been holding off tract development and saving a lot of their available land for industry, to keep the tax base strong and taxes low."

INDUSTRY HELPS ON COSTS

Since 1947, some 600 companies have moved to town, adding about $200 million in property to the tax roles. Industry now pays more than a third of the cost of government in San Leandro, 57 percent of the sales taxes and 45 percent of the property taxes.

With such growth, and the tax revenue potential that has come with it, it's all the more surprising that the city fathers have kept such a tight rein on costs. They've avoided borrowing—there's been only one bond issue, for a library, since the 1947 sewer bonds. And typical of the close watch they keep on expenses are these moves:

When a new public safety building is completed early next year, the city will pool the dispatching teams for police, fire, and general communications. Compared with present separate facilities, this will cut the communications staff to 6 men from 10.

When an addition to the 30-year-old city hall was built in 1964, offices were arranged so that clerks and typists could work in several departments rather than being pigeonholed in one. The saving: "Several" jobs, a city official says.

To revise the city's comprehensive land-use data, the city eschewed hiring another full-time city planner in favor of a college graduate student in city planning who wanted a summer's experience. His salary: $469 a month compared with $782 for a full-fledged planner.

To get a second public golf course, the city struck a deal with a rubbish disposal firm, allowing the firm to dump for free on useless bayside tideland. The disposal firm is even compacting the fill and contouring the area to golf course design. "All we'll have to do is put on a little topsoil and plant some grass," says Mayor Jack Maltester. "Otherwise, we'd have had to buy all that fill, and dirt cheap isn't cheap at all these days."

San Leandro has even saved money by appearing to spend it. The salaries it pays its police and firemen are among the best in the State. The top minimum for police is $693 a month, compared with $615 for Bakersfield, and $678 for San Mateo, towns of roughly comparable size. At the same time, San Leandro's police force numbers only 47, roughly two-thirds the average for cities of its size. "We find that we can get a job done better with a few highly qualified men than with a flock of mediocre ones," explains Mr. Maltester. The city had only one policeman quit all last year. Too, the city uses lower paid clerks for many police department desk jobs instead of uniformed officers.

The acid test: San Leandro's crime rate, already below State averages, fell 10 percent in fiscal 1965 while the statewide rate increased by about the same amount.

What all this means is that the city has managed to keep its spending well within what the city's population and industrial growth can support. While real estate property taxes are rising in all of Alameda County, which embraces Oakland as well as San Leandro, San Leandro's share of that tax has been declining steadily for 18 years. One typical middle income homeowner is paying $51 in property taxes to the city now, compared with $66 back in 1947. This 23-percent decline includes a 3.6-percent drop in the last year alone.

WHERE THE MONEY GOES

The city's budget in the current fiscal year is $5.7 million, a far cry from the $613,000 of 1947, but still slightly below the record $5.9 million of 1962 and only slightly above last year's spending. The spending is going for such things as city parks, development of all the city's San Francisco Bay waterfront into beaches and a marina, a $2 million library, and a new civic center complex, including the police and fire station, a new city hall, a courthouse, and headquarters for the chamber of commerce.

San Leandro even has afforded itself the luxury of turning down $2.5 million of Federal funds. Back in 1959 the city started planning a federally financed urban renewal project. But local citizens got up in arms about it—they didn't want land condemnation power in the hands of nonelected officials—so the city gave Washington back its money.

Then Wesley McClure, the city manager since 1947, came up with a new plan, locally financed. The city invested $1 million in the five-block renewal area, but it is utilizing a little-known California statute called the tax increment law. This allows the redevelopment agency to recover its investment by keeping any increased tax revenues stemming from the increased value of the facelifted buildings. The law hasn't been used much elsewhere in the State because of the availability of Federal funds, local officials say.

To help keep the project costs down, San Leandro also has been persuading property owners in the area to pay for modernizing their own buildings. Using a carrot-and-stick approach, the city promises to install new pastel-colored sidewalks in front of the stores that comply. "It's become a sort of honor badge," says Mr. McClure. And private property owners have already invested more than $1 million in their buildings as a result.

A GOOD CIVIC SPIRIT

San Leandro citizens insist its their spirit that has kept things humming—spirit that's sufficient to provide volunteer help to staff the library, for one example. How does such a spirit develop? One secret: "We've formed a citizens' committee for everything we've done around here," says Mr. McClure. "They really pave the way for getting things done."

In some respects, San Leandro has been lucky. Unlike some cities, it hasn't been forced to absorb a heavy influx of minority groups and unskilled workers. Combined with rapid growth in industry, jobs have been plentiful and the city's welfare load well below average. Too, officials of some neighboring cities see San Leandro facing more problems in the future than it has in the recent past.

"Nobody thinks badly of San Leandro," says a city administrator in Oakland. "It's a very progressive city." But, he contends, sooner or later San Leandrans are going to run out of land for industrial expansion. "Then they'll be facing the same problems everybody else does," he says. "I remember when you could buy land in San Leandro for $5,000 an acre. Now it's $30,000 and still going up. They don't have any sites left for large industrial plants."

But San Leandrans think otherwise. "We've only used 40 percent of our land," contends Frank King, manager of the active chamber of commerce. "And while we don't have many really large industrial locations left, that's not the type of business we want. We're after white-collar industry—clean, middle sized and beneficial to the economy."

[From the San Leandro (Calif.) Morning News, Mar. 5, 1966]

In Wall Street Journal: "The San Leandro Story" Becomes Nationwide News

"The San Leandro Story" made nationwide news yesterday as the Wall Street Journal told it in a feature article on its editorial page.

The story came out of a series of meetings held not long ago with Mayor Jack Maltester, City Manager Wesley McClure, San Leandro Chamber of Commerce President S. L. Feener, Jr., last year's president of the San Leandro Manufacturers' Association, R. L. McGinnis, and other business and industrial leaders assembled by the chamber.

The Wall Street Journal article, written by Lew Phelps of the San Francisco office, places great importance on the industrial growth of the city since 1947. Advantages to industry are clearly detailed—ample space, sound and efficient city government, favorable tax rates, and a community spirit that "has kept things humming," as Phelps phrased it.

The 18 annual reductions in the city's tax rate come in for favorable attention and many of the techniques for financing city government projects to keep the tax rate coming down are discussed. Mayor Maltester and City Manager McClure are given substantial credit for the civic accomplishments such as a beautiful new library and community center, civic buildings recently constructed or underway, the new marina, a golf course now in existence and one in preparation, the low crime rate, and a major do-it-yourself downtown revitalization project.

Incidentally, the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce reports that within the first hour after the story appeared, an industrial firm studying possible locations for a 10-acre, million-dollar-plus operation, picked up the phone and said, "San Leandro looks good to us."

Planning for Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Union, a well-respected journal in my home city of Springfield, Mass., agrees with President Johnson that something is wrong when it takes an airline passenger longer to get from the terminal to his downtown destination than it did to fly from city to city.

The newspaper states that President Johnson's transportation message touched most of the bases "improved safety, research on new equipment and methods, long-distance and intra-urban, with respect to travel and shipping on land, sea and in the air."

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to have the Springfield Union's thoughtful editorial summation of transit problems, published on March 5, included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PLANNING FOR TRANSPORTATION

New England, where the decline of railroad passenger service is excruciatingly apparent and where superhighway construction has lagged painfully behind growth in automobile travel, can take a special interest in President Johnson's pertinent revival of previous proposals for a Federal Department of Transportation.

The Johnson plan would consolidate in the single Department the activities of some 35 agencies now dealing with various phases of transportation, employing 100,000 persons, spending nearly $6 billion a year, and still not adequately satisfying the requirements of an expanding and increasingly mobile population.

Magnificent strides have, of course, been taken by the existing combination of private transport operation and Government regulation and assistance. But as the President pointedly suggested, something is missing when it takes an airline passenger longer to get from the terminal to his downtown destination than it did to fly from city to city in a comfortable, movie-equipped, high-speed jet.

Something is missing, too, when the New Haven Railroad's bankrupt condition threatens a hard-earned way of life for thousands of commuters utterly dependent on continued rail service within 60 miles of New York City. And this is not to mention the scandalous January transit strike in New York itself.

Mr. Johnson's transportation message touched most of the bases—improved safety, research on new equipment and methods, long-distance and intraurban—with respect to travel and shipping on land, sea, and in the air. The suggestion is clear that, if the Department goes through, its bureaucracy will be a czardom over the Nation's transportation complex.

But the Government is part way there already. Transportation interests now have to seek their favors through the present Federal agencies, and sometimes also work their rival wiles on Congress. The result is a hodgepodge.

The Federal highway program, for example, is a response to public demand for more and better roads on which to drive a skyrocketing number of cars. Truck and bus operators have been side beneficiaries. But this has been at the expense of the railroads which—unless something is done—will be in no condition to serve future demands for public transit. These demands may be substantial again, because some day even tomorrow's highways (and airlanes) will be hopelessly overcrowded.

The President might have been more specific than he was about rail passenger service. But his administration's interest, and Congress', is evident in the current federally sponsored studies of high-speed trains for the Boston-Washington corridor. If a Transportation Department can strengthen this trend toward better balance, its inevitably enlarging intervention in planning can do more good than harm.

Connecticut Partners of the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, since the late President Kennedy's proposal of an Alliance for Progress became a reality in 1961, that organization has inaugurated a new era of hemispheric solidarity and inter-American cooperation. One of the most recent developments of the Alliance for Progress has been the creation of its new organization, The Partners of the Alliance. The essential basis of the Partners of the Alliance is voluntary, nongovernmental effort on a State-to-State basis. I have had the pleasure of working with the Connecticut branch of this organization, which is directed by Mr. Ogden Bigelow and Mr. Anson C. Lowitz, and I am impressed with its accomplishments and its potential.

Two recent articles appearing in the February 23 and 24 issues of the Greenwich Times highlight one of the most recent phases of the Connecticut Partners of the Alliance's work, and as I feel that this may be a subject of interest to my colleagues, I include these articles in the Record at this point:

[From the Greenwich (Conn.) Times, Feb. 23, 1966]

Hospital Surplus Equipment Sent To Help Brazil

Greenwich Hospital has extended a helping hand to hospitals in Paraiba, Brazil, with the shipment of surplus beds and equipment to this needy area. The move was made under the auspices of the Connecticut Partners of the Alliance, Inc., an organization that grew out of the Alliance for Progress program created by the Government in 1961 to foster understanding and cooperation between the United States and South American countries.

The Partners of the Alliance have moved the program to a person-to-person basis, with participation by civic clubs, businesses, unions, religious organizations, schools, hospitals, and other organizations. The aim is to provide capital and materials for self-help projects, and is described as "giving a hand—not a handout" to those willing to work to improve their lot.

Connecticut's partner is the State of Paraiba, situated on the most easternly point of Brazil's northeast, an area plagued by drought, illiteracy, and disease. Fifty percent of all infants die before reaching the age of 2 years. Periodic flooding of the Paraiba River causes frequent epidemics of diphtheria and influenza. The people, frustrated by poverty, are constantly tormented by political propaganda that holds out promises which never come true.

The Greenwich Hospital contribution of surplus equipment, including beds, sterilizers, and dental equipment weighing in excess of 30,000 pounds is designed to make some of the hopes of these people a reality, according to Director William J. Donnelly.

The shipment also makes possible the greatest use of equipment that has become obsolete as a result of the current modernization program at the hospital, he said. He also urged other Connecticut hospitals, as well as other types of institutions and organizations, to release their surplus equipment for this effort.

The Connecticut Partners of the Alliance, Inc., is a nonprofit, private organization created for the purpose of implementing the partnership program in the State. Ogden Bigelow, of Greenwich, is president of the board of directors, comprised of leading citizens from all sections of the State. Anson C. Lowitz, also of Greenwich, is managing director.

Mr. Lowitz has visited the State of Paraiba and reports there is only one major hospital serving a population of 2¼ million people, and that it can accommodate only 300 people, under difficult conditions. In addition, he said, there is one pediatrics hospital in the entire northeast section of Brazil, serving a population of 22 million. The only other medical care available is at scattered health posts with meager facilities.

The Connecticut Partners of the Alliance, with offices at 283 Greenwich Avenue, is prepared to present illustrated talks on northeast Brazil. Meeting dates can be arranged by calling Mr. Lowitz.

[From the Greenwich (Conn.) Times, Feb. 24, 1966]

Giving a Hand

Those willing to work and improve their lot usually can find a helping hand, be it a person, an agency, or a nation. A good example is the program of the Connecticut Partners of the Alliance, Inc., which grew out of the Alliance For Progress created by the Government in 1961 to foster understanding and cooperation between the United States and South American countries.

Under the partners' program, capital and materials will be provided for self-help projects, Connecticut's partner in the venture is Paraiba, in Brazil.

Greenwich Hospital has come forward with help for hospitals in Paraiba, under the partners' plans. The hospital has contributed surplus equipment including beds, sterilizers, and dental equipment weighing in excess of 30,000 pounds. Moreover, hospital officials have urged other Connecticut hospitals to release surplus equipment for this effort.

Hospitals who are modernizing, such as Greenwich Hospital, can lend a real hand by offering such equipment to the partners' organization for their work in South America.

The Connecticut Partners of the Alliance, Inc., is a nonprofit group headed by two Greenwich men, Ogden Bigelow as president of the board and Anson C. Lowitz as managing director. Both know the needs of Paraiba very well. They pointed out that one section, with 22 million persons, is served by one pediatrics hospital.

Health facilities are in great demand in the poverty-stricken areas of South America, particularly in regard to children. The project undertaken by the partners' organization is a tremendous one, of immeasurable value. Greenwich Hospital deserves great credit for its donation to a highly worthy cause.

Submarine Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the observance of Submarine Week, April 11–17 when the veterans of submarine warfare will commemorate the 66th anniversary of the first acceptance of a submarine by the U.S. Navy in 1900.

Special ceremonies are being held in my district by the San Diego Chapter of U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II. This observance is a fitting time to note the role the submarine has had in our past wars, and salute the Nation's first line of nuclear defense, which today patrols the seas and oceans.

There is no doubt that our development of the submarine as a deadly and efficient instrument of warfare has served as the major deterrent to aggression from some nations that would seek to enslave other peoples. The fact that our undersea Navy is on constant alert has made the cost too heavy for aggressors to make the major moves that have been their desire on several continents.

Aside from the pride and defense interests, I have a personal interest in the submarine Navy. My son-in-law's father, Capt. Wreford G. Chapple, was part of the Pacific submarine action during World War II, when he received several citations for valorous service as commander of the U.S.S. *S–38* in the Phillipines Islands area. He also commanded the U.S.S. *Permit* and the U.S.S. *Bream* in heavy action in South Pacific seas. He is now living in San Diego, and I know that the special observance of Submarine Week will be of great significance to him and the many other veterans of the Pacific campaign who will meet at a number of functions.

The submarine has developed tremendously since it first joined the Navy in 1900. By next year, the United States will have 41 fleet ballistic missile submarines available. The Polaris missile has proven to be one of the most reliable and effective weapons in our arsenal. The submarine today is being used to protect amphibious assault forces, enabling them to increase maneuverability, travel light, hit hard and fast. The Poseidon missile, with twice the payload of Polaris will add new power to our far-ranging undersea striking force.

Our need now is for continued research and development of submarines. Adm. David L. McDonald, in testifying before the House Committee on Armed Services, warned that the Soviet Union has designs on the sealanes of the world. He stated:

> Soviet nuclear submarines are being built at a rate per year which may soon exceed our own. They will pose an increasingly grave threat.

The submarine service is a promising career for many young Americans. Developments in nuclear submarine propulsion have had advantageous spin-offs for industry and the advancement of peaceful harnessing of the atom.

As we honor Submarine Week in 1966, when our Nation has its broadest commitments for peace, and when the world offers peril on all sides, we can all be grateful to the courageous and competent men of the submarine fleet, who around the clock are our sentinels at the gate. It is proper that we think back to our last great struggle against aggression, and recognize the debt we owe those brave men who swept the Pacific, who risked much, and who fought furiously and victoriously for freedom.

Washington, D.C., Veterans Administration Hospital—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last spring it was my privilege to participate in the dedication of the new Veterans' Administration hospital here in Washington, D.C. Recently the director of that hospital, the able and dedicated Dr. Thomas J. Ready, wrote an article in the March 1 issue of the magazine U.S. Medicine which describes the operation of this fine institution.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of that article:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOSPITAL IS MOST AUTOMATED

(By Thomas J. Ready, director, Washington, D.C., VA Hospital)

On May 3, 1965, a 72-year-old World War I combat veteran from Arlington, Va., was carefully checked in at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, 50 Irving Street NW., Washington, D.C.

The hospital was VA's newest and most modern installation.

This patient was the first to be admitted to the new hospital, and the first to be transferred from the old Mount Alto VA Hospital on Wisconsin Avenue.

Mount Alto buildings—constructed in 1901 as a girls' school for domestic science, and operated as a 335-bed VA hospital since 1922—were completely out dated, out moded and out grown.

Today, the Washington hospital is not the newest in VA's farflung 165-hospital system, but it still is the most modern.

This new, 4-floor, fireproof, off-white brick, 710-bed hospital is just about the last word in construction; its equipment is of the latest type—the most modern available.

During its early planning stages and construction period, the hospital often was referred to by contractors, engineers, and medical people as the most automated in the world.

While actual construction work on the building has long since ceased, electronic engineers, study groups, educational and development planners and two computers work at a feverish pitch—to make its hospital procedures the most practical, efficient, economical and most automated, and, at the same time, to give the veteran patient the best treatment medical science can provide.

For it is here at the Washington VA Hospital that many improvements will be developed and introduced to scores of other VA hospitals throughout the Nation.

The planners, the builders, and the engineers have done their work well.

I and members of my immediate staff, and the Department of Medicine and Surgery, VA Central Office, Wahsington, have been busy, too, selecting an unusually fine staff of doctors, nurses, technicians, and research personnel.

Some of the best medical brains in the country are located in Washington only a few miles from the hospital.

Because of this abundant medical knowhow, the Washington VA hospital is capable of taking care of just about any illness known to man, and to do any surgery deemed necessary.

Many of the doctors on the VA hospital staff are on the teaching staff of one of the three medical schools in Washington, and many of the doctors on the staffs of the medical schools are available as part-time consultants at the hospital.

Our hospital is affiliated with all three schools, and they are all doing a fine job.

We cooperate closely with George Washington, Georgetown and Howard Medical Schools. We also are affiliated with dental schools at Georgetown and Howard Universities, and with nursing schools at Catholic and Howard Universities.

Senior nursing students for a number of years have been using our hospital as a training source. We are very happy about this for we use lots of nurses—about 161 registered nurses at the present time.

In addition to the medical schools, the hospital also works closely with the National Institutes of Health, the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Naval Medical Center at Bethesda and the National Bureau of Standards.

During the past 9 months, the Washington VA hospital complex has grown from an institution caring for 315 patients (at Mount Alto) to one currently serving about 600.

At present the hospital is operating 628 beds—237 of them medical, 191 surgical, 50 neurology and 150 psychiatry. This varies somewhat from the original plans.

The hospital eventually will be able to care for 240 neuropsychiatric patients, but to date 150 beds have been set aside for this type patient, in keeping with activation planning. By April 1, this year, it is hoped that the remaining 90 beds will become available for mental patients.

Original plans call for 240 beds for psychiatry, 40 for neurology, 30 for physical medicine and rehabilitation, 160 for surgery and 240 for medicine—a total of 710.

A total of 1,183 employees are required to care for the sick and disabled veterans in the Washington area. This number includes 42 full-time physicians, 6 part-time doctors, 55 residents, 4 career residents, 1 research associate, 4 medical clinical investigators, 1 senior medical investigator, and 2 physicians supervising special research labs (1 cardiovascular, 1 liver diseases); the number also includes 161 full-time registered nurses and 75 practical nurses.

Other sections, services, and groups which have been added, and their personnel assignments follow: automated hospital information system, 40 employees; testing and development center, 12; VA research center for cardiovascular data processing, 16; psychiatric evaluation staff, 9; audiology service and speech pathology clinic, 6; cancer chemotherapy, 2; prosthetic research, 1; and trainees for assistant hospital director, 3; personnel, 1; housekeeping, 1; management analyst, 1; librarian, 1; medical technology, 2; social work, 6; and psychology, 10.

The early billing the hospital received as the "most automated" is attributed to several unusual features. First, is the "Automated Hospital Information System," known to engineers and employees alike as AHIS, second is the Testing and Development Center; third, the automatic materials conveyor system (both lateral and vertical); and finally, the pneumatic tube system, which primarily replaces the hospital's messenger service.

The "Automated Hospital Information System" is in the research and development stage investigating the use of digital computers to store, process, and communicate certain data used in direct patient care in the hospital.

AHIS is operated by a team composed of the department of medicine and surgery personnel, who contribute their medical skills, and employees of the VA Department of Data Management, who work with design and development of automated data processing systems.

The system is primarily concerned with the recordkeeping and message communication resulting from doctors' orders, ranging from medications to diagnostic procedures. While AHIS will affect much of the data handling involved in direct patient care, it will not replace current medical records.

Many descriptive documents in the patient's chart, such as the narrative history, physical examination, surgical operative summary will continue to be compiled manually. AHIS will, however, produce summaries of clinical data from its automated files which should be of great value in day-to-day care of the patient.

A typical example of the AHIS system may be found in the doctor's order for a fasting blood sugar. Once written, the order will be put into the automated system at a special communication terminal at the ward nursing station.

Subsequently, the AHIS computer will automatically inform the laboratory that the test has been ordered, list it on a worksheet for the lab technician, alert the nurses, tell dietetics service to hold breakfast the following morning, accept the result of the determination, and relay the result back to the ward.

The AHIS team will work with hospital personnel in carrying out a series of experiments to test various parts of the system. During the testing phase, terminals will be located in one or two wards and in service areas such as radiology, dietetics, central service, clinical laboratory, and the admissions office.

Also contributing to the honor of being the most automated is the testing and development center—actually a division of systems and standard services of VA central office's department of medicine and surgery. The center is directly responsible for administrative research, studies, and similar projects conducted in the experimental laboratory.

RESEARCH FEATURE

The Washington VA Hospital is the first hospital of any kind that has provided space specifically designed to house and facilitate hospital administrative research activities. Among the employees of the hospital, the center has been dubbed the "experimental laboratory."

Several years ago, the pressing need for this type of research became apparent. This need since has intensified because of social, technical, and scientific changes, and it also has produced changing skill, staffing, procedural, and organizational requirements.

The testing and development center laboratory consists of 15,000 square feet of open floor space that has been enhanced by special construction features which allow ready creation, modification, and control of study environments.

For example, the floor is raised 14 inches above the regular level and covered with

2-by-2-foot-square sections. Any section may be removed, at will, to give easy access to supply, drainage and circulating pipes, power and signal circuits.

This concept will allow flexibility when room sizes, shapes, relationships are modified and/or various equipment is relocated. Walls have been left bare so that wall coverings of various consistencies, colors and textures may be tested. All walls and partitions used to form experimental areas are also sectional and movable.

The center will direct its attention immediately to special drug distribution systems, hospital education facilities requirements, unit management systems, hospital transportation systems, a nursing unit study and an examination and treatment room study on the nursing unit.

One study involves use of nurservers in the patient care area. This includes a double-door locker with the outside opening into the corridor and the inside opening into the alcove-lavatory area inside the patient's room. New VA hospital construction will include this feature.

One advantage of the nurserver is that all the necessary supplies and equipment needed for patient care are stocked in the clean locker while all soiled or used material is stored in the soiled locker for pickup and disposal. These double-door lockers are supplied daily with all the material needed to give nursing-medical care to the patient.

Soiled material is collected daily; both supply and pickup are accomplished without entering the patient's room.

The other study area is concerned with the educational and teaching facilities that are needed in a nursing unit. A study of the total hospital needs for educational facilities was recently completed by the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. The residents' area adjoins the classroom area and is connected by a folding partition, which may be opened for additional footage for a larger group.

The automatic materials conveyor system also has contributed a great deal to the automation at the hospital. White Fiberglas tote boxes, 20 inches long, 16 inches wide, and 10 inches deep are being used effectively to transport laboratory specimens, pharmaceuticals, mail, records, books, journals, and small supply items.

Each box has six metal tabs embedded in one side; these are magnetically charged by the station dial selector when the box is dispatched at any of the stations. The system is powered by 212 electric motors and controlled by 57 photoelectric cells and several control panels.

There are 20 back-to-back wards in 10 wings on the second, third, and fourth floors. A clean and a soiled conveyor room is located in each wing to serve both wards.

The conveyor system has both a clean and soiled section, and there are both clean and soiled stations in central service, linen rooms, supply warehouse, laboratories, pharmacy, library, and mailroom.

Experiments are being conducted to determine the possibility of using the system for removal of soiled linen, distribution of clean linen, and trash removal.

The trayveyor food service system consists of a tray assembly line located in the main kitchen and leads into a vertical shaft where mechanized lift equipment automatically picks up the tray and carries it to the food service room on the second, third, and fourth floors.

From the floor food service room, dietetic service employees remove the trays, place them on carts, and serve them to the bed patients. The removal of trays after meals have been served is accomplished on the same equipment in the vertical shaft, except that when trays go down to the main kitchen, they are automatically taken off the lift by a horizontal belt which carries the tray to the work area of the dish washroom.

The hospital also employs a pneumatic tube system used for transporting mail, records, paperwork of all types, and dry nonsecurity pharmaceuticals.

The air system has 69 stations located throughout the hospital, including wards, clinics, and all major offices and departments. The system requires no manual sorting since there is a mechanical automatic sorter to do this.

A great deal of medical research is being done at the Washington VA hospital. The budget for the research program alone in fiscal year 1966 will run approximately $1,400,000, and will require the full-time services of 101 people.

There are 44 active research programs currently underway in the following disciplines: medicine 25, surgery 6, basic sciences 3, pulmonary 3, neurology 1, psychiatry 1, radioisotopes 1, and research support 4.

Investigations in the hematology research program encompass studies at the clinical level as well as at the level of basic science. These investigations are concerned mainly with the problem of alcoholism, and how it affects hematopoiesis.

Studies have demonstrated the relative frequency of leukopenia in response to severe bacterial infection in the alcoholic patient, and subsequent investigations have shown that the severe alcoholic patient frequently has a decreased reserve of bone marrow granulocytes, and therefore, is deficient in the first line of his body defenses against infections.

More recent studies suggest that this defect is probably the result of folic acid deficiency.

Other investigations are concerned with hemorrhagic and thrombotic complications in the alcoholic patient with liver disease.

The essential factors controlling iron absorption from the gastrointestinal tract have eluded investigators. Studies in this field have been concerned primarily with pancreatic insufficiency, which seems to result in increased iron absorption in animals and humans.

Iron absorption in patients with pancreatic insufficiency have been studied, and an evaluation of pancreatic enzymes in laboratory animals has been published.

The hematology and tissue culture research program has done extensive study in the field of of lymphocyte function in immunologic reactions.

Research studies to date appear to supply a biologic link that has been missing, namely, the mechanism by which the lymphocyte acquires and transfers immunologic information. Demonstration of the importance of the lymphocyte foot appendage in immunologic reactions promises to provide further information about the function of this "immunologically competent" cell.

The implications are legion in a number of fields including microbiology, immunology, hematology, and infectious diseases. Only by further investigations of this type at the cellular level can advances be expected at the currently popular clinical level of organ transplantation.

The Liver and Metabolic Research Laboratory participates in the care of patients with liver and related diseases, and conducts clinical and basic research, and a training program for residents and fellows in these areas.

The laboratory's currently spanned scope of interest includes studies in the pathogenesis of cirrhosis and in mechanisms involved in toxic hepapathology. For the latter purpose, liver perfusion, studies of isolated tissue, tissue culture preparations, and fractionation of cells into component organelles is emphasized.

Plans include, also, the attempt to refine available diagnostic methods, including serum and tissue enzyme analysis and to study the mechanisms responsible for abnormal values in disease.

Implementation of these efforts will include automated biochemical determinations and computerized approaches to evaluation of the significance of resulting data.

A Veterans' Administration Research Center for Cardiovascular Data Processing is located at the Washington hospital. Research in automatic data processing of electrocardiograms was started at this hospital in 1957.

Corrected orthogonal leads were selected because it was found that the conventional 12-lead ECG contains a large amount of redundant information. An FM tape was installed in 1957, because such a system represents the most convenient means for reproducing analog data for further data processing. The tape systems also have been installed in six other VA hospitals.

In order to make the original ECG analog records compatible with digital computers, an analog to digital data conversion system was designed and constructed by the instrumentation section.

A computer program was developed which indicates the beginning and end of P, QRS, and T complexes. It was based on spatial velocity changes derived from the three orthogonal components first derivative of spatial magnitude.

Computer programs were developed for practically all known types of ECG analysis. For the first time it was possible to evaluate all these measurements on the basis of the same large record samples composed of practically all possible diagnostic entities.

The program performed satisfactorily and correct classification on the basis of QRS could be obtained in 83 to 94 percent of the cases depending upon the diagnostic entity. The same procedure applied to ST-T yielded 70 to 90 percent correct classifications.

Preservation of Natural Beauty in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a very interesting address by Mr. Edward C. Crafts, Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of Interior, delivered at the Governor's Conference on Natural and Environmental Beauty, held at Hartford, Conn., on March 10, 1966.

Mr. Crafts' address, entitled "The Judgment of History," deals with conservation and the preservation of our recreational and seashore areas. I am pleased to commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE JUDGMENT OF HISTORY

(Remarks of Edward C. Crafts, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior, Before the Governor's Conference on Natural and Environmental Beauty, Hartford, Conn., March 10, 1966)

You should be hearing today the voice of conservation—the Secretary of Interior, Stewart L. Udall.

He was here last September. He wanted to be here today but is out of the country on a special mission for the President. I bring you his greetings, regrets, and best wishes.

We are in the midst of a new conservation. What has triggered it off—the eloquence of a son of New England, the determination of a son of Texas, the gentle leadership of the First Lady, and the farsightedness of a practical visionary from Arizona. All have joined together to lead the "quest for quality."

Men who use their power creatively make an indispensable contribution to a nation's greatness. But the citizens of our land who respond to power and who in turn question its use make a contribution just as indispensable. This is why you are here today.

We are again seeing active leadership in conservation unmatched since the partnership of Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt.

President Kennedy said, "I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty, which will protect the beauty of our natural environment, which will preserve the great old American houses and squares and parks of our national past, and which will build handsome and balanced cities for our future."

We are fortunate that Governor Dempsey has responded to President Johnson's plea to follow the White House Conference on Natural Beauty of last May with conferences in each State. Connecticut is the 22d State to hold such a conference.

The Connecticut Forest & Parks Association—a principal sponsor of this meeting—was founded about 70 years ago. According to its letterhead, it is a voluntary group of people "interested in making Connecticut a better place in which to live by properly developing its forests and other outdoor resources."

What better way to express the objective of this Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty? There is no more powerful force on earth than an idea whose time has come. Those founding citizens of another century had foresight, indeed.

May I pay just a word of tribute to a fighting forestry professor of yesteryear, H. H. Chapman of Yale University, and to a longtime dean of forestry at Yale, Henry Solon Graves, who is the first professional forester it was ever my privilege to meet, and who counseled me about entering the forestry profession.

I would also like to say a good word about George A. Garratt, presently chairman of your State park and forestry commission and likewise a former dean of the Yale Forestry School. George and I are longtime personal friends. We traveled together and roomed together during and after the Third World Forestry Congress at Helsinki nearly 20 years ago.

There are many other citizens of Connecticut whose dedicated personal services and philanthropy have contributed much to making the State's parks and forests available for public enjoyment. I would be particularly remiss not to mention Joe Gill, Commissioner of the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources and Governor Dempsey's designated liaison with the Secretary of the Interior in the administration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Connecticut is a fascinating State. Relatively small in size, it is in the heart of the eastern megalopolis. Though highly industrialized, two-thirds of the State is wooded. It is the land of the white oak, the robin, and the mountain laurel.

Bisected by the "long tidal river" which is what Connecticut means, the State has 250 miles of sea coast with over 200 miles of beaches. The State has an historic countryside, a manufacturing tradition, the coastal zone along Long Island Sound, and the Connecticut River stretching 75 to 80 miles from Saybrook to the Massachusetts border.

It was my privilege last September 13 to join Senator RIBICOFF, Governor Dempsey, Congressman ST. ONGE, and Secretary Udall, on their boat trip upstream, from the mouth of the Connecticut River to Hartford. This is the day that Hurricane Betsy passed over the State in its way to the sea and the rain came down in torrents. Despite this, the beauty of the river and the wilderness of its shoreline came as a revelation to me lying as it does in the center of the industrialized Northeast.

When Senator RIBICOFF introduced his bill last August 26 to save the Connecticut River, he pointed out that the river is, for the most part, still a thing of beauty, but that it is surely being eaten away by developers carving out great chunks of landscape, by junkyards, oil tank farms, powerplants, and the countless hallmarks of our modern society.

At one time, Middletown was the principal river port and the river was a great channel of commerce carrying freight, passengers, and log drives. Up to 24,000 passengers a year were carried on the river to Hartford in 2,500 vessels. According to the Senator, "One recent observer called the Connecticut River the world's most beautifully lanscaped cesspool."

In viewing the river last September, we were told that it had been 50 years since the river was swimable below Hartford. We heard such terms as "too thick to drink and too thin to plow."

Surely the second step has been taken to advance the Senator's farsighted proposal by the commitment in the President's message to the Congress of 2 weeks ago in which he said, "For a region which now has no national park, I recommend the study of a Connecticut River National Recreation Area along New England's largest river in the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut."

I hope that study will be made before my time has ended in the Department of the Interior and I hope it will be my privilege to share in that study.

Nothing would please me more than to add the Connecticut to the Potomac and the Hudson in that group of our major eastern rivers that are receiving prime attention in cleansing their waters and in preserving and restoring the beauty of their shorelines and streambanks.

Connecticut can offer both challenge and response to President's Johnson's Conference on Natural Beauty of last May. William Holly Whyte's 1962 report on Connecticut's natural resources identified major needs, suggested legislative action, and proposed a $50 million capital program.

The State's own open space grant-in-aid program was the most positive result. An initial bond issue for $3 million was provided. This State program supplements Federal programs by providing 50 percent of the non-Federal costs of acquisition of conseravtion and recreation land to municipalities. Seventy-five projects have been initiated by 40 Connecticut towns and cities with an acquisition total of about 5,000 acres.

The State also has a fair assessment law for farm, forest, and open space land which provides for assessment on the basis of use rather than on the potential of such property for more intensive forms of development. This law has been in effect for 2½ years. State officials believe it is going to be one of their most effective weapons in the battle to save Connecticut's beautiful countryside.

The 1961 legislature of the State authorized local communities to establish conservation commissions. In the past 5 years, 66 such organizations have been formed in Connecticut towns and cities and have made a remarkable contribution in these localities by developing interest and enthusiasm in open space and outdoor beauty. Most of the open space projects presented to the State for grant-in-aid assistance have been initiated by these local commissions.

Recently, your Governor appointed a blue-ribbon committee of 100 of Connecticut's leading citizens and charged them with developing an action program to eliminate water pollution as a major problem in the State. This was forward-looking action by Governor Dempsey of the first magnitude. My hope is that the report of the Governor's clean water task force will be hard hitting. Anything less will be a disappointment and a letdown.

Because of the drought situation of recent years, the management of the watershed of the Connecticut River has become even more crucial. I understand that within 10 years, portions of the State may have to depend on the water of the river for domestic use.

The State has developed a 5-year statewide outdoor recreation plan which proposed a $68 million program for Connecticut. Of this, $38 million are proposed for State acquisition projects, $12 million for State development project, and $18 million for grants-in-aid to local governments.

This statewide outdoor recreation plan has been accepted by the Secretary of the Interior as qualifying the State for Federal matching grants from the land and water conservation fund. This year the State is eligible to receive $1.5 million of such moneys for 50 percent matching of State or local government acquisition or development projects. The annual amounts to be made available to the State in subsequent years will equal or exceed this amount.

Although Connecticut is expected to be a leader in participating in the land and water conservation fund and was among the first dozen States to obtain approval of its plan, applications for acquisition and development grants have up to now been received for only six small projects totaling less than $100,000.

I earnestly urge the State to move much more actively in taking advantage of available Federal aid from this fund.

Let us take stock for a moment as to what has happened in recent years.

President Kennedy's natural resources message of 1961 was the kickoff. He followed it up with another message in 1962 on our conservation program.

President Johnson has called for "the wisdon to use our wealth to enrich and elevate our national life and to advance the quality of our American civilization."

The President said, "We are going to assemble the best thought and the broadest knowledge." We did.

The natural beauty message of a year ago and the White House Conference on Natural Beauty of last May were effective follow-throughs.

The country was reminded that there could not, and should not, be reliance either solely on massive Federal programs, or on the resources of local governments or private citizens.

There was a call for new concepts in cooperation and creative federalism. The response has been tremendous by the business community, by public officials of all levels, by dedicated citizens and by an outpouring of legislation from the Congress.

The Water Quality Act of 1965, the Air Pollution Control Act, the Highway Beautification Act, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act, the Water Resources Planning Act, are all landmarks and serve notice "on the spoilers of our landscape (that) we will battle with all we have to preserve the beauty of our land and the beauty of our countryside."

We have had not only eloquence and brave words. We have had solid response and concrete action.

President Johnson's recent message on preserving our natural heritage coupled with his natural beauty message of a year ago are the conservation and natural beauty bible for the years ahead.

His message of 2 weeks ago called for a sane environment for man and recommended:

1. A clean rivers demonstration program, including appropriate water quality standards, long-range local planning, local contribution of funds, and a permanent river basin organization.

2. Transferring the water pollution control administration to the Department of the Interior, so that one agency could assume leadership in our clean water effort.

3. Doubling of Federal financial support for State water pollution control agencies.

4. A series of strong enforcement measures to abate water pollution.

5. Accelerated expenditures for water pollution control research.

6. Accelerated research and technical assistance to assist States and local governments in controlling air pollution.

7. Establishment of a National Water Commission.

8. Completion of the national park system by 1972.

9. Creation of a Redwood National Park in northern California.

10. Study of a Connecticut River National Recreation Area and completion of studies and planning for an Apostle Islands Lakeshore along Lake Superior, and a North Cascades *National Park in the State of Washington*.

11. Establishment in addition of four national seashores or lakeshores, two national parks, and two national recreation areas.

12. National recognition and Federal financial support for the Appalachian Trail and *establishment of a nationwide system of* trails with special *emphasis* on a network of trails near metropolitan areas.

13. A program of matching grants to States and to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

14. Completion of the wild rivers system as a complement to the Wilderness Act of a few years ago.

Two of the problems that confront us in the establishment of new parks, seashores, and recreation areas are escalation in land values and revenues to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

In 1961, Cape Hatteras was the only national seashore. Since then, Congress has authorized the establishment of Cape Cod in Massachusetts, Fire Island in New York, Assateague in Maryland, Padre Island in Texas, and Point Reyes in California as national seashores.

A new limited system of national recreation areas has been advocated by the Recreation Advisory Council. Congress has responded by authorizing the establishment of Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity in California, Delaware Water Gap in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks in West Virginia, Lake Mead in Arizona and Nevada.

Those public officials and members of Congress as well as local citizens who took part in these acquisitions can have a pardonable sense of pride in accomplishment.

The President has recommended numerous additional areas. Certainly there is urgent need for a Redwood National Park. The virgin redwoods grow nowhere else in the world. They are a world phenomenon. If a national park is to be established to preserve a portion of these unmatched forests, this must be done within the next year or it will be too late because the old growth redwoods are being rapidly harvested.

This will be an expensive park costing about $60 million to establish.

There is likewise need for a North Cascades National Park to include some of the most spectacular mountain scenery in North America.

The wild rivers legislation which has passed the Senate designates portions of rivers in Idaho, Washington, Oregon, West Virginia, and Montana as free-flowing national rivers, and the study of others.

The money to establish recently authorized areas and to implement pending proposals will come from the land and water conservation fund. Over the 25-year life of the fund, there should be sufficient amounts available but the problem is to peak the funding in the next 4 or 5 years in order to finance recent authorizations before speculation in land development escalates prices beyond reach.

Already we know it will cost substantially more to complete the necessary acquisitions of numerous units of the national park system than was estimated at the time authorizing legislation was enacted.

Where do you as individual citizens come in? In two very concrete ways. First, you should lend your support to the new national proposals for a redwood park, for a wild rivers system, and for the numerous other park and seashore areas which need to be established and preserved.

Second, you should support the land and water conservation fund by spending $7 for your annual Federal recreation area permit.

Part of the feeling of the Congress was that those individuals who personally partake of nature's bounty and enjoy our *national parks, forests, rivers, and seashores* should be willing to pay part of the costs. Thus, the land and water conservation fund is made up in part of revenues received from the sale of a Federal recreation permit.

This is the so-called golden passport. In the first year of our operations, revenue from *the $7 permit good to all Federal recreation areas for a family for a year failed by 90* percent to come up to our expectations. We had estimated about $25 million from the sale of this permit. Instead, we received about $2.5 million.

This year should be better. We are asking both States and conservation and recreation organizations throughout the country to join with us in publicizing and selling the permit. They are available at every American Automobile Association office throughout the land as well as countless Federal offices. The Outboard Boating Club is the first recreation organization to undertake sales to its members. Even if you never use the permit, you will be purchasing a share of stock in the national conservation heritage.

Without money in the land and water conservation fund, those areas which have been, and will be, authorized by the Congress cannot be activated. It is as simple as that. As a Federal administrator of some years experience, there is one thing I have learned. Great words and rhetoric can lead the way. Money is necessary to do the job.

Yet, we have made remarkable progress in the first year of operation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. Forty-seven States and territories have prepared statewide outdoor recreation plans. Some 400 acquisition and development projects from 35 States involving Federal obligations of $55 million and acquisition of 200,000 acres of prime recreation land and water have been received.

Practically all States are participating. Both State and Federal agencies are expected to obligate or qualify for all of the $125 million from the fund that is available this fiscal year.

We are especially pleased with two outstanding accomplishments achieved in cooperation with States in widely differing parts of the country.

The preservation as a State park of a substantial portion of the Nevada shoreline of world-renowned Lake Tahoe has been assured by combined efforts of the State, private philanthropy and utilization of the contingency reserve from the land and water fund.

On the east coast, preservation has been assured under State management of the Allagash Wilderness Waterway in northern Maine, subject to a citizen referendum this fall. The State of Maine has passed legislation authorizing such a waterway and State acquisition of bordering lands. The legislature has also passed a bond issue to raise State funds subject to confirmation at the November elections. The Secretary has committed Federal matching money if the citizens of Maine vote the bond issue. This is a new concept of Federal-State cooperation to achieve State administration and management of one of the outstanding canoe areas of the Nation.

Who or what are the enemies to what we must accomplish? There are only two—indifference and greed. There are the faint hearted or the greedy who say that we cannot wend our way through the Government thicket of proposals and programs, through the multiplicity of community actions, State actions, and county and Federal actions.

There are those who question the price of what it will take in terms of personal effort, determination, and dollars to clean our rivers, purify our air, preserve our parks and recreation areas, beautify our highways and make our cities liveable.

The answer is there is no alternative. This *is the second front. These are the works of* peace, and as the President stated, "They cannot wait until the guns grow silent and terrorism stops."

The answer was given in the natural heritage message. "We can corrupt and destroy our lands, our rivers, our forests, and the *atmosphere itself—all in the name of progress and necessity. Such a course leads to* a barren America. There is another course—more expensive today, more demanding. Down this course lies a natural America restored to her people. The promise is clear rivers, tall forests and clean air—a sane environment for man."

ADE Trainee Refuses Chance To Go to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty has been a regular feature in many newspapers across the Nation. Unfortunately, too often the accent has been on negative aspects of the program. There are far more heartwarming success stories than there are failures, and I think they are worthy of special attention.

I am happy to call my colleagues' attention to a recent article in the Tampa Times which pays tribute to a young mother who is well on her way to breaking out of the poverty category. She was selected as the most outstanding trainee in the poverty program conducted in the Southeast United States. Instead of accepting the award she has so justly earned, this young lady chose to continue doing the job that is most important to her.

Under unanimous consent, I include the full text of the article in the RECORD:

ADE TRAINEE REFUSES CHANCE TO GO TO EUROPE

(By Donita Mathison, Times staff writer)

Mrs. Janet Oleson, trainee in Tampa's antipoverty program Operation ADE, was chosen recently as one of seven finalists, nationwide, to work with various poverty projects in Europe this summer.

But, after much deliberation, she refused the offer—and is convinced her decision was right.

Since January, Mrs. Oleson has worked in the pharmacy department at Tampa General Hospital as an assistant for on-the-job training with Operation ADE (aid to dependent employables).

Because of her meaningful service in the community and her exceptional progress, she was nominated to represent the southeast in a scholarship program designed as an educational experience for participants in antipoverty programs throughout the United States.

It serves as a recognition to a person who best exemplifies the spirits of self-help and community action so strongly supported by Sargent Shriver both domestically through the Office of Economic Opportunity, and abroad, through the Peace Corps.

Seven recipients, one from each of the geographical regions of the Office of Economic Opportunity, will visit foreign countries for 2 months this summer and have an opportunity to learn how people live, work, and face problems of poverty in other parts of the world as well as how the Peace Corps performs.

"I stayed up all night trying to reach a decision because I felt it was a wonderful opportunity," she said. "But I believe the future in America is in my children and in my home. I know I hated to disappoint a lot of people but I had to put my family first."

Mrs. Oleson has three boys, 18 months, 3, and 4 years old.

She was concerned that two of her children needed medical treatment right now and she also would have been forced to hire a babysitter during the time she was away or have them placed in a nursery.

"My children need their mother very much while they're still so young, and I just couldn't rationalize the idea of leaving them," Mrs. Oleson said.

Mrs. Oleson is one of many women who have had difficulty obtaining employment because she has no marketable skill or it has become outdated.

The program is aimed at teaching women a skill so they can get off the welfare rolls or otherwise earn a sufficient living for their families.

Mrs. Oleson, a native of Tampa, was employed in investigative work out of State, and when she moved back to this area there was very little demand for that type of job.

She has been retrained in a more scientific field and today assists the registered pharmacists at Tampa General in various duties around the department. This job does not include filling prescriptions and other highly trained work.

Mrs. Oleson receives a maintenance allowance of $30 a week during training and plans are being made to place her in a permanent job when Operation ADE closes in April.

In the poverty programs, the training period varies from 6 to 30 weeks depending on the field.

Two months ago there were 204 people in training and nearly half of that figure had been later employed somewhere in the city.

The program works under the welfare division of the hospital and welfare board of Hillsborough County and operates with a budget of $846,000.

Operation ADE was begun only last June, but will merge next year with Neighborhood Service Centers, another poverty program in Tampa at a saving in administrative costs.

Director Rudy Spoto, of the hospital and welfare board, said when Operation ADE is integrated with the larger NSC, within a year there will be three neighborhood agencies in operation in Ybor City, West Tampa, and Plant City.

Confidence Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, in the eyes of the world, according to the Houston Post, the congressional vote on the Vietnam military operations bill was a vote of confidence on our Vietnam policy.

The policy that was endorsed was one of resolute firmness and pruduent restraint—firmness in resisting the Communist effort to take over South Vietnam by force and careful limitation of the amount of force used to resist this effort to what is necesary to keep the Communists from succeeding—while trying by every means to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict in southeast Asia through negotiations.

The view expressed by the Houston Post is one of many on this subject and I include the editorial as a part of the RECORD:

CONFIDENCE VOTE FOR L.B.J.

In the eyes of the world, the congressional vote on President Johnson's request for an additional $4.8 billion to pay for military operations in Vietnam during the remainder of the current fiscal year was a vote of confidence on the President's Vietnam policy.

The one-sidedness of the vote by which the money was authorized, 392 to 4 in the House and 93 to 2 in the Senate, reflected the degree of support that the President has in the country as a whole, and it is to be hoped that Communist leaders everywhere, but especially those in Peiping and Hanoi, got the message loud and clear.

The policy issue was much more clear cut resolute firmness and prudent restraint—firmness in resisting the Communist effort to take over South Vietnam by force and careful limitation of the amount of force used to resist this effort to what is necessary to keep the Communists from succeeding—while trying by every means to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict in southeast Asia through negotiations.

The policy issue was much more clear cut in the Senate than in the House, and this was appropriate since debate and criticism have been loudest there. Senator WAYNE MORSE forced a direct vote on presidential policy by offering an amendment to the money authorization bill, which would have repealed the 1964 congressional resolution approving and supporting President Johnson's actions. The effort to repudiate presidential leadership lost by a vote of 92 to 5.

If the men who control the governments in Peiping and Hanoi actually were under any illusion that the American people are deeply divided on the question of the proper policy to be followed in Vietnam, the vote must have come as both a surprise and a shock. It remains to be seen what, if any, effect this will have on their policies and courses of action, but at least the vote helped to offset any encouragement that they may have received as a result of recent senatorial and other criticism of the President's policy.

Even if the Morse amendment had been approved, the President's power to pursue the policy he is pursuing would not have been affected, and it is doubtful that he would have changed it, because he believes it is the right policy and one that an overwhelming majority of the American people support.

It is true that a few Senators voted to support the President reluctantly and with reservations, but the Communists can derive little satisfaction from this. In the first place, their number is few, and in the second place, their differences with the administration are not fundamental. There is little disagreement on basic objectives.

There are some, of course, who think that President Johnson should spell out in greater specific detail what this country ultimately would settle for in southeast Asia. But this would mean a loss of flexibility and could close the door to some opportunities for a peaceful settlement.

The overriding fact in southeast Asia remains that there can be peace anytime the Communists are willing to abandon their aggression and the use of force in an effort to obtain their objectives. Or, as Secretary of State Dean Rusk put it very succinctly recently, any time they are willing to stop shooting at and killing their neighbors. Or, to put it still differently, any time they are willing to stop being barbarians and show a desire to become members of a civilized world society.

Wentworth Town Meeting: A Commanding Voice at the Grassroots Reaffirms Stand Against Proposed Livermore Falls, Rumney Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago to the day, I took the floor of the House to argue against a $50 million project in my district—the high dam at Livermore Falls on the Pemigewasset River—see RECORD of March 16, 1964. This rebutted the charge often made against Members of Congress that they are all for economy except in their own districts.

I pointed how, after detailed study as a member of the Public Works Committee, I found that the objective of flood control in the valley would be accomplished just as well through the construction of small, dry dams on the tributaries of the Pemigewasset. This course would also avoid the heavy economic damage and extensive personal dislocations that would be caused by the construction of a high dam and the impounding of water.

My position was strongly supported by the voters of 10 towns in the Pemigewasset area. Some of those towns have reaffirmed their stand. A resolution unanimously adopted at the last town meeting on March 8 in Wentworth is typical.

This resolution is a commanding voice at the grassroots level. It deserves to be listened to in Washington. Too much time has already gone by without having this matter settled. The delay renders planning and economic development virtually impossible.

The resolution of the Wentworth town meeting follows:

"Be it resolved that the town of Wentworth, N.H., go on record as being highly opposed to the building of dams at Livermore Falls, on the Pemigewassett River, and at Rumney, on the Baker River, as proposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

"Be it also resolved that the town of Wentworth favors the continuation of the building of the smaller dams in the Baker River Valley as proposed by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service."

I certify that the foregoing resolutions were unanimously adopted by the voters at the town meeting in Wentworth March 8, 1966.

OLIVE M. BELYEA,
Town Clerk.

Macomb County Community College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in Macomb County, Mich., are very proud of the rapidly growing community college in our county. It is already an outstanding educational asset for young people in southeastern Michigan.

The south campus of Macomb County Community College was opened just last fall and now has been expanded to include five classroom buildings as well as office and student services structures.

Now plans are underway for the development of the college's center campus. In this connection, I should like to point out that a model of the first unit of MCCC's second campus has been cited for its architecture.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a news release regarding plans for the new college campus. Under unanimous consent I insert the news release from the Macomb County Community College in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MACOMB COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Cited by national jury as an outstanding school design, a model of the first unit of Macomb County Community College's second campus was chosen to be exhibited at the conference of the American Association of School Administrators, February 12 to 16 in Atlantic City.

The unit, a self-sufficient learning center designed as a component of a large community college complex, earned praise from the AASA school building architectural exhibit jury for "sensitivity to human needs and common interests of students."

According to the screening jury, this sensitivity gives character to the plan and the architecture symbolizes community college education.

Architects for the unit are Wakely-Kushner Associations of St. Clair Shores.

The $2.4 million project is the first in the development of MCCC's Center Campus on a 220-acre site at Hall Road and Garfield, between Mount Clemens and Utica.

MCCC's South Campus opened in September of 1965 and was expanded last month to a total of five classroom, office and student services buildings.

The first unit on the Center Campus, one of a series of five subcampuses housing 2,000 students each, is expected to be completed by fall of 1967.

Each learning center, comprised of three buildings, will serve as the major identifying element for the student body. A student will be able to receive all of his general educational instruction in any one of the learning centers. In addition, each learning center will house specialized vocational programs and laboratories.

Each learning center consists of three connected structures: a classroom building, a laboratory building and a student commons building. Emphasis is placed on flexibility of instructional space, providing areas suitable for teaching groups of from 10 to 160 students through the use of movable partitions and varying sizes of rooms.

Science laboratories are organized into units of 24 student stations but may be expanded to accommodate 48 or 72 students. Faculty offices are interspersed among the teaching areas to make the faculty accessible to the students.

The student commons building is designed as a gathering place for the students in each learning center. Here students can study, use reference materials, eat lunch or drink coffee, socialize, view displays, attend a musical presentation, lecture or dramatic work, purchase supplies or pursue other college-related activities.

Plans for the center campus call for two major areas divided by a meadow commons. On the north is the academic core with community-oriented buildings: the campus community center, fine arts center, auditorium, and office-conference center. These buildings will be connected to the learning centers on the south by bridges over the meadow commons.

Ultimate enrollment for the MCCC south and center campuses is expected to reach 30,000, about equally divided between the two.

Historic Church in Ovid, Mich., Gets National Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has ever been in western and central Michigan has noticed the fine old building to be found there. Houses, churches and other public buildings dating from the 19th century have attracted national attention as examples of good architecture and high craftsmanship.

A particularly good example is the old First Congregational Church in Ovid, Mich., which I am priveleged to represent in the House of Representatives.

Recently, it was announced that the church, now known as the Ovid United Church, has been recorded by the national historic buildings survey project. I wish to bring this to the attention of the Members as recognition of the lovely church in Ovid, and to bring to attention the activities of the national historic buildings survey project.

The project is sponsored by the Library of Congress, the National Park Service, and the American Institute of Architects. The recording service uncovers buildings of unusual interest or architectural merit, and then takes photographs, makes sketches, writes descriptive material. This material is then filed in the historic American buildings survey archives in the Library of Congress.

The project was founded in 1935, and has had a considerable impact in preserving for future generations our fine American buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the citizens of Ovid deserve congratulation for their effective work in maintaining the Ovid United Church building. As a mark of respect for the activities of the citizens of Ovid and as a recognition of the enduring value of the church as an historic building, a certificate of recognition from the national historic buildings survey project will be sent to Ovid in the coming months.

I am pleased to join the project in honoring the church in Ovid, and I think it appropriate to insert an article on the subject published in the Lansing State Journal:

OVID CHURCH GETS HISTORICAL LISTING

(By William J. Duchaine)

OVID—The old First Congregational Church, now known as the Main Street Building of the Ovid United Church, has been recorded by the national historic buildings survey project.

Pictures, architectural measurements and history of the nearly century-old edifice will be preserved in the Archives of Congress. It is one of about a score of buildings surveyed in the central Michigan project last summer.

The First Congregational Church of Ovid was organized March 3, 1871. George Fox, grandfather of Harold Beardslee, retired Ovid banker, was the contractor who built the original church and steeple. Fox, a carpenter, owned a sawmill.

The first minister was Rev. William Mulder. Charter members were: C. V. Beebe, M.D., Marie D. Beebe, R. J. Young, Jennie Young, Annie Davis, Henry M. Enos, Charlotte A. Bennett, Susan Beebe, Mary Ray, Mrs. G. D. Sowers, and Miss Jennie Mulock.

The church, built on a hill on High Street, was dedicated in 1872. It was moved to Main Street in 1899, and underwent considerable remodeling the following year. A parlor and porch were added, and an excavation was made for the furnace and dining area.

In 1923, trustees voted to excavate the remainder of the basement to enlarge the area. Harold Beardslee, Fred Green, A. D. Mosser, and C. W. Stone were elected as the committee to organize "work bees." Each man was to give at least 2 hours to the digging project.

This basement is now a large dining area, used for church suppers, Lions Club dinners, receptions, and banquets. The older part of the basement is used as the kitchen.

About 1943, the Congregational and Methodist churches were merged as the Ovid United Church.

Unemployment Compensation Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, public hearings are currently underway on H.R.

8282, the unemployment compensation reform bill, in the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member.

Many issues have been raised in recent articles concerning this proposed legislation, which I feel needs additional clarification.

In this connection, I wish to insert, at this point in the RECORD, a recently completed study to answer, on a section-by-section basis, the questions which were raised in a recent Readers' Digest article on this legislation. The study follows:

THE ARTICLE	THE COMMENT
The article characterizes the bill as "* * * a shocking grab for Federal power * * *" and "* * * nothing less than total revolution in our system for giving benefits to the unemployed."	There is no "grab" for Federal power, and 8282 is not a revolutionary federalization of the unemployment compensation system. The unemployment compensation system was created not by the States, but by the taxing power of the Congress when it passed the Social Security Act of 1935. Even in 1935 the Committee on Economic Security said that the requirements which State laws on unemployment compensation must fulfill could at any time be increased or altered by Congress, to achieve needed improvements in State laws.
This is nothing less than total revolution in our system for giving benefits to the unemployed. Historically, we have always let each State lay down its own rules for dispensing such compensation. H.R. 8282 invests this vast power in the Federal Government.	There have always been certain standards in the Federal Statute that State laws must meet for employers in that State to receive almost 90-percent credit against the Federal tax. H.R. 8282 would now provide some additional standards that State laws must meet in the future for the full credit to be allowed.
Washington would set the standards which probably would become the accepted policy in each of the 50 States. For, although the new bill does not say that the States must adopt its standards, certain tax penalties would be imposed on employers in any State that did not meet every standard in 8282. These economic teeth could effectively force all the States to go along.	The bill imposes no penalties—it just contains provision for tax credit. And as several independent scholars have pointed out, the Federal Government must be able to use some incentive to encourage the States to make needed adjustments within a reasonable length of time. And it should be noted that the new Federal "standards" allow, as now, great initiative and variations to be made by the States.
If these Federal standards do become law, the benefit provisions involved would probably cost billions of dollars more than present compensation programs. And employers—who have always paid the bill—would be saddled with an estimated increase of 60 percent or more in payroll taxes.	This statement creates a false impression about both present and prospective costs. Actually, benefits under State laws in 1965 totaled about $2.2 billion. Proposed improvements would have added less than another half billion dollars. One additional advantage of unemployment insurance taxes is that they are greater than benefits in periods of high employment and, therefore, represent an anti-inflationary mechanism. In poor times benefits exceed outgo from the fund, and the effect is an antirecession stimulation. In both respects unemployment insurance helps to stabilize our economic system.
Weekly compensation checks for many unemployed would double, or more, and in certain cases could be paid for as long as a year and a half.	Only where a benefit is now so small that it represents less than a fourth of the worker's lost weekly wage could this possibly occur. In such a case, the change is desirable. The bill does not require any benefit greater than one-half the former wage, and only then within the limits set by the maximums. The duration of the benefit depends on the worker's previous work record and on whether he continues to be able and available for work and registered for work. If he refuses a suitable job or appropriate training, his benefits will be discontinued.
In addition, H.R. 8282 would liberalize the ground rules for determining who's in or out of this benefit bonanza. It would open the floodgates for untold thousands of claims now outlawed by State statutes. It could make it easier for people to cheat in collecting benefits, and more difficult to punish the cheaters.	The bill would strengthen administration by providing for training of State personnel so they will be better equipped to prevent fraud, properly apply eligibility and disqualification provisions of State laws, and insure that payments go only to a qualified and eligible unemployed workers. H.R. 8282 in no way limits a State's ability to detect, prosecute and obtain criminal convictions for fraud, nor does it affect in any such provisions in State laws. In addition, H.R. 8282 allows for a benefit disqualification for fraud up to 3 years—greater than most States now impose. Because of a long history of increasingly restrictive and punitive State qualification laws (which, for example, in some States prevent a person from receiving benefits while attempting to go through training school in the evening!) it is the purpose of 8282 to open the doors for more legitimate and honest claims.
Such largess could further encourage a growing class in America—the voluntarily unemployed. Why keep on working, when it would be so easy to collect pay for not working? Especially since jobless benefits—in contrast to earned income—are not subject to any income or social security taxes, cannot be attached by creditors and are not subject to union dues.	In no circumstance would a claimant receive compensation for more than half his own weekly wage as a result of H.R. 8282. In addition to losing half his wage, he loses fringe benefits (under new contracts in the auto industry these add up to about $1 an hour) and all the amounts regularly added to one's social security accounts. And, of course, the right to collect unemployment compensation is only earned by working and by seeking work when unemployed.
Weekly, there are still about 1 million pending claims. In a year the cost runs about $3 billion.	The total amount of benefits paid varies greatly and with the number of persons unemployed. Only in 1958 and 1961 have benefit costs reached $3 billion. Under such circumstances, 2¼ million persons a month file claims. On the other hand, in recent months only about 1 million persons file claims weekly. Thus, while the system is needed and used in times of high economic activity as well as in times of recession, the state of the economy influences directly the extent to which it is used and the level of benefit costs. Wage insurance is responsive to need as well as stabilizing to the economy.
At present, not one State meets all the standards laid down in H.R. 8282.	Nor is there any provision or change in H.R. 8282 which has not or is not being tried in some of the States.
In fact, many abuses would get the sanction of law if the bill is adopted. For instance: Workers who voluntarily quit their jobs for any reason, including just plain laziness, could still get benefits.	H.R. 8282 does not require any State to pay benefits to any individual worker unless he is available for work, seeking work and willing to work, and provides further: Workers who quit jobs without good cause could be denied benefits for 7 weeks, a longer period than many States now provide.
Even most employees dismissed for outright misconduct could get compensation.	Employees dismissed for misconduct could be denied benefits for 7 weeks, a longer period than many States now provide.
Any jobless person offered a new job with both suitable wages and working conditions could turn it down—and still get compensation.	Claimants refusing suitable jobs without good cause could be denied benefits for 7 weeks, a longer period than many State laws now provide.

THE ARTICLE	THE COMMENT
	Even after 7 weeks, the disqualified worker will not receive benefits unless he is available for and seeking work, is willing to accept suitable work, and is eligible in all other respects.
Millions of workers would be able to take a year's "vacation" by quitting their jobs and collecting benefits at half their pay. After that, with just 1 more day's work, the job-shirker could be eligible for a further 26-week round of benefits at half pay.	H.R. 8282 neither requires nor contemplates the payment of benefits to any worker on "vacation." It requires payment only to workers with substantial past employment, and contains no provision that "1 day's work" qualifies an individual for benefits.
In some States, certain older workers could actually make more money—for a time—by retiring early and adding tax-free unemployment compensation to their company pensions and social security benefits.	H.R. 8282 contains no proposal relating to older workers or those receiving pensions. Whatever effect there would be on the eligibility and benefits of such workers would be attributable only to provisions in State laws.
At present, all States put a ceiling on weekly benefit checks. Alaska's top, for example, is $45. Under the new bill that State, by 1971, would have a maximum of $110 weekly, by the Labor Department's estimate.	Regardless of the maximum, the bill does not require that any worker in Alaska (or in any other State) receive more than half pay. It does not require that any individual be paid $110 maximum unless his own regular weekly pay was $220 or more.
H.R. 8282 is equally generous in the duration of payments. A common State-prescribed minimum now is 10 or 12 weeks—with 26 the usual maximum. The new bill would set a usual minimum of 26 weeks for everybody covered by compensation.	It certainly seems necessary to establish a minimum of 26 weeks, when 25 percent of the claimants in 1963 exhausted all their benefits before finding work. As an example of the options left open to the States, if a worker does not accumulate enough weeks of work to qualify for 26 weeks of benefits, the States may pay him benefits on a graduated basis of their own determining.
Some claimants could qualify for 26 more weeks by working just 1 day between the 1st and 53d weekly benefit checks—which comes to 78 weeks of tax-free payments.	The present provisions of State laws can be met occasionally by a person with an unusual work record of limited duration. In providing qualifying requirements in State laws, State legislatures obviously discounted the likelihood or frequency of such odd situations, and similar provisions in H.R. 8282 are merely adapted to existing State statutes.
To be eligible for the first 26 weeks of benefits, the new bill says a claimant must have worked 20 weeks "or the equivalent." Here is where the fancy footwork comes in. Actually, as Gordon W. Winks, a Chicago lawyer representing the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, told Congress:	To avoid substituting a uniform Federal formula for the individual State approaches, H.R. 8282 was drafted in terms of equivalents in order to accommodate the States' basic types of systems for determining benefit entitlement.
In 36 States a claimant being paid the statewide weekly average could satisfy the definition of equivalency by working only 5 weeks in a year, provided no more than 3 were in 1 quarter.	Under present laws in 21 States, he could now meet the qualifying requirements for benefits and in 39 States he could do so by working 5 weeks for somewhat higher than average wages.
Many part-time workers could satisfy the requirement by working only 2 days a week for 20 weeks.	This would satisfy present qualifying requirements in 12 States, 6 of which require less than 20 weeks.
A well-paid entertainer could satisfy all the requirements by working one day in one quarter of the year and one day in another.	This could meet present qualifying requirements in 40 States. For example, under the present Illinois law to be eligible a person must earn a total of $800 in his base period, with $175 in a quarter other than his high quarter. The entertainer could meet this requirement by earning $600 for 1 day's work and $200 for another day in a different quarter.
In the first place, the new bill would skyrocket the amount of payroll taxes earmarked directly for the Federal Government. This flat tax, levied on business, is now a maximum of $12 annually per worker; under 8282, this maximum would rise to $36.30, making an overall increase of $995 million per year. Payroll taxes for State compensation funds would also jump astronomically—to pay for the liberalized benefits and to cover the voluntarily unemployed pensioners and others now disqualified by State laws. Nobody really knows how much the whole works would add, but guesses range up to $2 billion—on top of the billions we are already spending on unemployment compensation.	The cost impact is grossly overstated. Actually, unemployment compensation protection is provided at bargain rates. In 1964 and 1965 the combination of State and Federal taxes averaged about 1½ cents per payroll dollar. Had H.R. 8282 been in full effect, the cost would have been about 2 cents. The Federal share of the tax would rise to $36.30 by 1971.
All States now have a system for a sliding scale of taxes on employers. In most States an experience rating is kept for each company, to record how many compensation claims are filed by its former employees. Firms with a steady employment record pay less taxes than those with a high labor turnover.	H.R. 8282 merely surrenders to the State legislatures full control of their traditional rights to regulate State taxation and removes Federal restrictions on this process. It is a "giant step" away from the domination of the States, and it is a reduction of the monolithic government in Washington.
H.R. 8282 does not go the whole way in giving the union leaders what they want in this respect. It would not abolish the experience-rating system, but it would make it possible to abolish experience rating with considerable ease. Under the provisions of the new bill, employers with a high labor turnover doubtless would join with the unions in pressuring their legislatures for uniform taxation of all employers. A system in which everyone paid at the same rate would of course reduce the high payroll taxes now paid by firms with bad experience ratings.	H.R. 8282 permits a State to keep its present experience-rating system if the State legislature wishes to do so. But the article does not trust State legislatures to evaluate experience rating on its merits, or to resist pressures of unions and some employers for another system. The writers apparently believe that it should defend at all cost, including the fullest use of Federal authority, maximum tax savings through experience rating for some employers, but that even minimum Federal protection for workers encroaches on the States' traditional rights.
A cabal of labor leaders and Washington bureaucrats is now trying, quietly but with determination, to ram through the greatest raid ever aimed at this country's unemployment-compensation system.	The comments above should clear up some of the fallacies and distortions concerning unemployment compensation and H.R. 8282. Public understanding of the issues will come from a more rational debate of the issues than is reflected in the opposite opening sentence of the Reader's Digest article.

Chicago Experiment for the Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, an experiment is being undertaken in Chicago to secure employment for the hard-core unemployed. The program is run by local agencies, coordinated by the State Employment Security Administrator. The three agencies primarily involved—the State employment service, the county welfare department, and the Chicago Anti-Poverty Agency—have several score persons canvassing, counseling, and testing. The program was undertaken because it had become evident that it would take a considerable effort to prod many of the unemployed out of their apathy, disillusionment, and ignorance.

Because I believe that a job is a catalyst that can create the hope and self-respect that are essential to lift people out of poverty, I am keenly interested in the results of this experimental program. It is interestingly described in the attached article from the Wall Street Journal:

CHICAGO PLAN ASSISTS HARD CORE JOBLESS WITH PERSONAL VISITS—SOCIAL WORKERS CALL ON CASES, URGE THEM TO TAKE TRAINING—OTHER CITIES TO FOLLOW SUIT

(By Philip M. Boffey)

CHICAGO.—For a very brief while, the fortunes of Herbert W. and his sister, Rita, both Negro school dropouts here, seemed to be getting a little sunnier.

Herbert had a good chance for an electronics assembly-line job at $1.69 an hour and Rita, at 18 the mother of two illegitimate children, was packing candy for $1.35 an hour. But Herbert muffed his chance, appearing a day late for his job interview, and Rita, after working for 2 days, didn't show up on the third and was laid off.

The cases of Herbert and Rita are being tackled by an unusual program here to reduce hard-core unemployment persisting in today's brisk economy. The experiment, called a human resources development program, and largely financed by the Federal Government, relies heavily on person-to-person contact. Welfare workers seek out the unemployed and "underemployed in depressed neighborhoods and offer them job training, medical help or whatever else is needed to help them land a job.

It is too early to ascertain how successful the new program, which is only a few months old, will be. Early returns indicate its cost will be high, but not as high as the eventual cost to society of not helping such people as Herbert and Rita, who have been on relief nearly all their lives.

SIMILAR PROGRAMS EXPECTED

Similar person-to-person programs are expected to begin shortly in at least four other cities. St. Louis has announced it will launch a program, perhaps in a few weeks. Rochester, N.Y., and Houston both expect to start interviewing the unemployed not later than April 1. And Federal officials report that Los Angeles is "actively considering" a program. Details will vary from plan to plan, but the person-to-person approach will be the same. Depending on progress in the first group of cities, Federal officials expect a second group to adopt the plan next fiscal year.

Chicago's campaign was sparked by Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, who suggested in a speech here in November "that there will be full employment in this country only as its communities get down to a case-by-case, person-by-person treatment of unemployment."

The program is run by local agencies, coordinated by Samuel C. Bernstein, State employment security administrator. The three agencies primarily involved—the State employment service, the county welfare department, and the Chicago Antipoverty Agency—have several score persons canvassing, counseling and testing, plus numerous staff members who perform administrative work. As the program expands, the staff is expected to increase. Besides the three main agencies, numerous business, labor, civic, and other governmental organizations are participating.

It has become evidence here that it will take a considerable effort to prod many of the unemployed out of their apathy, disillusionment, and ignorance. Herbert and Rita, for example, come from a family which has been on relief most of the time since 1947. Their father deserted long ago. Their mother, 37-year-old Mrs. Lucile W., also a dropout, presides over a household containing seven of her own children plus Rita's two.

EFFORTS THAT FAILED

Efforts to find steady jobs for Herbert and Rita repeatedly have failed. When poverty fighters tried to help Herbert last fall, he hung up the phone and refused to answer a letter. But after the person-to-person program was launched December 10, Isadore Hicks, a public aid caseworker, went out to the W. household in the Negro ghetto of Lawndale and persuaded Herbert and Rita to visit the neighborhood poverty-war center for counseling and testing by State employment service workers. Job openings were found, but the teenagers failed to take advantage of them.

Both youngsters then were referred to training programs, but failed to show up. Finally Mr. Hicks went to their home and escorted them back for further counseling. Rita, a shy, frightened girl, was too nervous to take vocational tests. She is now with the Neighborhood Youth Corps, doing part-time filing work for the city's antipoverty agency at $1.25 an hour until she calms down enough to be tested. Seventeen-year-old Herbert is headed for a welding and basic education course run by the county welfare department.

"If I can just get them in a program and keep them there, I'll have it made," says Caseworker Hicks.

The time and effort spent on Herbert and Rita is by no means atypical. Door-to-door canvassers sometimes go back four and five times to make an initial contact. The canvassing is done by unemployed persons hired from the immediate neighborhood by the city's poverty-war agency or, in the case of relief recipients, by county welfare workers. Once contact is made, canvassers spend anywhere from half an hour to half a day explaining the program and completing a questionnaire on everyone 16 and older in the family. They then arrange counseling interviews for potential employables, escorting them to their appointment, if necessary.

Early results of the program, according to Labor Secretary Wirtz, "indicate the mammoth task the Illinois State Employment Service faces in furnishing hope and employment for the participants in the program." In the first 12 weeks, the canvassers interviewed and completed questionnaires on about 3,000 individuals, all on a face-to-face basis in the home. They referred 729 of these to nearby centers for job counseling, but 161, or 22 percent, failed to show up for their counseling interviews. Many of those who did missed their first appointments and only came in after they were contacted again and given a pep talk.

Only 33 job placements have been made ("That's more than we'd hoped for at this time," says an official) and only 58 have been referred to training programs, mostly in basic literacy classes financed under the Manpower Development and Training Act. More than 400 persons have been referred to "supportive services," primarily rehabilitation and health services.

Meanwhile, the State Employment Service and the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry have launched a cooperative effort to identify job vacancies, reduce unrealistic hiring requirements and stimulate the creation of new jobs. In the first 7 weeks of this effort, 322 job openings were reported available to persons processed by the program.

CHIEFLY LOW-LEVEL JOBS

The initial placements have been primarily in low-level jobs and have involved persons who either don't want training or are too old to benefit much from it. A 66-year-old retired Negro got a part-time job setting up convention booths at $11 a day. A 44-year-old janitor got a better janitorial job that pays $1.65 an hour, more than he had been getting. A 60-year-old Negro was placed as a janitor in a discount house, earning $1.25 an hour, and his 50-year-old wife was placed as a maid in a private home at the same wage. There have been some placements in semiskilled jobs—a "touch-up girl" in a photo lab, a hand driller, a trainee to an offset pressman.

Many other cases, however, seem to defy solution. One early registrant, a 48-year-old Negro woman on relief for 23 years, has only a sixth-grade education, a history of high-blood pressure and tuberculosis, and four daughters to support. If this woman is to hold a job, she probably will need medical help, literacy and vocational training, and someone to look after her youngest child while the others are in school.

Poor health is a widespread problem. About 80 percent of all persons enrolled in the early weeks of the program were in such precarious health they required a medical examination to determine what, if any, work they were fit to do. The percentage of person needing a medical exam has been declining somewhat, but still is "more than half," officials say.

EMPLOYMENT FOR HUNDREDS

John S. McCauley, of the U.S. Employment Service, who heads Federal task force coordinating assistance to Chicago and other potential person-to-person programs, believes "hundreds and hundreds" of unemployed Chicagoans eventually will find steady work at minor clerical jobs or in restaurants, hotels, and other service industries.

"The jobs won't be spectacular," Mr. McCauley says. "But they'll be considerably better than no job." A few "diamonds in the rough," are expected to qualify for skilled apprenticeship programs or technician jobs. Chicago officials hope to have 10,000 persons either in jobs or in some kind of program to improve their employability by years end.

The Chicago program, which is expected to run at least until June 30, 1967, obviously is costly. Preliminary budget proposals call for Federal grants of about $900,000 to local public and private agencies to carry out the campaign for the remainder of this fiscal year, though some of this money may carry over into next year. Most of the Federal funds are expected to come from the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

These figures don't include training expenses—"probably the biggest cost to all," according to Mr. McCauley—and other services to be provided largely through existing programs or by local groups on a nonreimbursable basis. However, as Mr. Wirtz noted in suggesting the personalized approach: "This is not a matter of molly-coddling. It is a matter of cutting * * * the alternative cost the community has to bear every time an untrained person attaches himself or herself as a parasite to it."

Highlights of What the People Are Thinking Back Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the results of my annual questionnaire project have just been computer tabulated by Data Management, Inc., of Washington, and I believe that, due particularly to the emphatic responses given a number of the issues raised, they will be of interest to many of my colleagues.

While a special opinion poll is not necessary to indicate to Members of this House the deep concern of the American people over the war in Vietnam, it is nevertheless of no little significance, I believe that 70 percent of the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan who answered my poll favored doing whatever was necessary to win the struggle in South Vietnam. The personal comments accompanying this response repeatedly stressed the need to get the job done and as soon as possible. In addition 71 percent disagreed with the President's guns and butter policy of expanding domestic programs at a time when added tax revenue for war needs is required.

On the domestic side, in view of the industrialized character of much of the Sixth District, the fact that 66 percent opposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is certainly impressive. So, too, is the failure of key Great Society programs to gain broad support among respondents from Ingham, Jackson, and Shiawassee Counties, and Bath and DeWitt Townships of Clinton County. There were 69 percent who felt that the antipoverty program has been ineffective; 70 percent who said funds should not be provide for Federal rental subsidies for those eligible for public housing; and 65 percent who did not believe a new Federal Teacher Corps should be funded.

Not to be overlooked either, even though legislative action has already been concluded, is the resounding 74 percent who opposed the reimposition of automobile and telephone excise taxes.

These are but a few of the highlights of what the people are thinking back home and I know that all of the results will be of interest to my colleagues. I am pleased to make these views a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 89th Congress.

Questionnaire results, 1966

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Not sure
Should we—			
1. Provide a GI bill for Vietnam veterans (education and other benefits)?	93	5	2
2. Increase trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union?	36	54	10
3. Reimpose automobile and telephone excise taxes that were to be eliminated after 1965?	21	74	5
4. Repeal Taft-Hartley sec. 14(b) which permits States wishing to do so to enact right-to-work laws?	26	66	8
5. Change the minimum wage law to—			
Increase the rate from $1.25 to $1.75 per hour?	37	55	8
Expand coverage to farm workers, hotels, restaurants, and certain other businesses?	52	36	12
6. Have a 4-year term for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives?	55	40	5
7. Use stockpiles of strategic goods and surplus farm commodities as a means to control prices?	46	44	10
8. Permit a tax deduction or credit for parents paying college expenses?	67	29	4
9. Provide funds for—			
A new program of Federal rental subsidies for those eligible for public housing?	19	70	11
A new Federal Teachers Corps to be used in certain designated schools?	23	65	12
10. Has the antipoverty program been effective in reducing poverty?	9	69	22
11. Do you agree with the President's policy of expanding social programs at a time when war needs are becoming greater—having both "guns and butter"?	21	71	8
12. What should we do about Vietnam?			
Withdraw entirely 9			
Continue present policy 10			
Do whatever necessary to win 70			
Other 11			

Chairman Patman Justly Criticizes Agency Action Overturning Congressional Policies of Over 30 Years' Standing Against Abuses of Commercial-Investment Banking Tieups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest financial reforms of the New Deal was cleaning up the mess in Wall Street from conflicts of interests and abuses inherent in banking-securities tieups.

The Banking Act of 1933 and the Investment Company Act of 1940 are crystal clear that a clean break between the two industries was what Congress intended. Former Chairman Cary, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, in his 1963 congressional testimony spelled out in detail the tempting opportunities for self-dealing present in bank sponsored securities operations.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are those who would turn back the clock over 30 years when the Wall Street slogan was, "There's a sucker born every minute." Both the Federal Reserve Board and the Securities and Exchange Commission are bending over backwards to accommodate the entry of First National City Bank of New York into the mutual fund field. Needless to say, their weak attempts to justify this in terms of law and policy do neither agency much credit.

Fortunately, at least one Member of Congress has sounded the alarm over this highly disturbing development, and I refer to our distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Last Thursday, the SEC announced its decision to permit First National City Bank, a $14 billion Wall Street institution to operate a mutual fund. Chairman PATMAN's statement in response to this news is "must" reading for all Members. With unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD his remarks of last Friday:

STATEMENT BY HON. WRIGHT B. PATMAN, DEMOCRAT, OF TEXAS, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, ON SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION APPROVAL OF APPLICATION BY FIRST NATIONAL CITY BANK TO ENTER MUTUAL FUND BUSINESS

Yesterday's (March 10) split decision by the Securities and Exchange Commission, permitting establishment of First National City Bank's Mutual Fund, is truly astounding. Both the Federal Reserve Board and the Justice Department have specifically refused to say that such an operation by a member bank is not a criminal offense, punishable by fine and imprisonment.

Furthermore, when we enacted the Investment Company Act of 1940, Congress specifically provided that, in order to prevent repetition of grave abuses, self-dealing and conflicts of interest between banks and investment companies, hereafter no investment company could have a majority of its board of directors consisting of bankers. In this connection, former Chairman Cary of the SEC, in congressional testimony in 1963, again reminded the Congress of numerous conflicts of interest inherent in bank-sponsored securities operations. Therefore, the majority opinion of the Commission in approving First National City Bank's application to run a mutual fund is saying, in effect, that "Congress really did not mean what it said in 1940 and Chairman Cary was talking through his hat in 1963."

The Commission's weak explanation of its usurpation of congressional policymaking in granting this exemption is that the Comptroller of the Currency periodically examines national bank trust departments. But national bank trust departments have been examined by Federal supervisory authorities ever since national banks were first given trust powers back in 1918, long before Congress saw the necessity of preventing bank domination of mutual funds in 1940.

The entire opinion, except for Commissioner Budges' strong and convincing dissent, has a very strained and almost apologetic tone. But, of course, with the American Bankers Association at the very same moment pushing hard for a special interest bill that would take away all SEC jurisdiction over bank ventures into the mutual fund field, I suppose SEC approval should not have been too surprising.

Poverty War in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has a deep and genuine interest in helping the poor, the aged, and the unfortunate, I gladly supported the widely heralded war on poverty with the expectation that it would be beneficial to a number of persons in my State of West Virginia. However, I am compelled to report that this widely heralded war simply has not lived up to advance expectations, nor has it gotten off the ground in West Virginia.

West Virginia's largest newspaper, the Charleston Gazette, recently carried an excellent article and editorial on this subject. The article was written by Harry W. Ernst, chief of the Gazette's Washington bureau. I think it fair to say that this article is an objective look at West Virginia's war on poverty. It is proof positive that the war has not begun, but suggests it may never begin in my State.

I include the article and an editorial with my prefacing remarks:

STATE ONLY SKIRMISHING IN POVERTY WAR

(By Harry Ernst)

WASHINGTON.—At Naugatuck, Mingo County, the two-room school needed paint, its porch was falling in, windows were broken, and the outhouse was filthy.

The poor whose children attend the school twice asked the Mingo County Board of Education to repair it over a 5-week period. Nothing happened.

So on their third visit the poor told the board that they would withdraw their children from school unless it was repaired. The board huffed and puffed—and quickly made the repairs.

The incident at Naugatuck also alarmed some State officials who said such a school strike would have violated State laws, which seemed to concern them far more than the repair of a dilapidated rural school.

Middle-class parents long ago would have rebelled against such primitive school conditions. They would have organized and the school board would have responded faster than Batman. But the poor simply accepted their fate.

That is until the war on poverty reached Naugatuck. Through the Mingo County community action program, the poor formed their own neighborhood organizations.

The repair of the two-room school at Naugatuck dramatizes what can happen because Congress required the "maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served" in the war on poverty.

With an annual appropriation that doesn't even equal General Motors' profits in a year, the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) can't begin to meet the needs of the Nation's poor.

What it can do, if city halls and statehouses don't interfere is encourage the poor to organize and seek solutions to their own problems (an old American tradition)—as the poor are doing in Naugatuck.

But the West Virginia Economic Opportunity Agency has shown little enthusiasm for involving the poor. It seems more interested in totaling up Federal grants approved in the State, including those the agency has nothing to do with, in an effort to prove what a dandy job it's doing.

Those are the views of a man who keeps close watch on the antipoverty program—Miles C. Stanley, president of the State Labor Federation and coordinator and the national AFL–CIO's participation in the war on poverty. He also serves on the 15-member National Advisory Council to OEO.

Stanley and other observers of West Virginia's war on poverty are disappointed because the State has failed to develop more effective community action programs, the guts of the antipoverty campaign.

In fiscal 1965, West Virginia failed to qualify for and thus lost more than $900,000 of the $2.9 million in Federal funds allotted it for community action programs (CAP).

Neighboring Kentucky, with similar poverty problems, has a far more impressive CAP record. In January it had received a total of $8 million for community action programs compared to almost $3 million for West Virginia, which also hadn't obtained a nickel in CAP research and demonstration funds compared to $2,068,162 for Kentucky.

Stanley pointed out that the two States are served by the same OEO regional office, which indicates the responsibility for West Virginia's poor CAP performance lies primarily with the State, although he said the OEO staff needs to be enlarged.

There are three basic reasons why only a few promising community action programs have been developed in West Virginia, according to Stanley and other observers:

Stubborn resistance to involving poor people who are able to speak up without fear of losing their jobs.

The statehouse's desire for State-controlled programs, although OEO clearly calls for local community action programs.

Inadequate technical assistance from the West Virginia Economic Opportunity Agency, which is dominated by political appointees who have failed to help communities develop programs tailored to their individual needs.

"We hain't niver gonna git nothin fer this here holler anyhow," observed an unemployed coal miner in a county where the CAP director tells the poor what programs they need.

"Them other fellers (a reference to the CAP Director) don't care about us. We caint do nothin."

Stanley said some State officials are so fearful of truly involving the poor in the war on poverty that they interpret such talk as a Communist plot to overthrow the political establishment.

That self-proclaimed liberal Democrats would stoop to such shabby McCarthyism indicates why they really resist involving the poor.

If the poor become organized, as in Naugatuck, and begin demanding sanitary outhouses at their schools and passable roads, they could become a threat to the political establishment which now counts on their docile support.

County organizations, whose tentacles reach into many school systems, form the power base of the statehouse that keeps their allegiance with patronage and projects. If the poor were to tire of promises and defect, the county organizations could be in trouble.

The result might be the election of reform Democrats or even Republicans—a prospect that certainly terrifies the statehouse more than fear that the poor might seize power and transform Webster County into a collective farm.

Some think the statehouse has pushed State-controlled antipoverty programs in an attempt to corner the jobs they would generate as well as to claim credit and reap any political dividends.

Federal officials knocked down two of those programs—remedial reading and small business loans—because they said imposing State programs from the top isn't the same thing as developing community projects that reflect involvement of the poor.

Other evidence of the desire for State control was the statehouse's attempt to block the most ambitious community action program, in McDowell County, and passage of the West Virginia Economic Opportunity Act last year, which reportedly is the only State law of its kind in the Nation.

The West Virginia Economic Opportunity Agency accused the McDowell community action program of discriminating against Negroes—a flimsy charge that OEO quickly proved to be false in time to save the program.

Only the brotherhood of man concerned us in McDowell County, the agency explained. But others questioned whether the politicians realized too late that a private organization had cornered the antipoverty jobs which could have been doled out to the political faithful.

Stanley said he was delighted when the legislature, at the Governor's request, passed the West Virginia Economic Opportunity Act, because everyone thought it represented an anthusiastic commitment to the war on poverty.

But Stanley now has second thoughts about the act, which in effect gives the Governor veto power over community action programs. City and county support of such programs is forbidden unless the Governor recognizes them.

Why should the Governor be permitted to interfere with counties or cities that seek Federal funds for community action programs? The State act, however, enables the Governor to destroy any community action agency that upsets him. If it antagonizes his county political allies, he can withdraw recognition and deprive the agency of essential local matching funds.

"Perhaps Governor Smith has been given bad advice about the antipoverty program or there have been misunderstandings between OEO and the State," Stanley said. "Whatever the reasons, the program needs to be given a new direction in West Virginia."

The statehouse's reluctance to involve the poor and passion for State control indicates that Federal antipoverty funds are appreciated only if they don't rock the boat—an attitude which Stanley and others think is limiting the war on poverty to a timid skirmish in West Virginia.

POOR, NOT POLITICIANS, NEED ROLE IN STATE POVERTY WAR

The statehouse's approach in attacking poverty resembles the traditional custom of presenting baskets of food to the worthy poor at Christmas. The poor should be grateful that the statehouse loves them and wants to help them.

Any prospect of the poor organizing themselves and demanding services from the political establishment, a favorite pastime of the middle class, terrifies statehouse politicians who prefer the poor to vote right and then fade away until another election.

This attitude, reflected in the operations of the West Virginia Economic Opportunity Agency, endangers the progress of the war on poverty in the State. It requires firm action by Governor Hulett C. Smith who should take the following steps:

Replace the political appointees in the State economic opportunity agency with a staff of dedicated professionals who can provide the technical assistance that West Virginia counties need to develop effective community action programs and to truly involve the poor.

Begin organizing multicounty community action agencies, such as those in the Parkersburg area and in eastern West Virginia which was developed by West Virginia University's

Appalachian Center, so that more antipoverty funds reach the poor instead of going into administrative salaries.

Enlist the statewide participation of West Virginia University's Appalachian Center in organizing such multicounty agencies and in helping them develop programs. West Virginia University will require a Federal grant for that purpose, which should be obtained as quickly as possible.

Assign West Virginia University the task of encouraging State colleges to participate in the war on poverty, especially by coming up with imaginative proposals to take advantage of research and demonstration funds available from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

But the most important reform is for the statehouse to stop resisting involvement of the poor in the war on poverty and to begin trying hard to involve them. Otherwise, few significant results will be achieved because antipoverty funds are limited. Encouraging the poor to organize will give them needed self-confidence. It also will strengthen efforts to improve West Virginia on a variety of fronts where little progress will be made unless the poor are enthusiastic participants.

The statehouse has no reason to fear the political consequences, if Governor Smith lives up to his promise of "an administration of excellence," which should be eager to serve all citizens—not just its political chums.

Sgt. R. D. Williams, Former House Page, Gave His Life Courageously for the Cause of Freedom While Serving as a Marine in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of great sadness that I pay tribute today to the late Sgt. Robert D. "Bob" Williams, of Fayetteville, Tenn., a former page of the House who was killed in Vietnam recently.

Bob Williams was a fine, patriotic, personable young man who saw his duty clearly. He heard his country's call and volunteered for service in the marines. He asked for service overseas. And, he volunteered for more active duty after being sent overseas.

Bob William's courage and dedication were in the great tradition of the Volunteer State of Tennessee and of our country.

This fine young American served as a page under my sponsorship during the 1961 session of Congress. He enjoyed Washington. He was keenly interested in political science, history, and Government.

He was active in my State in the Young Democratic Club and when then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was the featured speaker at a Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner in Nashville, Bob Williams was the first to shake the hand of the Vice President at the conclusion of his address.

President Johnson in a telegram to Mrs. Kathleen Williams, Bob's mother, said this:

> Yours has indeed been a deep personal loss but you may take pride in the knowledge that your son's services to his country contributed greatly to safeguarding the freedom cherished so dearly by peace-loving nations throughout the world. In choosing to serve in the Armed Forces of his country during these troubled times, your son demonstrated the love of country and devotion to duty of a true American.

I join the President and others who came to know Bob Williams in extending our deepest sympathy to his fine and courageous mother and to other members of the family. The greatness of America was never more apparent than in the sacrifice and patriotism of this fine young man who gave his life in the cause of freedom.

"Intellectual Atmosphere Changes at Notre Dame—Entering Students' Records Better—Pay Boosts Attract High Caliber Faculty," Los Angeles Times, February 21, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the text of an excellent article by William Trombley, education writer of the Los Angeles Times, published in that newspaper on February 21, 1966, concerning the University of Notre Dame, which is located in the congressional district I represent.

The article follows:

INTELLECTUAL ATMOSPHERE CHANGES AT NOTRE DAME—ENTERING STUDENTS' RECORDS BETTER—PAY BOOSTS ATTRACT HIGH CALIBER FACULTY

(By William Trombley)

The tranquillity of the Notre Dame campus, which seems even calmer in the icy silence of a northern Indiana winter, does not bear witness to the intellectual turmoil at this most prestigious of American Catholic universities.

A graduate of 20 years ago might return to South Bend and see nothing to disturb him. The bizarre golden dome still sits atop the ancient administration building. The huge, 59,000-seat football stadium still stands at the entrance to the campus.

The alumnus of 20 years' standing would see some new buildings, to be sure—$40 million worth of them, including a 14-story, $9 million library, a computing center and a radiation research laboratory.

FEWER PRIESTS

He might notice that there are fewer priests on campus than there used to be. Only 78 of Notre Dame's full-time faculty of 516 are priests, 65 of them members of the Congregation of the Holy Cross, better known as the Holy Cross Fathers, who operate at the university.

But only if the graduate studied the scholastic records of incoming students, the published books of the faculty, the list of research projects in which Notre Dame professors currently are involved, and the content of courses would he gain an understanding of the real changes at his alma mater.

Entering freshman now average 575 on the college board verbal aptitude test and 630 in math aptitude, an increase of about 100 points in the last decade.

SALARIES DOUBLED

In the 13 years of his presidency, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh has doubled faculty salaries and has been willing to pay top academic dollar for key men. Two new professors of mathematics recently cost the university $24,000 and $22,500.

Notre Dame now loses few good men for salary reasons. "We keep the men we want," said Frederick D. Rossini, dean of the college of science, "against Harvard or Stanford or any of them."

As a result, there are now at least two dozen professors at Notre Dame who would be prize acquisitions for any faculty.

Notre Dame has been strong in the physical and life sciences for many years. The Lobund Laboratory for germ-free research, directed by Dr. Morris Pollard, has 20 separate government and foundation research contracts at present. A radiation chemistry laboratory, operated in conjunction with the Atomic Energy Commission, has a staff of 108 and an annual budget of $1.2 million.

MONEY FOR HUMANITIES

But in recent years research money has begun to flow to the humanities, too. For example, a research center with the improbable name of the Philosophical Institute for Artificial Intelligence, financed by the National Science Foundation, is studying philosophical problems related to the use of computers. Artists, biologists, and philosophers are involved, as well as computer scientists.

The arrival of Dr. George N. Shuster 5 years ago set off a flurry of activity in the social sciences.

Dr. Shuster, 71, had retired as president of Hunter College in New York City and was about to join the Ford Foundation when he changed his mind and came to Notre Dame as a special assistant to Father Hesburgh.

"I was attracted by the personality of Father Hesburgh and the ideas he had for this place," Dr. Shuster said recently, "he's always about 5 miles ahead of everybody else."

Father Hesburgh's appointment of Dr. Shuster is regarded by many as the smartest move he has made as president, since it was testimony of Notre Dame's desire to name laymen to top positions in the university (Father Hesburgh since has appointed two lay vice presidents) and also helped Notre Dame where it was academically weak, in the social sciences.

A Center for the Study of Man in Contemporary Society, headed by Dr. Shuster, serves as sponsor and fundraiser for a wide variety of social science research projects.

A massive study of Catholic elementary and secondary education has just been completed. Among a dozen projects currently underway are research into drug use in Harlem and a study of attitudes toward the poor.

The center has plunged Notre Dame into research that once would have been considered much too controversial. For instance, a team of sociologists is studying family and fertility problems in Peru, Brazil, and Colombia, working with a $562,000 grant from the Federal Government.

Five years ago, Dr. Shuster said, "Notre Dame would have had neither the desire nor the competence" to do such work.

John T. Noonan, law school professor, whose history of the Catholic Church's attitudes toward birth control has been widely praised, commented, "there was never any question" about the propriety of a Notre Dame professor tackling this subject. "Perhaps there might have been 25 years ago, or even 10 years ago, but certainly not today."

An international conference on theological issues raised by the Ecumenical Council will be held on the campus in March. A month later philosophers from around the world, including several from Communist countries, will gather for a congress in Marxist philosophy.

Notre Dame, like most universities, has weak departments. Psychology has suffered there, as at most Catholic schools, from the church's dislike for Freudian analysis. A department was just started this year.

Anthropology, sociology and political science require further bolstering.

Dr. Shuster believes Notre Dame must have a department or a school of education "because education is bound to be one of the great professional fields in the country" in the future.

GRADUATE PROGRAM

Much of the graduate program needs to be strengthened. Notre Dame now has about 1,000 graduate students in its total enrollment of 7,100 and offers Ph. D.'s in 17 fields. But several standard doctorates are not offered—in modern languages, for instance—and the increasing specialization in science means the university must add many new men.

Philosophy and theology are required courses at Notre Dame, as they are at almost all Catholic schools. Their quality is a source of campus controversy.

The philosophy department has broadened its interests in recent years. In addition to the expected experts in St. Thomas Aquinas, the department now has good men in existentialist thought, or phenomenology, as many Catholics prefer to call it, and in the history of philosophy.

NO PRAGMATISTS

However, there are no American pragmatists, and the university has hired very few non-Catholic philosophers, except on a visiting professor basis.

"This is a rather sensitive area," said the Reverend Ernan McMullin, an articulate Irish diocesan priest who heads the department. "I would prefer to have a Catholic if he's competent. It's not that I'm intolerably restrictive, but I'd want a man who understands what we're trying to do. He should see that the existence of God, the nature of the human soul, are very important questions. Not that we prescribe the answers, but we do believe the questions are important."

But some at Notre Dame would like to see more non-Catholics added to the permanent philosophy faculty and the curriculum and range of intellectual inquiry opened up even more than it has been.

Even greater ferment exists in theology.

A few years ago the theology department was generally considered to be the weakest in the university, an irony in a great Catholic institution. The courses were traditional and dull—"catechism stuff," critics on the present-day faculty call them.

Recently, however, the voices of younger, more liberal theologians have been heard.

One of these is the Reverend John S. Dunne, author of "The City of the Gods," which George Shuster calls "the best book anybody has written around here in years." A recent series of lectures by Father Dunne on contemporary religious issues drew overflow crowds.

"That never happened around here before," remarked President Hesburgh.

The students came in such large numbers, Father Dunne believes, because "these are the questions that really interest students today. They are questioning the church. They wonder whether they are really in the church any more. They are trying to break away from that old thou shalt not approach and find out about Christian love—how to relate to other persons, how to break through to autonomy, to real freedom."

In Father Dunne's opinion, no questions should go unasked in theology courses. "When the spirit of inquiry enters into theology, it has an effect on the level of living as well as thought. A kind of quest begins, a search for the meaning of life which is a very real thing for young people now."

Father Dunne continued: "What a Catholic university should do is witness to the fact that the search can go on within the church. One can question everything from within and search for the meaning of life without breaking with the church."

Like others at Notre Dame, Father Dunne thinks that when Notre Dame aimed for the top academically its leaders "might not have realized this would have a big religious dimension," that it would involve "a big break with the static past."

The right to free inquiry has not been fully established for younger theologians who do not have Father Dunne's reputation. Said one:

"Occasionally, if they hear you're saying something mildly heretical in class, they'll mention it. I suppose you could call it a mild warning. That's all—so far, at least."

INEVITABLE TIDE

These incidents appear to be last, desperate efforts by conservative theologians to stem an inevitable tide, however. Notre Dame will begin a doctoral program in theology next year and soon thereafter plans to set up a research institute in comparative religion, where Protestant, Jewish, and probably agnostic scholars will work with Catholics.

Father Hesburgh said he assumes there are atheists among Notre Dame's students (though 98.5 percent of undergraduates, and 95 percent of all students, claim to be Catholics).

Years ago Notre Dame might have dropped such students, the president said, but not now.

"If a student is going to be an atheist, this is probably as good a place for him as any," said Father Hesburgh. "There are big questions about God—does he exist? Has he had anything to say? Is it relevant to life today? The student should ask these questions. This is the place to work them out."

Hawaii Second in Nation in 1965 Personal Income Rate of Gain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii again has clearly demonstrated its economic vitality. In a recent survey conducted by the Business Week magazine, the results showed that Hawaii not only had the second largest rate of gain in personal income for the month of December 1965, but it also rated second highest among the 50 States for the entire year of 1965.

Hawaii's 13.2-percent annual increase was second only to Idaho's 13.9-percent rise. The average rate of gain for the entire United States for 1965 was 8.7 percent.

I am proud to submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record, the article in the March 1, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser which contains the Business Week survey results:

Isles Rate No. 2 in Income Gain

Hawaii had the second largest rate of gain in personal income for 1965 of any of the Nation's 50 States.

The State also had the second biggest rate of growth in the December personal income survey conducted by Business Week magazine.

For the year, Hawaii showed a 13.2-percent increase—right behind Idaho's 13.9-percent rise.

In December, personal income here climbed 17.5 percent over the same month a year ago. The leader for December was North Dakota with a 23-percent jump. Idaho was third at 17.3 percent.

For the United States, the average rate of gain amounted to 8.7 percent for the year, the largest ever recorded by the Business Week survey. And the December gain for the Nation was 9.4 percent.

Backing Our Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, typical of many newspapers, which I have seen, the Houston Post indorses the plan to give our fighting men in Vietnam the hardware they need to do their job.

The Post says:

> Surely, there are no thinking Americans who believe we now could withdraw from South Vietnam without doing ourselves irreparable damage.

And it adds that all patriotic Americans would want to supply our men with the material they need.

The editorial sheds light on issues of great concern, and with the belief that this article will be of interest to others, I offer it for the Record:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Mar. 2, 1966]

Vietnam Money Bill Voted

The Nation had more than ample debate on the administration's $4.8 billion Vietnam military authorization bill when Congress approved it Tuesday.

The bill in no way is a congressional mandate for increasing the pace of U.S. activity in Vietnam. It merely authorizes payment for military hardware for what we now are doing. Unfortunately, the debate on it, particularly in the Senate, became involved in the hawks versus doves controversy that ballooned from the Vietnam hearings conducted by Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The hearing and the delay in passing the money bill undoubtedly have been of much comfort to the Communist leaders in Hanoi and Peiping. Some of the things said at the Fulbright hearing by opponents of the U.S. effort to save South Vietnam from coming under the domination of the Hanoi Government very likely will strengthen the conviction of Hanoi that internal strife in this country will result in our withdrawal.

Nothing, of course, is further from the truth. The misguided individuals who speak for withdrawal overlook the fact that we have made a solemn promise to defend the people of South Vietnam against aggression, and that to break this promise would end the trust of our allies in the mutual defense agreements we have with them.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk spoke the blunt truth when he told the Fulbright committee that we are in Vietnam to fight Communist aggression and "because we must make clear that the United States keeps its word whenever it is pledged."

Indeed, the consequence of breaking our word to South Vietnam undoubtedly would have serious repercussions throughout the free world.

As for the military necessity of U.S. participation in Vietnam, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former U.S. Ambassador to that country and certainly a man thoroughly familiar with all aspects of the conflict, told the Fulbright committee that the Communist aggression in South Vietnam is a test of the theory that so-called wars of liberation can be won cheaply and safely. If the Communists were to win in South Vietnam, he added, the war of liberation technique "will be used widely about the world."

More than $3 billion of the money authorized by the bill would be used for procurement of aircraft. Surely, there are no patriotic Americans who would deny our forces all the planes they need to do their job.

Our pledge to defend South Vietnam was first made in the SEATO treaty of 1954, during the Eisenhower administration. It has been reiterated since then by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Surely, there are no thinking Americans who believe we now could withdraw from South Vietnam without doing ourselves irreparable damage.

Bravery Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, a young soldier in far off southeast Asia wrote down on a pad of notebook paper,

> The cowards die a thousand times, the brave die but once.

That quotation is contained in a letter Pfc. Hiram D. Strickland, of Graham, N.C., wrote to his parents before he was killed in Vietnam.

His letter was reprinted in a recent editorial in the Indianapolis Star. The paper titled the editorial, "He Understood," and said it could make no comment which could add to the eloquence of the letter.

Because I feel sure that many will want to read this moving letter, I place it the Record at this point:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Mar. 11, 1966]

HE UNDERSTOOD

Pfc. Hiram D. Strickland, 20 years old, had his own personal feelings about Vietnam.

He put them in a letter to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Donald A. Strickland, of Graham, N.C. It was written in ink on a pad of notebook paper.

Private First Class Strickland, like other young men in combat, had fears he might not come back and he expressed them. He wrote:

"I'm writing this letter as my last one. You've probably already received word that I'm dead and that the Government wishes to express its deepest regret. Believe me, I don't want to die, but I know it was part of my job. I want my country to live for billions and billions of years to come.

"I want it to stand as a light to all people oppressed, and guide them to the same freedom we know. If we can stand and fight for freedom, then I think we have done the job God set down for us. It's up to every American to fight for the freedom we hold so dear. If we don't, the smells of free air could become dark and damp as a prison cell.

"We won't be able to look at ourselves in a mirror, much less at our sons and daughters because we will know we have failed our God, country, and our future generations.

"I can hold my head high because I fought, whether it be in heaven or hell. Besides, the saying goes, 'One more GI from Vietnam, St. Peter, I've served my time in hell.'

"I fought for Sandy, Nell, Gale (his sisters), mom, and dad. But when the twins and Sandy's kids get old enough, they'll probably have to fight, too. Tell them to go proudly and without fear of death, because it is worth keeping the land free.

"I remember a story from Mr. Williams' (Thomas Williams, a teacher at Southern High School in Alamance County) English classes when I was a freshman that said, 'The cowards die a thousand times, the brave die but once.'

"Don't mourn me, mother, for I'm happy I died fighting my country's enemies, and I will live forever in people's minds. I've done what I've always dreamed of. Don't mourn me, for I died a soldier of the United States of America.

"God bless you all and take care. I'll be seeing you in heaven.

"Your loving son and brother, Butch."

The letter was undated. It was never sent. Before Private First Class Strickland could mail it, he was killed by a burst of enemy gunfire which struck him in the head. His parents were notified of his death in a telegram delivered by a taxidriver. The letter was found in a package containing his personal effects.

No comment we can make will add to its eloquence.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to bring to the attention of the House a speech delivered by Mr. Thomas E. Wisniewski of Baltimore, Md., entitled "Democracy: What it Means to Me." Mr. Wisniewski's speech was chosen as the winning Maryland entry in the 1966 Voice of Democracy Contest, sponsored annually by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary.

The speech follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Thomas E. Wisniewski)

Today someone—some soldier—dies in Vietnam, and the scent to touch his nostrils is either that of burnt gunpowder, some rare jungle flower, or the stench of another soldier's coagulating blood. Today someone dies trying to cross the Berlin wall, and the last sight that he sees is broken glass and broken hopes—but not broken people. Today someone enters this country to someday become one of its citizens, and the first sight that he sees, the first sensation he perceives, the first smell to touch his nostrils is that of—is there a word for it?

The first immigrants to this Nation used to be processed at an area on Ellis Island. They would step ashore and fill out the required forms and recite the required oaths and they would fear. They were soon led into a large hall. They were there—together. Here was the world's greatest collection of cowards and heroes. They were cowards because they ran. They were heroes because they ran. Many ran away from something. Many ran toward something. But they did run. They ran away from petty dictators and petty incomes. They ran toward hope. They had a simple faith in a new land—they had a simple belief in democracy. They had a simple hope to live.

To them democracy was not a theory—a government—a philosophy. It was a hope. At times it was naive, ignorant. At times it was brilliant—giving them the answer to the relentless question of "Why did I come?" Democracy is no longer the great experiment; it is the great reality. It is a reality that has no easy explanation, but nevertheless something that can be understood by the most ignorant and something that can be died for by the most cowardly.

To the immigrant democracy offers only one thing. It has no unpronouncable name, but some wish that it never be pronounced. All of democracy and all of the well-intentioned philosophy on democracy revolves about that one oft-repeated and oft-misunderstood word of dignity. Democracy offers man only one right—the right to be himself—the right of his dignity. From this all other rights proceed. But there can be no democracy if people do not want it. Democracy is not something that you put down in law books and point to it and say "There is our democracy; enforce it." It is something whose fragile existence is put into the hands of the individual. The individual decides whether to exercise it. If there is no respect for dignity in an individual's soul—he has no democracy. Democracy can be and is no more than a group of individuals acting together in respect of dignity and integrity—in respect of the individual.

Throughout the world there are those who die for it. May it be said of us that we live for it—that we live for democracy.

To the soldier, to the man on the other side of the Berlin wall, to the immigrant, and to me democracy is not a mere theory or philosophy. It is a simple reality whose essence is the respect, dignity, and integrity of the individual.

Wars of National Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, at the American Bar Association's House of Delegates meeting in Chicago last month, the association's standing committee on education against communism submitted a report of its programs of education on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. The chairman of this committee is Mr. Morris I. Leibman, a member of President Johnson's Panel on International Affairs and National Security. Among the activities conducted by the committee are summer training institutes for high school social studies and political science teachers, involving instruction on the contrast between communism and liberty under law. Eighteen colleges and universities have cooperated in these training programs. Committee publications are distributed to schools, professional, educational, and trade associations, as well as religious and civic organizations and the press. One of the committee's publications, a teachers' syllabus, "Democracy Confronts Communism in World Affairs," was purchased by the Department of State for distribution to U.S. embassies and consulates abroad. At the invitation of State and local bar associations and other organizations, seminars on communism and the free society are conducted.

At the Chicago meeting, briefings were held on a variety of subjects. One of the speakers was Dr. Richard V. Allen, chairman of the study program on communism at the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C Because of the continuing nationwide discussion of the meaning of the term "wars of national liberation," I am inserting Dr. Allen's statement made at the February 21, 1966, special briefing session.

Mr. Speaker, our country is deeply engaged in Vietnam today, and our conduct in that part of the globe will surely affect our future and the future of the entire free world. The people of the United States have the right to be fully informed on our involvement in Vietnam, what it means and what it entails. To its credit, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by its public Vietnam hearings, has made a contribution to the national dialogue. I believe that a full discussion of all viewpoints on all aspects of the problems facing the world is valuable.

Dr. Allen's statement follows:

WARS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION

(Address by Richard V. Allen)

Within the last year we have all heard the term "wars of national liberation" used with increasing frequency. Our newspapers, magazines, our television screens, the airwaves, the documents of Congress, and the speeches of administration spokesmen all have been filled with news concerning the so-called wars of national liberation.

What, precisely, is a war of national liberation?

Is it the expression of the legitimate interests of people who are on the march to democracy?

Is it a kind of "American Revolution" designed to free the citizens of countries which are ruled by despots, tyrants, and assorted corrupt powerseekers?

And now for the most important question: Is it the kind of war which Americans understand, and is it the kind of war which we are prepared to deal with effectively?

I believe the answer to each question is "No." And why? Precisely because a war of national liberation is a war waged by Communists for the express purpose of subverting, paralyzing, and ultimately overthrowing non-Communist governments everywhere. It is a form of warfare which the Communists have sought to legitimize; it is a form of warfare which they claim is sweeping the world; and is a form of warfare which we, the greatest and most powerful nation on earth, are ill-equipped and uninclined to deal with.

Let us turn back the clock 10 years, and let us imagine that we are assembled in this room in February 1956. Let us further imagine that there is a speaker on this platform who is telling you a fantastic tale. His story goes something like this:

"Today we are faced with a threat to our way of life unmatched by any threat in our entire history. We have failed to gain an appreciation of the times in which we live. Three years ago, when the Soviet dictator, Stalin, died, we took comfort in the pronouncement that the new Communist leadership would practice a policy of peaceful coexistence with the West. But, our speaker goes on to say, do not be fooled by such promises; actions speak louder than words, and when the Communists finally give up their drive for worldwide revolution, we will know it, for they will have begun to practice what they have preached. I, for one, do not believe that they have given up; I believe that they are trying to throw us off guard, that they are seeking to deceive us until they can muster their forces for a new assault on the free world, and that if we let ourselves be fooled again, we may one day wake up and find them on our doorsteps."

And then our imaginary speaker makes a fantastic, and some would say, an insane prediction:

"Because I believe that the Communists have not given up, I will predict tonight that within 10 years there will be an armed Communist camp on an island within a hundred miles of our shores; that the Communists will try to place weapons of mass destruction on that island; and that that island will serve as a staging base for the subversion of the entire Southern Hemisphere. I will further predict that the Communists will try to take advantage of the instability and chaos in Africa as the colonial powers of Belgium, France, and Great Britain withdraw their presence there; and I shall predict that within 10 years, the United States will have a quarter of a million men in the steaming jungles of southeast Asia, and that our boys will be losing their lives to protect an obscure and distant nation located there."

With that our speaker concludes his presentation, and is greeted by a mixture of polite applause and muffled laughter. And then, a voice from the back of the room cries out: "Who invited that lunatic to tell us a fairytale?"

But as our imaginary speaker rests his case, there is a very real man speaking in a hall 5,000 miles away. He has just finished a 3-hour condemnation of his predecessor, the leader of a mighty country. He has proclaimed that war is no longer inevitable, and that his country seeks to live in harmony with the rest of the world. He promised peace, friendship, and social progress.

The man was, of course, Nikita Khrushchev; the predecessor whom he had condemned was Stalin, and the peace which he had promised was the kind which only communism could bring to the world; it was the peace of total domination. In February 1956 Nikita Khrushchev pledged that kind of peace by combining the power of the Soviet Union and the rest of the Communist bloc with the "revolutionary forces of the national liberation movement."

So, here we are, 10 years later. Our imaginary speaker is gone, and so is Khrushchev. In the place of the imaginary speaker stands a bespectacled, somewhat overweight young man; in the place of Khrushchev stands not one, but two men, both bespectacled and both overweight. Our Chicago speaker is not given to making rash predictions, so he will not say that, within 10 years the U.S. possession of Puerto Rico will be subjected to a war of national liberation.

He will not say that strategically located countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America—now heavily infiltrated by Communists—may pass into the Communist orbit within a few years. He leaves that to his friends in Moscow and Peiping, and to the representatives of 77 other Communist Parties which met just 40 days ago at the Havana Tricontinental Conference. At Havana the Communist Parties of the world proclaimed that:

"We are deeply in sympathy with the courageous struggle waged by the peoples of Latin America. We express our fraternal solidarity with the armed struggle being waged by the Venezuelan, Peruvian, Colombian, and Guatemalan patriots for freedom against the stooges of imperialism. We are in solidarity with the struggle being waged by the people of Puerto Rico, which remains under the occupation of North American imperialism."

This statement along with the general declarations emanating from that Tricontinental Conference amount to nothing more than a new unilateral declaration of war upon the United States, it allies, and all non-Communist governments in the world.

Once again the Communists have publicly declared, for all the world to hear, that they are embarking on a new offensive against the free world. They have said that conditions are now ripe for the final push, and that they intend to utilise every weapon in their impressive arsenal of conflict techniques. They have promised that they will not give up the struggle against us, and that with the passage of time both our will to resist and our capability to resist will be weakened by the pressures of their "national liberation movement."

They know that the most cherished desire of the American people and of free people everywhere is the establishment of a just and lasting peace. They have dedicated themselves to denying us that peace, saying that our kind of peace is aggression. In short, they will not let us alone until we have given in, and they will challenge us to prove that they are wrong.

To put it another way: the Communists are convinced that we are slowly weakening, and that they are steadily gaining strength; that our prestige and honor are slipping away, and that theirs is rapidly increasing; that our will to resist and our willingness to get involved are ebbing away, and that theirs is reaching its peak; that we are losing, and they are winning.

Are they, in fact, winning? And are we losing? From the point of view of the Communist leaders in Moscow and Peiping there is little cause for pessimism. When they compare the map of 1920 with the map of 1966, should they feel that they are losing? From humble beginnings in the exile capitals of the world some 50 years ago they have created an empire which controls a billion people. Putting ourselves in their shoes we might ask, why should we give up if our strategy has paid consecutive dividends?

But, you may argue, the Communist world is now divided; Moscow and Peiping are at each other's throats, and it is likely that they will soon be locked in a prolonged and bloody war. Can't we take some comfort from the fact that the Communists, like thieves, are falling out among themselves? No informed citizen, much less the prudent specialist who makes a career of studying the Communist movement, would deny that the two Communist giants are engaged in an important and decisive debate.

But over what are they debating; strategy or tactics? Over whether, or how to continue the attack against what they call imperialism? Over means or ends? On this point of crucial importance we simply cannot afford to make a mistake; for if we do, it will be a profoundly dangerous, perhaps fatal, mistake.

At the present time, the Soviet Union and Communist China are waging a battle of words on one level, and are competing vigorously at another. What they are competing for is not each other's territory, but for the leadership of the international Communist movement. Each is trying to prove the validity of his tactics, but neither makes a secret of his strategy.

Perhaps you have heard the persuasive and cleverly presented thesis that Communist China is the biggest threat to peace because it is more militant, and that the Soviet Union is less dangerous because it says it wants to live in peaceful coexistence with the West. And perhaps you have also heard the theory that the Soviet Union, as it progresses economically, and as it becomes more and more like the United States, will gradually abandon its revolutionary goals.

But what does "peaceful coexistence" really mean? To us, it means "live and let live." To the Communists it means, in the words of Khrushchev, "a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle" between communism and capitalism. It means expansion of the worldwide revolutionary process with every means short of nuclear war; it means going to the brink, and then retreating when we respond; in plain language, it means warfare, a peculiar kind of warfare which we have never fought. It is the warfare of the "national liberation movement."

What, then, can we expect from wars of national liberation in the future, and what can we do about them?

First, we can almost certainly expect that there will be many more of them in the years ahead. Operating under its umbrella of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union will continue to use its rapidly expanding power to support them whenever and wherever possible. Few of us realize the dimensions of Soviet economic strength, and the strategic implications of that strength.

While the Soviet people are denied the necessities of modern life, huge sums are devoted to subversion, propaganda, espionage, and infiltration.

The Soviets posses the largest airline in the world, and have extensive airline routes to all the underdeveloped countries. Their commercial planes carry agents disguised as technical advisers to Africa, and on the return flights are loaded with students and cultural exchange delegations.

As of January 1 of this year the Soviet Union has one of the largest commercial maritime fleets in the world, and those ships ply the troubled waters of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, delivering cargoes of weapons, cutrate oil, and revolutionaries.

While the Soviets continue to supply the Vietcong by rail, sea, and air, they look to expanded trade with the West for the purpose of augmenting their military and productive strength. They continue to build up bases of subversion in Cuba and in Zanzibar, and hope to capture other strategically located islands to act as steppingstones in the chain of subversion.

We have said that we welcome economic competition. Do we in fact welcome it? Why should we? Should we promote trade with the Soviet Union when we know that American goods and know-how will be used, directly or indirectly, to support wars of attrition such as that in Vietnam? Are not the Communists asking us to give them the bullets, load the gun, and show them how to aim it?

Finally, our second question: What can we do to stem the tide of Communist "wars of liberation?" What I have presented here is an essentially pessimistic picture of the world. But I would ask you to keep in mind that this discussion has been devoted to a very important question—one that we are hard pressed to answer.

I do owe you a positive alternative, and it can be summed up in a few words: We can win any battle with any adversary if we make the decision to commit our unmatched strength and our own revolutionary ideals to winning when and where it counts; this will be done if we steer the path of realism and avoid the twin dangers of complacency and unfounded optimism.

Tomorrow, as we celebrate the birthday of our first President, millions of Americans will repeat the pledge of allegiance. We will recite it with pride, because it is the embodiment of the spirit of democracy. Elsewhere in the world, Communists will be taking another pledge, one quite different from our own. This Communist pledge of allegiance might sound something like this:

"I pledge allegiance to the destruction of your society, to the values for which it stands, and to the goals which it seeks to attain;

"I pledge allegiance to your destruction not because I feel hatred of you, but because you represent the decaying forms of the past; not because you have committed a crime against me, but because the system you represent and seek to perpetuate is in itself criminal; not because you want to live in peace and harmony, but because your way of life can never bring peace and harmony;

"I pledge allegiance to the new world order which I will help to create, and if you attempt to stop me, I will crush you."

Clearly, this is a challenge we must be prepared to meet. And if we cannot do it, who can?

Korea Sends Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, South Korea's decision to send 20,000 more troops to Vietnam to reinforce the allies "is a mark of solidarity with not only the United States, but with the United Nations."

This is the editorial opinion of the St. Petersburg Times, which add:

> It is truly heartwarming to have a concrete expression of gratitude from one of the nations which the United States has assisted.

Because this editorial is of such timely interest, I am offering it for the Record, where others may read it in its entirety:

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 2, 1966]

SOUTH KOREA COMES THROUGH

The vote of the South Korean government to sent 20,000 more troops to Vietnam to reinforce the allies—principally U.S. forces—is the best news about that unhappy war in many a day.

This doubling of the South Korean contingent is welcome, of course, just for the addition of that many tough, well-trained fighting men on our side.

But the importance and significance of the move goes far beyond that.

One of the best things about it is that this will ease the Communist charge of "white men fighting yellow men."

Of course, with South Vietnamese troops outnumbering our own by more than 3 to 1, the accusation already was a distorted piece of propaganda. But it is distinctly helpful to have Asiatics from another nation present in such large numbers.

(Incidentally, in answer to the question so often asked as to why we do not accept Chinese forces under Chiang Kai-shek, which he has offered, this is because that would be almost as great a provocation for Red China's full intervention as if we were to bomb Peiping.)

Another point made by the South Korean action is that it is a mark of solidarity with not only the United States, but with the United Nations, which were responsible for South Korea's independence.

It may begin to dawn on some other members of United Nations that this is their fight, too.

Finally, in the world as it is today, it is truly heart-warming to have a concrete expression of gratitude from one of the nations which the United States has assisted. This kind of thanks really counts.

Congressman William F. Ryan Asks: "What Is Our Franchise To Wage War in the Name of Peace?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago today, on January 16, William F. Ryan, our colleague from New York, made a major foreign policy address at the Sane dinner. On that occasion the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy presented the annual Eleanor Roosevelt Peace Award to Senator George McGovern in recognition of his significant efforts in the cause of peace.

During the course of his remarks Congressman Ryan raised a question which has special pertinency at this troubled time. He asked: "What is our franchise to wage war in the name of peace?" He suggested:

> America's experience in attempting to bring about peace is a history of efforts to achieve conditions which often reflect our aspirations and not, strictly speaking, our interests.

Congressman Ryan urged that we look beyond Vietnam to China and our relationship to Chinese aspirations and power. He said:

> Although we say—for purposes of convenience—that the near collision over the Cuban missiles was the critical impetus for the test ban agreement, we must remember that the lessons learned during long years of negotiations played a significant part in stabilizing the Cuban crisis. A comparable confrontation with China seems highly likely within the next decade; yet we have not initiated an equivalent dialog. In the Far East our real and attainable interests lie in heading off a war with China—in meeting the threat of famine, chaos, and civil breakdown in India—not in duplicating nature's disasters.

Mr. Speaker, these considerations are of the utmost importance, now, when critical decisions are still being made about our policy in the Far East. Congressman Ryan's speech is a valuable contribution to the debate that is taking place, and I want to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

An Address by Congressman William F. Ryan Delivered at Sane's Annual Eleanor Roosevelt Peace Award Dinner, January 16, 1966—Award Recipient: Senator George McGovern

In 1963, the French Government sent Da Vinci's "Mona Lisa" to the United States for a brief exhibition, chaperoned by André Malraux, the distinguished French author, art historian, and Minister of Cultural Affairs. In presenting the "Florentine Lady" to President Kennedy at Washington's National Gallery, Mr. Malraux added a small token of French civilization—an aphorism making up in elegance what it might have lacked in validity.

"Alone of all great nations," he said, "the United States has waged war without worshiping it." Then, his tribute finished, Mr. Malraux departed, leaving the Mona Lisa in the custody of an around-the-clock guard of Marines standing at parade rest in full dress uniform, their rifles pointing outward to the week-long crowds. Possibly the Mona Lisa had never been safer from her admirers, nor her expression so fitting.

The "Mona Lisa" is now back in the Louvre. Mr. Malraux is nearby, a member of the French Cabinet as before. But the Marines, if they are still in service, are very likely to be both out of dress uniform and out of their country, which has again called its young men to an unworshiped war.

We meet tonight against the backdrop of a somewhat eased domestic anxiety. In his state of the Union message President Johnson has outlined an economy which can support both guns and butter. He has displayed a diplomacy which seems willing and able to rain sticks, carrots, or both, on an adversary as the occasion demands. If there is a lingering suspicion that the butter will test out to be margarine and the peace offensive will yet be overshadowed by the unfolding of new war plans, there is still an abiding sense that President Johnson is a reluctant warrior. The crisis of confidence has been smothered in its infancy to the relief of the Nation which has looked on it as an unwanted child.

I believe that the current initiatives are born of a genuine desire for peace and that the President may be ahead of much of the country and many of its policymakers in wanting peace. What warrants skepticism is the values and policies which can bring a democratic leader, who has a distaste for war and the demands of international politics, to the brink of catastrophe abroad and a credibility crisis at home.

This is a question which may always be with us; perhaps it is beyond the power of any single generation to answer it or put it to rest. But tonight, and irrespective of any possible settlement in Vietnam, it has a special pertinence as the lull in this conflict allows us to see beyond to the potential collision between the United States and China.

What is our franchise to wage war in the name of peace? It is true that, for a violent people, the United States has often shrunk from the excesses of war in a way to command the respect to mankind. But it is a non sequitur to claim, therefore, to be respected as a peace-loving nation, much less to be a guardian of the peace. For a nation of our relative age in this changing world, our experience does not warrant that confidence.

We have had only one war, the Civil War, which ravaged our own country and brought anything like real hardship to its civilian population. The design for peace and reconstruction imposed after the war collapsed in just over a decade before sustained, but ineptly opposed, resistance. One hundred years later, the social dislocations of that war are considered by a majority of Americans to be their geatest domestic concern. Where the economic consequences of the war have been alleviated, the chosen means have often been unproductive: cotton output is heavily subsidized; tobacco's dangers are, like the writs of Caligula, posted nearly out of sight, and the South's industrial renaissance is strapped tightly to the engines of new wars.

Our record as a peacemaker in the wars of this century is incomplete, but no exceptional qualification for a preemptive right to police the world. In the aftermath of the First World War, the United States, like Russia, left Europe and the community of world politics. Russia was a broken country, reckoning its own devastation against the militant and internationally oriented ideology of the revolution. The United States, by contrast, was the strongest surviving power of the war. But it chose not to seek in the League of Nations some remnant of what Wilson had lost at Versailles. The treaty of peace, whose exacting terms far exceeded the capacity of the weakened League to enforce or temper it, degenerated into a de facto cease-fire. Its final breach came about to a considerable extent on the basis of a miscalculation of what the United States and Russia's response to that breach would be.

The United States cannot be faulted for its efforts during and just after World War II on behalf of a world organization. However, what it does stand accused of in Europe, and particularly in France, is the subordination of Europe's deepest concern to the cold war. Europe's deepest concern, of course, is Germany. The Russian and Eastern European solution to the German problem has been ruthless, but nonetheless consonant with Allied aims in World War II. American policy has been largely a contradiction of those aims as they were seen by Europeans and Russians.

West Germany has been co-opted as America's principal continental ally, a role which has allowed it to gain the present cash equivalent of many of its original war aims in this century. Reparations for Versailles would be a cheap price to pay for European stability, and the German-American alliance could be considered a diplomatic triumph if that were indeed the outcome. Unfortunately, prosperity is not necessarily pacification, and German prosperity is not the linchpin of a peaceful Europe. Stability in Europe has been sustained to a considerable extent by a balance of nuclear terror, a balance which American sympathy with German nuclear ambitions has threatened to upset. As long as those ambitions are treated as the natural yearnings of a people wishing to be sovereign, American policy in Europe may contribute more to the cohesion of the Warsaw Pact than to that of NATO. It will certainly not bring World War II closer to formal resolution.

It is fair to conclude, I think, that America's experience in attempting to bring about peace is a history of efforts to achieve conditions which often reflect our aspirations and not strictly speaking our interests. For where we have fallen short of achieving our aspirations, as in our own Reconstruction and Wilson's failure at Versailles, the outcome has often been a dismal alternative which we accept with indifference or alarm, but seldom with a desire to rectify it. As Prof. Stanley Hoffman, of Harvard University, has stated, we have tended to follow an erratic course of overinvolvement succeeded by periods of partial or complete withdrawal. I would add that, where we have stayed, as we have in Europe since World War II to pursue those aspirations against a former ally, we have compromised our original common interest in such a way as to revive rather than resolve the original conflict. In pressing for Japanese rearmament, we are taking the same path in Asia.

Whether we like it or not, nations put more faith in the constancy of others' interests than in their aspirations; and they put less faith than may be deserved in those who demonstrate the inability to discriminate between the two. This is important, I think, in understanding why we are so nearly alone in Vietnam, and why, in our isolation, we could become headstrong and lurch on to catastrophe.

We are in Asia seeking to protect what we call the freedom of self-determination. Our abstract of our own experience tells us that this is the preferred condition of mankind, that the evils of our own society are secondary and somehow acceptable in its presence, and that no legitimate society can emerge from any other sense of priorities. Terror or aggression, which threaten to eradicate this preferred condition, strike us as a consummate tragedy. And the power which threatens to bring it about becomes the closest thing on earth to consummate evil. The great danger in this is that no society—even the freest—has yet broken entirely free from the seemingly universal urge to meet consummate evil with the maximum violence. Our own civilization has often aggravated the tendency; the more we learn to abhor violence, the more we are inclined to impart an added sense of justice to those wars from which we do not shrink.

But, as against the tragedy of tyranny and the denial of human life it brings in its wake, we must weigh the excesses of our own efforts to avert it in southeast Asia. Indiscriminate warfare bordering on genocide is one. Another is the assumption that human nature is so malleable, and we speak so clearly for its essential qualities, that parts of the world we could not govern equitably ourselves must be brought to the point of effective, even democratic, self-government in a short period of time.

This is our noble aspiration and our stated reason for being in Vietnam. We have often settled for less, as we have in Laos and Cambodia, but in our present insistence on more for Vietnam we are running the risk of destroying what has already been achieved. Laos is once again a battlefield; the fragile but viable arrangement which has held that country together since 1962 is imperiled from both Vietnam—and now, apparently, Thailand. In the name of self-defense and the Geneva agreements, we risk setting off reactions which we cannot control and which could lead to renewed internal hostilities. Thailand's alleged strikes across the Laotian frontier are no less dangerous because the State Department says they are done without our direct assistance. Animosities between the Thais and the Laotians are ancient. Where an American-sponsored strike might be thought to have no territorial aim, an independent action by the Thais would surely be seen as a more serious incursion.

Cambodia—unified, independent, and struggling—also faces hot pursuit across its borders and is determined to resist. Assistance required for self-defense would be sought from the north, not from the east.

If the war widens into another Indochina conflict, a Vietnam settlement may lose its meaning. Even if it does not, turmoil in Laos could confront the United States once again with a challenge comparable to that faced by President Kennedy in 1961—when Laos displaced Vietnam in our concern for southeast Asia.

The risk of a wider war is, I believe, being weighed carefully in Washington. What may not be treated as candidly is the feasibility of inching our way to military victory in Vietnam. When President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, implied that we have reached a draw because each side has frustrated the other's aims, he was not describing an even exchange. In Vietnam, to have stalemated this guerrilla war is to have gained a tie in racing the crocodile to the swamp. North Vietnam has some 400,000 of the best troops in Asia of whom only a small part have been committed to the south. As the Mansfield report indicates, the massive increase in U.S. troops last year did not increase the percentage of the population under the effective control of the central government. Moreover, there are many who doubt that this control is effective in terms of our aim of self-determination. They feel that the gulf between the peasant population and the government has widened. The reported possibility of another military coup hardly suggests that this trend will be reversed soon.

On the evidence we now have, it would seem that one of our most realistic war aims in Asia is to gain time—time for others to change and time for us to change ourselves. Here our thinking must be really bold—even if painful. For possibly our greatest failure in the pursuit of peace during this century has been our squandering of time in dealing with China. Among the hard decisions which must be reckoned with is whether the opportunities we have missed are beyond recovery. In exploring past defaults, we should try to see the world as it was, as well as how it is now. It is interesting to discover, for instance, that Ho Chi Minh at one time hoped for U.S. assistance to help maintain his country's independence. It may also be important to recall that Sino-American affinities were once strong, and that the Western visitors to China report that they remain latent under the mutual avowals of enmity. And we should also reflect that during the last few years prior to the Chinese nuclear explosion, we were not without some opportunities to influence the directions of China's industrial development.

There can be no darker prognosis for America than that it should become the grand inquisitor of the world seeking out the Devil's disciples and assuming the task of destroying them on behalf of the timid, the powerless, or the indifferent. Yet our relations with the Chinese have been ominous. Like the doubting executioner we do not want to see their faces or have them described to us in vivid detail. Still less do we want to have our doubts aroused or confirmed by substained contact. Instead we have denied them the channels of diplomacy and condemned them for conducting diplomacy by other means.

China may prove to be an intractable and mortal enemy; the collision may occur for reasons beyond our influence. But we will never know the answer if we do not take some steps which leave that question open—even if we suffer abuse and ultimate frustration in the effort.

One such step in which we all have a particular interest would be a nonproliferation agreement. Despite the pall which Vietnam has cast over East-West relations, prospects for a nonproliferation agreement are not altogether dim. The obstacle to West Germany's participation in a multilateral nuclear weapons pool has been set aside for the second time in a year. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE—after consultation with the White House—is sponsoring a resolution supporting Presidential efforts to gain an agreement. This parallels a similar resolution at the onset of serious test ban negotiations and is widely interpreted as indicating the President's intent to spur negotiations. I plan to introduce a similar resolution in the House of Representatives.

The United States has indicated a willingness to have the Chinese participate. This may be an area in which the two countries can discover the threads of a common interest. China has not indicated a design or a desire to buy allies with nuclear weapons; to the contrary, she has urged other developing countries to match her achievements on their own. Nor is there reason to suppose that China does not want a nuclear monopoly within her present sphere of allies. Recent events in Indonesia indicate that she [China] would have long second thoughts about a different policy.

No one should imagine that getting Chinese agreement to formally forgo the spread of nuclear weapons will be either quick or easy. The lesson of negotiations with the Russians over disarmament and nuclear arms control has been one of patient efforts to persuade and educate. During that long history, proposal after proposal was discredited by being turned to propaganda purposes. But at all times, we and the Russians were learning about each other's theory of deterrence. Although we say—for purposes of convenience—that the near collision over the Cuban missiles was the critical impetus for the test ban agreement, we must remember that the lessons learned during long years of negotiations played a significant part in stabilizing the Cuban crisis. A comparable confrontation with China seems highly likely within the next decade; yet we have not initiated an equivalent dialog. To modify an historical truism—those who do not learn from their past successes are not destined to have those successes repeated.

In the Far East our real and attainable interests lie in heading off a war with China—in meeting the threat of famine, chaos, and civil breakdown in India—not in duplicating nature's disasters. There is a growing chorus of sanity in this country which reflects this—a chorus that unites those of us here with Julian Bond, of Georgia, whose campaign for reelection Sane has courageously decided to support. The hymn is simple and universal—"Build, don't burn." That is the mission of the man we honor; that is the legacy of the gallant spirit we remember tonight.

Hon. Henry Larcade

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, the day after his passing away, it was my disheartening duty to announce to the House the loss of the beloved former Member, and one of my predecessors as U.S. Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, the Honorable Henry Dominique Larcade, Jr.

Today, as one who can claim the privilege of having been a fellow Louisianian and fellow American of Henry Larcade, it is with pride that I relate to you some of his honorable history and good deeds which command for him the respect and admiration of all Americans.

Mr. Larcade, statesman of the first rank and loyal American, was born in Opelousas, St. Landry Parish, La., July 12, 1890. Some 53 years later, Mr. Speaker, that distinguished member of the Democratic Party, Henry Larcade, was elected to membership in this Chamber and ably served as a Member of Congress during the 78th, 79th, 80th, 81st and 82d sessions, which covered the period January 3, 1943, through January 3, 1953. He chose not to be a candidate for reelection in 1952.

As a freshman Congressman and at the outset of his decade of dedication in the House, which spanned most of World War II, Mr. Larcade was appointed to six standing committees of the House which existed during the 78th and 79th Congresses. They were the Committees on Education, Flood Control, Patents, Pensions, Territories, and Rivers and Harbors. During the 79th Congress he was named chairman of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Territories in connection with its study and investigation of proposed statehood for the then territory of Hawaii. In its report to the committee which followed, Mr. Larcade's special subcommittee recommended that immediate consideration be given to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

Following the reorganization of committees by act of Congress of 1946, Mr. Larcade continued his untiring labors during the 80th Congress as fourth-ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on Public Works as well as the ranking Democratic member of Subcommittees on Rivers and Harbors and Beach Erosion. For the 81st Congress the Public Works Committee merged its Subcommittee on Beach Erosion into that on Rivers and Harbors, over which Mr. Larcade presided as chairman; and he was at that time third-ranking Democratic member of the full committee.

During the last Congress of which Henry Larcade was a Member, the 82d, he had attained the position of second-ranking member of the full committee and continued his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors with distinction.

But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Larcade's service to his constituents and his country was not limited to that of the role of statesman, nor did he come to Congress uninitiated to the gravity and tragedy of war or the sacrifices attendant to the role of public servant.

Mr. Larcade served as a private in the 348th Infantry, 87th Division, U.S. Army, in World War I. Before the end of that War, he was commissioned second lieutenant in the Quartermaster Corps, Officer Reserve Corps. During peace time he was engaged in the banking and insurance businesses.

Henry Dominique Larcade, Jr., began his public service career in 1913, serving as a member of the St. Landry Parish School Board from that year through 1928. In 1928, he was elected from his district to the Louisiana State Senate and served through 1932. From 1936 through 1940 Mr. Larcade served as assistant clerk of the Louisiana State Senate. Not one to deprive his fellow men of his talents and energies, and following his strenous 10 years as a Member of Congress, Henry Larcade was to return to Louisiana and offer 4 more years of his life to his beloved State by serving in the Louisiana Senate once more, from 1956 through 1960.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that, in the passing from this life of the Honorable Henry Dominique Larcade, Jr., the Nation, as well as the State of Louisiana, has sustained the loss of a noble and faithful son. I extend my deepest sympathies to Mrs. Larcade and suggest that she has much to be proud of in his record of achievement for his State, his country, and his fellow man.

Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration Hospital—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the article appearing in the March 1 issue of U.S. Medicine, by Dr. Thomas J. Ready, the director of the Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration Hospital, describes some of the main lines of the VA research program being conducted locally.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of that article:

MAIN LINES

The hospital's heart research program is proceeding along three main lines:

1. Evaluation of antihypertensive agents: Since 1949 this VA research group has pioneered in the clinical evaluation of drugs for controlling high blood pressure. An active program of new drug testing is continuing; approximately 5 of 10 new compounds per year, that have been found to be both safe and therapeutically promising in animal studies, are evaluated in selected patients with high blood pressure.

Most of the antihypertensive agents in common use today received their early clinical evaluation in this department.

This department also is conducting a large-scale cooperative study involving 17 other VA hospitals on the long-term effects of the antihypertensive drugs which are commonly used in clinical practice. The primary purpose of this study is to determine how effectively these drugs prevent the complications of hypertension.

2. Study of the circulation during sleep. It is well known that the blood pressure falls during sleep, and it is apparent that the state of consciousness has a potent influence on the control of blood pressure.

This department is presently obtaining, for the first time, data on the amount of blood pumped by the heart and the state of constriction of the arteries during normal all-night sleep. The depth of sleep is determined by recording the brain waves and the presence of dreaming by recording eye movements. These are being correlated with the blood pressure, heart output, and blood vessel changes.

3. Assessment of heart and blood vessel functions by computer: This department is developing methods for determining heart functions and aging changes in the arteries, using recording devices that can be applied painlessly to the surface of the skin.

The recordings are made on magnetic tape and programed for the computer.

Such devices include heart sounds, the pulsations of certain large arteries, and the movements of the heart as detected on the chest wall over the heart. The ultimate purpose of the program is to provide new methods for determining the state of health of the circulatory system that can be applied on a mass screening basis.

Recent research activities in the metabolism and genetics section have been devoted to a correlation of endocrine defects and chromosomal abnormalities.

Doctors have been studying the effects of pituitary hormones upon testicular function, and the interconnections and control mechanisms which the sex glands exert upon the pituitary.

One of the conditions investigated is Klinefelter's syndrome, a congenital abnormality in which there are two X chromosomes and one Y chromosome, rather than the single X and Y chromosome of the normal male. Some of these patients are sexually underdeveloped, and benefit from testosterone therapy.

The 50-bed neurology service has from 50 to 70 admissions per month, and provides one of the largest bed services in the East devoted to diseases within the area of neurology.

There are active residency training and medical student teaching programs conducted by the staff with the aid of distinguished consultants and attendings. Research activities involve projects in clinical, epidemiologic, and electrophysiologic area.

The cardiopulmonary research laboratory in the hospital's medical service is considered one of the best in the country from the viewpoint of equipment and research, in addition to the important role that it plays in the management of patients with severe pulmonary disorders such as emphysema.

Since the VA 165-hospital system has about 10 percent of its patients discharged with a diagnosis of emphysema, the value of such a laboratory at once becomes apparent.

The radioisotope section is well-equipped to perform organ scans using the Anger Scinta camera.

The hospital laboratory service is programed to develop and utilize whenever possible automated and electronic equipment at the hospital.

An educational program has been developed for technical and professional personnel, which includes the establishment of a medical technology school and formal courses in pathology and microbiology.

In addition, the lab serves as a reference laboratory for 13 VA hospitals and stations in Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, and Puerto Rico, and assists these stations in maintaining quality laboratory programs.

Educational seminars are conducted for continuing professional growth, and to perform more complex laboratory procedures which would not be feasible for smaller VA hospital programs. The lab also serves as a reference laboratory for all VA hospitals in control of FTA fluorescent technics.

NEW INSTALLMENTS

The developmental program concerned with the evaluation of new laboratory instruments and methods, has been designed to assist the pathology division in VA's central office in its evaluation of the multiplicity of instruments and methods introduced annually into laboratory medicine.

The pathology service is one of the very few laboratories in the country with an automated program, and will act as a model for future development of computerized hospital information retrieval.

The hospital's dental service provides dental examinations and treatment for both inpatients and outpatients and conducts a training program for interns and senior dental hygiene students. Future plans include a residency program in oral surgery.

The central dental laboratory at the hospital provides specialized dental laboratory service to 74 VA installations in 18 States along the eastern seaboard.

The dental training center is the intra-VA postgraduate teaching center for dentistry. Courses are offered in administrative training to chiefs and potential chiefs of dental service. Trainees are selected on a nationwide basis from all VA stations.

The center currently is exploring the use of single concept film as a method of speeding information from the laboratory. The single concept film is a continuous loop, 8 millimeter, sound on color motion picture film stored in a plastic cartridge that can be used in a self-operated projector.

Through this audiovisual process, packaged educational material is available to the student where and when, and as often, as he needs it. The film may be used repeatedly until the material is mastered.

To assist members of the dental profession to keep abreast of the latest, rapid developments, the center is recording on film the most current concepts in dentistry.

Closed-circuit television, programed instruction on teaching machines, and other audiovisual equipment also are being used.

In the surgical service, a threefold program is underway—first and foremost, is patient care, followed by research and education.

All types of surgery, including open heart and stereotactic neurosurgical procedures are done. In addition, there are projects in cancer therapy, wound healing, tissue reaction, nerve conduction, laser radiation and cellular biology.

About 300 operations are performed each month.

Approximately 500 students obtain some part of their surgical training from the surgical service at the hospital each year.

The radiology department is one of the busiest spots in the hospital. The total number of patients, both inpatients and outpatients, averaging about 36,000 a year. And they are increasing. The average number of X-ray exposures is in the vicinity of 150,000 per year.

The therapy division has a cobalt 60 unit with a source of 5,000 curies, and associated with two TV monitoring units. A conventional deep therapy Picker 280-kilovolt Vanguard completes the setup which is planned to take care of patients in smaller VA hospitals in the area not equipped with radiotherapy facilities.

The workload is processed by a team of 4 full-time radiologists, assisted by a group of 13 technicians, providing around-the-clock service.

The equipment is composed of seven X-ray machines, two of which are 500 MA, four image intensifiers, a Franklin head unit, a Shomander biplane unit and two tomographic devices. In addition, there are two OR, two GU, plus five portable machines and two PAKO automatic film processors. Plans are underway for a third processor.

Within the next 3 months, the hospital's psychiatric service will consist of eight 30-bed wards, all of which are open door, unit system wards. Veterans are voluntary patients to this service, and may leave the hospital any time they wish.

The emphasis, of course, is on the team approach, using all modalities to help the veteran to gain insight into his emotional illness, to better his relationships with people and the outside world.

Psychiatry service has been greatly enlarged at this new hospital. Eventually, 240 beds will be devoted exclusively to psychotherapy. Many new rehabilitative facilities for the treatment process are located in an expanded physical medicine and rehabilitation service.

The renal dialysis unit is active in caring for patients with acute and chronic renal failure. The unit becomes involved in care when more conservative measures fail to support patients any longer.

HEMODIALYSIS

Hemodialysis is being carried on now in a separate dialysis unit with a three-bed capacity. A larger unit with a 10-bed capacity is being developed as this is written, and it is hoped that by March 15, or April 1 at the latest, the hospital will be able to handle from 10 to 15 patients.

The program is quite expensive, averaging approximately $10,000 per year per patient. This hospital program alone is expected to cost approximately $150,000 during the next fiscal year.

Treatment of several patients with renal failure already is underway. These patients enter the hospital twice each week for the dialysis procedure, and spend the rest of their time at work, or at home. The total time they spend attached to the dialyser is from 20 to 24 hours per week.

The program of the dialysis unit consists also of testing devices for dialysis, new dialysters and improved dialysate delivery systems, one of which is being developed and built into the new dialysis unit.

A kidney transplant program is being initiated and the dialysis unit will support patients in preparation for the transplant or during posttransplant periods when further hemodialysis might become indicated.

Several research projects are being carried out in conjunction with the program of the unit, by staff members of the center and the Nephrology research laboratory.

Several lines of investigation now underway are supported by U.S. Public Health Service research grants through the George Washington University School of Medicine.

The audiology and speech pathology service possesses a complete clinical, training, and research program in audiology and speech pathology. The extensive facilities provided for evaluation and treatment are utilized for veterans referred from the local hospital, as well as from VA regional offices and other VA hospitals in surrounding States. Special problem cases, however, are referred from any VA station in the eastern half of the United States.

Veterans who establish service connection from hearing loss are eligible for rehabilitation services.

The speech pathology program offers evaluation and treatment to veterans with language and speech disorders.

At this center the development and evaluation of new procedures which may be adopted at similar clinics throughout the Nation are constantly underway.

A laboratory supported by research funds is located within the area and is responsible for the development of special auditory tests and measurements for clinical, rehabilitative, and research purposes.

This research laboratory analyzes and prepares hearing aid data obtained from the National Bureau of Standards needed to determine which hearing aids will be issued by VA each fiscal year.

Newly appointed chiefs of audiology and speech pathology clinics are given 2 to 4 weeks of orientation at this center before assuming their duties in the field.

Nursing personnel at the hospital are carefully selected, oriented, and assigned to the various clinical services to carry out the prime aim of the hospital—care and treatment of sick veteran patients.

The current staff has graduates from 114 colegiate and hospital schools of professional nursing and 19 schools of practical nursing.

All newly appointed nurses are given a planned orientation program, generally of 6 weeks duration, and modified to meet individual needs.

Nursing assistants are given a concentrated 10-week class program with concurrent clinical practice and then complete the 1-year training period in the clinical area under close supervision of the professional nurse.

Many opportunities are available for members of the nursing team to broaden their clinical experiences.

Total electrically powered beds make it possible for the patient to assist in adjusting bed height for ease in getting in and out, or in elevating his head or feet to achieve a more comfortable position. The circo-electric bed is used in the care of the paraplegic or quadraplegic individual, and the surgilift eliminates manual lifting of patients from the stretcher as it operates mechanically.

FOREIGN UNIT

The foreign and insular unit, which operates under the registrar and outpatient services of the hospital, is an unusual group, peculiar only to the Washington VA Hospital. Actually, the hospital is the only VA station that acts as a center for the processing of medical, dental, and hospitalization requests, and authorizations for all eligible veterans residing in foreign countries and certain U.S. insular possessions.

There are approximately 125,000 veterans in this category which may or may not at sometime or other require the services of this hospital unit.

These functions include authorization and processing of physical examinations for rating and (GI) insurance purposes; authorization of medical and dental treatment; the furnishing of medication to veterans in isolated or underdeveloped areas; authorization of hospital care and the processing of claims for the cost of unauthorized medical services furnished in foreign countries.

The treatment of 600 patients is a mighty big job in itself—a chore that keeps a large hospital staff busy as bees, but when the institution also houses and serves a host of clinics, centers, testing and research units, things really begin to hum.

There's something going on at this hospital all the time.

Hawaii's Alan Nagao, 4, Chosen 1966 National Easter Seal Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a firm believer in the American institution of fundraising campaigns that help to support our various worthwhile causes, I am again in the cheering section of the national Easter seal drive of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults. If my enthusiasm seems a trifle greater this year, it is because of the 1966 National Easter Seal Child, 4-year-old Alan Nagao of Honolulu, Hawaii.

I fell an easy victim to little Alan's charm during his recent visit to the Nation's Capital when, with National Chairman Jimmy Durante, he helped President Johnson launch the 1966 National Easter Seal Drive. Accompanied by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Eddy Nagao, and his 9-year-old sister Shann, he will continue to make appearances throughout the United States for the campaign which will run from March 1 through April 10.

There is no doubt in my mind that Alan will continue to charm the Nation with his outgoing personality and boyish exuberance. Although he was born crippled with several physical defects, he has been able to overcome them and can look forward to a normal childhood and adulthood. His severest physical defect, a right leg that ended at the midthigh, was corrected with an artificial leg.

Blessed also with a high IQ and an understanding family, he is an ideal personification of the hope of all the crippled children and adults of our country.

I am proud and pleased to submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record an article written by Advertiser staff writer, Wallace Mitchell, on 1966 National Easter Seal Child, Alan Nagao, which appeared in the January 23, 1966, issue of the Sunday Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Advertiser:

President Has Kiss Coming From Alan

Four-year-old Alan Nagao knows just what he's going to do when Comedian Jimmy Durante introduces him to President Johnson at the White House on March 1.

"I'm going to kiss him," exclaimed the Honolulu boy with a gay laugh.

Alan has been selected as the 1966 National Easter Seal Child of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

He will be presented to the President by Easter Seal Chairman Durante in ceremonies opening the society's annual national campaign for fund contributions.

The campaign will run from March 1 to April 10 and Alan probably will be the country's most photographed and televised child as he makes appearances in Washington and New York for the opening ceremonies.

Alan is a smart (IQ 140), dimpled youngster with a bundle of personality. He was born with his right leg ending at mid-thigh, his right hand merely a blunt stump, and a cleft lobe on his right ear.

The other day he marched about the living room of the Puunui home of his parents, Eddy and Jean Nagao, at 709 Maui Street moving around on his artificial leg with ease as he answered questions and offered a few opinions of his own.

Alan and his mother had just returned from Luray, Va., where they made some precampaign appearances.

"I like the airplanes," Alan said when asked about his trip.

What food did he like best?

"Hamburgers. And french fries."

Hot dogs?

"N-n-no. I really like fish. All kinds of fish. And crab."

Alan feels no embarrassment about his midthigh stump.

"I was born with it," he said matter of factly. "It don't bother me."

He's been wearing an artificial leg for about a year and a half, can take it off by himself and can kneel, his mother explained. At a doctor's suggestion, he was taken to Sultan School for exercises to strengthen the muscles of the crippled leg.

He returns for therapy and regular checks on his gait. He attends the Na Lei Kindergarten and Preschool.

"We intend to put him in public school if we possibly can and that's why we're trying him out at Na Lei," his mother said. "He's getting along pretty good."

Alan was asked what he wanted to be when he grows up.

"I want to be the driver of a pilot—" he paused—"boat pilot.

"Like now my daddy is a boat pilot and my big brother and my Uncle Bobby. That's who turn it up. The boats goes up and he went sideways and on the last splash we went over and Uncle Bobby caught me and I hung on."

This was Alan's version of a mishap last August outside of Keehi lagoon when his uncle took Alan out fishing in the outboard-powered cruiser that stands in the Nagao yard.

Alan likes fishing and his father, a general contractor, takes him often.

"I like to play skateboard," volunteered Alan, whose mother added that he does play with a skateboard on his one good leg.

"I turn over on skateboard and ouch—ouch." Alan held his head.

Alan has a brother, Michael, 19, a University of Hawaii sophomore, and a sister, Shan, 9, who atends Maemae Elementary School.

Alan offered his left hand to shake when the interview ended. He picked up a casting rod.

"I like fishing," he explained.

Example of Superb Governmental Communication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in the March 8, 1966, edition of the Civil Service Leader, whose circulation approximates 143,000, there appeared a column of great interest and importance to the administration of government.

The column, "Your Public Relations IQ," was written by Prof. Leo J. Margolin of the Borough of Manhattan Community College and New York University. It emphasizes the urgent necessity for government to communicate clearly and accurately to all its numerous publics. Prof. Margolin cites as an example the 64-page fact sheet, 1966, of the New York City Housing Authority and awards the "public relations blue ribbon" to the authority's public information director, Mr. Oscar Kanny.

This fact sheet, copies of which were sent to my office here in Washington, reports on how the authority is employing the more than $2 billion in public funds. It should serve as a bright example to all levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the article referred to at this point in the RECORD:

WINS SECOND PUBLIC RELATIONS BLUE RIBBON

(By Leo J. Margolin)

(NOTE.—Mr. Margolin is dean of administration and professor of business administration at the Borough of Manhattan Community College and adjunct professor of public relations in New York University's Graduate School of Public Administration.)

The New York City Housing Authority today becomes the first public agency to win two of this column's public relations blue ribbons. The New York City Housing Authority earned its second public relations blue ribbon for its 64-page illustrated 1966 fact sheet.

As highly professional a result as one would expect from a government organization operating property worth more than $2 billion—and housing more than a half million people—the New York City Housing Authority fact sheet wins the blue ribbon for Oscar Kanny, director of public and community relations.

The public relations performance of the New York City Housing Authority has always been consistently excellent. The fact sheet is the icing on the cake. It is the nearest thing to perfection for a fact sheet, and should serve as the classic example for all government public relation professionals with a fact sheet in their futures.

The principal reason for the public relations blue ribbon award to the New York City Housing Authority and Mr. Kanny is the fact sheet's adherence to the principle of the public relations committee: What you do, why you do it, when and how.

The public relations committee is the public relations technique evolved by Prof. Clarence A. Schoenfeld, of the University of Wisconsin, and expertly described in his 1963 book, "Publicity Media and Methods: Their Role in Modern Public Relations," an unusually valuable source book published by Macmillan.

As explained by Professor Schoenfeld, "Prcom is short for public relations communications; the act of planning and producing the written, spoken, and/or pictorial message that form the pulse of a public relations program. Prcom may also be used to refer to the messages themselves."

In relating an enormous story with impressive facts and figures, the New York City Housing Authority fact sheet should make every member of the civil service corps proud that a government agency—manned almost totally by civil servants—has performed so superbly in the public interest.

To build a fact sheet as succesfully as Mr. Kanny constructed the one for the New York City Housing Authority, Professor Schoenfeld suggests an outline such as this:

What it is.
What it does.
Whom it's for.
How it's organized.
How it operates.
When it happens.
Where it's located.
Why it's offered.
What it costs.
How you can do (get) it.
Why it's good.

You won't have to look too hard to find all bases covered in the New York City Housing Authority fact sheet with items such as: 145 developments in all five boroughs with exact locations, making the total New York City Housing Authority population equal to the Nation's 29th largest city; seven developments with 2,668 apartments scheduled to open in 1966; 38 percent of all apartments under construction or planned designed exclusively for the elderly; racial or ethnic composition of authority residents in Negro, 40.8 percent; white, 38.9 per cent; Puerto Rican, 19.4 percent; Chinese, 0.6 percent; other, 0.3 percent.

An interesting sidelight to New York City Housing Authority fact sheet is that it is the first printed public document of a city agency to carry a special mesage from the new mayor, John V. Lindsay. His message is of official recognition by the city's new chief executive that it takes competent, experienced professionals to do the kind of public administration job performed by the New York City Housing Authority.

Government public relations professionals and others who wish to use the New York City Housing Authority fact sheet as a guideline for one of their own, may obtain a copy by writing to Public Relations Office, New York City Housing Authority, 250 Broadway, New York, N.Y., 10007.

Uncle Sam Joins Your School Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech delivered by Mr. Meldrim Thomson, president of the board of education in Orford, N.H. I commend to the attention of our colleagues, this fine speech by a dedicated American who is a champion of local government.

UNCLE SAM JOINS YOUR SCHOOL BOARD

Members and friends of the New Hampshire Conservative Union, I am more than happy to be with you today.

I am grateful for this opportunity to hang high at the doorstep of your organization a lantern of warning about our public schools. I pray that its piercing gleam might be seen from the plains of Rye to the hills of Pittsburgh.

There is a great revolution taking place in the field of public education today. In the picturesque language of the Future Farmers of America, this revolution is occurring wherever corn is grown and future farmers meet—reaching from the State of Maine to Hawaii, from the State of Washington to Puerto Rico.

If we raise no breakwater against it, this surging tidal wave of change will soon leave on the shores of our school districts—

1. A national educational policy that exacts blind conformity from local schools;

2. An entrenched bureaucracy of Federal educationists empowered to prescribe curriculum and specify textbooks for our schools;

3. A massive Federal tax commitment for myriad, unnecessary educational frills; and

4. Local school boards either reduced to impotency or gone forever.

Hark. Are these the fears of an alarmist—of one who sees a pedagogical ghost in every schoolroom closet? Perhaps, but I think not.

It is true that 3 months ago, contrary to the recommendation of our superintendent, five of our six-member school board in Orford voted not to accept $7,227 in Federal aid under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, because we wanted no part of Federal controls in our schools. Since then we have been labeled by some elements of the press, too lazy to rise above name calling, as rightwingers, described as far out, called scare-yell ranters, and have even been deprecated against as ignorant.

After 14 years of service on school boards in both New York and this State—years in which I always fought for teachers' raises, demanded teacher competency, struggled for and obtained bond issues for necessary new school buildings, and won and lost school board elections—I have learned to accept anomosities and vituperations as routine occupational hazards.

Who, then, says that an educational revolution now overspreads our land? Listen to the fashioner of present-day public school philosophy, James B. Conant, in his book, "Shaping Educational Policy," published 2 years ago:

"It is my belief there will be more radical changes in the future and this in turn means that our old methods of determining educational policy need drastic revision to meet the impact of the educational revolutions."

What is the goal of this revolution? Ultimate and complete control of the educational policies for our public schools. To put it bluntly, it is a struggle to see who will mold the minds of tomorrow's citizens.

Will the parents of today's schoolchildren, in their capacity as school district voters, retain their now tenuous hold on school policymaking powers through their elected school boards, or will this power be slyly taken from the voters by the advocates of a standardized, national school system? This is the issue.

The U.S. Office of Education would achieve its goal by creating through Federal-State channels a national educational policy. This has been described by minority members of the House Education and Labor Committee, as a "centralized, standardized, uniform national school system."

Dr. Conant would arrive at the same destination by means of a 50-State compact shaping nationwide, as distinguished from national, educational policies.

Either route would lead us to some lofty Olympus, far removed from the valley of the voters, where what is taught our children would be determined by the professional priests of education.

The Federal route is direct, lacking even the subtlety of circuitry. Why? Because the Federal educators now have a fat purse and no longer need follow the backroads of caution. The State-compact route is indirect. But the result must inevitably be the same. The makers of nationwide educational policy would be representatives chosen from the 50 States, but their method of selection would be so far removed from the direct vote of the people that the effect would be to place the making of educational policy in the hands of the professional educators.

How will this revolution be achieved? By the use of tax money. Whose money will be used? Yours and mine; and, since we still skip merrily round the Maypole of deficit spending, also the future earnings of our children.

The Federal educators have the perfect formula for obtaining their goals. They gather this money in the form of income taxes, then piously give it back to the schools as grants. We are not supposed to know that it was our money in the first place or that a huge percentage of it has rubbed off in bureaucratic attrition before it was returned to us.

Let me emphasize here that there could be no possibility of Federal control of our schools, if the Congress had the wisdom to enact the legislation proposed by Senator Cotton that would keep a fixed percent of Federal tax money in the State, safely earmarked for educational use only.

In another era of social revolution the secret of the money-persuading process was described by one of its great advocates as "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect." The innovators of 30 years ago recognized the power of tax money as a political weapon and boldly proclaimed that "nobody wanted to kill Santa Claus."

Dr. Conant, often a spokesman for the liberal school of thought in educational matters, describes the result of the Federal tax power on local schools as follows:

"A generation ago conservative school people, deeply committed to the principle of local control of the public schools, openly deplored the amendment which authorized the Federal income tax. This amendment, it was said, would destroy the basic structure of our public schools."

And so, despite the concern of conservative school people 30 years ago budgets rose, Government expanded, farm surpluses brought a national lunch program, war congestion gave us the federally impacted area program, sputnik frightened us into the National Defense Education Act; and yet none of these programs appeared to threaten seriously local control of our public schools.

Only with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last April, was the legislative machinery fashioned that would put Uncle Sam on every school board that accepted his gift of our money.

With the enactment of Public Law 89–10, happy bureaucrats in the U.S. Office of Education proclaimed they had billions to disburse and so the Federal commitment in education could not help but get bigger.

The same jubilation must have run through the headquarters of NEA, which according to Conant had for years endeavored to increase the educational financial resources of each State by massive Federal grants for the public schools.

Last fall our superintendent of schools informed our Orford school board that we would be able to get about $7,000 in Federal funds under Public Law 89–10, which we could use for remedial reading. We listened attentively. We were then running a deficit of about $8,000. This manna from Washington sounded like an easy, happy way out of our fiscal difficulties.

We filed the necessary papers for court approval of a special school meeting. While awaiting the outcome, some of us got copies of the law, read it carefully, became concerned with what we read, and began digging deeper. By the night of our first meeting five of our six board members were ready to recommend to the voters the rejection of funds under title 1 of the act.

I think it important to stress that our decision was contrary to the recommendations of our superintendent and the officials of the department of education, and even later ran counter to the policy statement of the State board of education. Also, it should be noted that until the Hillsboro vote, which preceded ours, some 50 districts had accepted funds blindly on the recommendation of their superintendents.

The Orford voters refused $7,227 on December 15. We thought the issue was settled, at least in Orford. However, we unexpectedly began receiving letters and phone calls asking for information and help. So we continued the fight by determining for ourselves that there was no severe reading problem in our school that we could not handle ourselves. I invited Congressman Ashbrook of Ohio to speak in Orford and wrote a pamphlet on the subject, so that voters around the State might be alerted to the many sound reasons for rejecting funds under title 1 of the act.

The issue continued to boil furiously in our town. By petition of 18 voters the question was added to the warrant for our annual school meeting. The local minister who favored acceptance of the funds got into the act by signing the petition, writing a letter to the editor, and holding meetings at the parsonage.

Our Orford Teachers' Association, an affiliate of the National Education Association, invited William McLin, one of their highly paid Washington lobbyists, to speak in Orford. The teachers campaigned during school hours, made press and radio releases, and even sent teacher-pupil messages home. And for this our board censured the teachers' association.

The pressure from within and outside of Orford was heavy and effective. The local paper pounded away at us. In the end we lost the vote on March 1. However, and this is very important to keep in mind, the Orford School Board has not yet accepted Federal aid under Public Law 89–10. The way our board is presently constituted with three favoring aid and three opposed to it, I would be greatly surprised if Orford accepted Federal aid this year. Thus, in Orford our ramparts have been pierced, not breeched.

The New Hampshire towns that originally rejected Federal aid have won precious time for us to arouse the voters to the dangers of Federal control of their schools. In our effort to alert the people we have been far more effective than seemed possible. Senator Cotton's office said we had built a successful backfire in New Hampshire. Congressman Cleveland says others in Congress are asking him why this furor over accepting Federal money.

Bear in mind this fight to reject Federal aid under Public Law 89–10 is only one manifestation of the struggle for the minds of our children that goes on daily. Powerful forces are working to destroy local control of your schools.

It is strange to me that not once since we began our fight in Orford has any adversary either denied, tried to explain or controverted, the U.S. Office of Education's own pamphlet, "A Federal Education Agency For the Future" published in 1961.

Listen to these statements from that pamphlet if you want to know the real goals of that office. And remember this was written before Congress gave them their billions.

"In addition to the Federal level of public policy determination, the Office has much concern with policy matters at the State and local levels."

And again, "the tradition of local control should no longer be permitted to inhibit Office of Education leadership."

The pamphlet enumerates 11 goals of the Office. Consider the following two and remember that they are the words of a spokesman for the U.S. Office of Education in 1961.

"Broadening of Federal interest in curriculum and improvement of instruction."

"Broadening of Federal interest to include educational activities and services outside the structure of organized education."

The respected columnist and educator, Raymond Moley, writing for the New York Herald Tribune in 1963 described the NEA as a powerful pressure group, as much a political organization as is the AFL–CIO.

Apparently the NEA became worried that 10 foolish little New Hampshire towns would say "no" to this Federal aid, for fear of controls. So they sent to the little town of Orford one of their great warriors whose shining armor and pontifications were supposed to awe our citizens.

I asked this impressive combatant if the NEA had ever backed Senator Cotton's proposal to leave a portion of the Federal tax in the States for educational purposes. He answered obliquely by saying they were now studying whether they would support this legislation.

Mr. McLin said, "the public school system is on trial." I ask on trial by whom? For what reason? In fact, what is so wrong with a system that has educated our citizens so well that today we enjoy the advantages of the greatest civilization yet fashioned by man.

These outspoken innovators must have some reason for attacking our public schools. I think Raymond Moley expressed this reason when he noted that the real objective of the NEA is to take more control of education away from school boards and official school administrators.

Moley said the NEA regards "education as too important a matter to be left to the direction of lay school boards and legislatures. It is dedicated to the idea of government by an elite of professional educator-politicians."

The NEA lobbyist assured his listeners in Orford that Public Law 89–10 carried with it no Federal controls. He did even more, he blandly cited section 604 of the act as specifically prohibiting Federal control of education. But under questioning he admitted no one could be fined or jailed if they violated this act. How meaningful can this prohibition be when it is administered by those persons most likely to violate it?

The Federal educationists can call controls by any other name they want, be it "standards, guidelines or criteria," and by any name at all you'll find that the Federal grants under title 1 of Public Law 89–10 are Federal bribes designed to take the policymaking power away from our local schools.

When school boards must obtain approval for the projects for which they seek Federal funds—that's control.

When the law says that applications for grants must be "consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish"—that's control.

When you cannot spend the money to improve your cafeteria but can spend it for a Saturday morning enrichment program—whatever that means—that's control.

People who insist on seeing a bureaucrat standing at their schoolhouse door with Federal funds in one hand and chains in the other before recognizing controls, remind me of the old farmer who would buy no life insurance because he was not dead. The controls are there; and easy to see by anyone who will open his eyes.

What can we do here in New Hampshire if we want to retain control of our public schools? There are two things we can and must do:

1. Say "no" to acceptance of these Federal funds.

2. Revive a keen sense of local responsibility for our public schools.

Why say "no" to tax money that is ours? I'll tell you why. There are two excellent reasons:

First, your "no's" when said loud and clear, will be heard in Washington, and it's a good bet that Congressmen who hear you will think twice before spending additional billions of your tax dollars on educational frills in an election year; and

Second, your "no's" will encourage your neighbors to stand up and be counted in the struggle to turn the rushing tide that today sweeps relentlessly toward a standardized, centralized, national school system.

What can we do to revive a sense of local responsibility? There are several vital areas in which we as citizens can reassert local control of our schools through local action. I shall not trespass on your patience by attempting to develop this thought in detail here. Perhaps it will suffice if I merely enumerate some possible actions.

1. We should vigorously refute the idea that more and more money will give us better and better education. I challenge the apostles of quality through money—and I speak of State and Federal tax dollars—to first demonstrate the need for it; and second, make an honest listing of the many ways they can economize in our schools today. They would be amazed at how long their list would be and how large the total of possible savings.

2. We should elect legislators who will overhaul many of our old, archaic, and unfair school laws. For just one example, consider how unfair and discriminating our comprehensive, area, and cooperative statutes are when thousands of dollars are disbursed to encourage bigness in high schools while countless small high schools that still must teach thousands of students are denied such funds.

3. We should insist that all of our school board members, at all times, exert at the local level and within the meaning of State statutes and regulations, a vibrant and enthusiastic leadership in their local school affairs. Their true role, while not one of truculence or arrogance, is certainly not that of a rubberstamp for every idea and program that emanates from the professional educator.

4. We should as citizens attend school meetings, become aware of school problems and their possible solutions, and work incessantly for sane and fiscally sound improvement of our public school program. For anyone who is really concerned about our Nation's future and who wants to contribute his bit to that future, there is no better and more effective way to help your country than to work constantly for the improvement of our local schools.

Last night the voters of Cornish won a great victory by rejecting Federal aid in a 2-to-1 vote. They did it by hard work. They held meetings, studied 13 copies of Public Law 89–10, and cited section and line in refutation to every argument advanced by their superintendent.

What the people of Cornish have done, others all over this State can do now, next year, and as long as may be necessary to win decisively.

Make no mistake about it, we are locked in combat in a great educational revolution. We, the voters, taxpayers, parents, and citizens will either win over the powerful pressure groups and entrenched bureaucrats, or watch them win the minds of our boys and girls while we stand smuggly by nibbling at the crumbs of Federal aid.

Friends, my warning is, beware of Federal control of your public schools. My message is, encourage vigorous local leadership of your schools. My hope is that, no matter how hard the battle goes, how long the struggle, you will resolutely strive for improvement of your public schools.

President Johnson Says Fight for Freedom Is American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson made a brilliant exposition of the domestic and foreign policies of his administration in a recent address following his acceptance of the National Freedom Award in New York City.

The President put the struggle in Vietnam in historical perspective, pointing out that it is the American tradition to fight for freedom.

Because of the great interest this speech will have to my colleagues and to Americans everywhere, I place this great speech in the body of the RECORD.

The address of the President follows:

Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Secretary, Senator KENNEDY, members of the fine delegation from New York, ladies and gentlemen at the head table, my fellow Americans, to be honored with this award by this organization is a very proud moment for me. I accept it with the gratitude of my heart and with renewed commitment to the cause that it represents, the cause of freedom at home and the cause of freedom abroad.

Twenty-five years ago, to a world that was darkened by war, Persident Franklin Roosevelt described the four freedoms of mankind: Freedom of speech and expression; freedom of every person to worship God in his own way; freedom from want; freedom from fear. Franklin Roosevelt knew that these freedoms could not be the province of one people alone. He called on all his countrymen—to assist those who endured the tyrant's bombs and suffered his opposition and oppression. He called for courage and for generosity, and for resolution in the face of terror. And then he said, "Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights—or keep them."

Wendell Willkie, Franklin Roosevelt's opponent in the campaign of 1940, shared his belief that freedom could not be founded only on American shores or only for those whose skin is white. "Freedom is an indivisible word," Wendell Willkie said. "If we want to enjoy it and fight for it we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin."

That was Republican policy 25 years ago. It was Democratic policy 25 years ago. It is American policy here tonight.

Then how well have we done in our time in making the four freedoms real for our people and for the other people of the world? Here in America we accord every man the right to worship as he wills. I believe we are more tolerant of sectional and religious and racial differences than we were a quarter of a century ago. The majority of our people believe that a qualified man or woman of any race, of any religion, of any section, could hold any office in our land. This was not so, not very clear at all in 1940. We are committed now, however great the trial and tension, to protecting the right of free expression and peaceful dissent.

We have learned to despise the witch-hunt, the unprincipled harassment of a man's integrity and his right to be different. We have gained in tolerance, and I am determined to use the high office I hold to protect and to encourage that tolerance. I do not mean to say that I will remain altogether silent on the critical issues of our day. For just as strongly as I believe in other men's freedom to disagree, so do I also believe in the President's freedom to attempt to persuade.

So let me assure you and my fellow Americans tonight that I will do everything in my power to defend both.

Twenty-five years ago freedom from want had the ring of urgency for our people. The unemployment rate stood at 14.5 percent. Millions of Americans had spent the last decade in the breadlines or on farms where the winds howled away any chance for a decent life. Tonight there are still millions whose poverty haunts our conscience. There are still fathers without jobs, and there are still children without hope. Yet for the vast majority of Americans these are times when the hand of plenty has replaced the grip of want. And for the first time in almost 9 years tonight the unemployment rate has fallen to 4 percent. This liberation from want, for which we thank God, is a testimony to the enduring vitality of the American competitive system, the American free enterprise economy. It is a testimony also to an enlightened public policy, established by Franklin Roosevelt and strengthened by every administration since his death. That policy has freed Americans for more hopeful and more productive lives.

It has relieved their fears of growing old—by social security and by medical care. It has inspired them with hope for their children, by aid to elementary and higher education. It has helped to create economic opportunity by enlightened fiscal policies. It has granted to millions, born into hopelessness, the chance of a new start in life by public works, by private incentive, by poverty programs. For the Negro American, it has opened the door after centuries of enslavement and discrimination—opened the doors to the blessings that America offers to those that are willing and able to earn them.

Thus we address the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, 25 years after his message to the America and the world, with confidence and with an unflagging determination. We have served his vision of the four freedoms essential to mankind—here in America.

Yet we know that he did not speak only for America. We know that the four freedoms are not secure in America when they are violently denied elsewhere in the world. We know, too, that it requires more than speeches to resist the international enemies of freedom. We know that men respond to deeds when they are deaf to words. Even the precious word "freedom" may become empty to those without the means to use it. For what does freedom mean when famine cloaks the land, when new millions crowd upon already strained resources, when narrow privilege is entrenched behind law and custom, when all conspires to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their lives?

I do not need to tell you how five administrations have labored to give real meaning to freedom, in a world where it is often merely a phrase that conceals oppression and neglect. Men in this room, men throughout America, have given their skills and their treasure to that work. You have warned our people how insatiable is aggression, and how it thrives on human misery. You have carried the word that without the sense that we can change the conditions of their lives, nothing can avail the oppressed of this earth—neither good will, nor national sovereignty, nor massive grants of aid, from their more fortunate brothers. You have known, too, that men who believe they can change their destinies will change their destinies. Armed with that belief, they will be willing—yes, they will be eager—to make the sacrifices that freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom. They will be able to look beyond the four essential freedoms—beyond to the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature; to the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become to cast off the yoke of discrimination and disease; to the freedom to hope, and to build on that hope, lives of integrity and well-being.

This is what our struggle in Vietnam is about tonight. This is what our struggle for equal rights in this country is all about tonight. We seek to create that climate, at home and abroad, where unlettered men can learn, where deprived children can grow, where hopeless millions can be inspired to change the terms of their existence for the better. That climate cannot be created where terror fills the air. Children cannot learn, and men cannot earn their bread, and women cannot heal the sick where the night of violence has blotted out the sun. Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettoes of our own cities, the struggle is the same. That struggle is to end the violence against the human mind and body—so that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom may be won.

We are pitting the resources of the law, of education and training, of our vision and our compassion, against that violence here in America. And we shall end it in our time.

On the other side of the earth we are no less committed to ending violence against men who are struggling tonight to be free. It is about that commitment that I have come here to speak now.

Tonight in Vietnam more than 200,000 of your young Americans stand there fighting for your freedom. Tonight our people are determined that these men shall have whatever help they need, and that their cause, which is our cause, shall be sustained. But in these last days there have been questions about what we are doing in Vietnam, and these questions have been answered loudly and clearly for every citizen to see and to hear. The strength of American can never be sapped by discussion, and we have no better nor stronger tradition than open debate, free debate, in hours of danger. We believe, with Macaulay, that men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely. We are united in our committment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should ever mistake our arguments for indecision, nor our debates for weakness.

So what are the questions that are still being asked?

First, some ask if this is a war for unlimited objectives. The answer is plain. The answer is "No."

Our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the success of aggression. It is not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination. It is simply put, just to prevent the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

Second, some people ask if we are caught in a blind escalation of force that is putting us headlong toward a wider war that no one wants. The answer, again, is a simple "No." We are using that force and only that force that is necessary to stop this aggression. Our fighting men are in Vietnam because tens of thousands of invaders came south before them. Our numbers have increased in Vietnam because the aggression of others has increased in Vietnam. The high hopes of the aggressor have been dimmed and the tide of the battle has been turned, and our measured use of force will and must be continued. But this is prudent firmness under what I believe is careful control. There is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation.

Third, others ask if our fighting men are to be denied the help they need. The answer, again, is and will be a resounding "No." Our great Military Establishment has moved 200,000 men across 10,000 miles since last spring. These men have, and will have, all they need to fight the aggressor. They have already performed miracles in combat. The men behind them have worked miracles of supply, building new ports, transporting new equipment, opening new roads. The American forces of freedom are strong tonight in South Vietnam, and we plan to keep them so. As you know, they are lead there by a brilliant and a resourceful commander Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He knows the needs of war and he supports the works of peace. And when he asks for more Americans to help the men that he has, his requests will be immediately studied, and, as I promised the Nation last July, his needs will be immediately met.

Fourth, some ask if our men go alone to Vietnam, if we alone respect our great commitment in the Southeast Asia Treaty. Still again the answer is a simple "No." We have seven allies in SEATO, and we have seen five of them give us vital support, each with his own strength and in his own way, to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Fifth, some ask about the risks of a wider war, perhaps against the vast land armies of Red China. And again the answer is "No," never by any act of ours—and not if there is any reason left behind the wild words from Peiping.

We have threatened no one, and we will not. We seek the end of no regime, and we will not. Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will reply. We have measured the strength and the weakness of others, and we think we know our own. We observe in ourselves, and we applaud in others, a careful restraint in action. We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched by caution in deed.

Sixth, men ask if we rely on guns alone. Still again the answer is "No." From our Honolulu meeting, from the clear pledge which joins us with our allies, there has emerged a common dedication to the peaceful progress of the people of Vietnam—to schools for their children, to care for their health, to hope and bounty for their land.

The Vice President returned tonight from his constructive and very highly successful visit to Saigon and to other capitals, and he tells me that he and Ambassador Lodge have found a new conviction and purpose in South Vietnam—for the battle against want and injustice as well as the battle against aggression.

So the pledge of Honolulu will be kept, and the pledge of Baltimore stands open—to help the men of the north when they have the wisdom to be ready.

We Americans must understand how fundamental is the meaning of this second war—the war on want. I talked on my ranch last fall with Secretary Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, and in my office last week with Secretary Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, making, over and over again, the same central point: The breeding ground of war is human misery. If we are not to fight forever in faraway places—in Europe, or the far Pacific, or the jungles of Africa, or the suburbs of Santo Domingo—then we just must learn to get at the roots of violence. As a nation, we must magnify our struggle against world hunger and illiteracy and disease. We must bring hope to men whose lives now end at two score or less. Because without that hope, without progress in this war on want, we will be called on again to fight again and again, as we are fighting tonight.

Seventh, men ask who has a right to rule in South Vietnam. Our answer there is what it has been for 200 years. The people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. So we will insist for ourselves on what we require from Hanoi: Respect for the principle of government by the consent of the governed. We stand for self-determination—for free elections—and we will honor their result.

Eighth, men ask if we are neglecting any hopeful chance of peace. And the answer is "No." A great servant of peace, Secretary Dean Rusk, has sent the message of peace on every wire and by every hand to every continent. A great pleader for peace here with us tonight, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, has worked at home and abroad in this same cause. Their undiscouraged efforts will continue. How much wiser it would have been, how much more compassionate toward its own people, if Hanoi had only come to the bargaining table at the close of the year. Then the 7,000 Communist troops who have died in battle since January 1, and the many thousands who have been wounded in that same period, would have lived in peace with their fellow men.

Today, as then, Hanoi has the opportunity to end the increasing toll the war is taking on those under its command.

Ninth, some ask how long we must bear this burden. To that question, in all honesty, I can give you no answer tonight. During the Battle of Britain when that nation stood alone in 1940, Winston Churchill gave no answer to that question. When the forces of freedom were driven from the Philippines, President Roosevelt could not and did not name the date that we would return. If the aggressor persists in Vietnam, the struggle may well be long. Our men in battle know and they accept this hard fact. We who are at home can do as much, because there is no computer that can tell the hour and the day of peace, but we do know that it will come only to the steadfast and never to the weak in heart.

Tenth, and finally, men ask if it is worth it. I think you know that answer. It is the answer that Americans have given for a quarter of a century, wherever American strength has been pledged to prevent aggression. The contest in Vietnam is confused and hard, and many of its forms are new. Yet our American purpose and policy are unchanged. Our men in Vietnam are there. They are there, as Secretary Dillon told you, to keep a promise that was made 12 years ago. The Southeast Asia Treaty promised, as Secretary John Foster Dulles said for the United States—"That an attack upon the treaty area would occasion a reaction so united, and so strong, and so well placed that the aggressor would lose more than it could hope to gain."

But we keep more than a specific treaty promise in Vietnam tonight. We keep the faith for freedom.

Four Presidents have pledged to keep that faith.

The first was Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his state of the Union message 25 years ago. He said: "* * * we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom."

The second was Harry S. Truman, in 1947, at a historic turning point in the history of guerrilla warfare—and of Greece, Turkey, and the United States. These were his words then: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

"I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."

The third was Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his first inaugural address. He promised this: "Realizing that commonsense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed, all freeman, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

And then 5 years ago, John F. Kennedy, on the cold bright noon of his first day in office, proclaimed: "Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

This is the American tradition. Built in free discussion, proven on a hundred battlefields, rewarded by a progress at home that has no match in history, it beckons us forward tonight to the work of peace in Vietnam. We will build freedom while we fight, and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high, hard road of freedom. We are too old to be foolhardy, and we are too young to be tired. We are too strong for fear and too determined for retreat.

Each evening when I retire, I take up—from a bedside table—reports from the battlefront and reports from the capitals around the world. They tell me how our men have fared that day in the hills and the valleys of Vietnam. They tell me what hope there seems to be that the message of peace will be heard and that this tragic war may be ended. I have read of individual acts of heroism—of dedicated men and women whose valor matches that of any generation that has ever gone before. I read of men risking their lives to save others—of men giving their lives to save freedom. Always among these reports are a few letters from the men out there themselves. If there is any doubt among some here at home about our purposes in Vietnam, I never find it reflected in those letters from Vietnam.

Our soldiers, our marines, our airmen, and our sailors know why they are in Vietnam. They know, as five Presidents have known, how inseparably bound together are America's freedom and the freedom of her friends around the world.

So, tonight, let me read you from a letter that I received from an American father, a warm friend of mine of many years, about his son, a young Army captain.

He said, "I have never known a man at war who showed less bravado in his communications with home. When he was not flying missions in his helicopter or working out of the batallion headquarters he and some of his buddies on their own visited the orphanages as individuals and played with the kids. He was deeply interested in the Vietnamese people, particularly the peasants, and he told me how sorely they wanted, more than anything else, to just be left alone in some semblance of freedom to grow their rice and to raise their families. This good young American, as thousands like him, was not on the other side of the world fighting specifically for you or for me, Mr. President. He was fighting in perhaps our oldest American tradition, taking up for people who are being pushed around."

The young captain described in this letter is dead tonight, but his spirit lives in the 200,000 young Americans who stand out there on freedom's frontier in Vietnam. It lives in their mothers and in their fathers here in America who have proudly watched them leave their homes for their distant struggle.

So tonight I ask each citizen to join me, to join me in the homes and the meeting places our men are fighting to keep free, in a prayer for their safety.

I ask you to join me in a pledge to the cause for which they fight—the cause of human freedom to which this organization is dedicated. I ask you for your help, for your understanding, and for your commitment, so that this united people may show forth to all the world that America has not ended the only struggle that is worthy of man's unceasing sacrifice—the struggle to be free.

Congressman William Jennings Bryan Dorn Addressed North Carolina Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman William Jennings Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina, addressed the North Carolina Annual Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in the Municipal Auditorium in the city of Raleigh on the evening of February 26, 1966. While our colleague spoke extemporaneously, someone was thoughtful enough to make a tape recording of his address. I submit for the Record a transcript taken from the tape recorder.

Congressman Dorn's speech was delivered to an audience of more than 1,500 citizens. He was frequently interrupted by applause. The speech was magnificent, comprehensive, and thought-provoking and I am certain that it will be read with great interest by our colleagues and our countrymen.

The best thing about Bryan Dorn is his lovely wife, Millie, a native North Carolinian, who has been his guardian angel during the many long years he has served in the House of Representatives.

Address of Representative William Jennings Bryan Dorn, Democrat, of South Carolina, North Carolina Annual Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Municipal Auditorium, Raleigh, N.C., February 26, 1966

Thank you, Bill Webb, for your very kind, gracious, and warm introduction. Governor Moore, Senator Ervin, Senator Jordan, Mr. Broughton, Mr. Hedrick, members of your distinguished congressional delegation, and my fellow Democrats, it is a great honor for me tonight to come back to North Carolina to address one of the greatest Democratic banquets held annually in the United States of America. [Applause.]

In 1946, after returning from World War II, I offered in the Democratic primary for the Congress of the United States from the Third South Carolina District. I remember campaigning up in a mountain area of my district. I had never been there before. I stopped at a weatherbeaten country store. There was a group of people gathered around out front. They were good people, but they were a little bit skeptical of people from my section. I talked to them about great Democratic programs such as social security, soil conservation, and rural electrification. I made them a little talk out in front of the store. None of them would look at me. They looked down. Finally, the leader of this group looked up and he said, "Young man, are you married?" I said, "No sir." He said, "You talk all right. I'll tell you what we'll do. We'll try you one time, but don't you go to Washington and marry no Yankee." [Applause.]

My fellow Democrats, I am in good standing in that area of my district today, having married a Tar Heel—a Democrat—a North Carolinian. [Applause.]

I do want to tell you how grateful the American people are, how grateful we are in the Congress of the United States to you Democrats in North Carolina for sharing with the whole Nation and the whole free world, men of the caliber, distinction, honor, and integrity of your two great U.S. Senators, Senator Ervin and Senator Jordan. [Applause.] I want to tell you how much I have enjoyed working in the House of Representatives over these years with some of the finest it has been ever my privilege to know, great North Carolina Democrats, dedicated to the cause of freedom, dedicated to the development of our Southland and devoted to those principles and ideals that made this Nation the wonder of the free world—your illustrious and distinguished Democratic delegation to the U.S. House of Representatives. [Applause.]

You know, my wife has briefed me over the years on the history of North Carolina; and coming up here on the plane today she insisted I read a book about Governor Aycock of North Carolina. You have enjoyed good government in North Carolina. You are proud of it. Yes, good government in North Carolina since Governor Aycock's outstanding administration around the turn of the century—more than 65 years ago. With good democratic government, North Carolina took the lead in the Southland in job opportunity, in new industry—the finest public school system in the South for many years, a great system of State colleges, good roads, and lately the fabulous research triangle.

You have pointed out the way—the Democrats in North Carolina—you have provided good government in North Carolina from the state house down to the local level. [Applause.] The Southland is grateful for that national leadership provided by the Democratic leaders of your great State and not the least of them is your illustrous and able Governor Dan Moore who is serving North Carolina with such honor and distinction today—a great middle of the road Democrat around whom we can all unit.

My fellow Democrats, in the fall of 1951 it was my honor to visit London, England, with your late beloved Congressman Herb Bonner—our Democratic colleague here, Walter Jones, now represents his district. We called on the great Winston Churchill at 10 Downing Street. At that time, Mr. Churchill was Prime Minister of England, following 6 years of Prime Minister Atlee. As we left, he called me back and asked about old friends in South Carolina. Then, Mr. Churchill said that when a government goes too far to the left or right there is no return to good, sound, middle of the road government. Mr. Churchill suggested I go back to the United States and oppose all liberals in our country becoming members of one party and all conservatives becoming members of the other party. He emphasized that all liberals in one party and all conservatives in the other would be fatal for democracy in the United States and injurious to the cause of freedom throughout the free world.

Mr. Churchill said that England was the greatest power on the face of the earth just a few years ago. Britannia ruled the Seven Seas. The sun never set on British soil. British legal jurisprudence, law and order, democracy, Christianity, and culture were exported throughout the world. Today we are a second-rate power, impotent before the great communist menace in Europe without the aid and help of the United States of America. The reason England is faltering, Churchill said, is because she made the mistake of having all liberals in one party and all conservatives in another. He said someday those extreme pseudo-liberals will get in power and there is no return to good sound democratic free enterprise government.

There is room, Churchill said, in both of your great American political parties for liberals and conservatives. You can afford diverse elements in both of your great political parties and particularly in your great Democratic Party. Your President Franklin D. Roosevelt [Applause] with whom I worked during World War II expounded that theory.

Churchill said there is not one single thing I can do to undo national socialism and nationalization of industry fostered on the people of England by the Atlee Government. Do not make that mistake in the United States.

We need balanced government. There is room in our great Democratic Party in the middle of the road for all of our people. We cannot move ahead to our destiny as a great party if we are in the ditch on the left-hand side of the road. Nor can we move ahead to the future salvation of our country and leadership of the free world if we are in the ditch on the right-hand side of the road.

The party founded by Thomas Jefferson was the party of all the people. Under that umbrella in the middle of the road all races, all creeds and all classes can unite and serve this Nation as we have in times past. This is a great challenge to the Democrats of North Carolina and of South Carolina and to Democrats throughout our Nation—to unite in the middle of the road, behind the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, private enterprise and those principles and that philosophy which made this Nation the heart and core of freedom and the arsenal of democracy throughout the world.

We can be proud of the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party has had a glorious history, dating back to Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. Thomas Jefferson opposed vested interests and class plutocracy. He believed that America could progress and carve out of the wilderness the great Nation we know today only if it included in the Democratic Party the man at the crossroads store, the small businessman, the farmer on the frontier, and the worker in the factories of that day. He had a vision. Thomas Jefferson dreamed dreams. He dreamed about a great nation stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the North to the South. He dreamed of a day when every American would have opportunity, education, and dignity. He was a builder who made his dreams come true. He knew that only through the Democratic Party, encompassing all elements of our population, could that party properly serve the American people. We can look back down through the corridors of history tonight and we know that Thomas Jefferson was right.

I think especially tonight of William Jennings Bryan, of Grover Cleveland and of those great Americans, great Democrats, like Alfred E. Smith who preserved a foundation of hope for the Democratic Party. I wore my first Democratic button as a kid at the Greenwood County Fair in 1928—when on the lapel of my coat I wore an Al Smith and Joe Robinson button. [Applause.] There were many great men who held the Democratic Party together in lean years; and it was principally this beloved Southland of ours that supported these great leaders. I remember reading about election after election when the Democratic nominee received virtually no electoral votes outside the South. We held the party together.

When 1932 came around the world was in revolution. Pause with me for a moment and think about the time of the Communist revolution in Russia in 1917 which resulted in a ruthless dictatorship under Lenin and Stalin. The whole world was aflame. Mussolini marched on Rome from Milano in 1922 and took over Italy eliminating freedom with black-shirt bigotry. Mare Nostrum became a reality and Il Duce a threat to world freedom. Yes, the war party took over in Japan and invaded Manchuria in 1931. The raving Hitler goose-stepped to power in Germany in 1933. The democracies were paralyzed with fear and apprehension. After a thousand years of feudalism in the world and class hatred, the democracy established by Thomas Jefferson and kept alive by Andrew Jackson and others was threatened with extinction from the face of this earth. But here in the United States under the leadership of the Democratic Party with our Constitution and private enterprise system, we were able to pull ourselves together and instead of goose-stepping to Washington with the hobnail boots of dictatorship, we gave to the people of the United States social security. Instead of blackshirtism and fascism we provided for them rural electrification, soil conservation, bank deposit insurance and social justice. Our country began to move forward with democracy, with freedom and representative government. We were faced a few years later with the combined military might of the Axis and those who sneered at democracy. Mussolini was reported as having contemptuously referred to the Congress of the United States as a bunch of "parliamentary charlatans." He said that men are cowards, flunkies, and traitors who can only be governed through their passions, their hatreds, and their bigotries. We overthrew this philosophy and democracy really began to come alive in the world under the leadership and under the banner of the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

Yes, I am proud of our Democratic Party. Then a few years later and a few years ago, Nikita Khrushchev stood in the kitchen in the Kremlin in Moscow and told a Vice President of the United States that "we will bury you. We will drive you off the markets of the world with agricultural and industrial production. America will be forced into a depression and the United States will have to adopt socialism and your children and grandchildren will live under socialism."

We are winning that phase of the cold war hands down. Under Democratic leadership it is no contest at all. Nikita Khrushchev was "sacked and fired" 16 months ago—a year ago last October—because he failed to drive America and the might of our democratic system, our private enterprise system, the capitalistic system, with its profit motive, from the markets of the world. Instead Khrushchev was sacked and fired in disgrace because this country moved ahead.

In 1961, in January, a young man stepped out in the snow in Washington to fill the office of President of the United States under a Democratic regime. Since that very day this Nation has had 60 continuous months of increased gross national product [applause]—the longest continuous cycle of prosperity any civilization the history of the world has ever known. Last year our gross national product increased $45 billion. Since 1961 our gross national product has increased $163 billion. Six million new jobs have been created. Unemployment has decreased from over 7 percent to a little over 3 percent. Profits have increased by 80 percent. This is the answer to socialism and fascism and communism. This is why the Communists are losing the cold war. They cannot compete with a democratic system sponsored and promulgated and led by the great Democratic Party with the principles and ideals of Jefferson and Jackson.

We are moving ahead. This is 1966. We are looking ahead to the year 2000. Some of you here tonight will go to the moon and other planets of the universe. Yes, this Nation is moving ahead, is solving our problems and is defeating the left and the right with democracy and freedom.

I want to report to you that we are going to win in South Vietnam. [Applause.] This is the greatest single issue facing the American people. This is the greatest single challenge facing the people of the free world today.

A few days ago I conferred with General Westmoreland, a Carolinian. I conferred with his second in command, Lt. Gen. Joe Moore, also a Carolinian and commander in chief of all the air forces in South Vietnam. There is always something behind good men. I was told that General Westmoreland and General Moore were Eagle Scouts together at the same time at Spartanburg High School, Spartanburg, S.C. [Applause.]

You can be proud of your men in South Vietnam. [Applause.] They are standing guard against aggression and terror. They have been sent there by our great leadership in Washington—a leadership which is following a course set by several administrations since World War II.

Lenin is reported as having said that the road to Paris is the road through Peiping. They have Peiping, China. They have had 17 years' time to liquidate our missionaries, to liquidate the educators, the lawyers, the doctors, and those who went to school around the world and those whom we trained. Now they are ready to move on that road to Paris as predicted and reported by Nicolai Lenin.

Why are they in South Vietnam? Why are the North Vietnamese there? They are making a cold, brazen bid for the oil, tin, the rubber, uranium, and manpower of southeast Asia. Their next step is India, then Saudi Arabia with 67 percent of the world's untapped oil. Commodore Perry, speaking before the National Geographic Society in New York City in 1856, 110 years ago, said that someday the forces of democracy and freedom will be locked in a death struggle in southeast Asia with the forces of totalitarianism, and freedom will hang in the balance. Teddy Roosevelt, more than 65 years ago, said if all Asia ever becomes united under the banner of totalitarianism, enslavement, and terror, then democracy would be in trouble.

Genghis Kahn, 500 years ago, conquered Asia and swept into Europe. Civilization and Western Europe would have passed from this earth but for the death of Genghis Kahn when almost at the gates of Paris. His son then withdrew to what is now European Russia.

I would like to say tonight, to France, that I wish the head of state in France, for whom so many Americans bled and died and for whom we spent billions of dollars—I wish he would go back and read the blueprint written more than 45 years ago about the road to Paris being the road through Peiping. The Communists are on that road today. If they overrun all of southeast Asia, they will conquer Asia and move into northern Africa. Western Europe is only a small peninsula on the Afro-Eurasian land mass. France is only a country on that small peninsula. With all of Asia and Africa in the hands of totalitarianism, Western Europe would be outflanked, and as Lenin predicted, would fall without firing a shot. America would be isolated and surrounded. Freedom in this world would be gone forever.

Our American men are fighting in South Vietnam for peace. They are fighting against totalitarianism. They are fighting to prevent the spread of war. They are fighting to prevent world war III. They are fighting—and I wish some in our own country would realize this [applause] they are fighting to prevent an escalation of the war. Those who want to appease the Communist aggressor are escalating the war. Those who want to collaborate and have coalition governments with the Communists are escalating the war. Those who want to withdraw are escalating the war. They are the ones who are preventing negotiation. They are encouraging Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung by their strange actions in the United States of America. I am in possession of some pretty reliable information that when the President extended the olive branch of peace, when he did everything humanly possible for peace in southeast Asia, that he could have brought Ho Chi Minh and the Hanoi outfit to the conference table but for the actions of certain people in the United States.

When in Saigon, I was told that some of the Vietcong captured in the jungles had pictures in their possession of peace demonstrations, beatniks and peaceniks in the United States. Therefore, they were encouraged to fight and to kill more American boys. I talked with a major from North Carolina—a Negro major—in one of the field hospitals of whom all Americans and Carolinians in particular can be proud. He said, "Congressman, we must win this war over these forms of terror and aggression." He introduced me to some of his patients and had me shake hands with them—some of whom had no hands to shake, no arms, no legs. They looked up and smiled. They said, go back and tell this story to those people in our own country who are causing escalation of the war by advocating withdrawal and appeasement. [Applause.]

Some people in the United States are demanding withdrawal. Where would they fight the forces of Communist aggression who are sworn to enslave and conquer the world. They say it's a long way from home, a nasty war, at the wrong time and in the wrong place. They say there are quagmires and monsoons. Where would they fight? Is the terrain any better in Oregon [applause] or in the Rockies? Where would these people make a stand. You are entitled to know. The American people are entitled to know.

This is a war of aggression—one of the most diabolical and sinister forms of aggression ever known in the history of the world. They are sending in terrorists under the ground. They have murdered 11,000 schoolteachers in South Vietnam. They have murdered mayors and members of the city councils. They are attempting to overthrow the government by terror, anarchy, and chaos.

We must stand firm. We must stand astride that road to Paris. Freedom indeed hangs in the balance today. The Communists have aimed two barrels, many tenacles all over the world, but two major barrels—one at the campuses of the United States, and the other at our men fighting in South Vietnam.

Ladies and gentlemen, do not take my work for it. J. Edgar Hoover, said of the demonstration last April 17 around the White House that it was Communist inspired and Communist led. I wish you could have seen it. I went down and looked at it, Senator—green hair, purple toenails, and all manner of beatniks—some of whom needed a shower, some of whom were paid. [Applause.] J. Edgar Hoover said that group was led by the hard-core enemy of American democracy, that they were promulgated and led by the Communist Party, USA.

I asked our great Secretary of State, Dean Rusk [applause] a few days ago—who went to college at Davidson College, N.C. [applause], who was a star basketball player there, whose forebears built the old Stone Church at Clemson University in my district and another, Benjamin Rusk, who went to Texas and signed the Texas Declaration of Independence. I asked Dean Rusk what effect do these demonstrations have on the war effort in South Vietnam. He gave me a classic answer. He said, they have the same effect that 20,000 demonstrators marching around the palace of Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi, demanding that he pull out, would have on America. In fact, he said, if 20,000 persons paraded with signs around Ho Chi Minh's palace, the war would be over and the American people would know it.

We cannot withdraw. We cannot abandon this little nation. I talked with the South Vietnamese people. I saw an American doctor there amputating legs and arms of civilians. There is one thing I learned in South Vietnam—that when war comes to a country, the civilian population is hit the same as the military. I went into a Vietnamese hospital. There were flies, mosquitoes, and blood everywhere. One of the doctors there was from the Mayo Clinic in Minnesota and had volunteered to go to South Vietnam. He said, "Congressman, I want to show you something." He took me over and introduced me to a 10-year-old Vietnamese girl. She had seen her mother and her father killed in her front yard 3 days before by the Vietcong and all her older brothers and sisters liquidated by the Vietcong. She was shot through the chest. And do you know what she was doing? Listen, this is the spirit of the South Vietnamese people—she was crying to go home, pleading with the doctor to let her go back home and take care of her 2-year-old brother and 3-year-old sister.

Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot let these gallant people down. This Nation will not let them down. [Applause.] President Johnson made a wise decision last year [applause] in rushing in men and equipment just in the nick of time. I was told in Saigon and in Nha Trang, Da Nang, Pleiku, and throughout that country that if we had been a few days later, freedom would have perished from this key area of the world. The President acted in the nick of time. And I want you to know this, my friends, when we are in war we must support the Commander in Chief. I opposed World War II and objected to a resolution in the South Carolina Senate which would have endorsed certain actions of the administration in Washington because I thought it might be better to let Hitler and communism fight it out. But once that war was joined, I supported the President of the United States. I am proud and glad Bill Webb mentioned the fact that my six brothers and I served all over the world during World War II—and some of us will go back again if necessary. Unity is what we need in this country. We united behind Woodrow Wilson. The Congressman from my own district voted against World War I on April 6, 1917, but once that war started the American people united behind Woodrow Wilson and we brought the boys home in a minimum of time. [Applause.] We did the same thing when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor.

This is the greatest challenge the American people have ever faced. I came back and stopped on the island of Formosa where they are phasing out foreign aid on the 30th of June this year. I saw there happiness, prosperity, full employment, courage and saw there a powerful army made possible with the aid and assistance of the United States. We can and will do the same in South Vietnam. We are not going to turn the world back to totalitarianism and slavery.

The great Democratic Party of the United States has led our country in time of depression and in time of war. It has led us to victory. We will not fail the American people today. Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, and our President today [applause] have guided the ship of state through stormy seas. We are going to unite. The Democrats of North Carolina are going to unite. We are going to perform and fulfill our destiny. It is a great party. We have saved this Nation time and time again. There is no doubt in my mind about it. And we are going to go through this crisis we are in today and we are going to prevent another world war.

Appeasement. I remember looking at the newspapers in 1938 and there I saw a picture of Neville Chamberlain with his high top hat and his umbrella—with a document in his hand. He had returned from Munich where he collaborated with the infamous Hitler and Mussolini. He said my fellow Britons this means peace in our time—because he had Adolph Hitler's name on a slip of paper. He sold out Czechoslovakia, a little free nation, and was just as guilty of starting World War II as Adolph Hitler. A few months after Munich, Hitler's legions were pouring into Poland, another small free nation. Twenty-five million people died in World War II. Chamberlain was just as guilty as Hitler in this useless slaughter.

We are not going to make that mistake again. [Applause.] We are putting the dictators of the world on notice that America is going to fight and we will prevent world war III.

It is a great honor to be in North Carolina. It is a great privilege always to be among Democrats—those who can unite in the middle of the road for our country. Americanism and the preservation of freedom everywhere means more to me than anything. The Democratic Party, I believe in because it has done more to preserve Americanism and to spread freedom around the world than any other single factor in our history. [Applause.]

The textile industry is essential to national defense. We went to the Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1956 and appeared before the platform committee. I introduced the president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute along with an employee in one of our mills.

We were well received. The Democratic committee adopted a plank in our platform which would have provided relief for our basic industry. The situation worsened and again we went back in 1960 before the Democratic platform committee meeting in Los Angeles. We were well received. John F. Kennedy, as our standard bearer assured us that the plight of our industry would receive his personal attention and top priority in his administration.

The great textile industry—the greatest single employer of people in North Carolina, South Carolina, and in the Southeast—was on the rocks. Unemployment was rampant. Mills were closing. Over 700 mills had closed since World War II and many of our towns were threatening to become ghost towns, yet our pleas had been falling on deaf ears from 1953 to 1961. I know that story well. I know what your North Carolina delegation did. I know what your Governors did during that period. We saved the textile industry.

There were those in Washington who thought the textile industry was expendable, that we should import textile goods from other countries at the expense of our own industry and employees. John F. Kennedy took the oath as President of the United States in January 1961 and a new day dawned. In the White House, a few weeks later, the President assured your distinguished and able Congressman COOLEY and myself that he would limit imports of unfair, low-wage, foreign imports to 6 percent of the 1961 level. John F. Kennedy kept that promise. Lyndon B. Johnson assured us he would carry out the Kennedy program to get rid of the two-price cotton under which our textile mills had to pay 8½ cents more per pound for American cotton than our competitors in Japan, India, and throughout the world—the most unfair economic restriction ever fostered on any industry in any country in the history of the world. Your distinguished congressional delegation, every single one of them, worked with us night and day and we saved the textile industry through a voluntary agreement limiting imports, tax advantages, depreciation, and elimination of the two-price cotton. The textile industry in the South today is expanding. They are putting in air conditioning. I wish you could sit on the platform with some of us when a new mill or an expansion is announced when they announce air conditioning because of the splendid program inaugurated by Democratic administrations. They are enjoying these improvements made possible by a great Democratic administration. Now textile and related employees are on full time with time and a half for overtime. Expansion is the order of the day. Thirty thousand new jobs have been created in the textile industry since the elimination of two-priced cotton.

We are going to continue to move forward. The South is coming into its own—new factories with tax revenue for better schools. In High Point, where I spoke last week to 1,800 school students, I went on a tour of the surrounding area where they have gotten over a hundred new plants in the last few years. Unemployment? There is no unemployment—thanks to a great Democratic administration in North Carolina at the local and State level and to an administration in Washington that has taken business into its confidence and is putting emphasis on the private enterprise system as the way to employ people, provide opportunity, expand business, expand education and better hospitalization. I could talk to 12:00 o'clock about the great Democratic Party [applause]; however, I leave with you the eloquent words of a great Senator from a neighboring State who said: "He who saves his country, saves all things; and all things saved, will bless him. He who lets his country die, lets all things die; and all things dying, curse him."

The Democratic Party of your country and mine, the Democratic Party of your State and mine has done everything humanly possible and has made an admirable record in preserving those principles and ideals that made this Nation the wonder of the world.

The Grassroots Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, many editorials have been written by newspapermen and columnists of long experience on important and vital issues facing our country and our people.

Several days ago, I received a letter from one of my constituents in which she has ably expressed her views—one of the finest that I have received and I want to share it with the Members of this body.

I think it demonstrates that the folks from the grassroots are thinking about the problems confronting this Nation and are far better informed than some of the experts might think.

The letter follows:

COFFEYVILLE, KANS.,
March 4, 1966.

Hon. JOE SKUBITZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SKUBITZ: I appreciate the opportunity you are giving your constituents to express their wishes. On a few of the points I am unsure and fear that some of my ideas may contradict each other. Certain things I should like to expand upon, much as I realize your time does not permit you to read much mail such as this.

Vietnam: Even our allies do not approve our being there and generally they continue to trade with our enemy. With our small percentage of the entire population, we cannot hope to patrol the entire world and should not launch into such a program. Keeping out aggressors into weak nations should be a U.N. responsibility with all nations participating.

We are not being told the whole truth about the U.N. situation. After a delegate returns from his survey an optimistic report is given concerning our having the enemy under control, the tide has turned, the war is practically won, yet each week's casualty list shows an alarming increase despite our light or no losses reported with each confrontation of troops. With the terrific number of Vietnamese who are deserting, it hardly appears that the country's populace sincerely opposes communism. Perhaps the majority actually prefer that form of government. How can we know? I am not an isolationist but do firmly believe the line must be drawn somewhere in the sacrifice of our young men and our money. I hope and pray that a negotiated peace may yet become a reality to get our country off the hook without loss of face.

Personally I do not hold the President wholly responsible for he inherited this problem and was told by Republican leaders what steps the country should be obliged to take. Frequently, we are reminded of the prosperity our great country is enjoying. Most of us resent a war prosperity and would prefer to settle down to just normal good times.

Foreign aid: The recipients do not respect America for it and my recommendation would be to cut off all foreign aid in the form of money. To offer help in the form of advice, upon request, as a means of improving living conditions, education, government, financing, production methods, sanitation, health, etc., instead of dollars, would teach underdeveloped nations to help themselves while building up national pride. Maybe more of this sort of aid is being given than I realize; I am not thoroughly familiar with our foreign aid program except for the gargantuan expense of it. We cannot be "Uncle" to everyone without spreading ourselves too thin.

Apportionment: Congress is a living example of a two-house legislature, one house of which is not based on population. It should be legal within individual States if it is in the Nation. Democrats used to believe in States' rights; how the party has changed with everything being taken over by the Federal Government.

Minimum wage: This is another area undergoing too much regulation. A worker should be paid what he is worth to his employer. In small business and industry, service areas, farming—profits will not likely be sufficiently high to meet the minimum wage standards, yet persons employed in these fields may want to remain in their own communities in preference to migrating to a better labor market.

14(b) of Taft-Hartley: We need to retain "right to work" laws. This should remain a free land; I hope we never repeal 14(b) section.

Rent subsidy: There would be unavoidable injustices if subsidies are granted. How about the people with incomes barely above the limit for aid? They would fare less well than their subsidized neighbors. Care must be taken that we do not reward poverty to such great degree that the condition becomes too desirable, the way our welfare clients regard that program. There should be no advantage to throwing one's money away, or his desire for self-support, to qualify for aid. After rent subsidies who would want to own his own home and pay the taxes? Let each family head try to support his household; initiative is important, so should homeownership be. If there is money available for rent subsidies why not use some of it to offset an increase in the ridiculously low $600 personal exemption from income tax? It would benefit many people, more worthy ones in most cases. The general taxpaying public appears to be growing consistently more dissatisfied with Government collecting and spending and would appreciate some relief.

The GI bill: This has passed but I was shocked at the President's attitude about the cost of the measure after it got back to him. He resented additional funds going to servicemen, while from the other side of his mouth he was asking more billions for foreign aid, antipoverty, and his Great Society. Evidently he does not hold our country's defenders in very high esteem. To me they should come first after working years for practically nothing, risking their lives, suffering injuries, losing jobs, being separated from families, interrupting their education, and so on.

Do you favor: The Great Society cannot be legislated. If ever we attain such status it will come slowly. Culture grows; one doesn't wake up with it the day the dream program goes into effect. Money alone won't do the job; it takes generations to change a family's way of life. My theory is that all foreign and domestic money aid should be earned, not given. Many welfare families are being robbed of their self-respect, ambition incentive to work, by money being given to them. Every able-bodied person of employable age should be required to work at something in order to earn his dole. The same should be true of nations that receive our aid; something must be expected of them in return so that they may maintain self-esteem.

After having worked for a time as a social worker I definitely feel that the present welfare program is doing and has done, very little to improve the recipients of aid. It is too certain and easy a means of existence. A rare few can be interested in making an effort to learn a trade or develop a skill which would enable them to earn a living. The children, in general, look forward to getting a grant for themselves as they grow up. What is needed most is education to fit each to be a contributor to society and be self-supporting, but it appears reasonable to conclude that education must be made compulsory.

And on the subject of education, why does the draft place a premium on dropping out of high school? A recent article in the local newspaper stated that among previous rejections only the high school graduates would be called for reexamination. Won't that encourage boys to drop out? And a police record for even minor offenses eliminates lads from serving their country. Any boy who doesn't want to be in uniform can flunk his mental test; he has that much skill. These are good escape means for fellows who do not desire to become soldiers; but aren't they the caliber to do the hand-to-hand fighting in Vietnam? Like Muhammed Ali, it might be a benefit to them to serve. Otherwise their chances are not too good.

Thank you if you have borne with me this long. The letter perhaps will not help you, but it does get a few thing off my chest.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Copying Without Compensation Is Piracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a Maryland publishing and printing complex, the Williams & Wilkins Co.-Waverly Press, Inc., employs over 700 people and publishes and prints over 150 scientific journals and over 125 scientific books annually.

The Williams & Wilkins Co. has been seriously concerned about the impact of Xeroxing and other forms of reproduction on their journal circulations and book sales potential. With photocopying production estimated to grow from a current 12 billion copies annually to 25 billion copies by 1970, the company feels that if scientific societies, publishers, and authors are not now compensated directly or indirectly for copying, the Federal Government will wind up with complete control of the scientific press.

Williams & Wilkins suggests that royalty accounting of payment for copying is now feasible with new developments in data-processing and computer technology; and the cost of developing such a concept is a necessary price for society to pay to insure the survival of a free press, and to protect the jobs of hundreds of thousands in the printing and paper industries.

Since there has been little public education on the complex issues involved in copyright, I request that Williams & Wilkins' comments on the effect of personal use copying on small publishers be inserted in the RECORD for the purpose of stimulating public discussion of the legislation they propose:

COPYING WITHOUT COMPENSATION IS PIRACY

(Minority report by the Williams & Wilkins Co., in rebuttal to the statements made by the Technical, Scientific & Medical Book Publishers Group on the subject, "Fair Use of Material From Copyrighted Books in Science, Technology, and Medicine When Photocopied.")

The title and thesis of this memorandum is built on the statement by the author of "The Caine Mutiny," Herman Wouk, at the congressional hearings held last summer on copyright law revision:

"In the 18th century * * * a very simple principle became the basis for the founding of a free community. The principle was stated in five words: 'Taxation without representation is tyranny,' something we all learned as school boys. On the basis of that phrase a new nation came into existence.

"The restriction of the right to copy may be phrased so: 'Copying without compensation is piracy.' On this simple basis * * * the free community of the arts and the intellect arose and exists to this day. It was great wisdom in the British legislators to restrict the right to copy, a wisdom which was followed throughout the Western World and then throughout the civilized world, and which was taken over into the Consttiution by the proviso that the Congress had the duty to protect and restrict the right to copy—that is, to make laws covering copyright."

As publishers of medical and scientific books and journals, we are completely opposed to the attempt of the Technical, Scientific & Medical Book Publishers Group to define "fair use" as it applies to photocopying.

We submit that the manufacturer of any visually-readable duplicate of part or all of a copyrighted work—by a government agency, an educational institution, a library, a business, or an individual—is not "fair use" if there is no compensation to the copyright owner.

We further submit that for the latter half of the 20th, "information exploded" century, the constitutional dignity of the right not to have property taken without just compensation, plus the prohibitions in the 1st amendment against abridgement of the freedom of the press, must take priority in copyright legislation over article I, section 8, of the Constitution ("The Congress shall have power * * * To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and inventions").

We recommended that the Congress:

1. Enact a general revision of the U.S. copyright law in 1966;

2. Give statutory affirmation to the right of the copyright owner to receive reasonable compensation for facsimile reproduction of part or all of his works;

3. Give statutory affirmation to the fact that the copyright owner does not have the right to deny access for the reproduction of copyrighted works if the party who reproduces the work can and will pay reasonable royalty;

4. Enact enabling legislation to:

(a) Provide for the indirect payment of royalties by institutional copiers to copyright owners, by establishment of the Royalty Clearing House Facility, under the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress and the Register of Copyrights:

(b) Provide funds to enable the Library of Congress to study and apply existing hardware techniques for library automation to the clerical task of collecting and disbursing royalties;

(c) Give the Register of Copyrights march-in rights to terminate a copyright, subject if necessary to judicial review, if a copyright owner's refusal of reproduction rights at a reasonable royalty is not deemed in the public interest;

(d) Levy a 1-percent ad valorem tax on all copying machines, and a 1-cent-a-page tax on copying machine output, in order to finance the dissemination by government bodies of commercially unpublishable information of definite value to science, to the arts and humanities, to education, and to business. This would include not only the Library of Congress but the National Science Foundation, the National Library of Medicine, the Office of Technical Services, the National Agricultural Library, the National Bureau of Standards. This would provide revenue credits to this function of the Federal Government, in accounting theory, of over $150 million in 1966, based on industry estimates of copying machine output, and over $300 million by 1970. This estimate assumes washout accounting (i.e., the Library of Congress and the Royalty Clearing House Facility are credited with 1-cent-a-page royalties for the reprinting of copyrighted materials by Government agencies in the executive branch, for further disbursement to copyright owners). It assumes no exemptions for educational and not-for-profit institutions, the copying machine industry's biggest potential market. It is based on copying machine output of all works, not just copyrighted material, an unknown but vulnerable quantity. Its basic premise is to finance governmental involvement in the copyright revolution, to force public recognition of the copyright owners' rights, to force fiscal and operating controls on copying—particularly at educational and nonprofit facilities, and failing that, to provide the means by which copyright owners can be compensated for unpoliceable infringement of the market for their works;

(e) Authorize the Postmaster General to issue "royalty stamps" in appropriate denominations and available at any post office, by which small institutions, commercial establishments, and individuals can pay royalties directly to the copyright owner in lieu of reporting copying usage to the Library of Congress' Royalty Clearing House Facility. Mailed on Government postcards by the copier to the copyright owner, and redeemable by the latter at less than face value and in bulk quantities at his local post office, this documentary could be issued in two parts: one, to be affixed to the material copied, as evidence of compliance, if ever needed; the other, pasted on a postcard and mailed as species of payment to, and later redemption by, the copyright owner. In this system, everybody wins: the post office is guaranteed revenues by the difference between face and redemption values of the "royalty stamps"—the copier can easily pay the copyright owner, in effect, on a "scrip" basis with no significant accounting burden—the copyright owner, with the advantage of bulk redemptions, can collect earned copying-royalty earnings, also with no significant accounting burden, through the facility of the post office acting as a clearinghouse.

(f) Refrain from exempting any governmental or not-for-profit organizations—including educational institutions, their administrators, their faculty, their students—from the principles and application of copyright law.

It is important to state here that we do not wish to restrict doctors, scientists, educators, librarians, students from copying, as such. The modern copying machine is a useful tool in the dissemination of knowledge, but its economic toll on publishers of technical, scientific, medical, and reference books and journals has been grossly underestimated, even by our colleagues and competitors in the Technical, Scientific, and Medical Book Publishers Group.

We object strongly to the Technical, Scientific, and Medical Book Publishers position paper on photocopying, because its permissiveness on free personal use copying is nothing more than economic suicide in this day and age. And, we object in principle to any group dictating hamstringing codes or guidelines of ethical practice for other groups of society to follow, and we are sure our friends in science and education agree with us. The burden of insuring that science publishing remains free and independent rests squarely on the shoulders of scentists, educators, and librarians and nowhere else, and we are certain that, if royalty compensation is the only way out of this "fair use" dilemma, they will agree that a small part of the fee they pay for photocopies should in some way go to the copyright owner.

"True civilization depends on the extent of obedience to the unenforceable," stated Lord Moulton in the spirit of another classic phrase, "Authority is only as great as the will to obey." Here is the gut issue of "fair use," reprography and the copyright law. Prior to the 1960's—the pre-Xerox civilization—we would gladly have gone along with a Technical, Scientific, and Medical Book Publishers position paper, gladly endorsed and lived with any fair practice code that our friends in the library industry would come up with. Why? Because it didn't hurt, and the lack of commonality of research interests in science meant little erosion to the market for any single work if personal use, notetaking photocopies were furnished the investigator. But, when the copying machine output hits a rate of 12 billion copies a year, and promises to double within a few years, it is quite obvious that usage of tens of thousands of machines at thousands of centers of education by literally millions of researchers and students is eroding the market for specialized works.

Publishers such as ourselves can no longer tolerate a little bit of infringement, without compensation, than acknowledge the validity of the state of being a little bit pregnant. It should not be necessary to have to emphasize the economics of lost sales to a publisher whose market is in the low thousands—but, if photocopying causes the loss of only two or three subscriptions to a journal, or only two or three book purchases in each of the few hundred market areas where scientific research is done, it will no longer be possible to publish scientific books and journals on anything but a subsidy basis, with the Federal Government calling the shots on what gets subsidized, what gets published.

It is important to emphasize that the markets for most specialized scientific books and journals do not grow materially or in direct proportion to the increase in the scientific population. Why? Because as knowledge grows, it fragments and becomes specialized, and the specialized areas of interest call for more and more specialized books. This twigging effect phenomenon, in the economics of science publishing, simply means the market for most good specialized books will always remain in the low thousands, or disappear entirely if the copying machine takes over.

Determining "fair use," or trying to make guidelines for various interested parties to follow, seems to us to be fruitless and impractical—something like trying to determine how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. The question is not one of assigning relative degrees of permissiveness to copying machine users, or implying that even the honest users, the majority, must be policed. They don't want to be, and don't have to be, if we and they only accept the principle that the copyright owner must be directly or indirectly compensated for copying usage.

Is it such a complicated matter, after all? Reading over the Library of Congress publication, "Libraries and Automation," it seems to us that our friends in the hardware and the systems industries could certainly contribute answers to the relatively simple clerical matter of applying data processing and mechanization technique to the royalty question—whether it involves punched-card accounting or more sophisticated computer technology, it's not really a very hard job. We publishers have been doing it for years.

Are doctors in practice, academic scientists, students really going to object to a penny or so royalty to be included in the price for the photocopies? We think not. American medicine has always believed in fee-for-service—we're sure no doctor who is supplied with photocopies by his nearest library or medical society is going to object to a small fee that compensates the copyright owner who made the information available in the first place. Scientists certainly won't object if the royalty payment is the only tangible way to keep scientific journals and scientific societies healthy, free, and independent. The Congress has recognized the need for support of research and development, and certainly the royalty payment, charged to the grant, has as much justification as the purchase of the copying machine and the paper to feed it. Students conditioned to pay 10, 15, 25 cents a page for photocopies are perfectly able to afford a few pennies more for the copyright owners.

What about libraries? It is a shame the librarians have had to be caught in the middle of this dilemma, because long ago they recognized the problem and were the only group in the educational complex that set up a code of ethics, which technology has now made obsolete.

Let's look at the economics of library practice, as reflected in the following quotations:

"The better medical school libraries have allocations which vary as follows. Personnel, 60 to 75 percent; resources, 20 to 40 percent (one-fourth for textbooks and monographs, one-fourth for binding, and one-fourth for serials); other (supplies, equipment, etc.), 5 to 10 percent."

"The most widely held view among leaders in the field of library science is that books and journals will for the indefinite future continue to be the essential resources of the library."—From the January 1965 special issue of the Journal of Medical Education entitled "Guidelines for Medical School Libraries."

"Robert T. Divett, of the University of New Mexico Library School, advocates that 90 percent of the library's budget be spent on staff, messenger service, telephone, photocopying, telefacsimilies, and rentals while only 10 percent be spent on books and journals."—From the December 6, 1965, issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association, in an article entitled "The Community Hospital Library."

"It may come as a shock to some that nearly $25,000 of the budgets of the Boston Medical Library and of the Harvard Medical Library was devoted to operating the part of the lending service that relates to periodicals. * * * The library's copy service, substantially stepped up in the countway, is regarded by many as a good substitute for borrowing a periodical issue or volume * * * the ability to obtain quickly a legible copy of a journal article will ease materially the inconvenience of not being able to carry away the original."—From a letter written by R. T. Esterquest on "The High Cost of Lending" in the New England Journal of Medicine, November 11, 1965.

Now we're all for library copying services, but it's obvious from the above that expenditures for books and journals are a minor cost of library operations, and the copying machine is one way a good library can cut payroll costs involved in operating a lending service, cut down on duplicate subscriptions normally necessary to take care of reader traffic. In effect, and maybe it's all inevitable and right in the interest of library service, libraries have put themselves into the publishing business in order to increase service, save labor and overhead—but the cost of this function is right out of the hides of the copyright owners who made the library's resources possible in the first place.

We haven't any idea of the clerical costs involved for a library to assume royalty liabilities to copyright owners, but it seems to us it's a necessary price for society to pay in order to insure a free press and a progressive library system that protects the right of the copyright owner to exist. Perhaps the excise tax revenues on copying machine output could finance this new obligation of the modern library.

Whatever the case, we are sure the library associations will rise to this challenge. We know of no other alternative.

The Legacy of Bishop Buddy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the entire community of San Diego has suffered a great loss through the death of the bishop of the San Diego diocese, the Most Reverend Charles Francis Buddy.

Though not of the same denomination, my profound respect of Bishop Buddy as a man and a servant of God is of long standing. His spiritual philosophy and knowledge was applied so often and so meaningfully in our community that many thought the name "Bishop Buddy" was a nickname.

The San Diego Union editorial of Monday, March 7, states clearly how San Diego feels over the loss of this fabulous individual and I ask my colleagues and those who study the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD across the Nation to read it closely:

GOOD WORKS HIS MEMORIAL—THE LEGACY OF BISHOP BUDDY

The single sentence that most typifies the philosophy and work of the Most Reverend Charles Francis Buddy, bishop of the San Diego Diocese, was eight words he spoke to Pope John XXIII in 1959.

"My greatest joy," he told the Pope, "is the crusade for souls."

Today, when Bishop Buddy has been taken from his beloved San Diego for a greater kingdom, the crusade for souls remains as one of the great accomplishments he left behind.

As the result of the crusade to return strayed people back to His ways, hundreds of thousands of persons also will be able to enjoy eternal happiness in the Kingdom of God.

San Diego's greatest joy, when our sorrow at the loss of Bishop Buddy becomes less acute, is the fact that His Excellency graced our city for three decades of his more than half-century service as a priest.

We are morally and physically a better community because of his presence. For while his goal always was spiritual, the bishop was keenly aware that many of the means were temporal. When a person came to him with a spiritual or physical need, Bishop Buddy never asked the man's faith but gave of himself unstintingly to fill the need.

As a result of his zeal, energy, acumen and towering personality, the diocese of San Diego increased Catholic parishes from 67 to more than 220 to strengthen the work of saving souls. Hospitals, schools, clinics, recreation centers, and day nurseries were constructed to serve and take care of other needs of humanity.

Alcala Park, the "Fortress on the Hill," one of the outstanding institutions of its kind, will fortunately serve to carry on the spiritual and educational tradition of Bishop Buddy.

This is the legacy the late Bishop Buddy has left us—the spiritual philosophy and and wisdom that will lead us to eternal happiness, and the physical base of churches, cathedrals, and educational institutions to accomplish the goal.

The philosophy expressed during his sunset years is particularly appropriate:

"Take a stand with Christ. Do not argue with temptation on it. In the sacraments we receive nourishment and strength to triumph over evil. * * * If the human heart were explored, it would reveal a vast wealth of affection that could heal the wounds of mankind."

Proper recognition for his work has come from persons of all faiths and from many lands. One of the great honors he received was selection as Assistant at the Pontifical Throne by Pope Paul VI in 1963.

Today the San Diego area prays and grieves over the loss of Bishop Buddy, consoled somewhat only by the thought that he now serves as assistant at a higher throne.

Hindsight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, much is being said these days concerning our country's commitment and challenge in Vietnam.

The Wheeling Intelligencer, a distinguished morning newspaper whose birth predates the State of West Virginia, and its distinguished editor, Thomas O'Brien Flynn, in an editorial, adds another facet to the discussion of the Vietnam situation. Mr. Flynn is not prospective in his article but recalls the national discussion which was had previous to the last presidential election.

I include Mr. Flynn's article, entitled "Hindsight," in the Record:

HINDSIGHT—IF GOLDWATER WAS WARMONGER IN 1964, WHAT IS MR. JOHNSON TODAY?

During the 1964 campaign, it will be recaller Senator Goldwater proposed the defoliation of Vietnam jungles under cover of which the enemy not only infiltrates into the south, but launches guerrilla attacks on our troops and then melts back into the underbrush.

Cries of dismay arose all over the land, not the least strident of them coming from the Johnson camp. What sort of a reckless monster was this man Goldwater anyhow? Did he want to bring down on his country the charge of resorting to inhuman tactics? Did he want to turn every friend against us?

The other day, in reacting to a hunger striker who quit eating, he said, to protest defoliation in Vietnam, a State Department spokesman defended the practice as a necessary war measure. He explained that the cover is stripped from trees to deny the Vietcong guerrillas places of concealment. It is used along roads, railroads, and canals where the Vietcong ambush military and civilian traffic; also in remote areas where the Communists use the thick jungle cover to establish training bases and along known trails used as supply routes.

It might also be observed in passing that in that excellent message on crime prevention he delivered to Congress this week, the President made specific reference to crime in the streets asserting that a truly free people cannot tolerate "fear that can make us afraid to walk the city streets by night or public parks by day."

Goldwater, it also will be recalled, was criticized for the emphasis he put in his acceptance speech on this same subject and the disposition of the administration to ignore it.

More than any other factor, this newspaper is convinced, fear among the American people of what Barry Goldwater might do as Commander in Chief of our military forces prevented his election. Millions of citizens believed him to be trigger happy. They were fearful of what might happen if he were invested with the necessary authority. They felt safer with Mr. Johnson, a man they believed to be more cautious; a man with a reputation as the great compromiser. They were confident that the well-advertised "Johnson treatment" would prove as effective with the enemy in Vietnam as it had with those he dealt with in the Congress of the United States; that he would bring the war to an end in short order without the commitment of any more American troops, without the suffering of many more American casualties. Mr. Johnson and his associates, of course, played this campaign theme up to the hilt. And it paid off.

But which was the more forthright or more knowledgeable man? Given the facts of our involvement in this war, and viewing it purely from the military point of view, isn't it just possible that had Barry Goldwater been elected and decided to hit the enemy at once with everything we had without this interminable piecemeal escalation we have witnessed, victory would be ours by now, the fighting behind us?

TVA Bond Authority Should Be Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association News, published by the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, in its February issue has some very cogent comments in an editorial on the need to make permanent the revenue bond authority for TVA.

The editorial points out that TVA self-financing has worked remarkably well with the TVA Board of Directors exercising its authority in this regard in an efficient, responsible manner.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the Record, believing it to be of interest to my colleagues and to the Nation generally.

The editorial follows:

PERMANENT BOND AUTHORITY

In August 1959, President Dwight Eisenhower signed into law an amendment to the TVA Act authorizing the Authority to issue revenue bonds as a means of financing added electric power facilities.

TVA was authorized to sell "bonds, notes, and other evidence of indebtedness" in an amount not exceeding $750 million outstanding at any one time "to assist in financing its power program and to refund such bonds."

When the ceiling of $750 million was placed on TVA's bond authority, it was obvious that the ceiling would be reached in a few years. But since revenue bonds financing was a new device for TVA, the Congress felt it best to review it after an initial period of experience to see that it was working satisfactorily.

Today two facts are clear:

1. Bond financing has worked well for TVA. The TVA Board of Directors has exercised its authority in an efficient, responsible manner; TVA bonds have a triple-A rating; four major syndicates have been formed to bid on each of the bond issues; and there is general agreement that bond financing has been proven to be a good device.

2. The time has come to make permanent this revenue bond authority for TVA.

The "trial" period for TVA bond financing has shown this to be a conservative means of meeting growing power needs in the Tennessee Valley area. Now, Congress should remove the "temporary" tag, and put TVA revenue bond financing on a continuing, long-range basis.

Last month the first bill was introduced in Congress on this matter—a bill which would make permanent TVA's revenue bond authority, Senator Ross Bass of Tennessee, introduced the bill (S. 2827). Other bills will be forthcoming, since there is great interest among members of the Tennessee Valley delegation. Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, is the ranking Republican on the Senate Public Works Committee. And on the House side Representative Robert E. Jones, of Alabama, is chairman of the House Public Works Committee which will handle this legislation, and Representative Robert Everett, of Tennessee, is a member of the committee. Representative Joe L. Evins is a key Member of the House on TVA matters, as are other House Members.

At present TVA has $340 million in outstanding bonds and notes, while an additional $160 million will be required to complete generating units and transmission facilities now under construction. This includes the 1,500,000-kilowatt generating unit now under construction at the Paradise steamplant, scheduled for operation to meet the loads expected in the winter of 1969–70.

During 1966 TVA expects to place orders for generating and transmission facilities which will obligate the greater part of the remaining bond authorization permitted under the 1959 amendment.

To give an idea of TVA's need for capital, the peakload in 1964–65 was about 12,800,000 kilowatts, while the peak in the 1965–66 winter season has been 14,263,000 kilowatts—an increase of nearly 1.5 million kilowatts.

The annual rate of growth, however, is not that high. It averages 1 to 1.1 million kilowatts a year, which means $150 to $175 million for capital, each year.

TVA estimates that it will be able to produce about $50 million a year of capital from its electric power revenues, which means that TVA will need $100 to $125 million a year from bonds and other borrowing to meet new plant needs.

One issue which may arise in the Congress is whether there should be another temporary limit placed on the amount of bonds TVA may have outstanding. It is clearly unnecessary—indeed, a reflection on the private money market—for Congress to write into the law a dollar limit on TVA's bond authority.

First, TVA's service area is limited, so the only expansion of TVA would be vertical, in its present area.

Second, the bond covenants to existing bond holders place limitations on TVA; and certainly TVA cannot issue new bonds without proving to the private money market that there is a justifiable need.

Third, the TVA act requires TVA to charge rates to cover all costs, including bond principal and interest, and payments to the U.S. Treasury.

Congress should make TVA's bond authority permanent, and continue to hold TVA accountable for continued excellent performance.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*	1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*	
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg*	914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*	
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*	1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*	301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn*	119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George, *Idaho*	
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*	800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	4517 Wetherill Dr., Westmoreland Hills, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*	The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*	
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	

Appendix

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, sure and it's a very special day today—St. Patrick's Day, it is. And it seems the Irish have had a bad press—or a good one, depending upon your colors—since the toppling of Lord Nelson's monument on O'Connell Street in Dublin last week.

Mr. Edward Sheehan, one of Hawaii's better known Irishmen, took back to the auld sod this week in his "Sheehan's World" column in the Honolulu Advertiser. The article provides fine reading for those with a special lilt in their hearts on this day. I trust that it will not offend my good colleagues for it mentions not only Irishmen but former Jewish lord mayor of Dublin, a British lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and a brother of a lad named Kiyonao Okami, U.S. Consul in Dublin.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record in its entirety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TAKING THE LONG WAY TO TIPPERARY

(By Edward Stephen Sean McCormack Sheehan, Advertiser staff Irishman)

The 12-year-old bully had me on my back and was pounding my head on the pavement:

"Say you're not gonna vote for Al Smith" he demanded, "Say you're gonna vote for Hoover."

I was only about 9 at the time and hadn't planned to vote for anybody. My mother swabbed the lumps on my head and told me I had been under assault because we were the only Irish family in the neighborhood. It was the first time I knew I belonged to a very special group.

(A few miles away, across Boston, a lad my age was romping on a Brookline lawn. His initials were J.F.K. and it would be his unique destiny to lead us Irish over the last hill.)

Since that head-thumping day the American Irish have walked a long road. Saint Patrick's Day has become an undeclared national holiday. Many less fortunates now climb all over their family trees searching for an Irish branch—or twig—or even a leaf. The film genius, Sean O'Feeney (John Ford), in a speech before the local brotherhood, once told how pleased he was to be made an honorary member of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick. John said he'd always wanted to join the Beverly Hills chapter but Sam Goldwyn, Sol Wurtzel, and Sam Spiegel wouldn't let him in.

ONE OF THE SELECT

This year I face the jubilee Thursday with a different smile in my Irish eyes. It's pleasant to be Irish—but to be an Irishman who has been to Ireland is something quite unusual. Very few Irishmen can claim the honor. Last year I went "back where I had never been," and it was everything I hoped it would be.

The plane from London bumped and plunged and the man next to me murmured, " 'tis the rocky road to Dublin." I happily tuned to the gentle lilt of the brogue, a melody I would enjoy for days. The men talked about horses: "He's a sure one, Mike, a marvelous, foine animal. * * *" The stewardess: "And will you take a cup of tea, Sor?" My wife stage-whispered: "They all sound like Barry Fitzgerald." Our seatmates looked at her and smiled, as one indulges a child.

Then, through the mists, Ireland was below, looking for all the world like Hawaii. The same multigreens, mountains, and flatlands, the same brown patches of cultivation and crooked strings of country roads. I was reminded of what Lyle Guslander had told me: "It's Kauai—with Irishmen."

SEEKING ANCESTORS

Like all Irish-Americans, I went looking for ancestors. It was a long way to Tipperary, and the Irish countryside is the world's most beautiful obstacle-course. Cars are fewer but other encounters more frequent, and the big problem for me was driving on the left side. More than once, absorbed in reverie, I strayed to a screeching halt before trucks, herds of cattle, hitchhikers and gypsy caravans. Once I almost knocked a man off a bicycle and he looked back and crossed himself. My wife, reduced to a nervous wreck, asked me to teach her the blessing.

The magic names of the tranquil towns come back to me—Moate, Athlone, Ballinasloe, Athenry, and Tuam. In the shadow of 8th century ruins a man smiled and said "This country isn't settled yet." At Galway Bay it was a holiday. A loudspeaker announced to vacationers along the chill shore that the junior chamber of commerce would sponsor a donkey race. The souvenir shops were selling J.F.K. statuettes. In the north there are great, still lakes and brooding hills. At beautiful Ashford Castle, where Ford filmed "The Quiet Man," the ghosts are known to knock on the doors of guests late at night.

Along the twisted web of Irish lanes from north to south are other castles, abbeys, churches, stark and crumbling in the fields; deserted stone cottages, their thatched roofs long ago blown away, their families scattered. It is one of the tragedies of Ireland that its principal export has been Irishmen.

Near Lisdoonvarna I sat with an old man by a turf fire. From his door we could see the barren Aran Islands. His sheep grazed, like tiny cotton balls, far up the rocky mountainside. He showed me worn photos of his daughter and son. She had a face of beauty and innocence under a nun's cowl. He was an electrician in New York. The old man's thoughts were far away. "It must be beautiful in America." Instead of a goodbye he said "God bless." I heard that often in Ireland.

TO PUB FOR KNOWLEDGE

In a smoky Limerick pub I watched through the window as gulls wheeled over the River Shannon. A man said: "Ah, yes—there's a Sheehan here * * * 'Fat' Sheehan, the butcher." He turned to his pint and added, "and he charges too much." There was also another Sheehan in town, I discovered, but he was in France, designing a church. I found some McCormacks (my mother's side) but they were all buried in a Tipperary graveyard near the shell of an ancient chapel. We drove back to Dublin through the villages, past the tumbling remains of watchtowers where settlers of a 1,000 years ago had taken refuge from pagan raids. The signs along the roadside read: "Put A Tiger In Your Tank," and "It's A Long Day That Has No Guinness."

After the lonely green beauty of the countryside Dublin was a brown enormity. Donkeys dodged Volkswagens and Fords. Old men with carved faces chewed pipes and young priests glided by on bicycles. The girls had bright, dark-ginger faces and most wore no makeup. The older women reminded me of my aunts. The country boys, tawny and apple-cheeked, lolled on wagons and watched the girls through gypsy eyes.

The signs on the windows of the bookmakers read, "Turf Accountant"—proof, I thought, of the claim that the Irish speak the most imaginative English in the world. In front of the Shelborne Hotel a beggar woman played "Swannee River" on a harmonica and held a baby, swathed in tweed rags, with her free arm. My wife pointed out she had a different baby every day, indicating that she "rented" them. The woman's sales pitch was one of poetry and passion. I gladly handed her a coin every day just to hear it.

We sat in the office of Kiyonao Okami, consul of the United States. Over his polished desk in the Embassy he told of working his way through Stanford as a member of a Hawaiian orchestra. He had never lived in the Islands, but he gleefully gave us a rendition of the "War Chant" in faultless Hawaiian. Like most Irishmen, his cheeks were pink. He was married to a Caucasian and had a daughter engaged to an Irish-Jewish boy.

BIT O' EAVESDROPPING

Later, in the big sitting room of the Shelbourne, we loafed and watched the handsomely dressed aristocrats arriving for the horse show. Actor Dan O'Herlihy studied a racing form in a corner. Brendan Behan's widow was being served tea by a tiny boy with an old man's face. The girl from the tourist office noticed me staring at the lad. "I hope you don't think we have child labor here," she said. "They're all at last 14."

In one corner, Robert Brisco, who served as the Jewish lord mayor of Dublin, was talking to some cronies. I edged my chair closer, hoping I might hear some reminiscence from the old revolutionaries about the bloody revolt in 1916. But they were talking about a girl who was less than beautiful. One graying connoisseur remarked: "As we say down in Limerick—she is no oil painting." Disappointed, I decided to take a stroll in Saint Stephen's Green across the street.

DAYS OF THE TROUBLE

Along its shaded paths and ponds there are statues of Irish poets and heroes. Suddenly I was startled. One statue was headless. I read the inscription. It said the monument had been erected to a "British Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland." Back at the Shelbourne I asked the porter if the bust had been destroyed at the time of the "trouble" in 1916.

"Lord no, Sor," he told me. "They blew it off just a little white back * * * took out all the windows in the hotel, it did." There was a hint of John Jamieson on his breath. I patted the tourist guidebook in my pocket for reassurance. It actually read: "Contrary to an out-of-date misconception, one seldom meets with bombs in Ireland and a bulletproof waistcoat is not indispensable."

Later that day I talked to Briscoe. I recall his saying: "You must remember our revolution has taken place in our lifetime. Yours in America was a long, long time ago."

This past Tuesday, Honolulu papers carried the story of Irish extremists destroying the Lord Nelson Monument on O'Connell Street. "* * * hundreds of tons of masonry crashed down just a few yards from the famed post office—focal point of the 1916 Easter uprising."

Poor, lovely Ireland. Not only her origins, but her people, are among history's enigmas.

God bless.

Water for the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of the arid West water has been a rich and avidly sought prize. Without water this great area of the United States would be a wasteland. In the West today are the greatest water reclamation facilities ever built by man. They are monumental tributes to American genius and enterprise. Each day their limits are stretched further to state the water needs of a steadily growing population and an ever-increasing economy. It is necessary constantly to expand these facilities to meet the new needs.

In contrast to prior decades in the history of the West, when men fought each other for water, today men of many States unite in cooperative efforts to collect it, preserve it, use it and reuse it again and again. A prime example of this spirit of cooperation in the pending Colorado River Basin project. All the States of the Colorado River Basin—Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, and California—have submerged their individual differences and united on this project for the maximum utilization of the Colorado River's waters.

With the foreknowledge that even this great project will not suffice their needs in the later years of this century and the next, their Colorado River Basin project wisely provides for a study of all western water resources with an eye to future redistribution of surpluses to areas of need.

On March 11 the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner commented editorially on the project as follows:

RIVER PACT

The Colorado River Board of California has voted its endorsement of the proposed legislative compromise which is expected to clear the way for Congress to authorise a $1.6 billion Colorado River Basin project.

The same proposal has been endorsed by the Upper Colorado River Commission and by official water agencies of the other two lower basin States, Nevada and Arizona.

With a hearing scheduled to be resumed by the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation in Washington later this month, the prospect becomes rosier that at last the entire Southwest is united in its procedure for obtaining more water.

Besides authorizing the central Arizona aqueduct and five water projects in the upper Colorado basin, the revised version of the law protects existing uses of the water against the demands of the new projects, such as the central Arizona aqueduct.

This means that Arizona and California are geting together after their long years of warfare and that each is looking toward the Pacific Northwest for the possible water of the future. The new legislation will provide for a Federal study of "all western water" to find a source of surplus supply to amplify the overcommitted resources of the Colorado River.

The dream of the future, although that may be a couple of decades from now, is to use water from the copious mouth of the Columbia River, where more than 150 million acre-feet of fresh water go to waste annually in the Pacific Ocean. Less than 10 million acre-feet would care for all of the needs of the Pacific Southwest for another quarter of a century.

It's been a long, thirsty battle, but the Colorado agreement is certain to result in a verdant future.

Right Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Columnist Roscoe Drummond hails the "ingredients" President Johnson has used in setting a policy for Vietnam. He says the President's actions have been marked "by deliberateness, prudence, and determination."

The ingredients have produced "a very clear and properly limited objective: to keep South Vietnam from being taken over by force." The course the President is following is, in Drummond's opinion, the best assurance we can win without spreading the war.

Since the issue he discusses is of vital concern to the entire world, I suggest that the column, which I read in the New York Herald Tribune, be printed in the RECORD where others may review the points which are raised.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Mar. 13, 1966]

HOW L.B.J. IS RUNNING THE WAR

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—I would like to say a good word about President Johnson's management of the Vietnam war.

Obviously there is a great risk of timidly doing too little to arrest the aggression.

Obviously there is great danger of recklessly doing so much that Red China enters the fighting.

With these two opposite perils in mind, I cannot escape the feeling that many more Americans will come to see that the President is bringing to bear on the conduct of the war wisdom, caution and determination.

What is the touchstone of wisdom in our role in Vietnam? Surely it is to do whatever is needed to secure South Vietnam from conquest and to use our massive military power in such a prudent and measured manner that Peiping is given no legitimate reason to enter the war.

Such a course will not get the easy plaudits of those who want to win quickly at any cost by bombing North Vietnam to bits.

Such a course will not get the praise of those who want to quit at any cost by pulling out.

Such a course will not get a high Gallup rating from those who suggest we haven't the reasources to defend South Vietnam and that, anyway, a little aggression in southeast Asia is no concern to the United States.

As these conflicting views find their level in public opinion, I believe that the Nation, on reflection, will feel even more reassured that Gen. Curtis LeMay is not deciding the bombing over North Vietnam, that WAYNE MORSE is not managing the defense of South Vietnam, and that Senator FULBRIGHT is not deciding where aggression concerns the United States and where it doesn't.

During the period when he was determining how the mounting attacks directed from Hanoi should be met, President Johnson—as reported by Charles Roberts in his book, "L.B.J.'s Inner Circle"—remarked to his intimates: "I'm not going north with Curtis LeMay and I'm not going south with WAYNE MORSE."

Fortunately, the President is not easily pressured either by events or by extremist advice.

He did not act hastily; he acted deliberately.

He did not act recklessly; he acted with great care.

He did not act timidly; he committed the United States to do whatever is necessary to defend South Vietnam successfully—but no more.

These are the ingredients of mind which have marked the President's course in Vietnam—deliberateness, prudence and determination.

What they have produced is a very clear and properly limited objective: to keep South Vietnam from being taken over by force.

And how is he acting to make it least likely that Red China will enter the war?

He is not using U.S. air power to bomb cities in the North.

He is not sending U.S. ground troops to occupy any part of North Vietnam.

He is not seeking the downfall of the Hanoi regime.

He is not asking for the "unconditional surrender" of Hanoi. He is asking only for an unconditional end to aggression against its neighbor.

Few Americans want to desert South Vietnam.

Few Americans want to wage the war so recklessly as to tempt Peiping to enter it.

The ingredients of President Johnson's conduct of the war—deliberateness, prudence and determination—are the best assurance we can win without spreading it.

Seventh Anniversary Hawaii Statehood

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1959, this House approved the Hawaii statehood bill. Seven years later, in March of 1966, we all can look with pride on the progress of our 50th State. I join with others of my colleagues to wish Hawaii and its people a happy anniversary.

Besides being the paradise islands of the Pacific, it is a shining example of the peaceful and successful blending of cultures and races. The warmth of her sun and beauty of her beaches are surpassed by her warm tolerance for individual beliefs and values and her appreciation for human dignity. How much many of us can learn from Hawaii. In Hawaii, racial equality lives while in some parts of America it is still only a dream.

May Hawaii continue to add to its achievements of the past 7 years.

Big Step Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the vote on the Asian bank contribution "was a step of the greatest long-range significance," the Houston Post said in a recent editorial.

The Asian Development Bank means that "if and when a stable peace can be established in the Far East, a special source of capital will be available for the financing of sound development projects in underdeveloped countries of the region," the Post believes.

The paper states that to the extent international banks "can supply the needs of developing countries, the need for direct American aid will be reduced."

Their informative look at this important step will be read, I believe, by many of my colleagues, and it is with this in mind that I insert the editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 8, 1966]

ASIAN BANK CONTRIBUTION VOTED

Perhaps because of intense preoccupation with the Vietnam war, a proposal that the United States contribute $200 million toward establishment of the new Asian Development Bank sailed through Congress with almost no opposition and attracted almost no public attention.

Yet it was a step of the greatest long-range significance in that, if and when a stable peace can be established in the Far East, a special source of capital will be available for the financing of sound development projects in underdeveloped countries of the region.

Asian countries themselves will contribute to the international capital pool and largely control its management. The United States will participate but not dictate.

Nineteen Asian countries and 12 other nations will be charter members of the bank. The largest contributions, $200 million each, will be made by the United States and Japan, but the two countries each will have less than 17 percent of the vote.

The United States already participates in four similar institutions, the World Bank, the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank, all of which supply funds for developing countries, and the Export-Import Bank, which supplies money to European countries seeking financial help from this country.

Another regional bank for Africa is being proposed, and this country is expected to contribute to it also.

To the extent that these international banks can supply the needs of developing countries, the need for direct American aid will be reduced, and this point explains at least partially the lack of opposition in Congress to participation in the new Asian bank project.

In addition to quieting American critics of foreign aid, this approach to extending financial help to underdeveloped countries reduces the effectiveness of the Communist propaganda charge that the American foreign aid program actually is an instrument for promoting neocolonialism.

Although it is true that some countries not friendly to the United States may be able to get help through these international banks which are supported in part with American tax dollars, channeling of U.S. aid through these institutions should help put an end to the game of blackmail which some countries now play, that of threatening to join the Communist bloc if the United States does not come through with the financial help demanded.

Support of these banks also is in line with President Johnson's promise that greater emphasis will be placed in the future on extending help to those countries that make an honest effort to help themselves. While giving support to the idea of establishing an Asian development bank, the United States took the position that the Asian countries themselves must take the initiative, contribute to the international pool of capital in proportion to their resources and ability to do so and be largely responsible for operations of the institution.

In applying for help from the Asian Development Bank, Asian countries principally will have to convince representatives of other Asian countries that their projects are sound, that they need and deserve the help sought and that there is a reasonably good chance that their undertakings will succeed in accomplishing their objectives. Each participating country will have a vested interest in preventing waste and in conserving resources of the bank. A three-fourths vote will be required to increase the capital of the institution.

Brunswick Schools Use Title I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Congress is reviewing the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, it is appropriate to call attention not only to some of the difficulties which have arisen, but also to the solid progress which has been made in school districts which have employed Public Law 89–10 with intelligence and imagination.

Such a district is the Brunswick-Burkittsville Elementary School area in Frederick County, Md. Since designation of this region last October as an area qualifying for assistance under title I of the act, the school administrators and teachers of Brunswick and Burkittsville have developed and begun a far-ranging program of specialized and personalized elementary education. Under a Federal grant of $45,759 for the current semester, these schools have instituted an intensified, nongraded educational program designed to improve their pupils' emotional stability, physical health, social maturity, and educational abilities. A special feature of the project is the "Saturday Club" program, offering the children a wide spectrum of interesting and enriching activities.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Principal Lee Smith and his entire staff for their accomplishments to date, and I place in the RECORD at this point a summary of their efforts, from the Brunswick Blade-Times of March 10:

FEDERAL AID GRANT OF $45,759 PROVIDES VASTLY EXPANDED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AT BRUNSWICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Brunswick Elementary is among the first in the county to cash in on the title I project, a part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This is the largest Federal grant program ever authorized for attacking the vicious cycle of poverty.

The title I project's major concern is meeting the special needs of educationally deprived children. Since the relationship between low educational achievement and poverty is great, this project makes available several billion Federal dollars to help meet these special needs which must be satisfied before a child can overcome his learning handicaps.

THE LOCAL PROJECT

The local project, which includes the Brunswick and Burkittsville schools, has been granted $45,759 for the February to June 1966 period. The grant is being utilized mainly in the areas of supplementary and remedial instruction and health and welfare services.

Though the grant is based primarily on low family incomes, educational need determines which children may benefit. The focus is on helping children who fall below the norm. Therefore, the new instructional aids and materials in addition to supplementary and remedial instructions, made possible by this grant, are available to all children in the schools.

PRINCIPAL PLANS PROGRAM

Thanks to Principal Lee Smith's ingenuity and imagination, the local project has been tailor made to meet the special needs of this community. On October 5, 1965, it was learned by Mr. Smith at a county principals meeting that the Brunswick area had been designated as one which qualified for Federal aid through title I. He immediately began writing a project which would help fulfill the goals established under the nongraded approach.

The nongraded program is designed for maximum learning opportunities for children, taking into account the knowledge of boys and girls, and the knowledge of the world in which they live and will someday make their way. The nongraded plan allows each child to work at all times at the instructional level which fits his educational foundation and mental maturity. This allows for more teachable groups and an improved learning situation for each child. The project was written to include additional personnel and equipment and materials to better enable the school to meet the needs of the educationally deprived. The nongraded program with its continuous movement of children according to their own rate of maturation will encourage and promote the philosophy of continuous growth.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives set forth in the project are: (1) to increase the reading achievement (further develop oral and written vocabulary, rate of silent reading, comprehension in silent reading, facility in oral reading, interest in reading, and skill in using various printed materials); (2) to further develop social adjustment (develop child's ability to get along well with peers, younger children and adults—develop child's concern for the welfare of others); (3) to further develop emotional adjustment (develop child's self-concept—help him to see himself as an important individual, one who is a part of a family, school, group, and community); and (4) to further develop a well-rounded program of health and physical education (develop motor skills and body efficiency, provide worthwhile recreational activities, and overcome physical handicaps and nutritional deficiency.

ADDED PERSONNEL

By now you've probably guessed additional personnel was needed to instrument such a gigantic project. Fifteen additional persons were hired on a full-time basis for the regular school week; 8 instructors staff the 16 Saturday clubs; and 4 busdrivers operate the free shuttle bus service designed for transporting children to and from the clubs. Three other busdrivers are used for fieldtrips.

Included in the 15 full-time employees are 13 teacher aids: Mesdames June Campbell, June Deener, Mary Dyer, Norma Jean Frye, Marlene Gordon, Ernestine Harris, Arlean King, Mary Jane Lloyd, Gertrude Phillips, Catherine Shewbridge, Margo Smith, and Mr. Lertie Powers. One aid, Mrs. Katherine Van Holten, has been assigned to work at the Burkittsville School.

The aids were screened, interviewed and hired at the county school board office. These persons answered an ad in the county papers and filed application last fall.

Mrs. Shirley Colvin was appointed vice principal, and Mrs. Nancy Virts is filling the vacancy created by this appointment. Mrs. Kathleen Gill is the additional physical education instructor.

Mesdames Doris Bennett, Bonnie Garvin, Thelma Gross, and Margaret Spurrier coordinate the four history-travel clubs. Mesdames Karen Aylor, Ruth Dredden, Duane Smith, and Mr. Ralph Dyer conduct three 50-minute classes each Saturday in art, creative dancing, music and physical education, respectively. It was proudly reported that 540 pupils are enrolled and attendance each Saturday is very good.

Samuel Croen, Lynn Follin; Melvin Lloyd, and Lertie Powers are the shuttle busdrivers. Drivers for fieldtrips include Mrs. Evelyn Culler, James Matthews, and Harold Zecher.

NEW EQUIPMENT

Besides the additional personnel the following items are included in the budget:

1. For new equipment, $3,030, which includes four primary typewriters to be used at the primary levels for typing experience stories; musical instruments to be used in the Burkittsville School to develop cultural interest among some of the children who have indicated an interest in playing a musical instrument and who could not afford to buy or rent one; and audiovisual equipment to provide individual and small group experiences related to reading activities in all subject areas. This equipment includes two opaque projectors, a 16 mm. sound projector and several sets of headphones.

2. For materials of instruction, art supplies, teaching aids, textbooks, reading tests, etc., $5,1500.

3. For health services, $1,000. This includes dental and medical care.

4. To provide lunches for some children to help them overcome nutritional deficiencies, which cause frequent illness, headache and general irritability, $2,460.

5. For community service which can be used to purchase clothing for needy children, $150.

6. For fixed charges which include school insurance for those who need it, $1,900.

7. For pupil transportation service, $3,660.

8. For maintenance and operation of the school plant, $360.

9. For the Saturday clubs, $4,000. The historical-travel clubs visit places of interest and historical significance in the immediate and surrounding area. The children plan, study history, and evaluate their own trips. The music clubs offer instruction in vocal music and music appreciation to further cultural development. The physical fitness clubs provide group instruction to develop coordination and general physical condition and teach wholesome, worthwhile recreational activities. The art clubs provide instruction in handicrafts and use of art materials to develop creativity. The dancing clubs offer instruction in creative dancing. Periodically, the parents are invited to participate as chaperons and to share in experiences on trips, to listen to musical programs, see art exhibits, and to participate in some sports activities.

Even though the project is but an infant, all areas concerned are functioning effectively and smoothly. The overwhelming, enthusiastic response has most successfully launched the title I project, and it is soaring toward higher heights in the direction of better schooling for educationally deprived children.

Protecting the SBA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, much concern has been evidenced both in the House of Representatives and in the other body concerning the well-founded rumor that this administration seeks to destroy the independence of the Small Business Administration by transferring the same to the Department of Commerce. Members on both sides of the aisle in both bodies have met this suggestion with a firm resolve that transfer of this agency shall not occur. Its independence shall be maintained.

My colleagues of the minority on the Select Committee on Small Business pointed out some several months ago the difficulties that the Small Business Administration is experiencing as a direct result of the indecision of the Johnson administration with respect to the future of the SBA. It is interesting to note that the position of the minority that this valuable agency needed an Administrator pointing out that the position had been vacant since September and that every effort should be made to revitalize the SBA in addition to the appointment of an Administrator in order that the small business commounity of this Nation would continue to have a strong independent voice in these days of big government, big business, and big spending programs. It is interesting to note that the distinguished and responsible newspaper, the Washington Evening Star, in its Saturday editorial of March 5, 1966, entitled "Protecting the SBA" draws attention to this administration's derelictions with respect to the operation of the SBA and likewise the need for an Administrator, and suggests the appointment of an Administrator and urges that the independence and atonomy of the SBA be preserved.

The article follows:

PROTECTING THE SBA

For several weeks a rumor has persisted that the administration intends to transfer the independent Small Business Administration to the Commerce Department. Commerce officials are reported busy trying to round up support for the idea on Capitol Hill. And a group of lawmakers, largely drawn from Small Business committees in both House and Senate, have been attacking the proposal.

Admittedly, the task of opponents is difficult. The White House has not as yet broached the subject, and as one critic declares, "It's like trying to dynamite fog." But obviously a behind-the-scenes contest is taking place.

Supporters of the SBA's independence fear that tucking it in some cranny of Commerce, where big business enjoys major influence, will in effect kill the agency. There is some historical justification for this view. During World War II a couple of small precursors of the SBA did an ineffective job. The Division of Contract Distribution, created in 1941, and the subsequent Small Business Unit within Commerce, were both largely paper organizations.

But as Ross D. Davis, SBA executive administrator, noted recently, there are ways to assure the agency's independence even within a larger department. He suggests that placing it at the Under Secretary level in Commerce and granting it semiautonomous status could do the trick.

Obviously there would be administrative advantages in such a consolidation. Apart from the savings of taxpayer dollars, the SBA would have a voice in many decisions affecting all business. The resources of Commerce, including its economists and data and research staff, would be available.

The small businessman represents a powerful political force in every industrial nation. One has only to recall how Pierre Poujade, for all his irresponsible rabble rousing, was able to capture a quarter of the National Assembly seats in France a decade ago by appealing to little shopkeepers. For this reason the GOP now seems to have seized upon the SBA shutdown as an election issue.

All of which demonstrates that the White House should make sure to preserve this agency's function. If the SBA is to be left as is, an administrator should be appointed now. (The post has been vacant since last September.) If the agency is to join Commerce, guarantees of its autonomy need to be made explicit.

National School Patrol Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to cosponsor a joint resolution providing for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Patrol Week.

I believe that this honor is richly deserved by our students, who come to school a bit early, stay a little later, and give up some of their free time so that they can contribute to the protection of their fellow students.

This resolution honors the members of the school safety patrols throughout the Nation, but I would like to note here that I am particularly proud of the members of my district, who do such a wonderful job for their schools and cities.

Their love and devotion to duty will long be remembered, and a special tribute is in order to each and every one.

The American Automobile Association, a joint sponsor of these programs along with the schools and local police forces, awards the young patrol members, who have actually saved a life, with Gold Lifesaver Medals, and I feel that we, too, should recognize the great contribution that all of these fine young boys and girls unselfishly make to our society by designating this week as National School Safety Patrol Week.

The selfless consideration of their fellow man, which these students exemplify, is a quality which we strive to instill in our young citizens, and the safety patrol offers one avenue to achieve this objective.

I am hopeful that this resolution will be passed in the near future so that this year's week will coincide with the national school safety patrol parade, which will be held here in Washington on May 14, and in which more than 30,000 boys and girls from 25 or more States are expected to participate.

I am extremely pleased to join with my colleagues in requesting that this recognition be given to the members of our school safety patrols.

Prosperity Not a Villain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the economic boom our Nation has been experiencing has now entered into its sixth year. An editorial appearing in the Houston Chronicle, an outstanding Texas newspaper, comments on this prosperity.

The editorial points out this administration's view, as expressed by President Johnson, that appropriate caution must be exercised to keep the boom rolling and to avoid inflationary bottlenecks. It has been by this exercise of caution that the dire predictions of some elements of our society have failed to come about. With the competent direction of our President this economic growth can be maintained, and, as the editorial states, prosperity need not become a villain.

The editorial follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Mar. 12, 1966]

CAN WE LEARN TO LIVE WITH THE BOOM?

The Nation's economic boom started its sixth year this week. But the anniversary was greeted with mixed reactions—some of which may have been a little confusing.

Some elements in the business community continued to issue the same chant. These groups and individuals have speculated for years that the economic barometers cannot keep climbing. In effect, they contend that what goes up must come down. To date they have been denied the opportunity to say: "We told you so."

And there are others who fear that inflation is already here and that it is the principal reason for the slide in the stock market.

The administration's view, as expressed by President Johnson, is that appropriate caution must be exercised to keep the boom rolling and avoid inflationary bottlenecks. There can be little doubt that the Government has the power to do this through various controls which it has exercised in recent years.

In addition, the President has ordered new efforts to deal with manpower shortages which can be an inflationary factor if industries find it necessary to raise their offers unnecessarily high to attract the employees they need.

The main goal in the manpower area will be to work harder than ever to match jobs and men. It is somewhat ironic that the need for this action is prompted by the lowest unemployment level in more than 12 years. The reduction of unemployment has been one of the prime goals of the President and his predecessor. Now that it has been significantly reduced it is necessary to take steps to head off shortages of workers in some areas which can slow up the expansion of the economy and put pressures on costs and prices.

The President has ordered that special measures be taken to work on this problem as well as keep it under surveillance. He has taken similar steps to check inflation. His basic belief seems to be that the economy is a creature of man and that man can still sustain and direct it. In short, that prosperity need not become a villain.

Jobs for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the special task force to help find summer jobs for young people is stressed in a recent Houston Post editorial.

In giving the task force assignment to Vice President HUMPHREY, the Post points out:

> President Johnson said very frankly that one of the objectives is to head off social unrest during the long, hot summer.

The paper adds:

> Idleness among young people unquestionably has been a major contributing factor to the violence, increased crime, and other social disorders that have erupted across the country.

This thoughtful editorial on a vital matter can be read with benefit by others, and with this in mind, with permission I include it in the RECORD:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Mar. 11, 1966]

SUMMER YOUTH JOBS SOUGHT

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who hardly has had time to catch his breath since his return from a far-ranging mission to the Far East to explain this country's Vietnam policy, has been handed another special assignment by the White House that is hardly less difficult and challenging, and certainly no less important.

It is that of formulating and recommending by April 1, as head of a special task force, a program of special action aimed at assuring jobs for an estimated 1.75 million young people during the summer months.

In addition to those young people who soon will be joining the Nation's labor force on a permanent basis, as school graduates or dropouts, large numbers of teenagers will be seeking temporary work during the summer vacation period. In many cases, their return to school in the fall may well depend upon their finding this work.

With economic activity continuing at a high level, the summer employment outlook for students should be fairly good, but this is something that cannot be left to nature or chance. A special effort will be required, not only by Government but by business, industry, organized labor and all civic or community agencies in a position to help.

Continuing Federal programs to reduce unemployment among young people and create enough new jobs each year to absorb additions to the work force must be supplemented by an effort to make summer work available for high school and college students.

Vice President HUMPHREY headed a similar panel last year, and it was credited by the Johnson administration with bringing about, as the result of a national effort, the employment of 1 million young people. Of these, only 37,000 were given jobs within the Federal Government itself. A greater effort will be required this year because there will be more young people wanting, needing and looking for work.

In making the assignment to the Vice President, President Johnson said very frankly that one of the objectives is to head off social unrest during the long, hot summer. Large-scale unemployment among young people of employable age cannot but produce explosive social situations, and experience in recent years has shown, as the President observed, that "unrest is typically greater during the summer months."

Idleness among young people unquestionably has been a major contributing factor to the violence, increased crime and other social disorders that have erupted across the country.

This alone justifies the Federal Government in taking the initiative in a national effort to provide maximum summer employment for young people. But it is not a job that the Federal Government alone can do. It's everybody's job and everybody's responsibility to join in the national effort by doing what they can. Everybody will benefit.

Redwood National Park and the Colorado River Basin Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 3 issue of the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram very forcefully states the case for Redwood National Park as a true conservation measure and very forcefully sets forth the inconsistency of the opposition by some conservationists to the Colorado River Basin project:

PROPER USES OF WILDERNESS

Friends of America's rapidly shrinking wilderness are idealists who often weaken their cause by pleading the wrong cases.

Let us consider a right case and a wrong one of the conservationists. They are the proposed Redwood National Park and the proposed lower Colorado River project.

President Johnson's pea for the redwoods will likely be passed over by Congress this year. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall warned that too long an argument will mean that "the chain saws will win and there will be no park."

"If we don't get the park this year or next, it will probably be too late," he said.

America needs this park. It means recreation and beauty for generations yet unborn. Once the great trees are destroyed they can never be replaced. Americans should demand that an indifferent Congress take action.

An example of wrong conservationist thinking is the opposition to the proposed hydroelectric dams on the lower Colorado. Conservationists see a threat to the Grand Canyon although only a small section would be affected at all. The lakes would enhance the recreational value of the area.

The dams would provide true conservation of the most valuable commodity in the Southwest. Without water the potential growth is limited.

Wilderness is not a thing of value in itself. America was once all wilderness. Every acre of farmland, every city block was created by the pioneers. Sometimes they abused the land and their children are paying for their folly. Sometimes they used it very well indeed.

Conservationists should stand against waste of natural resources. When they oppose the correct use of resources they are going too far.

Charles Percy Urges Equal Rights and Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, recently my friend, Charles H. Percy, Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate, addressed a meeting of the Mississippi Council on Human Relations at Jackson, Miss.

The timeliness and significance of Mr. Percy's remarks prompt me to offer them for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am confident that my colleagues in the House of Representatives, as well as citizens throughout Illinois and the Nation will benefit from reading Mr. Percy's remarks and giving heed to his observations and advice.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF CHARLES H. PERCY, TO THE MISSISSIPPI COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS, JACKSON, MISS., FEBRUARY 17, 1966

I come to the South not, I hope, as an intruder, but as a native son.

For generations, my branch of the Percy family lived in Alabama, and a second branch lived here in Mississippi. My grandfather was a drummer boy at the headquarters of Robert E. Lee, and later he served on the faculty at Washington and Lee University. My father spent most of his life in Mobile, and I was born across the bay at Pensacola, Fla.

I am not, then, a stranger to the South.

Tonight I would like to discuss equal opportunity, first as a businessman, and then as a Republican politician.

When I talk of equality, I do not do so under a halo of self-righteousness, for I live in a glass house. My city, Chicago, has nearly a million Negro citizens. They do not have equal access to jobs. They do not have equal education. They do not have equal housing. I myself live in a village of 3,000 persons where there is only 1 Negro family; this is not a sociological accident.

Cloaked in hypocrisy, discrimination in the North is just as real as discrimination anywhere. Our racial problems, especially in the cities, are at least as serious as yours. Martin Luther King has made no mistake in coming to Chicago to mount an assault against our wretched slums. We in the North must work just as hard as you in the South to hammer out a society of justice, equality, and dignity.

A good place to begin is in the field of employment. I submit to the businessmen here among you that job discrimination is not only bad democracy—it's bad business. To support my point, let me give you a brief case history.

In 1949, when I became the president of Bell & Howell, not one Negro was employed by the company. I had been concerned about this for a long time, but I was not in a position to do anything about it until I assumed the presidency.

Once that responsibility was mine, I carefully examined the reasons the company did not hire Negroes. These reasons, I found, included every myth ever used to discriminate. Essentially, I was told that a reversal of company policy wouldn't work.

I am pleased to report that it did work. I called a meeting of all supervisors and department heads, and made it clear that we would begin hiring Negroes on the same basis as whites. Anyone who disagreed with the new policy was free to resign. No one did.

Now, after 17 years of experience as an equal opportunity employer, we can say unequivocally that the performance of Negro employees has met our standards in every way.

Despite our record at Bell & Howell and at numerous other companies, we in the North have not yet attained equal job opportunities for all citizens. In Chicago alone, Negroes represent 26 percent of the population but account for 43 percent of the city's unemployment. With labor critically short in some areas of our State, one out of four Negroes in East St. Louis is still without work.

In many communities, then, the most serious problem facing the Negro is employment—securing and holding a job that not only enables him to support himself and his family, but makes him feel that he is truly a member of the community. Negroes and whites in Chicago have told be of the overwhelming hopelessness that comes when a man can't find a job. Inevitably, unemployment engenders resentment and despair—a despair I saw in my own father when we were on relief during the depression. Welfare does not change this. Too often the price for public assistance is a sense of lost human dignity.

What we are talking about here is what Martin Luther King has called "a sense of somebodiness." I think the business community here in Mississippi, as in Illinois, has a great opportunity to provide many more of its citizens with that "sense of somebodiness," while at the same time doing itself an important favor.

I have seen your advertisement in the New York Times which urges outside companies to come to Mississippi. It was an attractive ad, and perhaps it will help to bring new industry to your State. But, as a businessman, I can tell you that much more appealing is the potential of the labor force in Mississippi—a potential which many regions of our Nation cannot provide.

It is up to you to realize that potential—to educate that labor force, to give it needed skills, to open up opportunities for it. When you have done that, there will be less need to advertise for outside industry.

Both in the North and in the South, we must see to it that Negroes are not the "last hired and first fired." And we must do better than to make surface concessions to racial decency; the illusion of equality is not enough. It is not enough simply to require the Negro worker to wear a white shirt, a jacket, and a tie, while asking him to continue to perform the same menial chores as before.

The opportunity to advance is as important as the opportunity to work. Let us all look to the example of Marietta, Ga., where the biggest single airplane factory in the world employs highly placed Negro engineers, mathematicians, and technicians—where Negro foremen supervise both white and Negro workers.

And so I urge the businessmen of the South, as I have urged the businessmen of the North, to give the Negro the equal opportunity, the equal treatment, the equal break that is rightfully his. Do it for your own sake, for your country's sake, and for the sake of the harmonious human relations this council seeks to foster.

As some of you may know, I recently ended a quarter-century career as a businessman to begin what I hope may be an equally long career of public service. However, as I learned in 1964, job opportunities in politics are not always what they seem, and the competition for advancement is very tough indeed.

I am now running for the Senate against PAUL DOUGLAS. If the Mississippi press should ever comment on our race, I can only hope it will deal more gently with us than the Jackson Mississippian dealt with an earlier Senate race in Illinois. The Mississippian stated that the South could have no choice between "a pair of depraved, blustering, mischievous, lowdown demigods." At that time, the paper was speaking of Abraham Lincoln and another Douglas—Stephen Douglas—during their famous 1858 campaign for the Senate.

In talking to you about civil rights as a Republican, I do not speak for myself alone. Many share my views.

As a Republican, I have long been proud of much of our civil rights record. And one need not go back to Lincoln to find cause for pride.

The recommendations of the Eisenhower administration led to bipartisan enactment in 1957 of the first Federal civil rights legislation in over 80 years. Republican Governors like Rockefeller in New York, Scranton in Pennsylvania, Romney in Michigan, and Hatfield in Oregon are providing strong leadership in the field of equal rights.

It was two Republican Representatives, HALLECK, of Indiana, and McCULLOCH, of Ohio, who made it possible in 1963 for President Kennedy to get the civil rights bill through the House Judiciary Committee.

And as much as any man, it was Senato EVERETT DIRKSEN from my own State of Illinois who was responsible for the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In the spring of 1964, the Republican Critical Issues Council, headed by Dr. Milto Eisenhower, recommended Federal legislatio to insure fair employment practices and guarantee access to public accommodatio to all Americans. These recommendatio were included in the Civil Rights Act of 19 which won the support of 80 percent of the Republicans in the 88th Congress. And in the 90th Congress, I look forward to joining Hatfield of Oregon, Brooke of Massachusetts, and Taft of Ohio in reaffirming the Republican commitment to effective civil rights legislation.

Ironically, the Republican 1964 presidential candidate found it impossible to vote for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 because he considered the sections on fair employment practices and public accommodations to be unconstitutional. And it was his negative vote, I believe, more than any other factor, which enabled the Republican Party to carry the Deep South in the 1964 national election.

As much as any Republican, I am anxious to see the South in the Republican column on election day, but not for the reasons that it was there on election day, 1964.

Some people voted for the Republican ticket in protest against the Democratic administration's stand on civil rights. Some people voted for it in the hope that a Republican administration would take a far weaker stand, or perhaps even squelch the Negro revolution.

I am not proud of those votes.

In 1964, the Republican Party won five Southern States by setting foot upon what has been called "the shifting racist sands," and that was a triumph neither for Republicans nor conservatives.

Such a victory will not serve the future success of our party, or of any party. For what we succeeded in doing in 1964 was to drive practically the entire Negro vote in the United States into the Democratic camp.

With each passing year, the Negro vote will—and should—grow, as more and more Negroes register with the help of the Federal Government and of private groups. In many States, the Negro has the opportunity to become the decisive factor in determining the outcome of elections.

As a Republican, I can only hope that the American Negro will judge my party by its complete record, and not by an isolated aberration of that record. I hope, too, that he will keep in mind that segregationist Democrats dominate public offices in Southern States, and that 90 percent of the poor in America have lived under Democratic rule in southern and urban areas for the past several decades.

However they decide to judge us, I ask Negroes not to be indifferent to the opportunities and duties before them. Negroes have the opportunity—and the duty—to fulfill the responsibilities that come with their long-delayed rights. First-class citizenship requires equal rights and equal responsibilities.

No right, no responsibility, is quite so formidable as the vote. With it, Negroes have a potential to effect change that they never had before. As one New Orleans minister has said, "The answer to police brutality is the vote." And it is the answer to much, much more, if only it is applied to good advantage. Properly used, the votes of Negroes could provide the final thrust in the struggle for equal opportunity. And wisely used, those votes will not form a one-party bloc. For we have seen in Chicago that when one party takes the Negro vote for granted, that vote loses much of its power.

If the Republican Party ever hopes to attract that vote—if it wishes to remain the progressive party I think it is—then we Republicans must heed the lessons of 1964.

We must make it unmistakably clear that the traditionally progressive position of our party on civil rights will never again be betrayed by subtly appealing to a backlash of white resistance.

Both parties must be on guard lest they become the tools of the racists. There are some Republicans here in Mississippi who are no more interested in true Republicanism than George Wallace is interested in the fundamental principles of the Democratic party. In each case, these men are using respected party labels in an effort to perpetuate segregation and inequality.

We must never forget that the Republican Party was founded as a party of reform; when we abandon reform, our vitality is drained.

And we must above all be the party of justice and freedom in the field of civil rights and civil liberties. We must see in every man the work and genius of God. We must respect, support, and actively defend the rights of every American, as an individual and as a citizen. To do less would be to deny our heritage.

All those, both Republican and Democratic, who deplore * * * Federal intrusion into State and local government, should be as concerned about States responsibilities as States rights.

If every State had met its responsibilities to assure the rights of all citizens, there would have been no need for a Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, and there never would have been the strife and the anguish this country has witnessed in recent years. As Ralph McGill has observed, if political and public leadership had supported the processes of law in 1954 when the Supreme Court's school decision was handed down, "the South—and the Nation—would have avoided the bitter and disgraceful harvest of hate * * * that has been so much a part of the years since."

Those of us who wish to see State and local government remain effective must remember the past. For it has been truly said that those who cannot remember the past are condemned to live it again. If, for instance, we in Chicago fail to respond to the challenge of our slums, then we may be sure that the Federal Government will increasingly assume the responsibilities in urban housing which should be ours.

And similarly, if you here in the South do not move with greater energy, speed, and sincerity to give the Negro his vote, to abolish injustice to Negroes and to civil rights workers at the hands of all-white juries, to advance the cause of civil rights across the board, then you can be assured that the Federal Government will—and should—pass more and more of the legislation which so many southerners abhor.

In the social revolution of the sixties, it is incumbent on each of us, northern and southern, Republican and Democrat, black and white, to look ahead and to plan ahead—not to temporize, not to drag our feet in the sands of the past. With open minds and hearts, we must decide what is needed, and then we must do it.

President Johnson thinks a great society is possible and that is a worthy goal he shares with all Americans. But I believe that before a society can be great, it must be just.

A just society will provide equal opportunity to every citizen, whether he lives in Philadelphia, Pa., or Philadelphia, Miss.

A just society will insure the dignity of every citizen, from the South Side of Chicago to South Carolina.

A just society will guarantee the rights of every citizen, whatever his color, his creed, his cause.

A truly just society will not be easily attained. We have learned that the hard way. The shaping of such a society is a complex and delicate task which requires and deserves patience, as long as patience is not cynically invoked as a screen for inaction.

But a just society can be achieved. In a short time, we have already moved a long way toward it. We can move still further, still faster, if, individual by individual, institution by institution, in Watts and in Harlem, in Chicago and in Jackson, we voluntarily set the just society as our goal. All of us working together can hasten that day when democracy will truly work for every American.

We in this room, we in the Republican party, and we in the United States, could do no better than to follow Abraham Lincoln's personal creed. "I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors," he said, "and I shall adopt new views so fast as they shall appear to be true views . . . and I intend no modification of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere might be free."

Keep on Top of Close Air Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, Feb. 12, 1966]

KEEP ON TOP OF CLOSE AIR SUPPORT

One of the most significant points brought out in the critical House report on close air support is that the Army and Air Force have been looking at close air support aircraft through opposite ends of the same telescope.

The report notes that two major studies of the subject have been conducted over the past 4 years, and that one of these, made by a joint Air Force-Army group, resulted in a "secret report" in 1963.

The House subcommittee makes some illuminating comments about the latter document.

The subcommittee reveals that, "In the final report on the joint study conducted in 1963 by the close air support boards of the U.S. Army and the U.S. Air Force, dated August 15, 1963, it became very evident that there was a great difference of opinion between what the Army wanted as a close air support aircraft, and what the Air Force wanted to provide them.

"The Army asked for a STOL capability from sod or semiprepared strips; the Air Force asked for a 5,000-foot takeoff.

"The Army called for an all-weather navigation capability and simple visual target acquisition means; the Air Force agreed that an all-weather navigation system was necessary but called for 'optimized weapon delivery capability'—whatever that means.

"The Army said that an ordnance load of 4,000 pounds would be adequate; the Air Force called for 10,000 pounds.

"The Army called for a plane with a speed of from mach 3 to mach 9; the Air Force wanted to cruise at mach 9 and have a supersonic capability.

"The Army called for an aircraft such as the Navy VAL (A–7A). The Air Force said they wanted a versatile supersonic fighter aircraft for close air support, and concluded that the presently programed supersonic fighter aircraft provides a substantial gain in effectiveness over the VAL selected by the Army as a close air support aircraft, and 'provides the additional bonus of multipurpose capability.'"

The subcommittee, after listing these differences of opinion, concluded:

"It is obvious that the Army and the Air Force were not talking about the same plane."

The House group is harshly critical of the Air Force for never having "built an aircraft designed primarily for close air support" and for not being "actively engaged in developing one at the present time." It also is critical of the fact that the Air Force took so long to warm up to the COIN/LARA counterinsurgency aircraft developed by the Navy for the Marine Corps. The subcommittee "notes with interest that the Air Force's gung ho recommendation for the LARA came the month after this subcommittee was created and 2 months after another subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, after a visit to Vietnam, had recommended that a COIN aircraft must be accelerated."

In this respect, the committee might also have taken note of testimony given by Dr. Harold Brown, then Defense Director of Research and Engineering (now Secretary of the Air Force), in an appearance before the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee on the fiscal 1965 military budget. Asked why the Navy had been given the job of developing the COIN aircraft, Dr. Brown said: "The Air Force does not want to do it. * * * It is not fast enough to suit their views of what they should do in counterinsurgency."

After reviewing Army and AF differences of opinion as to what type of plane is required for close support, the House subcommittee says that, "In view of the wide divergence between what the Army feels it should have * * * and what the Air Force has been willing to provide * * * the Army should have a substantially greater voice in this regard than they have had in the past."

We agree. But the House Armed Services Committee should not be content just to embrace the findings and recommendations of the report; it should follow through (as it did in the vital "airlift" studies of 1960 and 1963) to assure procurement of aircraft which meet Army requirements.

The entire subject should be kept under continuing surveillance until there is no longer even a hint that all is not well.

[From the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, Feb. 12, 1966]

NEW MILITARY PAY FORMULA

A new military pay bill, calling for an automatic increase in Armed Forces pay if the pay of civilian employees of the Government is increased, has been introduced in the House by Armed Services Committee Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Although the Defense Department has ruled out any possibility of a military pay boost during 1966 (the Journal, January 29), the Rivers proposal would make such an increase mandatory if the pay of civil service employees should be boosted.

The Rivers measure also would make the military increases retroactive for 1 month prior to the effective date of any increase in civilian pay. The House chairman said the purpose of this feature of the proposal is to "emphasize that our valiant fighting men in Vietnam continue to have priority consideration in any actions by the Congress."

He said, "If we are to have guns and butter for every American citizen, I see no reason why our fighting men in Vietnam must accept guns and yet have denied to them and their loved ones at home, their share of the butter."

Chairman RIVERS said his introduction of the pay bill is "intended to preclude the executive branch from arbitrarily ignoring the needs of military personnel when recommendations are made to the legislative branch for increases in the compensation of civilian Federal employees."

He said both the budget message and economic report of the President "give a clear indication that the executive branch contemplates another increase in the pay of Federal civilian employees during 1966. Regrettably, I find no evidence whatsoever that the executive branch is giving any consideration to a comparable adjustment in military pay.

"The recent effort of Congress to establish relative comparability and equity between the military and Federal civilian pay structures was upset by the enactment of an average 3.6 percent civilian increase on November 1, 1965. This differential will now be further increased and aggravated by another Federal civilian employee pay increase during 1966.

"I will not stand idly by and permit this unacceptable situation to occur. I am confident that the Congress will give my recommendation its overwhelming approval.

"My legislation is very simple. The bill provides that military personnel will be given an increase in their compensation during 1966 only if Federal civilian employees are provided an increase in compensation."

Oregon Protests Cut in Funds for Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WENDELL WYATT
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from the superintendent of public instruction in Oregon, protesting the proposed reduction in funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and in work-study programs under section 14 of Public Law 210. Because of the soundness and clarity of reasoning, I am including this letter in today's RECORD:

MARCH 14, 1966.

Hon. WENDELL WYATT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am writing to you to express the deep concern of many of us in the State department, the local schools, and the community colleges with the failure of the proposed Federal budget for 1967 to include the full amount of authorized appropriations under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–210). If the amount in the Federal budget submitted by the administration is appropriated rather than the full authorization of $225 million under section 4 of Public Law 88–210, Oregon's allocation will be approximately $280,000 short of the anticipated amount. These funds play a key part in this State's planned improvement of vocational education opportunities for high school and post-high-school youth and adults. Our efforts will be seriously impaired if this anticipated Federal financial assistance is not provided.

Even with the full authorized appropriations, Federal support of vocational education is far from adequate to meet the rapidly expanding demands. The following examples indicate some of our more critical financial problems:

Community college enrollments have been increasing at an annual rate of more than 30 percent and promise to continue at a high rate of growth. More than half of these students are in vocational programs. State and Federal funds presently available for 1966–67 are not sufficient to maintain the existing ratio of Federal, State, and local participation in operating costs. Alternatives are to increase local taxes, to increase tuition, or to deny admission to students wanting to enroll. A similar condition exists in relation to the vocational program at the high school level.

About $600,000 of Oregon's allocation of Federal vocational funds for this year are being used for community college building construction projects which are actually eligible for well over $1,500,000. Additional vocational facilities are badly needed in Lane, Umpqua, central Oregon, Portland, Clatsop, Salem, and southwestern Oregon community colleges. Even with the full appropriation under Public Law 88–210, the eligibility and need for Federal funds on projects planned for 1966–67 will again be far in excess of the maximum available, and it will doubtless be necessary to postpone construction of some projects.

High school districts in several parts of the State are planning to offer vocational education programs but are limited by lack of suitable shops and laboratories. The $150,000 of Federal funds we have been able to budget for construction of high school facilities in 1967 is only a small part of the indicated need. Planning is underway for area vocational facilities in Jackson County, Columbia County, Linn County, Clackamas County, Coos County, and Portland.

Providing new and expanded shops and laboratories for vocational programs requires large expenditures for instructional equipment. The high schools and community colleges have been budgeting a considerable amount of local funds for this purpose, but the amount of Federal funds available is far below the amount needed.

An outline of the planned use of State and Federal vocational funds is enclosed. Not included in the outline are estimated local fund expenditures for vocational programs of well over $6 million each year.

Another area of concern is the reduction from $25 to $10 million for the work-study program under section 14 of Public Law 88–210. This work-study program is making it possible for 540 of Oregon's young people to continue in vocational education programs this year. Local high schools and community colleges have developed this work-study program at considerable effort and it does not seem appropriate to reduce the financial support needed to continue the program when it is just getting established. The work-study program is proving a very valuable adjunct to vocational education, and its expansion to serve more of our youth is needed.

In view of the above indicated needs, your efforts to obtain, as a minimum, the full appropriation authorized under Public Law 88–210 are very important in giving Oregon's youth and adults an opportunity to prepare for productive employment and to maintain their employability.

LEON P. MINEAR,
Superintendent, Public Instruction.

Miss May V. Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the many friends of Miss May V. Harris of Bethesda, Md., were deeply saddened by her death last month at the age of 77.

During her lifetime, Miss Harris compiled a long and notable record of patriotic service. A descendant of Philip Freneau, the American poet of the Revolutionary period, she was extremely active in the Descendants of 1776 chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. From 1943 through 1946, she served as regent of that chapter, and also became State chairman of the Americanism committee of the DAR, and an officer of the State officers club.

As a tireless member of the Red Cross, Miss Harris gave a great deal of time and energy to the bloodmobile projects during World War II. She received a decoration from the Paderewski Society for her work during that period at the embassy of the Polish government-in-exile.

High among Miss Harris' many interests were music and literature. Having studied music in New York and Connecticut, she sang with the Washington Opera Society and in two church choirs. She also found time to write children's stories, usually emphasizing the theme of international friendship, and published the book, "Carnival at Stroebeck," in 1938.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the countless friends and admirers of Miss May Harris in tribute to her many accomplishments, and I extend my deep sympathies to her surviving sister, Miss Florence E. Harris.

Congress and the Health of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech I delivered at the seminar on science, public policy, and public information, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md., on October 28, 1965:

CONGRESS AND THE HEALTH OF THE PEOPLE

(Address by the Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat of Rhode Island, chairman, House Subcommittee on Appropriations, at the seminar on science, public policy, and public information, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md., October 28, 1966)

Dr. Shannon, Dr. Sessoms, Dr. Masur, ladies and gentlemen, I am impressed indeed with the number and quality of ladies in this group. I am sure that if the President could be here this evening, he'd stop threatening to fire his information staff and replace them with Johnson City High School kids.

I am very glad to have this opportunity to address this meeting on the interplay of science, public policy and public information. It provides me with the first opportunity I have had to explore the state of the art of public information with those who are expert in the translation and interpretation of science, medicine, and related fields for the general public.

As all of you know, it has been my privilege to have had something to do with the field of medicine—particularly medical research—over the past 20-odd years. In that brief span, medical schools have gradually added the missing link in their communications with the community and the press; and the government agencies—which formerly refused either to hire public information specialists or, if they did, took care to phoney their titles or otherwise hide them—have come out into the open and assigned them important responsibilities.

The results, of course, have been dramatic. No longer is it necessary for a reporter to make a dozen calls to a medical school to track down a needed bit of information. No longer is the Federal health agency operated like a close corporation: its business is virtually conducted in public. But the most heartening development of all has been the change in attitude on the part of the scientists and practitioners of medicine. Attitudes ranging from unresponsiveness and complete distrust of so-called outsiders has been changing to those of cooperation and helpfulness. You here tonight—and your associates in the several media—have played a large part in these changes and you are to be congratulated for it.

But with the expression of new emphasis on the service aspect of modern medicine and all that this implies in terms of needed facilities and professional manpower, it is more vital than ever before that there be no failure in communication with the general public. NIH is to be commended for calling this seminar—to enable you representatives of the academic world to meet and exchange views with your counterparts here at NIH. Your involvement in the shaping of public policy is great—and in my opinion is going to become much greater.

Let me tell you why: the 1st session of the 89th Congress has provided the basic framework for vast new gains in health and medical education. I am very proud to have played a part in this, but I am convinced that only the right combination of public awareness and public support made it possible.

We have torn down some of the economic barriers separating our older citizens from the care they need.

We have taken steps to assure that top-quality medical care may be obtained in every region of our country by authorizing the bringing together of the worlds of medical research, medical education, and medical practice.

We have greatly strengthened the ability of our health professional schools to prepare greater numbers of better trained practitioners to serve the medical, dental, nursing, and public health needs of the present and the future.

Further, Congress has extended and expanded the vaccination assistance and support of migrant health services, extended and expanded the health research facilities construction program, permitted Federal funds to support staffing of community mental health centers, and provided for a greatly improved system of medical libraries around this Nation. We have done all these things while at the same time providing the largest—but still inadequate—appropriation for medical research in history.

Now, this is an outstanding record, and all of us in the Congress are proud of it.

But we know that all of this was possible only because there was sufficient understanding and awareness among the people of this Nation of the possibilities for better health. Thus we in Congress were able to give these programs the boost they needed. Public policy and practical action came together in a happy meeting.

We in the Congress have a responsibility—and the power—to promote the general welfare; but we can not discharge the responsibility or exercise the power in a vacuum.

This is where you—as public information people in government and in the academic community—come into the picture.

The newly authorized and expanded programs of the 89th Congress represent a considerable investment on behalf of the American people. Thus, the taxpayers not only have a right to know of the results of their investment but—in certain of the programs—an adequately informed public is an absolute necessity if the program is to succeed.

For example, a tremendous task lies ahead in seeing that the public is adequately informed about the many aspects of the heart disease, cancer, and stroke program. The NIH public information staff—as well as you, at the medical colleges and other institutions—will have this job. In this instance, it will be particularly important to see that the public does not receive the wrong information. All of this means one thing: added responsibility—a phrase you have heard numerous times in the past.

I am aware that already—by the very nature of your functions—you are involved in a wide array of activities.

I know, for example, of the fundraising some of you must do to help your institutions as they improve their facilities. Earlier this month I was at the University of Utah for the dedication of the university's new medical center—the largest public building in the State. That center cost more than $15 million, and, while State and Federal appropriations covered some of the construction costs, a considerable amount still had to be met by fundraising. And just last week I learned of the University of Chicago's plan for raising $160 million.

I am also aware of the amount of effort many of you devote to student recruitment programs, continuing professional education programs, and straight-forward community relations projects.

You may be concerned at times at the seeming fragmentation of your efforts, but I would hope that you can continue to meet your current responsibilities and at the same time interweave new responsibilities in such a way that—regardless of the task, directly or indirectly—you contribute to an increased public understanding of science and medicine in today's and tomorrow's society.

Eastier said than done, you say. And I must agree. But a start must be made. Perhaps the most important area to consider is that of human resources needed to do the job. Now if your field is typical, you might first start by asking yourselves where the new freshly trained manpower is coming from? I understand that NIH has a modest training program for young people entering this field but that its handful of vacancies has never been filled at any one time because sufficient numbers of qualified people simply have not been available.

You might ask yourselves whether there is sufficient awareness of the needs and opportunities in the field among students.

You might determine whether the journalism school in your area is aware of the extent to which science and technology pervades our daily lives and what the school is doing in response to it. And while you're at it, you might determine whether your journalism school is even teaching its students to write. If there is substance to the charges in the current issue of Harpers, I wonder whether the journalism schools—with the exception of a handful—can be regarded as a reliable source of basically trained manpower for the health information field.

One more question on human resources. Has anyone posed the outside possibility that the science departments and the medical schools should teach their students to write in a concise and orderly fashion? This would not only improve communications in a number of ways, but you might even be able to interest some of the science students in the health information field.

Now let me pose a question or two on the physical resources of the information business. I know you have progressed a long way from the days when the news release went out and the job was considered finished. Today you are using a wide variety of audio and visual materials to tell your stories. But don't forget that the tool department is being changed as much and as rapidly as the main areas of your interest—science and medicine.

Just one example—and you are all equally aware of it, I know: Color television. There is no doubt that it is here to stay. Expanded color programing coupled with recent surveys that put science and medicine at the top of the public's interest list—aside from spy stories—means a tremendous opportunity for all of you.

Thus, the question: How many of you are geared to acquiring and making available materials for use in color TV? Let me phrase another question on your total activities. How many of you have a budget against which you can plan your projects and programs over a period of time? This approach—as many of you have demonstrated—permits the generation of new ideas and development of new approaches. Or do you find yourself passing the hat when a new emergency arises?

A third element—the substantive content of your strictly public information activities—concerns me.

It has long worried me—and it worries me more and more—that the public seems to have so little idea about the nature of the research process. It needs to be educated to realize that medical advances are the result of long and patient labor over a period of years—rather than the result of pouring a few million dollars over a few gifted scientists working in well-equipped laboratories to produce instant cures.

I am concerned about the amount of science-fiction that is being given the public today in the guise of science reporting. This is the science news story without any perspective. The public needs to know—for instance—the difficulties in the way of developing the first successful implantation of a permanent, artificial heart at the same time that we hold out the promise of such a development.

Now let me turn to a fourth element, namely, cooperation. The fact that you are here, ready to consider, as a group, some of the factors that are important to your work, is commendable. If I have any criticism, it is that this meeting did not take place a year or two or three ago.

A closer involvement of public information people—a closer identification by you and your staffs at universities and medical schools all over the country with national goals—is called for. A closer coordination of your efforts with those of the National Institutes of Health is also highly desirable if you are to make your major contribution to the dialog between the citizen and his government that is the hallmark of democracy.

We have been fortunate in the past 20 years in this regard. We launched a post-World War II expansion of the National medical research effort largely upon the wave of public confidence that followed the successful scientific achievement of releasing nuclear energy.

To my mind, what has been made possible by the actions of the first session of the 89th Congress is an expression of a new wave of public confidence—a wave of confidence that expresses satisfaction with and approval of our national efforts in medical science but indicates that the service aspects of medicine require greater attention.

Now if this wave is to be sustained we must satisfy the general public's right to know of the results of their investment, and, as I have said, in certain programs the public's right to begin to benefit directly from them through enlightened involvement.

You ladies and gentlemen, as representatives of highly respected institutions, and your colleagues at NIH can—between you—accomplish much of the education job that needs to be done. You and your staffs at the medical schools and universities can help shape the public policy goals of a modern, scientifically literate society.

Health of Our Children at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, recommendations for reductions in the school lunch and special milk programs sponsored by the Federal Government are a *matter of great concern to all sections* of our country—rural and urban alike.

These programs have had extremely beneficial effects on the health of our children over the years.

At this time, I place in the Record the views of the California State Grange, in the form of a recent letter to President Johnson. The letter, dated February 7 and signed by Mr. J. B. Quinn, master of the California State Grange, follows:

President Lyndon B. Johnson,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We are in accord with and proud of your most recent statement that "the United States spend more than half a billion dollars to help other nations of the world stamp out the slavery of ignorance and the scourge of disease." The success of the Peace Corps around the world, the shipment of wheat, dried milk and other essential foodstuffs to supply hungry people with at least the minimum daily food requirements, is the mark of a humanitarian nation. We certainly are in favor of your concern with poverty in America, whether in rural or urban areas.

However, may we comment on recent developments that could spell the end of both the school lunch and the special milk programs. The most important aspect is the effect on the health of the children. Many of them receive their only balanced meal of the day from the school lunch. The cut of $19 million on the school lunch program means "saving dollars instead of adding to the children's health." Even more drastic is the $103 million milk budget cut to $21 million (along with stringent new rules of how to allocate this inadequate amount) since this could result in the death knell of the milk program due to higher costs to every pupil as well as eliminating free milk to those without funds to pay.

The dairy farmers have followed the administration's advice and actually curtailed milk production to relieve the Government of purchasing and storing surplus. Also, any milk that children do not drink will add to the surplus as well as storage costs, which could cost even more than the so-called savings through denying milk to needy children.

Surely the U.S. slogan should be "Butter and Guns," for what profits America to win a war and lose the added health that children receive through the school lunch and milk programs.

Mr. President, we urge you to restore the school lunch and milk programs funds that are deleted in the proposed budget for the fiscal year 1967. Keep the children's added health as a first duty of America.

Even if this drastic reduction of the school lunch and milk programs would balance the budget (which it would not) it would still be false economy since "healthy children are priceless."

The present school lunch and milk programs are the result of many years of actual experience of the amount of funds needed, of actual successful operation under a variety of conditions, or size of schools, of teaching personnel to adequately operate these programs both in urban and rural areas. Unless the funds, as voted in the budget by the Congress, are adherred to, irreparable damage could result for many years to come.

The California State Grange again respectfully requests restoration of the original amount appropriated for both these food health programs.

Respectfully yours,
J. B. Quinn,
Master, California State Grange.

Subtle Attack on Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, since legislation to increase the minimum hourly wage rate is under consideration, I include in the Record an article which appeared in the March issue of the Teamster. This very clearly sets forth the reasons why there should not be one minimum wage rate for adults and another rate for youngsters, as some have advocated.

Subtle Attack on Minimum Wage

One of the ironies that has grown like an indestructible weed in the free enterprise flower pot is that in any discussion of wages this Nation readily and regularly forgets what it learned 50 years ago.

A depressing illustration of this appeared in the recent Presidential panel report on automation. An obscure phrase in the report reflected a heartless idea that a handful of academic economists have been pushing for some time: A lower minimum wage for teenagers entering the work force.

The report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress concluded that if the Government does inaugurate a program of public service jobs to ease unemployment, that the wages should not be less than the Federal minimum "with the possible exception of a partial exemption for youth."

In other words, pay teenagers a substandard minimum wage.

The notion, of course, would roll back our socioeconomic history to the period before 1912 when there were no minimum wage laws anywhere in the land. It would destroy the philosophy of the legal minimum wage, which is, that society has certain obligations to safeguard the life standard of its members.

The history of our minimum wage—the innovation was borrowed from Europe—began when Massachusetts and eight other States enacted such laws in 1912–13. The enactments mirrored a great deal of social unrest understood by organized labor. The minimums applied only to women and minors, however. In 1923, the minimum wage movement came to a halt when the U.S. Supreme Court held that such laws were invalid except as applied to minors.

With the onslaught of the great depression in the thirties, a few States resumed minimum wage legislation. In 1937, the Supreme Court—recognizing urgent needs voiced mostly by organized labor—upheld the constitutionality of such laws for millions of women who had begun to join their husbands in the depression drudgery of winning bread.

The crowning achievement, promoted by a dedicated labor movement, was the establishment of a Federal minimum wage in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. By the time of the Korean war, nearly all States that lacked them had enacted minimum wage laws to supplement the Federal standard. Or, as in the example of Arkansas' $1.50 daily minimum, to undermine the Federal standard.

Today there are those who would erase this painful progress with a split minimum wage—one for adults and a subminimum for youngsters.

Aside from discriminating against youth, which already has enough handicap in the labor market, subminimum pay for teenagers eventually would destroy the concept of a minimum wage for all workers. It also would revive a new national scandal of child labor exploitation.

Employers who now cry that youngsters aren't worth $1.25 an hour would—with the enactment of a subminimum for teenagers in public service programs—suddenly discover that youth had all kinds of attractive work qualities.

Splitting the minimum wage, as unfeeling eggheads recommend, is a medieval solution. Advocates of such a plan would be more faithful to their consciences if they recommended the policy which kings decreed after the black death ravaged Europe 600 years ago: Fix a maximum pay standard to prevent rise of wages above a level set by the employers who toadied to the kings.

For whatever reason, can a Great Society afford to countenance subminimum wages for anyone?

Erin Go Bragh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the feast day of St. Patrick, the patron saint of the Emerald Isle, truly as the old song says, "It's a great day for the Irish." But it is typical of the Irish that they share their great day with people of all nationalities and as I look around the Chamber, it is easy to see that on this wonderful day when we commemorate the memory of the apostle to the Irish, everyone is an Irishman for the day.

Ireland is a small country as countries go but Ireland is not merely the 4 provinces and the 32 counties that lie between Cobh on the south and Belfast on the north. Rather Ireland is the millions of persons of Irish descent whose ancestors left Hibernia—a name which is of Latin extraction, I might point out—during one of the times of "throuble" and settled in the United States, the Dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and other places throughout the world. With them the Irish took their love of home and of God and a pride in their Celtic heritage.

An indomitable race, the Irish have always exhibited a patriotism and pride in their adopted lands which is second to none. Indeed, in every one of our wars, the presence of the Celt has always been more than evident.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation on this day, owes much to its citizens of Irish extraction. I join with Irishmen everywhere in a fervent, Erin go bragh.

United States Must Expand Domestic Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Food and Drug Administration approve the use of fish protein concentrate for human consumption. Approval of this concentrate would give many benefits, a major one being the expansion of the U.S. fishing industry.

The United States has now slipped to fifth place among fishing nations of the world. It is ridiculous that this Nation should rank behind Peru, Japan, Red China, and Russia as a producer of seafoods. Even more absurd is the fact that nearly 62 percent of the seafood eaten by Americans is imported from foreign nations.

Each year Americans spend up to $600 million for imported seafood, and the State Department has allowed Soviet sales of seafoods in this country.

In view of the increase in Cuba-based Russian fishing trawlers operating in the South Atlantic and Gulf areas near Florida, I just wonder whether these Soviet seafoods sold in the United States will be taken from grounds once dominated by Florida fishermen?

American fishermen now take only 5.1 percent of the total fish caught throughout the world. Russia's catch is almost double that of this Nation. In addition, the U.S.S.R. is placing a greater national priority on its fisheries, while U.S. fishing is declining.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, as a first step toward revitalization of the American fishing industry I urge the Food and Drug Administration to approve the production of fish protein concentrate, or fish flour. This concentrate, which is produced by pulverizing the entire fish, sanitizing it, further reducing it to fine white powder, would then be used as an additive to human foods. It has been suggested that the cereal and grain industries use the additive to fortify their products. Also, markets for such product in undeveloped nations could be quite large.

Studies show that if only the unharvested fish caught from U.S. coastal waters were used for fish concentrate, sufficient high quality protein would be provided to balance the diets of up to 1 billion people for 300 days. This diet supplement could be accomplished at a cost of approximately one-half cent per person per day.

And if the FDA approved fish concentrate the U.S. fishing industry could sell over five times more fish than it is selling today.

Certainly a seafood producing State such as Florida would feel the immediate impact of this new market.

Project Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Project Vietnam, sponsored by the Agency for International Development, has received very little publicity but, in my opinion, is doing a fantastic job in spreading goodwill in the villages of Vietnam. Under this program American physicians leave their lucrative private practices to give freely of their time for 8 weeks' service in the hospitals of Vietnam. They receive only transportation and a very small per diem. In my opinion, this program is one of the most successful which is sponsored by AID.

Dr. M. T. Merrill, who formerly practiced in my hometown of Gilroy, Calif., and who was well known for his leadership in civic activities, is now in Vietnam and has been writing a series of most interesting letters to the Gilroy Dispatch which it has printed. Dr. Merrill's experiences are typical of the unselfish service rendered by participating doctors in Project Vietnam, and I believe they will be of interest to Members of the entire House. His letters, as reprinted in the Gilroy Dispatch, are presented herewith:

DR. MERRILL WRITES FROM VIETNAM HOSPITAL

Dr. Lowe left yesterday, leaving the surgery in this place to me. Dr. Keit, 60-year-old Vietnamese surgeon, has a private practice in town and uses the hospital for that only. I'm expecting a lot of business tomorrow, because there's a big operation going on about 10 to 12 miles away tonight, wherein it is said that ARVN (the "friendlies"—Army of the Republic of Vietnam) are getting badly clobbered by the Vietcong. The 105 millimeter artillery at the far end of the bridge entering the town (about a quarter mile away) have been banging away tonight, as they do periodically, either firing at a specific target or in H. & I. (Harassment and Interdiction)—also known as "just stirring up a rice paddy" some 10 or 15 miles away.

I've slowed down on picture taking—didn't take any around the hospital until the last couple of days, not wanting to act like primarily a tourist—but will be hitting another spasm of using film now in trying to preserve and immortalize this dear, improbable place.

The only really disturbing thing about the whole situation here is seeing the death and injuries, in soldiers and babies, women and old men, and knowing that it is deliberate, man-caused destruction of pulsating people. At least I'm thankful that so far I've seen no casualties caused by my countrymen. But rest assured that I am well and happy and challenged and stimulated and safe and been "in country" (as they say here) a week already.

February 12, 1966.

Today is Saturday, and hospital goes onto night status (three or four nurses on duty for the whole place) at noon. However, I had to call the surgery crew back this afternoon, and have spent most of the day extracting grenade or mortar fragments—a bullet from a woman's back and grenade fragments from another woman's forearm this morning; a ¾-inch grenade fragment from a girl's ankle joint this afternoon (she has others in leg knee, and thigh, which are still there); and then an old gentleman who was hit with a bit of some sort of metal fragment which went up through his buttock, rectum, bladder, and some loops of small bowel; I resected a piece of bowel, closed the bladder, did colostomy, and amused the surgery crew by taping a urethral catheter (a type of catheter) in—they seem not to be familiar with this and don't have a Foley in the place. There is a great problem of obtaining supplies and equipment here—this has to be done through Vietnamese channels and then (maybe) USAID channels, and hopeless delays are encountered.

February 16, 1966.

Today's was a neat experience—going to a "Med CAP" (Medical Civil Action Program) trip to Tu-Thau, about 6 kilometers from here, in an area just outside of the main village in a largely refugee area. We saw 260 people in a period of 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours after lunch—most were seen by the medics and I saw the ones they referred to me. The trouble is, of course, that one can rarely make a diagnosis, and can give little more than placebo treatment.

Our concepts of medical treatment are so foreign to these people that after they leave the treatment line they will often exchange pills for prettier colored ones, or give some to a friend—and if you give more than 2 days' supply, either they give it to the child all at once or the Vietcong will come in after we leave and confiscate it. Our No. 2 cook here at the house, the week before I arrived, found the big bottle of chloroquine tablets, took them home, and gave an unknown amount to her children; two died, and three became very ill indeed.

But anyway, it was a delightful and frustrating, hot, sweaty, discouraging, heartwarming, and intriguing experience. I wasn't carrying any grenades, but there were plenty of other people around (the Popular Forces troops) who were, and they hurried us away from the place about 4:15 because "too many Vietcong." The Vietcong seem to be a nocturnal breed.

One can drive many of the roads (selectively) around here in the daytime, but after 5:30 p.m. it has to be a real emergency to put anybody on the road outside of a military operation. The town here, itself, is well protected, but here too we are advised not to wander in the outskirts alone, nor to go out on the streets at night. Needless to say. I heed all warnings in my customary cautious fashion.)

We have admitted 6 cases of cholera to the hospital (one death) in the past 2 days, and have obtained 2 tents and 50 cots for an outside cholera ward.

Yesterday, as an example, my activities included:

1. Removed bullet and bits of tibia from 8-year-old boy (local anesthetic).

2. Removed bullet from compound fracture of femur in 10-year-old boy and inserted Steinman pin for traction (general anesthetic).

3. Inserted Steinman pin for traction, in man injured in bus accident.

4. Repaired perforated jejunum in man who fell out of Lambretta (a funny little three-wheeled bus).

5. Perineal urethrotomy for removal of stone in an old man with urinary obstruction.

6. Removed inclusion cyst of palm of hand.

7. Checked a girl with a gunshot (or grenade fragment) through the neck—no heroics required—doing well.

Plus making rounds, checking some X-rays, and trying (with mediocre success to resuscitate a baby delivered by Bac Si Keit by Caesarian. Not all days are quite like that, but just about. Only here 1 week and already brimming over with experience, enthusiasm, etc.

February 21, 1966.

The USOM people in Saigon have suggested an R. & R. (Recreation and Rehabilitation) trip to Vung Tau for me for next weekend. Vung Tau is a beach resort town not far from Saigon, and is now a GI town largely, with bars, girls, swimming, girls, bikinis, girls, bars, and marines.

I have countersuggested a trip to Kontum, to visit one of the other Project Vietnam doctors and see some of the mountain country. If transportation can be arranged, I think it will work out. (The sad thing, of course, is that there are no bars, girls, swimming, girls, bikinis, girls, nor bars—only marines.) Also, and especially, I want to get a glimpse of the Montagnard way of life.

The past 2 days have been a welcome respite. Things slowed down Saturday, and Bac Si Keit was emergency surgery call, so yesterday (Sunday) I made rounds, and goofed off the rest of the day—slept, ate, whittled, slept, played an hour of badminton with Romeo Gloriani, showered, rehydrated, napped, ate, whittled, then wrote some more in the book.

Today for the first time I had time to see every patient and find some who had been lying about since long before I came, and needed attention—casts with decubitus ulcer, draining horrid wounds inside, etc., a couple of colostomies whose original problems I can't find out except that they were wounded many weeks ago, operated on in Saigon, then sent here. Still can't take care of things promptly as they should be, but if the Vietcong just stay slack on our province a few more days, we can clear house pretty well. There have been a couple of operations within a few kilometers of town last week which loaded us up with customers.

We're expecting another Project Vietnam doctor (surgeon) about March 7, which is largely why I'll be able to get away for a few days. It's such fun having the whole surgical show to myself that I'll probably be almost jealous when a surgeon comes.

Today I took on a new advisory capacity, and I think U.S. Agency for International Development will likely open a new agency just to develop it further. I saw a small boy flying a kite and the kite had just dipped down far below a tree top, so the string was getting caught.

The little tad was making that age-old mistake of winding in, but I pointed out to him that he should break the string and let it go, allowing the kite to fall to the ground on the other side of the tree. (I dare say this is one area of social action in which we are now ahead of the Vietcong.)

(Referring to a language class). My teacher-students have reached an average number of about 1.4 per session. This time they were Ong Hong and Co Nga; he is North Vietnamese and she is south (as to the confusions resolved as we go). I'm making a bit of progress in Vietnamese—just enough to keep my interpreters, surgery crew, and one of the policemen behind the house interested in teaching me.

And many patients and folk in the town get a good laugh out of it, too. I'm getting to the point where I sometimes now can tell when the interpreter hasn't asked the patient the question that I wanted. One of the intepreters keeps trying to tell me how to practice medicine, and I'm trying to slough her off on somebody else.

The doctor at the hospital in Can Tho said they had a mortality rate of about 40 percent. We are a much higher class though we have had up to three patients in one bed at times.

Of course, we do send out all the wounded soldiers and some of the more critically ill or wounded; but I believe we have only had three deaths in the hospital since I've been here—one baby with congenital heart disease (probably), one child with cholera who died in the emergency room, and a boy 15 years old who came in with three perforations of his ileum and temperature of 105, due to typhoid fever with necrosis of Peyer's patches. I did a bowel resection but he was too sick and died about 24 hours later.

(Have done a colostomy, two bowel resections, repaired a perforated jejunum, treated a knife wound of the chest with pneumothorax, a gunshot wound through the lung, done a perineal lithotomy, and treated many compound fractures and bullet and grenade and mortar wounds, closed a lacerated trachea in one Vietcong and circumcised another, opened some very large abscesses in some very small children, saw a woman with cholera receive 13 liters of saline intravenously in the first 232 hours and go home on the fourth day under her own power, treated a gunshot wound of the brain and another that nicked or contused the cervical spinal cord in a little girl, opened an abscess of the tongue, and caught three butterflies, and no diarrhea.)

This hospital is really becoming more activated since the Project Vietnam doctors have been coming, and especially since about mid-January when people began to learn that there was a surgeon here.

If time permitted, and the hostilities in the area stayed down to a dull roar, we could get some bits of classes and informal training going more than at present, and make quite an impact on the quality of medicine, because we have a generally good crew of competent nurses, without whom the place would be nothing but a flock of barns.

State Loses Another $900,000 in U.S. Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include together with my remarks of preface the editorial which appeared in the Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register, of Tuesday, March 15, 1966, commenting on the war on poverty program in the State of West Virginia:

State Loses Another $900,000 in U.S. Aid

All through the structure of local and State government in West Virginia there runs indecision, ineptness and plain petty politics which manifests itself at almost every turn today.

West Virginia's pitiful showing in the much-heralded war on poverty program is just another example of how the State and local communities have failed to show initiative, imagination, and aggressiveness in seeking to implement the new processes introduced at the Federal level.

When we come right down to it we wonder just how many of the poor have had their lot improved one iota as a result of all the fanfare surrounding the antipoverty program.

To date West Virginia's participation under the Economic Opportunity Act has been disappointing. In fiscal 1965 West Virginia failed to qualify for aid, thus lost more than $900,000 in Federal funds allotted to it for community action programs in the war on poverty.

In January the neighboring State of Kentucky had received $8 million in Federal funds for community action programs as compared to almost $3 million for West Virginia. Besides, the Mountain State hasn't received a nickel in community action funds for research and demonstration programs while Kentucky has walked off with $2,088,162.

Naturally State authorities will say that the communities have fallen down and there is some truth to the accusation. However, it is up to the State to provide the leadership and imagination to assist the communities in launching programs designed to help the needy.

We believe Miles C. Stanley, president of the State Labor Federation, hit the nail on the head in pointing up one of the reasons why only a few promising community action programs have been developed in West Virginia.

Mr. Stanley said there has been inadequate technical assistance from the West Virginia Economic Opportunity Agency, which is dominated by political appointees, who have failed to help communities develop programs tailored to their individual needs.

We have to agree with Mr. Stanley and the handwriting was on the wall early last year. In fact, last spring the News-Register warned that the State's war on poverty was in trouble. After two State officials appeared here to discuss community action programs the News-Register stated that their "appearance here contributed little to the local effort for they said nothing that already hadn't been written or stated heretofore about these programs." They spoke in vague generalities and recommended increasing the size of the Community Action Committee which then numbered 30 persons. This suggestion met with ridicule here and after their visit one county official joked that he would take the telephone directory and get about 700 names to fill out the committee.

If State officials working under the Economic Opportunity Act have done anything it has been to confuse local persons interested in trying to fashion meaningful community action programs. We know of one instance where a local institution seeking to map a program under the Office of Economic Opportunity received nothing for its effort other than the old run-around. Hours of work were devoted to preparing application forms, trips were made to Charleston, telephone calls were put through to Washington and even contact was made with Sargent Shriver, Director of the OEO. The local institution was given conflicting information and in the end left hopelessly confused.

What is happening with the war on poverty is being duplicated every day with numerous other programs in West Virginia. Despite all we hear about the huge amounts of Federal funds available to our communities, the truth is that many of these funds are almost impossible to obtain because of redtape, mismanagement and ineptness on the part of State officials. It is a most frustrating course to follow for any community.

If West Virginia communities ever are going to get their fair share of the Federal outlays and the benefits that can be derived from such programs, it is up to State government to set its own house in order first.

Cheers for U.S.S. "James K. Polk" and Admiral Rickover on Successful Completion of First Sea Trials

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a former Navy lieutenant, I am always more than pleased with U.S. Navy successes. A real success has been added.

Cheers are in order for the captain, the officers, and the good crew, and to Admiral Rickover and the construction team, upon the successful first sea trials of the U.S.S. *James K. Polk,* our 35th U.S. Polaris nuclear submarine. The success after success of our U.S. Polaris nuclear submarine program is amazing.

My hearty congratulations to Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze for the progress and success of the U.S. Navy under his leadership.

I submit for the record the excellent letter of Admiral Rickover at sea, North Atlantic, March 14, 1966, and wish the good crew smooth sailing and safe harbors for the future.

The letter follows:

U.S.S. "JAMES K. POLK,"
At Sea, North Atlantic, March 14, 1966.

DEAR MR. FULTON: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 35th Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *James K. Polk* was built by the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn. We also have in operation 22 attack-type nuclear submarines, making a total of 57.

This ship is named for James K. Polk (1795–1849), ablest President between Jackson and Lincoln, and one of the few who rose from log cabin to White House. Born in North Carolina, the eldest of 10 children of a plain farmer, Polk grew to manhood in Duck River, Tenn., a rude frontier settlement on the edge of the wilderness. His ancestors were Scottish Covenanters who migrated to Ireland early in the 17th century and to America a hundred years later, settling first in Maryland and later moving westward in search of a freer and better life.

The future President's family found in Tennessee the hoped-for land of promise where unremitting toil was all that was needed to attain prosperity and an honored place in the community. Young Polk worked long hours on the farm and, since there were no schools, was taught the three R's by his parents. He was good at mathematics and liked to read. When he reached 17, his father was able to grant him his wish for an education leading to a professional career.

Though never in robust health, Polk was all his life a prodigious worker. He accomplished much because he had enormous drive and great talent for systematic and sustained mental labor. It took him but 3 years of formal instruction to make up his educational deficiencies. At 20, he was admitted to the University of North Carolina with sophomore standing, graduating with first honors in mathematics and classics. He read law and, before he was 26, had become one of the leading practitioners in Columbia, Tenn., as well as a promising candidate for public office.

After one term in the State legislature, he entered the U.S. House of Representatives where he served from 1825 to 1839, the last 4 years as Speaker and leader of the Jacksonian forces. Polk would have preferred to remain in Congress but was drafted by his party to run for Governor of Tennessee, to save the State for the party. Elected in 1839, he lost in 1841 and 1843—the only setbacks in an otherwise uniformly successful career.

In those days, rival candidates used to travel the country together, putting up at the same inns, often sleeping in the same bed, taking turns addressing the same meetings to which voters flocked from distant parts, as much for entertainment as for political discussion. Polk ran on his record as Governor. He had given his State an excellent administration, rescued it from near bankruptcy, and initiated significant reforms. His rival, semiliterate but shrewd, never discussed issues but took pains to amuse the audience. He won, it seems, chiefly because he was the better storyteller.

Polk was being considered for Vice President when the Texas and Oregon issues burst upon the country causing a deadlock that could be broken only by nominating Polk as a compromise candidate for President. The 1844 election was one of the most hotly contested the Nation had ever experienced. The issues between Democrats and Whigs were sharply drawn, feelings ran high, the country was almost evenly divided.

Odd as it seems today, the candidates for the Presidency did not campaign actively since it was then considered unseemly to give the appearance of seeking this high office. Polk won with 170 electoral votes to 105 for Clay. Though at 49 he was the youngest President, he was committed to a more ambitious, more precisely stated administration program than any of his predecessors. All of it was carried out in the single term to which he had limited himself voluntarily when accepting the nomination of his party.

In the domestic field, Polk's achievements proved ephemeral, but his views, consistently Jacksonian, still have historic interest. He was a strict constitutionalist because he was certain this alone could preserve the Union. He opposed the protective tariff because he deemed it "unjust to tax the labor of one class of society to support and fatten another." He feared that Federal funds for internal improvements would destroy State sovereignty.

It was better "to live as freemen in a trackless wilderness than ride as vassals down a broad highway." He wanted Federal funds kept separate from the private banking system to prevent their being used for credit expansion and cheap money.

The Federal Government, he thought, should be brought back to "what it was intended to be, a plain economical government." In the foreign field, Polk's success was both spectacular and of enduring importance to the Nation. An ardent expansionist, as was natural given his pioneer background, Polk added more territory to the United States than any previous President except Jefferson.

He settled the 40-year-old Northwest boundary dispute by skillful diplomacy and admirable nerve in face of a possible two-front war, inducing Britian to relinquish her longstanding demand for a boundary along the Columbia River, which would have cost us the State of Washington, in exchange for abandonment of our claim to what is now British Columbia.

On the basis of discovery and settlement, this was the most we could justifiably ask or, for that matter, realistically hope to obtain without resorting to war. Our southwest boundary was moved to its present location as a result of Polk's able management of the

Mexican War and the ensuing peace negotions.

Mexico was generously compensated for the loss of California and New Mexico though not of Texas which had been lost 10 years earlier in exactly the same way as Mexico herself had been lost to Spain—by a successful indigenous revolt. We paid Mexico considerably more per acre than Napoleon had charged us for the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. When Polk left office, the United States stretched from "sea to shining sea."

Polk stood out among leading figures of his day in his unfaltering devotion to the national interest, uninfluenced by personal or parochial considerations, yet most 19th century historians accused him of precipitating the Mexican-American War in the interest of slavery expansion. This verdict has since been reversed in consequence of the publication early in this century of relevant official documents from the archives of Texas, Mexico and Great Britain, which made it possible to see the issue more accurately. When Polk took office, the annexation of Texas was already an accomplished fact. Having warned us she would consider this "equivalent to a declaration of war," Mexico promptly severed diplomatic relations.

Both sides moved troops to the Mexican-Texan border. Unfortunately, the two countries disagreed as to whether the Rio Grande or the Nueces constituted the boundary. It was in the disputed territory between these rivers that hostilities broke out spontaneously and a war that neither country really wanted began.

That Polk was able to execute his entire domestic and foreign program is the more remarkable in that he was neither a charismatic leader identified with some great popular movement, nor a politician adept at manipulating people and events. How he was able to resolve the great issues pressing upon him can best be understood by reading the diary he kept while in office.

The President emerges from its pages an able and astute administrator who approached every problem with a logical mind and a keen sense of political realities, who gained his objectives by stating them with precision and justifying them with well-reasoned argument. One cannot but feel that he understood the issues he dealt with better than most of his experts, whether they involved war strategy, military supply, diplomatic negotiations or how to get congressional approval for his measures when the nominally dominant Democrats were so rent by faction that every Executive request was attacked by at least one element in his party, enthusiastically supported by the Whigs.

Written for personal use, as a reminder of the official happenings crowding his overfull days, the diary gives an intimate glimpse into the Executive office during a transitional period in our history; a time when, as a result of war, technological change, and the physical growth of the country, certain aspects of the democratic process, certain political habits had become outmoded, but the American people were not yet prepared to relinquish them. Take the fine old tradition that every citizen has access to the President.

It had become an intolerable burden, for the business of the Nation was now so large it demanded all a President's time and energy. Polk found that "no President who performs his duty faithfully and conscientiously can have any leisure." He rarely took even a brief vacation and often had to toil far into the night to complete official tasks for which he found no time during the day, so besieged was he with people wanting to shake his hand or pay their respects, and with officeseekers and patronage-soliciting politicians who, as he wryly put it, seemed to feel that providing jobs was "the chief end of government."

Or take the persistence of divisive geographic and ideological interests which, in Polk's time, tended to take precedence over the national interest. So much so that politicians in all sections of the country indulged in the mischief of threatening to break up the Union whenever national action went against their parochial interests. The well-publicized quarrels in the Senate, which were caused by intrusion of these divisive factors into every foreign policy issue, were a serious handicap to Polk when he was engaged in difficult negotiations with Britain over Oregon, or sought by diplomatic means to end the War with Mexico. The American people and their leaders had not yet accepted the maxim we now take for granted that "politics end at the water's edge."

One cannot read Polk's diary without warming to this thoughtful man of uncompromising integrity whose political philosophy, as he once said, "was not of yesterday," but "formed upon mature consideration," and adhered to whether it was expedient at the moment or not. Having achieved the objectives of his administration, he refused renomination and retired to private life. He died 3 months after leaving the White House.

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

The Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Edward Clark, our dynamic Ambassador to Australia, made a speech at the Sydney Club in Australia on March 10, in which he outlined the objectives of the Great Society to the Australian people.

Ambassador Clark is a great American who is making a good impression in Australia because his drive and enthusiasm are so admired by the people of this great American ally in the far Pacific.

I have asked leave to make the speech part of these remarks, and I commend its reading to my colleagues:

THE GREAT SOCIETY

(Speech given by Ambassador Clark to the Sydney Club, Mar. 10, 1966)

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a great pleasure to visit this beautiful and exciting city of Sydney and I am especially happy today to be with the members and guests of the Sydney Club. I don't mean to imply that I like getting away from my home town of Canberra, but it's nice to see how the other half live—or should I say the other 99 percent. And I'm always interested in seeing how the opera house is coming along. I've bought a couple of the lottery tickets, so I feel it's partly mine.

When I first heard about the Sydney Club, I was told that it was originally known as the Millions Club. Being a banker, I naturally thought of money, for which I have the greatest respect and admiration. Money doesn't talk—it shouts. It really will not buy happiness, but can help you look for it in a lot of nice places. Now I don't necessarily have in mind the Pink Pussy Cat, because I have not been there yet. I must admit that the prospect of talking to a group of Australian millionaries intrigued me. Then, out of curiosity, I asked someone whether the word "millions" referred to pounds or dollars—and the answer came back "neither"—it meant people. Well, I don't mind—I like people too. Especially girls. I have three beautiful granddaughters.

I want to take a moment to salute your founder, the late Sir Arthur Rickard, who worked so hard for so many years in the service of your club and the betterment of this great city. I feel there is a certain measure of common ground in the purpose and work of the Sydney Club and the subject of my talk today—The Great Society.

Just last December, your distinguished President, Sir John Northcott, in his Christmas message, pointed to the need "to consider the faith and fellowship which lie at the core of human affairs." Sir John also spoke of the continuating need to restore our trust and tolerance toward others, as well as the need to maintain the highest standards of fellowship and human dignity.

These are the same ideals which underly the concept of the Great Society to which the President, the Government, and the people of the United States are directing so much of their time, energy, and money.

I have been asked many times: "What is the Great Society?" In its essence, it's a program designed to satisfy the highest aspirations of our society. It's not only the idea of providing everyone a roof over their heads and enough to eat, although that is a part of it. It also means:

Equality of opportunity for all our citizens;

Equal justice under the law;

The opportunity to work and improve one's status in life;

Freedom from anxiety in our old age.

In short, the object is a better world for ourselves and our children as well as for our neighbors and friends all over God's world.

I have known our great President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, for many, mnay years and have worked very closely with him on a great number of undertakings. He is a great humanitarian. Gentle and soft hearted. Kind and considerate. A most wonderful character. I have heard him talk about his concept of a Great Society many times and I know he considers it the most challenging and important task that the American people have ever faced. President Johnson has pointed out that for almost two centuries we have steadily progressed in our American way of life, but he adds that we are only at the beginning of the road to a really Great Society.

Some people, including many writers, say the Great Society actually started almost 190 years ago when Americans achieved their independence and proclaimed as their Nation's goal: "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That, in a nutshell, is what the Great Society is all about. Others have said that the Great Society is part of a continuing revolution—a planned revolution—going back about 33 years when the New Dealers, under the inspirational leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, fought against the tyranny of poverty, ignorance, insecurity, prejudice, and fear.

In those days, in the 1930's President Johnson was a young New Dealer himself, Administrative Assistant to a Texas Congressman. Today, he is fighting hard to bring to reality some of the dreams which he and his fellow New Dealers shared more than 30 years.

President Johnson has not been content with past accomplishments. He has given the American people a fresh new approach to their own destiny. At his urging, we have begun to look beyond the years immediately ahead to the unfolding of the third century of our Nation's history.

He has called upon us to see: That problems, long gnawing at the roots of our society, must be brought to the surface and eliminated; that currents of change whose flow had seemed random are moving together in a new tide; that possibilities thought to be remote in fact lie close at hand. We have been made more fully aware of this generation's trusteeship of our country's future. We have been summoned by our President to compare the pattern of our society against the design of a Great Society—to make those parts which are missing—and to remake those which are flawed.

What are the roots of the concept, and how will it affect my country's course? Here are the words in which President Johnson told how he himself found the answer to the hard question of how a President can know the right course to choose:

"The answer was waiting for me in the land where I was born. It was once barren land. The angular hills were covered with scrub cedar and a few live oaks. Little would grow in the harsh caliche soil. And each spring the Pedernales River would flood the valley.

"But men came and worked and endured and built. Today that country is abundant with fruit, cattle, goats and sheep. There are pleasant homes and lakes, and the floods are gone. Why did men come to that once forbidding land?

"They were restless, of course, and had to be moving on. But there was more than that. There was a dream—a dream of a place where a freeman could build for himself, and raise his children to a better life—a dream of a continent to be conquered, a world to be won, a nation to be made.

"Remembering this, I knew the answer. A President does not shape a new and personal vision of America. He collects it from the scattered hopes of the American past * * * it has guided us every step of the way * * * it shall lead us as we enter this third century of search for 'a more perfect Union.'"

That vision so eloquently expressed by President Johnson, which looks out upon "a world to be won," is drawn from the whole history of America. The course it sets for us leads straight on form where we stand today, laying down no burden, rejecting no responsibility, discarding no commitment. It is a demand that we keep faith with ourselves.

In the President's state of the Union message last January, he said that there are three roads that lead to the Great Society:

"Growth in the economic health and abundance of our country;

"Justice, to permit all our people to share the freedom and opportunity of America;

"Liberation of our genius and abundance to enrich the quality of our lives."

These are not empty phrases but ambitious goals which are backed up by specific action programs or proposals designed to move the American people down these three roads. Let me summarize a few of these programs to show you that the concept of the Great Society is not merely a dream but a serious program of action on many fronts. These are some of the things that are underway or are "in the works," as we say:

1. A program in education to insure every American child the fullest development of his mind and skills.

2. A massive attack on crippling and killing diseases. This includes medical care of the aged, cooperative international efforts to eliminate the killing diseases, stepped up medical research and education, and the development of new community institutions for the mentally retarded.

3. A National effort to make the American city a better and more stimulating place to live. This includes specific programs in the fields of housing, slum clearance, improved and expanded community facilities, better transportation and health services, recreation and parks, and the purification of water and air.

4. Measures to conserve the national beauties of America—more National and State parks, highway beautification, and the ending of the wasteful and degrading poisoning of our rivers and lakes.

5. The development of regions of our country suffering from distress and depression—the so-called war on poverty which is well underway.

6. New efforts to control and prevent crime and delinquency.

7. Steps to insure equal justice to all our people, including the elimination of every remaining obstacle to the right and opportunity to vote.

8. Support for the creative arts and sciences.

These are some of the Great Society programs of action; progress is being made in all of them. But the goals of the Great Society are not specific and the programs are not static, because people will always aspire to and work for the betterment of life. The goals and achievements of one generation are the starting points for the next. Our dynamic society will never reach the point where people can sit back and say, well, we've made it—we have achieved the great society. For there will always be enough things to do to improve the lot of our own people and the people of the less fortunate lands.

While President Johnson has set forth the goals of a Great Society for America—and has started us down the road—the President and the American people know that we have no monopoly of the desires to build a better society. They are common to every individual and every nation. It is our hope that, while we make progress toward a Great Society in America, our efforts and experience will help other nations to make progress, in their own way, toward their great societies.

So in our common pursuit of human dignity and freedom and a better life at home, we will not forget the two-thirds of the world that lives under a burden of ignorance, disease, poverty, and despair. History has not let us abide in the delusion of isolationism. Freedom is not divisible, nor is the struggle for an improved lot for mankind, for a greater society of the human race.

At the time of America's foundation, we did not claim that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness was a birthright for Americans and Americans only. We will be happy to share with the other nations of the world the techniques and programs we test and develop in pursuit of the Great Society. We will be happy to export this type of revolution.

This revolution—this searching and working for a better life—is taking place, step by step, in many countries around the world. And we and you and the other members of the Western society are helping create this revolution. Vice President Humphrey said in Canberra last month that "we are the revolutionists—not the Communists. We are the agents of justice and reform—not the Communists." This certainly is true. The Great Society is a dream we can all share and can all work toward for it reflects the highest aspirations of mankind.

I would like to leave with you a few words that President Johnson spoke 2 years ago at the University of Michigan:

"The Great Society is not a safe harbor, a resting place, a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor."

In my country we sing and love an old hymn called "Blest Be The Tie That Binds" and now may I say God bless you everyone. I thank you.

Tribute to Ireland's Patron Saint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with the House membership in its annual observance of St. Patrick's Day. My participation this year takes on added significance, because the Ancient Order of Hibernians has done me the great honor of electing me an honorary member of that order.

All my memories of March 17 recall occasions of festivities, wit, and wholesome merriment. I boast the friendship of hundreds of friends—men and women of Irish descent. From them I have also learned their true inner feelings—of how their ancestors, who loved their native land, experienced centuries of tragedy and suffering in defense of their inborn freedom of spirit. Success crowned their efforts when eventually most of the Emerald Isle was released from colonial status, and the Irish people were rewarded with the rights of government through democratic principles. This little country stands as a splendid example today, stimulating hope in the hearts of small nations of the world imprisoned under Communist rule.

Many glowing words, in song and story, will be heard this weekend, wherever people stop to pay tribute to Ireland's patron saint. I will enjoy hearing them because St. Patrick's Day is of great significance in New York City. For my own part, I would like to conclude my statement by reading the words of Ireland's national anthem. It is a stirring song, and as you hear its words you will detect a similarity to our own beloved anthem, which was inspired by the deeds of a fighting little band of Americans who were dedicated to breaking their own colonial shackles. This grand "Soldier's Song" was made available to me some years ago by Mr. J. J. Bolger at the Irish Embassy:

THE SOLDIER'S SONG

We'll sing a song, a soldier's song,
With cheering, rousing chorus.
As round our blazing fires we throng,
The starry heavens o'er us;
Impatient for the coming fight,
And as we wait the morning's light,
Here in the silence of the night,
We'll chant a soldier's song.

(Chorus)

Soldiers are we, whose lives are pledged to Ireland;
Some have come from a land beyond the wave,
Sworn to be free, no more our ancient sireland,
Shall shelter the despot or the slave;
Tonight we man the gap of danger, in Erin's cause come woe or weal;
'Mid cannon's roar and rifle's peal, we'll chant a soldier's song.

In valley green on towering crag
Our fathers fought before us,
And conquered 'neath the same old flag
That's proudly floating o'er us.
We're children of a fighting race
That never yet has known disgrace,
And as we march the foe to face
We'll chant a soldier's song.

(Repeat chorus)

Sons of the Gael. Men of the Pale.
The long-watched day is breaking;
The serried ranks of Innisfail
Shall set the tyrant quaking.
Our campfires now are burning low,
See in the East a silv'ry glow,
Out yonder waits the Saxon foe,
So chant a soldier's song.

(Repeat chorus)

National Traffic Safety Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the subject of traffic safety is one to which increasing attention is being paid, with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce holding hearings on a number of traffic safety bills this week.

One of the sponsors of a bill to create a National Traffic Safety Agency, my able colleague and good friend, the Honorable JAMES MACKAY of Georgia, delivered an address on "The Need for Effective National Traffic Safety Legislation," on March 8, 1966, to the Third Annual Conference of the Southern States-Armed Forces-Federal Regional Traffic Safety Workshop, at Chattanooga, Tenn. The address contains a fine historical summary of efforts to do something about the traffic safety problem, and deals incisively with the principal issues. The speech follows:

THE NEED FOR EFFECTIVE NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY LEGISLATION

It is a pleasure to be here in Chattanooga today to participate in this workshop because the simple fact that you are assembled here this morning from all over our region is evidence of your determination to continue and accelerate efforts to reduce mounting losses of life and property associated with traffic accidents.

It was my privilege to attend your first meeting in Atlanta. At that time I was a member of the Georgia Legislature and I there expressed concern over the fact that our State legislatures were failing to act in concert to build a safer traffic environment, and, indeed, were almost failing to act at all. My concern was justified because, notwithstanding considerable interest, the States are moving at a snail's pace, if at all. Georgia drew a blank in the last two sessions although more than 40 safety bills were put in the legislative hopper.

NEED FOR TRAFFIC SAFETY LEGISLATION

Today I have been asked to speak to you about the need, as I see it, for effective traffic safety legislation by Congress. I speak as an advocate and not as an observer because the bill I prepared which would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency was introduced in the House and Senate on February 3 of this year. Twenty-five Members of the House have joined me as cosponsors and 15 Senators led by Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, sponsor the bill in the Senate.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE HEARINGS MARCH 15

The House bills are pending in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on which I serve and the Senate bills have been referred to the Senate Commerce Committee. Chairman STAGGERS will open hearings on March 15 on these bills and on the administration bill which was sent over last week at the time the President delivered his message on transportation, including traffic safety.

Chances are that this 89th Congress will enact the most significant traffic safety legislation in the 90-year history of the automobile. I hope so, and I intend to do all within my power to see that we get positive results out of this session. We are going to have to act together positively and cooperatively to build a safer traffic environment or we are going to die separately as a result of our inaction.

EDITORIAL CONDEMNS LEGISLATORS

Politicians are accustomed to criticism and to the impunging of our motives. This is the way a free society works, but now and then you read an editorial that astounds you. Such a one I found on the front page of Barron's, the business weekly.

The editorial was captioned: "Traffic Safety, Politics and Prejudice in the Driver's Seat." The editorial charged that the reason why the Congress is taking an interest in the death toll on our highways this year is that it, "like lung cancer and poisoned wells * * * constitutes what politicians call a gut issue, that is, one in which emotion tends to prevail over reason." The editorial goes on to say, "Contrary to the sweeping charges, the Nation's automotive safety record is nothing to be ashamed of in this imperfect world. It happens to be far better than most of its counterparts abroad, where safety supposedly comes ahead of style, and it has shown vast improvement over the years". The editorial concludes that, "None of the foregoing is likely to stop muckraking writers or political demagogs, who know pay dirt when they strike it * * * whatever Albany or Washington may pretend, highway safety hangs primarily on individual responsibility. No Federal program will ever get from here to there."

I don't intend to offer a rebuttal to this superficial editorial, or to try and defend Congress. Instead I want to relate to you some of the legislative history of the subject of traffic safety and why so many of us in this 89th Congress are determined to get the Federal role in traffic safety explicitly defined by an appropriate act of Congress this year.

WHY THIS YEAR?

A legitimate question might be asked at this point. Why this year? Why has concern and talk of legislation suddenly mushroomed? After all there has been concern about traffic accidents since the advent of the motor vehicle. Thirty years ago J. C. Furnas wrote a stem-winding article in the Reader's Digest entitled, "And Sudden Death," which should have stirred people to action then. Why the furor now?

The best answer I can give you is to say that a number of people in public and private life have become aroused because it is dawning on them that this problem has had national attention for 40 years but that whatever we have done to date has not sufficed. A review of the work of private groups and organizations, and our public efforts discloses how enormous energies devoted to solving a complex problem can be subverted, sidetracked and rendered ineffective by limited thinking, by fetishes, by special interests, by failure of people to work closely together, and by individuals riding forth in all directions.

THREE CANARDS

Much of the effort has gone stale. It is heartbreaking to realize that people continue to view the traffic accident phenomenon from the point of view of 50 years ago. This fact is illustrated by three frequently heard canards. First, it is said that the American people are indifferent about the loss of human life on our roadways. Second, it is said that we gladly pay the price in human life for the thrill of speed. And third, it is said that people don't want anything done—that safety is not marketable and that people don't want any restraints—that death on the highway is just one of the risks you take for the convenience and pleasure of driving where you want to go.

How did these ridiculous propositions gain such wide currency? The answer is twofold: Because of the special nature of the traffic accident, and because of the methods we have used to achieve a safer traffic environment.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENT—AN INDIVIDUAL OCCURRENCE

The traffic accident is an individual occurrence. It is undramatic except for those immediately involved. It does not have any unfavorable economic consequences except to the victims—at least that is the popular view.

What if it were not an individual occurrence? Let me try this on you. Next month we expect, and hope that 52,000 men, women, and children will be in our new Atlanta stadium for the opening game of the Atlanta Braves. What if some new kind of catastrophe engulfed these people in violent, sudden or agonizing and in some instances flaming or lingering death. Our Nation would mobilize as never before because in our Judeo-Christian culture we do value human life.

The same result happens on our highways but in a different way. These accidents occur one by one, around the clock, around the calendar and around the country. Show me the American who shrugs his shoulders when he hears about the death of another human being in a traffic accident in his neighborhood and he will be the exception—not the rule. We do care. It is easy to dismiss traffic accidents as the product of speed. How many times have people said to me: "Isn't it the nut behind the wheel or isn't it just speed?" The truth is that no one can give you absolute answers because the shameful fact is that we just don't have accurate data on which to make firm judgments. In our society which has done so well generally in data gathering, data processing, and computerizing almost everything, we have failed to gather accurate, uniform and sufficiently detailed information concerning causal factors in traffic accidents and in resulting deaths and injuries.

NOT ALL DRIVERS ARE NUTS

But even with the partial data at hand you can't dismiss our enormous losses by just blaming the driver. Some people who die are nuts behind the wheel but most are prudent, responsible men and women who perish in split second situations. They are not all nuts.

CRASHWORTHY AUTOMOBILE

Ralph Nader, an able and angry young attorney who has written the thought-provoking book, "Unsafe at Any Speed," stated recently in his testimony before a subcommittee chaired by Senator RIBICOFF which is holding hearings on traffic safety, "The plain fact is that it is faster, cheaper, and more enduring to build operationally safe and crashworthy automobiles that will prevent death and injury than to build a policy around the impossible goal of having drivers behave perfectly at all times under all conditions in the operation of a basically unsafe vehicle and under often treacherous highway conditions."

And further, Col. John Paul Stapp, the noted Air Force authority on the durability of the human body, tells me that more than 42 percent of all traffic fatalities occur under survivable conditions—that is to say that speed does not account for the deaths. This, translated into last year's statistics says that perhaps more than 20,000 lives might have been spared.

THE ACCIDENT—COMPLEX PHENOMENON

One other comment about the nature of the accident. It is often a complex phenomenon occurring in a complex environment, investigated in many cases by inadequately trained men, and re-examined in most instances by insurance men and lawyers to fix legal liability—not to determine true causation. Thus far, we see only the top of the iceberg, and often not that much.

The nature of the traffic accident in part accounts for our difficulty and lack of success in coming to grips with it as the number one killer of young Americans between 15 and 25 and the fourth killer of Americans of all ages.

AN UNBELIEVABLE TANGLE

The history of our attack on the traffic accident, the record of our public and private attempts to create a safe traffic environment, have resulted in an unbelievable tangle. Our problem here is something like the population explosion. A chap told me that everybody is doing something about it but nobody is getting results.

A NICKEL PER CASUALTY

The motor vehicle and the airplane have been treated differently. Everybody knew that a craft heavier than air was unsafe and so great precautions were taken. The Federal Government controlled the air space and the licensing of the aircraft for airworthiness and of the operator—in other words, the total environment. Concern for air safety has advanced to the point that when my wife drops me at the airport she doesn't worry about me getting to Washington; I worry about her getting back to our home safely. And we have gotten results. We have set standards and we have enforced them. We spend over $700 million a year and we employ over 40,000 people primarily to watch over the safety of our air passengers. Last year, 1,300 people died in aircraft accidents—about 14 for each 10 billion miles flown. We do all this yet less than 12 percent of our people fly each year and only 40 percent have ever flown. And we spend $100,000 per victim to discover the causes of airplane accidents but less than a nickel per casualty on traffic accident research.

A LOCAL CURIOSITY

The automobile, when it took to our streets, was little more than the familiar wagon with a motor on it and no horses up front. They called it a horseless carriage and that's where we got the name horsepower.

It was strictly a local phenomenon. City councils put the first legal restraints on it with such ordinances as ones restricting it from going over 5 miles per hour or requiring that someone precede it on foot to see that pedestrians were warned of its approach. And one other fact made the picture simple then. The motor vehicle was a curiosity owned by the town's rich boy or eccentric.

The States got into the act as they developed a road system to accommodate the car and they adopted rules of the road together with a few safety requirements such as the headlight, the horn, the brake, and in some cases, the fire extinguisher.

Long before the automobile, ship and train wrecks had resulted in national legislation to require safety performance standards to prevent the loss of life on these two means of public transportation.

OTHER TRANSPORTATION REGULATED

The Federal Government has regulated interstate commerce and protected the general welfare by stringent laws and executive action to protect the interstate traveler in all interestate transportation other than the individually owned passenger vehicle. Even the bus and truck have been regulated for safety and the casualties have been strikingly low by comparison. Five passengers die for every 10 billion miles traveled by train, 13 die for every 10 billion miles traveled in buses, while 570 die for every 10 billion miles traveled by car.

Even after you consider all of the reasons, and they are many, it is hard to understand why there has been such a good response to other transportation hazards and such a poor response to the virulence of the traffic accident.

So far as we know, the first traffic fatality occurred when a lady stepped off a street car and was struck down by a motor vehicle in 1899. As the number of vehicles increased the number of deaths increased steadily. In 1917 deaths exceeded 10,000. In 1924 they almost reached 20,000.

LIFE AND DEATH MEETING

Thus, it was not until after a quarter of a century of steadily incerasing deaths that this new phenomenon received national recognition. Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover convened in 1924 the first National Conference on Street and Highway Safety. The conference was termed a life-and-death meeting.

In the usual manner a report, long since buried, was issued. In 1926, the conference was reconvened and it approved a model for a uniform vehicle code dealing with the rules for registering a car, the licensing of operators, and the rules governing the operation of vehicles on highways. The model code was hailed as the outstanding achievement of the two conferences, yet to this day none of the States has undertaken to adopt this code in toto. Furthermore, rather than being promoted at the Federal level, the maintenance and updating of this code is done by a small group of professional who constitute the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, financed in part by Federal funds and in part by contributions from industry. This organization is just one of a myriad which have attempted to fill the void at the national level to combat the traffic accident.

COBWEB OF CONFUSION

Unfortunately, because of their number and because they each struggle with only one small portion of the problem, not with the total environment, they form a cobweb of confusion both for the layman interested in becoming an informed citizen and for the public official who wants to take action.

In 1936, 38,000 died. That year Congress acknowledged the problem of the traffic death toll for the first time by requesting the Bureau of Public Roads to make a comprehensive report on the various elements of traffic safety. The report dealt with such problems as the nonuniformity of State traffic laws, the need for skilled investigation of traffic accidents to understand their true causes, and inadequacy of traffic accident research and inaccuracy of the statistics. (Incidentally, today, 30 years later, we are still complaining that these very needs have been largely unmet, and that national legislation is required to assure that they will be.)

The Bureau of Public Roads report lay dormant until after World War II. In 1946 an attempt was made by the Chief Executive to pull together the diverse interests to get effective action. President Truman called a Highway Safety Conference to study and make recommendations. This conference adopted an action program which has been called "a positive and practical, balanced program of measures necessary in the interest of highway safety." The Conference continued to meet periodically to revise its program and to issue annual reports of progress.

GROWING JUNGLE

In 1954 President Eisenhower convened the White House Conference on Highway Safety. Apparently this was required to revitalize the group's interest on highway safety. A result was the formation of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety to serve as a continuing body to promote and update the action program developed in the late 1940's. In essence this program is designed to serve as a guide to State and local action for traffic safety, but there are no provisions, other than by promotion, by which the Committee can effectuate the program. The Committee can only encourage "the formation or strengthening of State and local organizations devoted to the application of the techniques of traffic safety set forth in the action program."

And so the jungle grows. Among the 37 traffic safety organizations serving on the Committee's advisory council are the American Automobile Association, the Association of Safety Council Executives, the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee, the Automotive Safety Foundation, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, the National Highway Users Conference, and the National Safety Council.

SMOKE BUT NO FIRE

Who can keep all these organizations, their functions, and their purposes straight? This is not to stay that there is anything wrong with expresed concern about traffic safety as represented in all these groups. It is merely to say that there is lots of smoke being created but there is no fire being lit by all the energy. Today, more than 20 years after the conception of the action program, the President's Committee reports that the States and major cities have really failed to measure up to the minimum traffic safety guidance program. How long does it take to get action out of the action program?

FLICKER OF INTEREST

The Congress has not been much more successful than the executive branch in its traffic safety efforts. In 1956 Representative Kenneth Roberts began his series of traffic safety hearings which lasted until 1963. The most comprehensive of these hearings was held in 1956 and they served as a catalyst to the executive branch to designate units within the Federal Establishment to be concerned wtih the protection of the American citizen on the Nation's roadways. In that same year the Congress directed that a report be prepared by the Secretary of Commerce on action the Federal Government should take to promote the public welfare by increasing traffic safety. Although timid in its recommendations, this report has served as one of the few comprehensive sources of information on the problem. But, the report and the flicker of interest in the executive branch were the only concrete actions which developed.

LIMITED LEGISLATION

Since 1961 several specialized pieces of legislation have been enacted by Congress, but unfortunately they have been severely limited in scope or almost totally ineffective. The enactments include the national drivers license register, seat belt and brake fluid standards, minimum standards on federally purchased cars, and the Baldwin amendment, which, unfortunately was changed to say "should" instead of "must."

RIBICOFF RESOLVE

We come back to the question: Why is the subject of traffic safety currently expriencing national focus in the form of 55 bills introduced in the Congress since January 1965, a Presidential recommendation in the state of the Union message, inclusion in a special Presidential message on the new Department of Transportation and almost constant attention by the national press? Because, as I mentioned the other day on the floor of the House of Representatives, we have such men as Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, who is a modern Paul Revere in his constant plea for congressional action on this subject, men who stake themselves out with perseverence to conquer the apathy.

Last summer Senator RIBICOFF attempted to get an amendment added to the excise tax cut bill that would have authorized the use of some of the excise tax funds for traffic safety purposes. His proposal was voted down. This defeat strengthened his resolve to dig into the causes of the whole problem and we have seen just that in the continuation of his traffic safety hearings last July and again this winter.

OTHER ADVOCATES

And there are others. There is Ralph Nader, whose book "Unsafe at Any Speed," has been referred to as "Unfair at Any Rate" but it has not been refuted. I have already mentioned the valuable role played by my friend Ken Roberts, of Alabama. My colleagues SAM FRIEDEL, of Maryland, and JOHN BALDWIN, of California, have also been innovators in the field, as has Senator GAYLORD NELSON in his efforts to assure that only decent tires can be sold on the market.

MACKAY COMMITMENT

My own role has been to carry out my long-standing commitment to myself to legislate on this question and to express myself as the angry man that I am when I see magnificant people snatched from our midst unnecessarily. I have attempted to study the complexities of the problem and propose an effective program that goes to the heart of the issue. With Ken Roberts' unfortunate defeat, and with JOHN BALDWIN's illness, there have been few men in the House highly motivated to action. For that reason, I have attempted to sound the alarm and to be prepared to shepherd through an effective piece of legislation, regardless of whose name is attached to it.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY

My proposal is to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency. We decided, after considering the evidence, that, as a result of better roads and faster automobiles, we now have a national traffic environment, that no individual State can build a national traffic environment by itself, that traffic losses have become a national problem profoundly affecting interstate commerce and that there should be a national response to the problem, that there should be national leadership in building a safer traffic environment, that we have been working here and there on specific facets of the problem, but that we have failed to develop an approach to the total traffic environment. We reached the conclusion that any action short of a congressional response to the traffic problem would be less than what is desirable.

That is why we propose a National Traffic Safety Agency. The purpose of the agency is clearly spelled out in the bill itself which states that it is, "to reduce the extent of death, injury, and loss of property resulting from traffic accidents by providing the means for a concerted attack on the problem through the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Agency headed by a highly qualified administrator; the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Center which shall bring together public and private information and research; and through a national program for traffic safety which shall seek to achieve a uniform national traffic safety environment by means of the vigorous application of knoweldge as to the principal causes of traffic accidents, deaths, and injuries."

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

We believe that the President's proposed legislation is a long step in the right direction, but both his bill and our bill need deep study and the legislation Congress should pass has not yet been perfected. Among other issues that will have to be considered in committee hearings are: the most desirable method of financing the agency, how performance standards for new automobiles can most effectively be determined and administered, what the timetable for action should be, and how specific the legislation should be in its direction to the executive. These are difficult questions indeed.

There is now an absence of positive national leadership for traffic safety. I believe that the State legislatures and local governing bodies will respond to the leadership proposed in our bills. My own State senator said he thoroughly approved of the idea of a uniform legal environment but he did not know where to turn to find out about what should be uniform.

ONLY TWO DEPARTMENTS INVOLVED

I predict that this Congress will act to correct these weaknesses in our traffic safety policy which are so apparent. It will be derelict in its duty if it does not act. An agency that can serve as the center for traffic safety activity in the Federal Government is desperately needed. Through my study of the problem I have found that it is not accurate to say that 16 Federal agencies have some part of the overall responsibility for traffic safety. In fact, most of them deal primarily with training and limited research for internal operating reasons. Actually there are only two major departments involved.

The Public Health Service has a Division of Accident Prevention but it has no specific statutory authority other than that contained in the broad duties of the Surgeon General under the Public Health Service Acts. Its 1966 budget is less than $2¼ million, and about three-fourths of this amount is awarded in individual research grants on the human factors in traffic accident injuries. In the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Public Roads maintains an office of highway safety which is authorized to operate under general references to highway safety. Its 1966 budget is less than $6 million, and it is primarily concerned with safety of highway construction and design.

INDUSTRY A BIT HYSTERICAL

The reaction of the automobile industry is crucial to the achievement of good legislation. Some of its leaders have been a bit hysterical because the industry has been severely and perhaps unfairly criticized. I told one of the industry representatives that an elected politician knows that abuse is part of life and that his industry should be mature enough to make an intelligent response to the present situation.

The automobile industry should be at the forefront of efforts to build a safer traffic environment, should accept the necessity for the Federal role in defining safety performance standards, and should not obstruct solutions, but should help construct them.

The easy out so long used that, "It's just the nut behind the wheel" won't work anymore. We, the people, just don't accept this.

THE TIME IS NOW

I have been in Congress long enough now to have developed a profound respect for the Members of our national legislative body. And I have known many in your ranks for many years. I believe in you.

The time has arrived for action. We are not looking for scapegoats. We are trying to prevent 50,000 men, women and children a year from becoming sacrificial lambs to our collective social negligence.

I solicit your positive action and support in helping this 89th Congress enact effective traffic safety legislation.

Slogans won't do it. Sophisticated, dedicated political action on the part of our citizens and their elected representatives can make Government serve our needs. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the sole purpose of government."

Let us then, achieve this purpose.

Bible Reading and Prayers in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, for several years, the question of Bible reading and prayers in public schools has been a matter of much conversation, debate, and misunderstanding. Many theologians, writers, and columnists have attempted to explain the basic issues of this problem, with varying degrees of success. One of the finest articles I have seen on the subject was written by the Reverend Stanley E. Melton, in his column, "Comment," which appears weekly in the Dearborn Heights Leader, published in my 15th Congressional District. I was so impressed with this article that I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COMMENTS

(By Rev. Stanley Melton)

One of the issues confronting Americans these days which has caused a great deal of noise from certain sectors is the question of Bible reading and prayers in the public schools. Let me direct a few random thoughts to this problem.

For one thing, many good people have been unduly agitated by accepting as fact certain extreme rulings which were not a part of the Supreme Court decision at all.

However, this ignorance is far more palatable than the hypocrisy involved in much of this furor. I daresay that the majority of those who have thrown up their hands in horror at this decision haven't read the Bible to their children for years and seldom, if ever, have family prayer. The school was never meant to replace the function of home and church.

There is a disease in our country known as religiosity. It acts this way. It causes us to make a polite little bow to God on many occasions and in many places (such as sporting events, civic meetings, PTA, etc.). After this little ritual we assume that we have been religious and that we have transformed the activity or organization into a Christian one. This common disease has the special danger of immunizing us against catching the real thing. It has also brought so-called religion together with some mighty strange bedfellows.

I know this is an extreme example of this religiosity at its worst, but it makes its point: Flynn Harvey, Ohio grand dragon of the National Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, tells about his troubles in trying to secure land on which to hold a meeting. He reports, "They said they would let religious organizations use it but they wouldn't let the Klan use it. We feel we are a religious organization. We cannot open up a meeting of no kind unless the fiery cross is lit, which is by electric. The Bible has to be present and if you go by the Bible and the cross, how much more religious can you get?" Thank you, Mr. Harvey, for that profound description of religion.

If this ruling does nothing more than awaken us to see that there are but two institutions on this earth which can be held responsible for religious training, namely the home and the church, then it will have been used by God for good. Too many parents are forever trying to shift their God-given responsibility to some other agency. This is the surest way to undermine our Nation's moral and spiritual vitality.

Judge James J. Comerford—Irishman of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today in New York City some 100,000 marchers will parade up Fifth Avenue as all New Yorkers join in celebrating St. Patrick's Day. The chairman of the St. Patrick's Day parade is James J. Comerford, justice of the criminal court. I want to take this occasion to salute Judge Comerford, who is a valued friend, constituent, and former associate of mine on the staff of District Attorney Frank S. Hogan. Judge Comerford richly deserves the honor of parade chairman and the sobriquet "Irishman of the Year."

I call my colleagues' attention to an article by Ed Wallace about Judge Comerford and the parade which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on March 16, 1966:

[From New York World-Telegram and Sun, Mar. 16, 1966]

Irishman of Year: After Life of Devotion

(By Ed Wallace)

The greatest thing that can happen to an Irishman, on any given day, is to serve as parade chairman of the St. Patrick's Day parade.

This year the chairman is James J. Comerford of Coolraheen, Castlecomer, Kilkenny, who has been getting ready for the job all his life.

When he was 15 years old he joined the Irish Republican Army, was wounded twice in action and received two of Ireland's highest military decorations.

Comerford came to the United States when he was 24 and in 16 years of night school, without scholarships or aid, he completed Washington Irving High School, took a bachelor of arts and master's degrees from Columbia, his law degree from Fordham and his doctor of philosophy degree from New York University.

JACK OF ALL TRADES

To pay for his education he pushed a handtruck for a grocery store, was a plasterer's helper, window cleaner and was a subway worker while attending law school.

"Each day I would carefully slice the pages from my law texts, fold them once and put them in my hip pocket. Whenever I had a minute, or even a half minute, I would whip out the pages and study * * * on the platform, or under a light on a stairway. All my old law texts have the pages cut out."

Subway workers have named him Irishman of the Year.

Comerford was admitted to the State of New York bar in 1947, served 6 years as assistant district attorney and is now a judge in the criminal courts of New York, having served previously on the domestic relations court, magistrate's court, and as a justice in the court of special sessions.

HEAD OF HIBERNIANS

He was for 3 years national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, the organization which holds title to the St. Patrick's parade.

All this from a man who arrived in New York at age 24, a time when most men are beginning to think more of settling down than finishing high school at night.

The honor of parade chairman is a degree attained through hard work and represents the pinnacle of achievement to a dedicated group of men who work the year around to bring off the parade.

Since 1950 Judge Comerford has been chairman of the formation committee, a job which can only be learned through experience and consists of assigning more than 200 marching groups their location in the parade, and keeping them in position on side streets off Fifth Avenue until their moment arrives to join the pageant.

ALL GROUPS WELCOME

The job was somewhat simplified many years ago when it was decided that the parade was open to people of all faiths and national origins, and that participation would be in groups, not as individuals.

"We are sometimes asked why we parade," Judge Comerford said. "I'd say there are several answers, but the best answer would seem to be—as human beings it is ideas and ideologies which keep us going and give meaning to the years of our lives.

"The St. Patrick's Day parade is not a protest against anything, but is in praise of many things," the parade chairman declared. "First we are honoring a saint, and we are saying at the same time—what a privilege we have to live and work in America. In a way we are calling attention to Fifth Avenue as one of the famous streets of the world—and most of all we are out to have a good time with music and banners, the skirl of the bagpipes, the cheers of the crowd.

ANNOUNCES SPRING

"When you see the varied groups which make up the line of march, an onlooker with a belief in God is surely reminded to have respect for the religious beliefs of others—regardless of what they may be.

"It is an occasion for proud steps and light spirits—winter is over and we are at the threshold of spring."

Following the oldest tradition of the parade two battalions of the 69th Infantry, 42nd Division, National Guard, will lead the pageant for the 115th consecutive year.

The "Fighting 69th" units will leave their armory at Lexington and 26th Streets, go west to Fifth Avenue, and to the regimental marching song, "Garry Owen" will step off to a beat which will follow to the intersection at 42d Street at exactly noon.

Without breaking cadence they will continue up the avenue and the 218 marching groups will flow precisely out of 44th Street and other side streets to form up the line of march which will pass the official reviewing stand at 64th Street.

If the day be fair, and everything works out, the parade will pass the reviewing stand in 6 to 7 hours.

BIGGER, BETTER THAN EVER

As always the parade is bigger than ever with a half dozen new marching units taking part for the first time. By tradition the groups will be composed mainly of bands, bagpipe in addition to drill teams from parochial schools, high schools and colleges, hospitals, schools of nursing, all the New York City departments, many chapters of the Emerald Society, and groups representing the Irish counties, military organizations, the Federal Government, and the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

All boroughs and the eastern seaboard will be on parade, including marching groups from as far as Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and Massachusetts.

"Along with all our sophistication, the parade continues to get bigger and better after 115 years and if we are becoming more ethnic, we are also becoming more tolerant and, hopefully more sensitive to our ideals," Judge Comerford said.

"Patrick, it should be understood, was a man who did his own thinking—and I believe the average man, more and more, is doing the same thing. He is thinking for himself, politically and otherwise.

"It should be a great day—for everybody."

Two of the Nation's Urban Transit Research and Development Experts Testify at House Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today two of the Nation's top experts in the field of urban transit research and development made an outstanding contribution to our Housing Subcommittee's understanding of the problems in this field.

Dr. James P. Romualdi, director, and Dr. Thomas E. Stelson, codirector, of the Transportation Research Institute of Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh, addressed themselves in particular to an amendment proposed by Congressmen Ashley, Reuss, and myself to the pending metropolitan demonstrations and urban development bills. Drs. Romualdi and Stelson supported this amendment strongly. Our amendment would direct the Secretary of HUD to prepare for the Congress by January 1, 1968, a program which looks toward a breakthrough within 5 years in research, development and demonstration of new systems of urban transport.

As these two distinguished experts testified:

> Great strides have been made in recent years in the development of techniques of systems engineering in defense, aerospace, and industrial systems. We must now modify and adapt these new techniques to obtain the best solutions to problems in the physical, social, and economic development of transit systems.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert their testimony in the Record:

Statement of Dr. James P. Romualdi, Director and Dr. Thomas E. Stelson, Codirector of the Transportation Research Institute of Carnegie Institute of Technology, on Amendments to President Johnson's Omnibus City Demonstrations, Metropolitan, and Urban Development Act of 1966

We appreciate this opportunity to express our views on the proposed amendments to the Metropolitan Demonstrations and Urban Development Acts. In particular, we wish to comment on amendment No. 4, "Expedited Program for Research, Development, and Demonstrations of New Systems of Urban Transport."

Transportation—the movement of men and materials—is a vital function of all urban centers. Free-flowing movement in traffic arteries is a sign of urban health. Congestion and strangulation in these arteries is a prelude to death. Even the most casual observer can plainly see the critical conditions of ill health suffered today in many urban centers due to transportation arteriosclerosis. Furthermore, what once seemed to be an obvious cure—the construction of more and better highways, streets, and parking facilities—is now obviously inadequate if not downright wrong. The urban transportation crisis has been thoroughly described and fully documented. We will not waste your time extending this documentation but are concerned primarily with plans that will lead to a resolution of this crisis and a return to healthy transportation conditions in our cities.

In solving a transportation problem the question is not: Can it be solved? There are many possible solutions. The real question is: What is the best solution? Time and expense are critical parameters that guide one to effective planning and the prudent use of human and material resources.

An urban center can be viewed as a large, complex system composed of many subsystems such as communications, water supply, recreation, housing, sanitation, etc. Transportation is one very important such subsystem. Here then is our first real need—the systematic research and development of new concepts in the analysis of complex systems for application to transportation problems. Systems engineering—so little understood by the general public and by a great number of technologists—is the optimization of decisionmaking and, as such, distinguishes really creative engineering from routine operations. Great strides have been made in recent years in the development of such techniques in defense, aerospace, and industrial systems. We must now modify and adapt these new techniques to obtain the best solutions to problems in the physical, social, and economic development of transit systems.

The second need is extensive research in transportation technology to develop entirely new, imaginative and better urban transit techniques. No significant research has been done since the conversion of horse cars to electric power a hundred years ago. We need a breakthrough—not only the technological breakthrough understood by many, but also a mental breakthrough in attitudes and viewpoints. Herculean technological feats in aerospace and defense fields are taken for granted. Yet, engineers and planners hesitate to make modest changes in urban transit systems. There are many reasons for this lethargy. The traditional diversity of local interests—particularly center city and suburban differences—hobble effective planning and action. Furthermore, the automobile is formidable and extremely popular competition. It has most of the desired features of good mass transit: convenience, flexibility and public acceptance. It is the only mode of mass transit for which the individual will knowingly, willfully and gladly go into debt. In the face of this obstacle, it is not surprising that private or local government capital has not ventured into experimental alternates that require large planning and construction expenditures. Yet alternates must clearly be found. For all of its apparent attractiveness, the automobile can never adequately serve all urban transit needs. One lane of modern expressway will move about 2,000 cars per hour under optimum conditions. With the current occupancy average less than two persons per vehicle, this represents less than 4,000 persons per hour. As these 4,000 persons pour into the city, they move in 6 million pounds of metal that must be stored for the day in 7 acres of parking space. In contrast, one rapid transit line running on exclusive right-of-way can move 40,000 persons per hour with little or no storage problem. The economic incentive to move to rapid mass transit is virtually irresistible yet such change is exasperatingly slow.

The second need—imaginative and innovative research—must be carefully coupled with the planning, development and demonstration of new transit systems. The serious need for more research and development is clearly evident. Studies of propulsion, suspension, guideway and control will all provide fruitful results. The economics of mass transit—and the conservation of urban land—are closely related to developments in propulsion and guideway research.

A good rapid mass transit system must be clean and quiet. It must be attractive and available when needed. It must penetrate the population pockets of the urban and suburban community and discharge passengers at a multitude of convenient locations. In short, it must be skillfully woven into the fabric of a modern city with intelligent, comprehensive planning and research. This, then, is the third need. Demonstration projects provide the final step in translating new knowledge in transportation systems and technology into reality.

For better urban rapid mass transit, there must be cooperation and organization on the local level because each local problem is unique. Planning groups must have competent personnel and assistance in the design and execution of such projects. Universities will play an active important role in these developments. Engineers must be trained to properly understand and control such new and complex systems, and universities provide the backbone of resources for both training and research. Large expenditures of money will be required to attract and train the necessary brainpower in transportation technology.

We cannot emphasize too strongly how little research has been done in rapid mass transit and consequently, of the danger of rushing into premature construction. Transport systems are expensive. Spending billions for obsolete systems would be tragic, yet many are rushing to support this position of folly. The reason for this mistake is obvious. A balloon or airplane cannot take a man to the moon and everyone realizes that a new and different vehicle must be built to achieve a moon landing. On the other hand, a horse and buggy will still move a man through a city if he is willing to risk life and limb, or better yet, people can always walk as they have for thousands of years. Thus, the urban transport problem has a different character from a moon landing. The problem is not one of feasibility, but of optimization. The need for and payoff from well-planned research may be even greater in transportation, however, because the results intimately and directly affect such a large portion of our population.

The urban transportation crisis is a national issue whose resolution will require substantial resources that only the Federal Government can provide. Assistance in planning, research, and the demonstration of new and better urban rapid transit must be substantial to be significant. This program can be viewed essentially as the breaking of a log jam—a log jam of ignorance, disorganization, and lethargy that has permitted our cities to become distorted and convulsed by lack of adequate and attractive rapid mass transit.

The City Demonstrations, Metropolitan and Urban Development Act of 1966 provides the natural opportunity to integrate the vital transportation subsystem into the total urban system. Amendment No. 4 will facilitate the logical inclusion of transportation in these activities.

War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days, I have placed in the RECORD a series of 10 articles by Detroit News Reporter Tom Joyce on the war on poverty. Mr. Joyce traveled widely, probed deeply, and wrote eloquently in seeking to answer the question "Boon or Boondoggle?"

Following the publishing of the articles, the Detroit News, a newspaper of independent bent, has commented editorially on the Joyce articles and the war on poverty. Its observations and conclusions are printed below, under leave to extend my remarks:

[From the Detroit News, Mar. 9, 1966]

PLENTY OF FEDERAL BOONDOGGLING BUT—WAR ON POVERTY A BOON

With this edition of the News, a careful study of the first 18 months of President Johnson's much ballyhooed war on poverty by Reporter Tom Joyce is concluded. The basic question posed at the start was whether this war was a "boon or a boondoggle."

Without question we believe it is a boon.

It is very easy to criticize this scheme. Born as a political campaign tool, it has been a political pawn ever since. True to the traditions of the Federal bureaucracy, it has attracted its share of incompetents, redtape, and corruption. It has meant more Federal fingers in local affairs, huge costs with small dividends, and a good deal of controversy.

We do not expect the criticism to stop, nor should it stop if there is something to criticize.

Let us hope, however, that the critics give ample thought to the facts as developed through the efforts of Joyce and others who have taken the time to make on-the-spot investigations.

For every person who reads about a rumble at a Job Corps training site, there are others who were there and can testify that job skills are being taught effectively to young people who would otherwise be destined to swing aimlessly through a lifetime cycle of poverty.

For every person who believes "you can't erase poverty," there are others who have been working in the slums and have seen this poverty cycle being broken.

In the strict sense, it is probably true that some people will always be poor because their health, age or intellect frustrate all efforts to lift them out of misery. But each new effort to ease the burden of the 34 million poor uncovers more effective ways to reduce that number.

The best time to fight poverty is right now, when abundance is so evident. It is also the time when progress comes hardest, for the poor are more easily overlooked. And the clear need for controlled Federal spending to ward off inflation further complicates the problem.

In view of the evident successes of those poverty war programs dealing with youth and job training for those with the most limited skills, it seems obvious that the strongest possible support must be given such programs.

A task of this immense size demands priorities, and if the first year and a half of experience has taught anything, it has taught that the poverty cycle can most effectively be broken at the level of the young.

Looking back on these first 18 months, we don't agree with those who claim money's being poured down that ever-present rat hole. More accurately, we have been throwing it like a handful of seeds over an acre of fertile soil.

Some of the seeds have blown away in the wind; others have fallen on rocky ground; some have produced healthy young plants and many have not had time to germinate.

Pioneer in Union Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished resident of New York—indeed, of the Nation—Mr. David Dubinsky, has just announced his retirement as president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. In the 34 years in which he served his members, he has brought them leadership in many ways. The ILGWU has been a stanch fighter for the economic rights of the workers in an industry once characterized by its oppresssion of minority group employees.

In addition, Mr. Dubinsky has been in the forefront, nationally and internationally, of the fight against Communist tyranny. He has been a force for social good and has enlisted the support of his members in the campaigns he has helped lead for more than three decades.

The New York Times today summed up the thoughts of many of us who have long admired the energy, imagination, and determination of David Dubinsky. I ask permission that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

PIONEER IN UNION STATESMANSHIP

In his more than three decades as president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, David Dubinsky has made his own name and that of his union synonymous with social responsibility and creativity. His retirement at the age of 74 deprives the Nation as well as organized labor of one of its most constructive voices. The loss is particularly acute for New York City, where the garment union has long played a pivotal role in the city's biggest industry.

Mr. Dubinsky preceded Walter P. Reuther and George Meany in enunciating the concept that labor must go forward with the community and not at the expense of the community. He helped emancipate the workers of the old Jewish and Italian ghettos from the sweatshop, then turned to the still unfinished task of protecting a new generation of Negro and Puerto Rican workers against the erosive effect on union wages of competition from "runaway" employers in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the South.

A lifelong foe of union racketeers, he was a chief architect of the ethical practices codes of the AFL-CIO. When it became clear in the early scandals over maladministration of many union welfare and pension funds that labor could not do the cleanup job alone, he was principally responsible for persuading the rest of organized labor to abandon its traditional resistance to any form of Government help in eradicating abuses.

He has never lost the sense that unionism was a cause, not a business. He extended that conception into the political realm in the last municipal election by throwing his energies into John V. Lindsay's fusion campaign, instead of lining up with Mr. Meany and the Central Labor Council in ritualistic adherence to the old-line Democrats.

To all his activities he has brought excitement and imagination, and these qualities will be especially missed in a movement increasingly dominated by organization men. The union's sound policies undoubtedly will continue under Louis Stulberg, its dedicated and able secretary-treasurer, who seems virtually certain to move up to the top spot; but no one will be able to duplicate the Dubinsky gusto.

Mitchell I. Ginsberg: A Closeup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Mitchell I. Ginsberg, the new welfare commissioner of New York City, brings a wealth of talent and experience to that crucial post. Former associate dean of the Columbia School of Social Work, he now has the opportunity to put into effect many of the progressive ideas which he previously advanced. There is a need for bold thinking in the administration of welfare programs, and Commissioner Ginsberg has already shown he intends to pioneer.

Judy Michaelson, New York Post reporter, on March 16, 1966, wrote a profile of Commissioner Ginsberg which I call to the attention of my colleagues:

[From New York Post, Mar. 16, 1966]

WELFARE BOSS

(By Judy Michaelson)

He wanted to become a baseball player, "but it became clear that although I was good enough as a fielder I couldn't hit, and there's no future in that."

He wanted to go into the Foreign Service—"nice and exotic"—but he never got anywhere. Even in the Army, during World War II, he never made it overseas.

Instead Mitchell Irving Ginsberg, 50, who is the city's new welfare commissioner, became a social worker. He is former associate dean of the Columbia School of Social Work.

A scholarship student, he had come out of Tufts University at the tailend of the depression in 1937—summa cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa, and without a job suitable for a major in history. So, while going for a master's on fellowship, he took a part-time job teaching basketball in a YMHA back home in Boston. He's 6 feet 3 inches.

"The executive director told me there was this national competition for a fellowship to the New York School of Social Work," said Ginsberg the other day in the gold-carpeted commissioner's office at 250 Church Street. In black, horn-rimmed glasses, Ginsberg still looks scholarly. And, with that broad A, he still sounds Boston.

"I figured I had nothing to lose. One, I wouldn't get in, and two, so what? So I applied, and I got it, and of course my two friends came with me."

His two friends? They had gone through 6 years with him at Boston Latin and 5 at Tufts. One, David Goldenberg, is now executive director of Hamilton-Madison House, and the other, Efraim Gale, is head of the Jewish Community Center in Miami.

"I drifted into social work, yes, but the concerns I had were always there. My father—he worked in a garage—worked 7 days a week, 12 hours a day, for very little money. I always felt something ought to be done.

"You know, there are a lot of myths about the poor," says Ginsberg, suddenly shedding the academician's demeanor. "The poor are happier, the poor are stronger. I've yet to meet a poor person who thinks he has these advantages."

In his sophomore year at Tufts, Ginsberg got a National Youth Administration job (that's the organization Lyndon Johnson headed) at 30 cents an hour digging ditches; in his junior year at 40 cents an hour cataloging all the stories on World War I from back issues of the New York Times; and in his senior year for the same money teaching sports in a settlement house. In his senior year, Ginsberg captained Tufts' tennis team.

In 1948, he married a Boston girl, the former Ida Robbins. They have no children.

Ginsberg took his new job only after considerable persuasion. He describes himself as a cautious man but now that he's in the job he's warming to it. "Three weeks and 2 days I'm on the job," he said the other day, "and everything is more than I thought. More problems, more concerns, everything takes more time—and we need more money."

His department handles 525,000 clients at a cost of a half-billion dollars, two-thirds of which is met with Federal and State funds. Last week, he announced several major changes including the creation of welfare client advisory groups and the substitution of an affidavit for a means test for potential clients, on an experimental basis. "Change comes even more slowly than I thought, but there will be changes."

Particularly, he would like to see a change in attitude on the part of the public and welfare workers toward relief recipients. "Better than 95 percent are the old, very young children and their mothers, the disabled, the blind.

"You get beaten down long enough, and you begin to behave the way other people think you are."

Uniform Time Act of 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6785), to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote no on this bill. I would have voted aye on the original bill which would have left to each State the determination of whether or not they would accept daylight saving time, but would have eliminated confusion by requiring all localities which had accepted it to enter upon and leave it at the same time.

To, in effect, require each State to adopt daylight saving time is to go too far. I opposed, while in the Oregon State Legislature, a bill which would have given to Multonomah County and contiguous counties the option to adopt daylight saving time. The confusion which resulted proved the wisdom of that vote. Oregon now has daylight saving time. Its effective date coincides rather closely to this bill, so the bill would have only a minimal effect on Oregon.

Nevertheless, the question of whether or not any one State should adopt daylight saving time should be decided by the voters of that State voting for daylight saving time rather than being required to vote against it—as this bill provides—in order to remain on standard time.

I therefore intend to vote no on this bill.

Proud Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the Houston Chronicle comments on how well our American soldiers are measuring up in Vietnam.

It quotes General Westmoreland as saying:

> I could not be prouder of the U.S. fighting men. * * * Operations by American troops have lived up to our high standards and we can all be proud of them. Not only the Army soldiers, but the Marines, too, and the U.S. Air Force and Navy fliers.

I feel that the editorial praising our men should be made a part of the Record, and herewith offer the article for publication there.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Mar. 8, 1966]

U.S. Fighting Man Is Measuring Up

Since the beginning of our Nation succeeding generations of young American soldiers have had their mettle tested on the harsh field of battle. Particularly has this been true since the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor in 1941. That act projected us into the greatest of all wars, and from it we emerged as the leading power of the free world. In upholding that leadership, young Americans have been called to fight in distant lands—first Korea, and now South Vietnam. Ultimately, the strength of the United States is determined by how well they perform, for not even the mightiest engines of destruction can substitute completely for a fighting man's personal courage and determination and aggressiveness under enemy fire.

In this regard, it is gratifying to note the appraisal of Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam. "I could not be prouder of the U.S. fighting man," the general says. "Our American troops are getting better and better, week by week. They are becoming more professional. * * * Operations by American troops have lived up to our high standards and we can all be proud of them. Not only the Army soldiers, but the Marines, too, and the U.S. Air Force and Navy fliers."

That's high praise. And America indeed is proud of this newest generation of battle-tested veterans.

Hazy on Solutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press news analyst points out that those critical of the war in Vietnam are "snagged on the dilemma of how to end it."

The writer, James Marlow, declares that the critics have some ideas on what to do or not to do—"but are hazy on solutions."

His articles, which I read in the Carroll, Iowa, Times Herald, states:

> President Johnson tried to get the Communists to negotiate. Having failed, he must continue the war, he feels, without stepping it up to such a degree that Red China might feel impelled to jump in.

The thought-provoking analysis will be of interest to my colleagues, and with this in mind, I have permission to make it a part of the Record:

Viet Policy Critics Hazy on Solutions

(By James Marlow)

Washington.—Senator J. W. Fulbright is a kind of classic example of all those critical about the war in Vietnam but snagged on the dilemma of how to end it.

They have ideas on what to do or not to do—as some showed before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which Fulbright is chairman—but are hazy on solutions.

Two speeches by Fulbright, an Arkansas Democrat, one last June 15 and one March 1, and a statement Sunday night show the dilemma of the critics of the Johnson administration which is in a bit of a dilemma itself.

President Johnson tried to get the Communists to negotiate. Having failed, he must continue the war, he feels, without stepping it up to such a degree that Red China might feel impelled to jump in.

In June, Fulbright said complete victory would be too costly but unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam is unthinkable because of the disastrous results.

Withdrawal, he felt, would betray this country's obligations to people we have promised to defend and weaken their belief in U.S. guarantees.

At the same time he was against stepping up the war, although how else the Communists can be convinced to quit fighting is difficult to imagine.

He suggested negotiations to end the war, with major concessions by both sides, although admitting Johnson's efforts to get the Communists to negotiate wound up nowhere.

Nevertheless, Fulbright envisioned a compromised peace and after that, he proposed, the United States should join with others in a large program for the social and economic development of southeast Asia.

(Johnson had proposed just such a program weeks before Fulbright did.)

Almost a month before Fulbright's June 15 talk, Johnson said the Red Chinese are bent on dominating all Asia but on March 1, Fulbright came up with another speech, this one proposing how to deal with Red China.

He suggested an agreement with Red China to neutralize all of southeast Asia although there was nothing to indicate Red China would ever consider such an agreement.

Once such an agreement was made, Fulbright said, the United States and China should pull back all their forces. But Red China does not have forces on the soil of other nations.

How such an agreement could be policed to prevent Red Chinese cheating would be monumental in itself. Fulbright did not go into details on that.

Fulbright announced Sunday night that his Foreign Relations Committee will open hearings Tuesday aimed at increasing public knowledge about Red China. He said there is a real danger that the open-ended Vietnam conflict will lead to war between the United States and Communist China.

Americans should be "open-minded and inquisitive" and try to learn all they can about the Chinese, he said.

Last Thursday, 2 days after Fulbright proposed his neutralization idea, Red China linked Johnson and his critics together as fools and said there was no fundamental difference between them about continuing the Vietnam war.

Outstanding Newspaper Career of Edwin Lebherz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues Edwin J. Lebherz who has recently retired upon concluding a 52-year career as a newspaperman in the Buffalo area and here in the Nation's capital.

Mr. Lebherz began his career as a copy boy with the old Buffalo Express and ended it as the western New York editor of the Buffalo Evening News. In the interim he served as Washington correspondent for the Buffalo Courier-Express. Between 1939 and 1941, Mr. Lebherz covered the hectic Washington beat during President Franklin D. Roosevelt's third term.

Mr. Lebherz' career has been distinguished by outstanding achievements in the journalistic world. He has long been admired and respected by all those, including myself, who were fortunate enough to serve under his able direction. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Record an article from the March 9, 1966, Buffalo Evening News praising Mr. Lebherz:

Ed Lebherz Retires, Ending 52-Year Newspaper Career—Area Editor of the News Held Many Top Jobs With Local Papers

A 52-year career as a newspaperman around Buffalo has ended with the retirement of Edwin J. Lebherz.

Mr. Lebherz, who will be 69 April 2, began his career in 1914 as a copy boy with the old Buffalo Express and ended it as the western New York editor of the Buffalo Evening News.

It was a career twice interrupted by wartime service in the U.S. Navy. In World War

I, he was commissioned an ensign. From 1919 until September 1941 Mr. Lebherz served as a reservist in Buffalo. He retired as a lieutenant commander in 1943.

When he returned from his first naval tour of duty in 1920, it was as a copyreader for the Express.

In 1926 Mr. Lebherz became the city editor of the Express, but a year later moved over for a brief time as night editor of the old Buffalo Times.

That same year he returned to the Buffalo Courier-Express as city editor, a post he held for 12 years until he became the Washington correspondent of the Courier-Express.

Between 1939 and 1941 Mr. Lebherz covered the hectic Washington beat of the pre-World War II days, during President Franklin D. Roosevelt's third term.

On February 26, 1945, Mr. Lebherz came to the Buffalo Evening News as an assistant city editor and in 1957 shifted to the metropolitan area desk. He directed reporters and correspondents covering western New York outside Buffalo and nearby areas of Canada and Pennsylvania.

A Kenmore resident for years, Mr. Lebherz now resides at 192 Linden Avenue, Buffalo.

"I've got so many things to do that I almost don't know which one to tackle first," he said recently.

Almost is right. Mr. Lebherz made his first-things-first decision and currently is enjoying the late winter climate of Florida.

To: All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, recently an essay written by Rene G. Pichard and addressed "To: All Americans" came to my attention. Reading it I was immediately struck by the special appropriateness of its message for Americans of all generations but perhaps especially for the young. It is too easily passed off as a truism that Americans take their freedom for granted. Mr. Pichard's essay gives renewed testimony to the very real extent to which we are dependent upon and indebted to those who were not born Americans for an understanding and appreciation for what it means to be an American.

So it is we continue to profit from the observations made by Alexis de Tocqueville of "Democracy in America" in the 1830's. So too, can each of us benefit, I believe, from the personal testament of Mr. Pichard which won him a George Washington Honor Medal Award from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge and, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am pleased to make available this prize-winning composition to the wider audience it deserves:

To: All Americans

(By S/A Rene G. Pichard,
U.S. Air Force)

As a naturalized American, I have something to say to many native Americans: You have no idea how lucky you are to be an American. I say this because I have known a different way of life.

When the Nazis occupied my native country, I had the choice of working at the Ford Motor Co. near Paris or of being deported to Germany as a slave laborer. I chose Ford and there heard about America's plenty and freedom. I resolved that if I survived the war, I would go to America myself. My wish was granted; in 1945, after many difficulties, I arrived in New York with my country's delegation to the United Nations.

What impressed me in America? The warmth with which Americans of all social classes received me, an unknown foreigner. The many churches of all creeds so crowded on Sundays. Complete freedom in the newspaper and in speech. American law, by which a man is considered innocent until proved guilty. Factory parking lots crowded with workers' cars, and the comfort in which the workers lived. The civic consciousness of so many ordinary Americans as reflected in charity drives, youth ogranizations, voters' leagues. The encouragement given education—scholarships, part-time jobs for students, night school classes for adults. (In my country, if one did not have the family backing to attend college in youth, a college education was forever ruled out.)

After 6 months in America I felt this way: The real greatness of America was not in the multitude of cars and refrigerators that American technical skill turned out, but in the ideals of liberty and justice that sponsored the wide distribution of these goods, and the free enjoyment of life with equal opportunity for all. Certainly these ideals had not been achieved in full, but Americans were striving hard to achieve them; they were living ideals.

Wanting to be a part of America, I found a way to apply for citizenship. When the Korean war began, I joined the Air Force, in order to serve my new country in uniform. I am still in uniform. The Air Force has made it possible for me to get an education and to develop myself in a way I could never have done in my native land. I can never do one-tenth as much for America as America has done for me. I have never for one moment regretted becoming an American. My only regret is that I am not eloquent enough to make some native Americans realize how precious are the freedoms they enjoy so effortlessly. Our freedoms are not something we can take for granted. If we are to keep them—and to extend them to every last one of our citizens, as we must in order to keep them—we will have to work and to make sacrifices. As one of the newer citizens of the world's oldest democracy, I think our freedoms are well worth the sacrifice.

Rural Areas Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for reprinting in the Congressional Record a speech entitled, "Rural Areas Development," delivered by A. T. Mace, Deputy Administrator, Rural Community Development Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at DeFuniak Springs, Fla., on March 4, 1966.

The speech follows:

Rural Areas Development

Mr. Koerber, on the part of the Department of Agriculture, I congratulate you.

And I want to congratulate all of you for creating this opportunity to publicly recognize the initiative and drive of one of your citizens.

Whole communities that should be moving forward, keeping up with the national economic growth, often feel frustrated and do not know where to turn. Through this public recognition of Mr. Koerber, community leaders throughout rural America should recognize a little more clearly that answers can be found, that economic growth, and progress and the improvement of human resources can take place.

I had the opportunity to come to Florida today with Congressman Sikes. During the trip he expressed in many ways his pride in the progress the counties in this area were making.

Mr. Congressman, I have visited with some of the people in your district and have seen some of these accomplishments. You have a right to be proud of what is taking place.

The purposes of rural areas development have been, and are today:

1. To increase the income of people living in rural America—per person and per family—and to eliminate the causes of underemployment.

2. To expand more rapidly the job opportunities by stimulating investments in rural America in all the enterprises and services that make up a modern economy—factories, stores, recreational enterprises, crafts and services of all kinds, and technically trained and other professional people.

3. To develop rapidly but in an orderly way a wide range of outdoor recreational opportunities on privately owned and public lands—recreational opportunities to serve the needs of a growing population in the cities and towns and rural areas.

4. To readjust land use, nationwide, to achieve a balance so that each acre and resource are used for purposes to which they are adapted, and to meet national needs.

5. To preserve and improve the family farm pattern of American agriculture.

6. To provide appropriate services and adequate financial support for the protection, development, and management of our soil, water, forest, fish and wildlife, and open spaces.

7. To improve existing rural community facilities and institutions and where needed to build new ones so that people in our rural areas are assured pure water supplies, first-rate schools and hospitals, adequate streets and roads and other services that are standard in a modern community.

8. To make continuous and systematic efforts to eliminate the many complex causes of rural poverty.

Despite the productive triumph of the agricultural segment of the rural economy, the rural areas have not shared equally with the rest of the Nation in income, in job opportunities, and in resources for human development.

The 1960 census showed median rural income at $4,381 compared with urban income of $6,166.

Almost half (46 percent) of the families with money incomes under $3,000 live in rural areas—although fewer than one-third of America's households are rural.

Rural America has almost three times the proportion of dilapidated and substandard houses as urban America.

Educational preparation of schoolteachers is lower in the rural areas. A recent National Education Association study shows 39.2 percent of the rural teachers with no degree. The comparable urban figure is 10.9.

Emergency services, including ambulances, are often inadequate or nonexistent in rural areas.

Unsafe waste disposal and water supplies present health hazards in many rural communities.

The ratio of physicians and surgeons per 100,000 population was 178 in central cities of metropolitan areas and 52 in rural areas in 1960.

The rural areas development program has rested, and continues to rest, on two structures. The first of these is the committee made up of local leaders interested in economic development and improvement of human resources in rural areas. The second is the technical action panel made up of the State or local representatives of the agriculture agencies together with people from other Federal agencies and from the State agencies. Beginning in 1961, rural areas development committees on a county and State basis were formed rapidly. For some months, we have had something more than 2,100 of these committees in operation. This is more than two-thirds of the number of counties in the United States.

In his February 4, 1965, message to the Congress, the President called for strengthening the rural areas development program through the provision of an outreach service wherein the field agencies of the Department of Agriculture would assume responsibility for rural people having full access to all of the services of the Federal Government for which they were eligible.

The President said:

"It is not easy to equitably distribute Federal assistance to a scattered rural population. Rural communities often lack the specialized organizations found in major cities which keep informed of development programs and initiate action to make use of them. Special measures must be taken both by the States, and by Federal agencies to reach rural people, particularly in remote areas.

"Since it is clear that an administrative office for each Federal agency or program cannot and should not be established in every county, a method must be developed to extend the reach of those Federal agencies and programs which should, but do not now, effectively serve rural areas."

This afternoon we have seen real evidence that local people were working together—and working together effectively to solve their problems.

As someone said this afternoon, once you start you can't let up.

As someone else pointed out, once you get one thing rolling, it is easier to get something else done.

I might add another success truism. If you find that you are started after something that won't work, don't be afraid to kill it and start over.

This job you are doing is different from anything a farm-oriented person has ever done before. This calls for working with bankers; with engineers; with chemists; with Madison Avenue salespeople. It involves working with other agencies. It involves long trips to see strange people.

But it can be done.

You will do it.

You are doing it.

Vietnam, by Wick Fowler, Correspondent for the Denton Record Chronicle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a series of articles by Mr. Wick Fowler, correspondent for the Denton Record Chronicle, Denton, Tex. Mr. Fowler has just recently returned from an extensive tour of Vietnam, and I feel that his articles are not only very timely, but also self-explanatory of our position in South Vietnam; such as the enclosed editorial by Fowler.

Mr. Fowler was the first Texas newspaper correspondent in two wars. During World War II, in Italy, Fowler was one of four American correspondents injured when bombs hit a house on the Anzio beachhead. Among the others was the famed Ernie Pyle, later killed in the war in the Pacific.

I am also enclosing an article by Nat Henderson, staff writer for the Austin Statesman, Thursday, March 3, 1966 following an interview with Mr. Fowler:

Time for Cohesion

Vietnam is everybody's war. It is not an ordinary police action.

Whatever decisions are made in Washington as to how the situation is to be handled, Americans owe an obligation to the Armed Forces fighting for survival in this foreign land almost halfway around the world.

It is not a war limited to those who are involved directly. Many thousands more Americans will be in Vietnam before the conflict is ended. Many billions more in American dollars will be spent.

Many votes will be changed because of actions by men in public office. But these are small costs compared with sacrifices made by our men in Vietnam and by their loved ones back home.

Vietnam was a long time in coming, a gradual process of our foreign policies of many years' standing, to feed and secure nations of the world. It is a result of our stand, whether weak or strong, against Communist conquests of nations that wanted to have no part of them.

There is an ironic undertone to testimony at Washington hearings from military and political experts who now offer criticisms and solutions. The irony lies in the fact that many of them were in positions of power when the original policies were laid down and later pursued.

They now scream their criticisms, long after their horses broke out of the stable.

Isn't this about the right time for cohesion all over America and in many foreign lands? If we determine that the Communists will not listen to anything but guns, then we had better talk to them in an explosive language they understand. You do not have to be a seer to see that the longtime Communist doctrine is one of conquest of free nations, including the United States.

In the meantime, while Government officials are determining the route of the Vietnam war, Americans have many opportunities to give support to the men over there. They need supplies and they need moral support from home.

They need more supplies of a nature to win over the population, for this is a major side of the war. We must help in obtaining school facilities for the villages and hamlets, for education is one of the big answers to the riddle of denying communism's expansion.

Something of a practical nature needs to be done for the hundreds of thousands of refugees who have flooded Saigon and other areas. That is, they are to be returned to their home areas with higher ideals and ambitions to live under self-rule and freedom from terrorism, whatever its source.

It is apparent that the South Vietnamese need to become more aggressive in this war, for it is primarily their war for life itself. The government we are advising needs to learn the rudiments of democracy, real democracy. It needs to close that big gap between the hierarchy and the peasant.

Democracy and free elections are not something you can hand to a culture that is 4,000 years old and expect it to be understood. This will take years of education and examples of how a real democracy works. Right now, there is about as much understanding in Vietnam of democratic processes as there would be in explaining the Einstein theory to an elementary school dropout.

Our American boys in Vietnam are doing a magnificent job. But they need all-out support, unified support to win the objectives in this war. It is a war, not a police action.

The Reds understand strength, and power, and authority. They are anxious to sit down at a peace table when they are whipped.—Wick Fowler.

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman,
Mar. 3, 1966]

Reporter Scores Homefront

(By Nat Henderson)

One of the top newsmen in Texas has returned to Austin from Vietnam with a call for escalation of the war on the homefront in tactical support of the troops on the battlefront.

"We're simply not measuring up here to the guys that are fighting over there," Wick Fowler says after spending 2½ months as a war correspondent in Vietnam.

"It burns me up to see the difference—a serious war there and a political war here.

"We think about losing votes—they about losing lives," Fowler says in a reference to elected officials.

"We must concentrate more on supplies and equipment instead of debating on who started the war."

Fowler takes a dim view of the diplomats and private groups within the United States which worry more about what France and certain other nations think than about the actual American sacrifices in Vietnam.

"All Americans must get behind our fighters both morally and physically.

"Why waste away Americans to try to please some country across the world and out of the war?"

He adds, "As long as they're killing Americans, we've got to be more serious than pleasing another nation whose men are not being lost."

Fowler predicts a long war that will affect more and more homes as the casualty lists come out week upon week.

"When these strike closer to more families and their neighbors, then more people will realize that every American is involved in this thing. The tragedy unfortunately will wake them up," he says.

"But now, we've got a great bunch over there, and we're not giving them enough help and support by a long shot. We can't quite realize this is a serious war—not a political action or a little sideshow."

Fowler is critical of the misguided humanitarians who want to continue supplying North Vietnam with food and medical supplies but who in reality "kill more Americans" by doing so.

"The British claim they only send nonstrategic supplies to North Vietnam, but when will people learn that all supplies are strategic in war? When will they realize that each bowl of rice only makes someone stronger and gives them the energy to make arms that shoot Americans or build roads that take enemy troops into conflict with our own men?"

Fowler also is critical of those who want to continue the war at a snail's pace in order to appease Red China.

"Nobody over there is afraid of the Red Chinese, and even if they were, they'd rather fight them now and there while they don't have nuclear capability," Fowler says.

While a controversy continues over supplying North Vietnam with nonstrategic goods, American soldiers in South Vietnam cannot get such nonstrategic items as lighter fluid and other goods needed not for war—but for comfort.

"The PX in Saigon has anything, but those in the north—fighting zone—have nothing. It's not a problem of shipment but lack of distribution," Fowler says.

"The Government could straighten out this if it would," he adds.

Fowler, who traveled in Vietnam as a correspondent for the Denton Record-Chronicle, went into the field looking for Texans while carrying a German camera, Japanese film, and Italian typewriter.

"Texans were everywhere, and there were more aggies than at a muster. At Da Nang alone I found five aggies and one teasipper," Fowler said in a humorous vein that has made his reporting popular wherever he goes.

But the smile faded as he returned to the serious side of his trip to Vietnam.

"Why do we play politics with lives? We haven't lost anybody in a political campaign."

Macon, Ga., Telegraph Selected To Receive Georgia Education Association Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 16, 1966, the Macon, Ga., Telegraph received the School Bell Award presented to the outstanding daily paper of the year by the Georgia Education Association for outstanding school news coverage. Specifically, the award was made for excellence in reporting and/or interpreting the objectives and goals of education.

It is significant that this award takes place when, today, almost 1,000 correspondents representing over 500 newsgathering agencies are reporting from the House and Senate Press Galleries of this Capitol. These journalists are dedicated people who perform a valuable service to the public, to their employers, and to the Nation. These are the people who record the events of today which become our country's history.

Equally important, however, are the unmentioned chroniclers who constitute the administrative staffs of the news media, for it is these people who are responsible for putting the news into its proper perspective. It is therefore of special significance that the Macon Telegraph is recognized in such a manner.

Many man-hours and extensive personal cooperations are involved in producing a newspaper. The efforts of those involved are usually taken for granted by the average American citizen who purchases the finished product for 10 cents.

Being chosen the recipient of this award illustrates the fine job that the Telegraph are doing in keeping the public informed of school activities, which are a vital part of the life of any community.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the ownership and staff of the Macon Telegraph, and include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the daily press of Georgia on March 16, 1966:

THE TELEGRAPH SELECTED TO RECEIVE GEA AWARD

ATLANTA.—The Macon Telegraph has been selected to receive one of four School Bell Awards presented annually by the Georgia Education Association for outstanding school news coverage.

Editor William A. Ott will accept the honor at the School Bell Awards dinner, which will open the 99th GEA convention in Atlanta Wednesday night.

Other winners are The Swainsboro Forest Blade in the weekly newspaper category, WSB–TV of Atlanta in the television category, and WLFA of LaFayette in the radio category.

The awards are made for excellence in reporting and/or interpreting the objectives and goals of education. Nominations are made by members of the teaching profession.

The Telegraph was nominated by the Bibb County GEA unit, which is headed by Otho Pirkle, principal of Jessie Rice Elementary School.

The basis for the judging was a scrapbook prepared by Mrs. Juanita Krysalka of the Bibb unit's public relations committee. Other committee members who worked on the project are Chairman Mrs. Valree Flanagan, Mrs. Florence Sanders, Mrs. Jacquelin Harrison, and Don Edwards.

The GEA judges said of the scrapbook, "The content reflected good community support of education, good editorializing, and interest of newspaper in wide coverage. Information about activities of individuals and groups as well as the total school program was covered."

Receiving honorable mention will be the Brunswick News, Mrs. Constance Johnson of the Columbus Ledger, the Cordele Dispatch, the Warrenton Clipper, the Elberton Star, the DeKalb New Era, and North DeKalb Record. The Fitzgerald Herald, the Hartwell Sun, WAII–TV in Atlanta, WGST radio in Atlanta, and WSB radio in Atlanta.

The awards will be presented by Julian A. Pafford of Statesboro, chairman of the GEA school public relations committee.

Featured speaker for the dinner will be J. C. Bostain of the Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Slovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, March 14 is an important day for Americans of Slovak origin. It is the anniversary day of Slovak national independence. Public ceremonies marking this day will be held in many communities throughout the United States.

Great credit must go to the people of Slovakia for their unbreakable attachment to liberty and their struggles for the right of self-government. This spirit prevails in Slovakia today despite foreign occupation, the denial of elementary human rights and organized programs to destroy the ancient culture of her people.

There is increasing evidence that the new chains of imperialism on the Slovak people are weakening under the popular pressure exerted by the people for freedom of expression and self-government. This is a tribute to their determination to reject foreign occupation and to fight on for a restoration of their national independence.

Mr. Speaker, anything we can do to encourage the Slovak people in this cause serves the cause of peace and world freedom. Over many years responsible national organizations have urged the Voice of America to establish a Slovak desk as a part of our international information program. I have supported that proposal because I am convinced the best way to demonstrate our friendship for the people of any foreign country is to speak to them in their own language, to recognize their cultural values, to encourage them in their just aspirations for self-government.

The Slovak people have always maintained a warm friendship for the people of our country and a keen admiration for our free institutions. It is time that we responded more fully to evidence our support for their struggles to regain their national independence. A Slovak desk in the Voice of America would provide comfort and encouragement to our friends in that unhappy land.

I salue the Slovak people on their Independence Day and join with their many friends in our country in the hope that they will soon regain their rightful place in the community of free nations.

What Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, amid the clamor to boost interest rates and taxes to ward off inflation, the voices of reason are beginning to be heard. A substantial segment of the Nation's business leaders see the dangers and the possible consequences of underestimating the continuing need for capital to sustain our economic growth.

The ingredients for classic inflation are not present in our economy today. Administered price hikes, profiteering, and speculation can exact a tremendous toll from the American people, and they must be brought under control; however, it should not be done in a way that slows the legitimate productive requirements of our economy. These malfunctions in the economy must not be permitted to push us into deflationary policies that are sure to bring on a recession.

Columnists Evans and Novak have expressed some of the concern that is felt in the business community over these proposed policies. I recommend to my colleagues their column, "What Inflation?" from the Washington Post of March 16, 1966:

WHAT INFLATION?

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Just as the Washington consensus has come to regard an income tax increase as nearly inevitable this summer, a strong dissent is starting to be heard from a minority both in industry and on Capitol Hill.

That dissent boils down to this: Inflation today is more phantom than reality. The increase in the cost of living results more from arbitrary decisions of business executives trying to widen profit margins than from classical overheating of the economy. Under such conditions, a tax increase will do no good.

Consider the big tax package in embryonic form at the Treasury for possible submission to Congress this summer along with new Vietnam war appropriations. This package almost surely would boost income taxes across the board, for both individuals and corporations. The present 47-percent rate on corporations would climb to 50 percent.

But, ask the dissenters, to what good would this do? Their answer: Corporation executives probably would pass on the higher taxes to the consumer by raising prices to maintain profit margins. But if they cut back expansion and production because of higher taxes, the inevitable result would be the very shortages that lead to higher prices.

Thus, the stage is set for a massive struggle to influence President Johnson's decision. Never at home in the field of economics, he has been understandably preoccupied with the problem of Vietnam and has given little time to economics. But the time is near when he must decide whether to boost taxes.

Strongly in favor of raising income taxes are the Treasury, most of the official and unofficial presidential economic advisers, and Wall Street. Big finance in New York, obsessed by the threat of inflation, is in a panic demanding a tax boost.

Added to this powerful roster supporting a tax increase is the Federal Reserve Board headed by William McChesney Martin. This independent central bank has left no doubt that if the President does not boost taxes, it will fight inflation its own way. That means continuation of the high-interest rate, tight money policy that has restricted credit more than at any time since Eisenhower days.

But against this formidable array, there is now a dissent that asks: What inflation?

Some leaders in the automotive, steel, and electrical manufacturing industries believe the danger of inflation is greatly overblown. They worry about soft spots in the boom economy and a slackening off of demand, particularly in the auto industry.

To these industrialists, the real danger is the spiraling of interest rates induced by the Federal Reserve Board and its fellow-travellers in the banking industry—money being the one commodity on which the White House is unable to impose price guidelines. The fact that the Fed in continuing to squeeze the lending power of banks is viewed by one industrial leader as a "crude and cruel" method of controlling inflation that can lead to a slump and unemployment.

In fact, the dissenters are coming to feel that explosive combination of a big income tax increase and tight money could trigger the first recession of the Kennedy-Johnson era—a slump actually coinciding with rising costs in the Vietnam war.

But how can Mr. Johnson ask for higher spending on Vietnam without an accompanying tax increase? The dissenters' answer is to keep a full economy rolling, satisfying demand, and keeping prices down.

This would require much more credit than is available today. It would require a new monetary policy. One suggestion that may soon come privately to the President is to ask bankers to adopt a more selective lending policy—easy credit for increased production but tight credit for speculative purposes.

This emerging dissent on the basic question of inflation and taxation leaves the door barely open for the President to ignore his top advisers, all of whom favor a tax boost. A tax increase, followed by even a small economic slump just before the election, may give Mr. Johnson pause.

Our Dope Problem—And Yours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a series of legislative proposals on the subject of narcotics, which is not only a problem in New York, but also in the Nation and throughout the world.

In my 17th Congressional District there is an outstanding weekly publication called Town and Village which has been seriously concerned with this problem and is conducting a campaign to ameliorate it.

In their issue of Thursday, March 10, 1966, there is an editorial describing the situation as they see it.

I include at this point in the RECORD this editorial, and I hope that all of my colleagues will have the opportunity to read it:

OUR DOPE PROBLEM—AND YOURS

To our way of thinking, the most important point in the dope story on today's page 1 is the spillover of addicts from south of 14th Street into the town and village area, looking for the easy victim who will provide property or cash to purchase the next "fix." As our anonymous reporter concludes: "We are, indeed, one city * * * and the problems of each of us have a nasty way of becoming the problems of all." Since many newspapers (including this one) have previously run exposés on dope, it seems to us that the distinction of this piece is its emphasis on the spillover phenomenon from slum neighborhoods into respectable ones.

In spite of good police work, the number of addicts continues to grow. As fast as the kids are picked up, other kids arrive to "turn on" in their place. We know from having talked with the officers involved just how discouraging a task it is to keep our streets safe and clean. The odds have been stacked against the police, until now, until the presentation by Governor Rockefeller of a comprehensive, coordinated program of compulsory treatment of addicts and more severe punishment for peddlers. More than 2 years ago Assemblyman Paul J. Curran and town and village staffer Pete Young anticipated the Rockefeller program with a proposal for compulsory civil commitment of addicts. It is refreshing to see their work (and the work of many others) now bearing fruit.

But keep in mind that what the Governor proposes is going to cost the taxpayers at lot of money. Many millions of dollars will be involved, especially for the bond issue that will be necessary to finance the construction of new treatment and detention facilities. From the most hard-headed accounting point of view, this is (in our opinion) a good investment. Various surveys have disclosed that dope addicts are responsible for about one-half the crimes committed in New York City. Addicts steal approximately $1 billion worth of property and cash in this city alone, each and every year. So the Governor's program makes a lot of sense, both economically and ethically. We urge you to assist in its passage in any way that you reasonably can.

Two arguments on the dope issue fail to impress us. The first is a wierd bleat from the weird bleaters that the civil liberties of addicts will be menaced somehow by compulsory commitment for treatment. These same people have argued for years that the addict was not primarily a criminal, but rather a sick man. Now, when it is proposed to treat him like a sick man, like a dangerous schizophenic, let us say, the cry of civil liberties is suddenly heard in the land. This is nonsense. The commitment proceedings under the Rockefeller program are as carefully controlled and as subject to due process as commitment proceedings for mental illness.

The other argument, which comes from the weirdest bleaters, is (if we may summarize): Dope is good for you. Beatnik poet Allen Ginsberg has expressed it best with his picket signs reading, "Smoke pot. It's cheaper and healthier than liquor." This is more nonsense. It stems from pseudophilosophers in the East Village and elsewhere who maintain that we are moving into an era of expanded consciousness achieved by marijuana, heroin and the very newest mind-benders such as LSD. There is no telling how many impressionable teenagers have been, and will be, seduced by this kind of intellectual posturing. Dope is not good for you; it is deadly dangerous. And there is no record of any musician, artist or writer improving his performance while being "high." Our congratulations to such community institutions as St. George's Episcopal Church which have presented eminently worthwhile programs discussing these plain facts.

We also will continue to discuss the plain facts about dope, and we will keep you posted on the status of Governor Rockefeller's comprehensive program.

Statehood Legislation for Hawaii

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues today in celebrating the anniversary of the date that statehood legislation for Hawaii was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives.

The overwhelming vote of March 12, 1959, climaxed years of effort by the people of territorial Hawaii to obtain full citizenship status. It cleared the way for the Presidential proclamation which finally declared Hawaii to be our 50th State.

Beautiful Hawaii, often referred to as "the loveliest fleet of islands that lies anchored in any ocean," will celebrate her seventh anniversary as a State this August. And, it is an unusual testimony to the maturity of the democratic spirit of our youngest sovereignty that she, more than any other State, has recognized in both legal and living terms the essence of equality and tolerance.

Discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, or ancestry is not only forbidden in Hawaii by law, but is a stranger to the harmonious spirit of one of the most friendly and polyglot spots on earth. Hawaii's citizens come from every corner of the globe, and they have welcomed and returned in kind the gracious spirit of aloha.

It is interesting that Hawaii is not only a young State, but her citizens, also, are young and energetic. The average age of the island resident is 24 years old, younger than our national average. And they are educated young people. Hawaii's fine educational system can boast of having the highest university enrollment in proportion to population of any other State.

Culturally, Hawaii hopes to become a bridge between East and West. Her varied ethnic composition gives her a unique advantage in promoting international relations and understanding. In the summer of statehood, 1959, the University of Hawaii sponsored the third decennial East-West Philosophers' Conference. Over 40 leading philosophers from 11 nations came to the island paradise. Today Honolulu's newly constructed International Center can seat more than 11,000 persons in a theater-concert hall and arena complex.

Hawaii's natural advantages are abundant. Her warm equable climate offers year-round appeal to the vacationer. Her location in the mid-Pacific is ideally suited to international trade with the nations of Asia and the Pacific rim. Her strategic military value is unquestioned. So, also, is her value for the expanding research and development activities in the fields of oceanography, volcanology, and astronomy as well as in space vehicle and missile tracking and in the studies of solar radiation and other astronomical phenomena.

Hawaii, our most western and most southern extension of the United States, has been a beautiful and proud addition as our 50th State. The translation of her official State motto gives an inspirational reminder of her ideals: "The life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness."

Already the home of a civilized and graceful people when first discovered by Capt. James Cook in 1778, Hawaii has bloomed through the dynasty of Kamehameha into the 20th century and statehood with enviable success. She has been able to derive the benefits of modern life without losing her charm and Polynesian softness.

The brotherhood of man is a meaningful concept in our outlying State, a rather strange paradox since she, not the mainland, felt the bombs of World War II. Let us hope that mankind can learn from her example.

Action Urged

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Constitution praises the administration's efforts to control crime, and it adds that further delay in passage of a bill to control firearms sales is "inimical to the public welfare."

The paper hails the calling for more effective action against crime, for more efficient courts, improved corrective machinery, and comprehensive planning for major reforms.

Because the article sheds light on such a vital subject, I offer the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 11, 1966]

CUTTING OUR CRIME BILL

President Johnson's message to Congress on control of crime is significant from several standpoints. In calling for more effective action, more efficient courts, improved corrective machinery and comprehensive planning for major reforms, he was reacting to the rapid increase in the Nation's crime bill.

If this crime toll, running into billions annually, can be lowered, the additional investment will be worthwhile. The President asked for increased appropriations for the 1965 Law Enforcement Act from $7.2 million to $13.7 million—a modest price to pay in relation to the crime bill.

The President does not propose to take over responsibility of local law enforcement agencies. He does propose to improve them through Federal programs in education and research into techniques. If carried out, these would result in a more uniform system of justice, administered by more capable officers.

Stressing rehabilitation programs, the President asked for consolidation within the Justice Department of Federal prison, parole and probation functions. And the Secretary of Labor was directed to develop "effective ways to provide correction institutions with job information for good-risk paroleess."

As for the indiscriminate sale of guns, the President cited an urgent need for legislation to regulate the flow of firearms into dangerous hands. Here he should know whereof he speaks.

"There is no need to curtail the right of citizens to keep arms for such traditional pastimes as hunting and marksmanship," the President declared. "But there is a pressing need to halt blind, unquestioned, mail-order sales of guns and the over-the-counter sales to buyers from out of State whose credentials cannot be known."

Control of firearms sales is already before Congress. Further delay of its passage is inimical to the public welfare.

No Room for "Goo-Goos" in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Evening Star carried an excellent report on the war on poverty in Chicago. This penetrating article on Chicago's effort to effectively eliminate poverty was prepared by Mr. Haynes Johnson, a staff writer for the Evening Star.

I would like to call this article to the attention of my colleagues and in particular to those who have been so quick to criticize Chicago's program.

It is most significant to me that so distinguished a reporter as Mr. Johnson with no particular ax to grind nor any reason to embellish any of his facts has prepared an impartial and factual report on the situation in Chicago.

I congratulate Mr. Johnson for his thoroughly impartial reporting. He has performed a most significant public service by putting the antipoverty program in Chicago in its proper perspective.

Mr. Johnson's article follows:

NO ROOM FOR "GOO-GOOS" IN CHICAGO

(By Haynes Johnson)

CHICAGO.—Near the door was a huge smiling photograph of Richard J. Daley, the mayor of Chicago. Inside there were bands and bunting, posters and placards, potted palms and plants, red-white-and-blue curtains, a Negro boys' choir singing "Our Unity Enjoy" and "The American Dream," and a banner spread across the stage saying:

A YEAR OF COMMUNITY PROGRESS

It was reminiscent of a thousand block rallies, ward meetings, and political conventions, but this was different. In typical lusty fashion, Chicago was saluting its own efforts in the war on poverty.

The alderman, the Cook County judge, the city commissioner, the county board member and the people listened while the speakers, quoting Lincoln, Roosevelt and Kennedy, described what progress Chicago has made in that fight against poverty.

When the speeches were over, all the photographs had been taken and the crowd was milling about, a Negro standing off to the side said quietly:

"It has a chance to work if they'll let it. You know everybody's in favor of change if it doesn't hurt them—but you can't have change without hurting someone."

Change and conflict are the dominant notes in Chicago's poverty program. Out of this ferment comes a strong sense of action and genuine, if limited, accomplishment.

There's no doubt that Chicago's poverty program is enmeshed in politics. But that doesn't mean politics has sullied the program, or that Chicago is the classic example of the noble poor engaged in a virtuous struggle against the venal politicians.

This is not the old-style blatant pork-barrel politics of the past. It is more subtle, and probably more successful.

One can look far and wide in the Chicago poverty program for evidence of outright patronage appointments or political hiring and firing. If it exists, it is not apparent. Instead, Mayor Daley seems bent on running a good program—perhaps on the correct assumption that a good program bears its own political fruit.

In a poverty campaign as in all its public acts, Chicago is pragmatic and tough-minded. It does not have time for "goo-goos," Chicagoese for do-gooders. Yet of all the local wars on poverty this reporter has seen, Chicago's is the most dynamic. It is also the most controversial, for this is the scene of a national philosophical and political struggle.

Essentially, the fight in Chicago is over the interpretation of the Economic Opportunity Act, the law under which the Federal war on poverty operates.

Chicago—and that means Mayor Daley—takes the position that the act stresses local, not Federal, initiative. The city wants to run its own program its own way. Washington says that even if it is not spelled out in the law, the Government must set the standards and program criteria.

The central issue is control of the program and that vexatious clause in the act which states that poverty programs must be "developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of the groups served."

Everyone agrees that means the poor must be involved, but what is "maximum" and what is "feasible" and in what way shall they "participate"? As other articles in this series have shown, these questions are the source of bitter controversy in communities across the Nation.

Mayor Daley and his supporters say the poor are involved in Chicago's program, and there appears to be a good basis for the claim. But his critics don't agree.

The major opposition comes from a group called the Woodlawn Organization located in the heart of the South Side slums. The Woodlawn Organization, or TWO as it is called, was established by Saul Alinsky, whose community action groups have worked to achieve progress through such tactics as demonstrations, rent strikes, and political pressure.

CRITICS ASSAIL POLITICAL CONTROL

TWO wants a share of the Federal poverty money to be used to operate programs free of city control. In a recent issue of its own publication, for instance, TWO defines "the great issue before this Nation now" as:

"Can public funds finance basic, root reform of the social structure and values of America, by going to independent groups organizing the poor? Or will the billions coming from Washington simply continue, with much more expensive advertising campaigns, the present state among poor Negroes of alienation and degradation?"

To the Woodlawn leaders, the present war on poverty is "actually a war against the poor. * * * It is a war against us when money is used to buy off our rage against being confined to the ghetto. It is a war when public money is used to distract black people from building enough power to break out of the ghetto."

Stripped of its rhetoric, the complaint is that the poverty program is controlled by the ruling political power. In Chicago that means the Daley Democratic organization, the last of the big city machines.

Daley unquestionably does control the overall poverty structure. He heads the committee that runs the poverty program. He appoints the committee director who in turn appoints the program center directors. They in turn appoint the advisory committee members who are the representatives of the local communities. They pass on all poverty program proposals.

Arrayed against Daley have been militant local groups like TWO and, at least in the early days, an important segment of the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington.

"They had a group in OEO that saw the program as an opportunity to reform the world, and they were going to start with Chicago," said a city official.

DALEY DEFENDS APPOINTIVE SYSTEM

Washington wanted members of the advisory committees, who were the so-called representatives of the poor, to be elected rather than appointed. Such an election will be held in Los Angeles on March 1.

Daley countered along these lines: in volatile Chicago such an election would tear the city apart and create animosities that would never heal. In addition, an election of that kind in Chicago, would mean only that every ward leader would make sure that his own handpicked man won.

To Daley supporters, the present appointive system "guarantees," as one official said, "minority representation." Debatable though that may be, that issue of representation appears to have been settled months ago, in private confrontations between Mayor Daley and Sargent Shriver, the head of the OEO (and the former president of Chicago's school board as well as the manager of the Chicago Merchandise Mart).

Today Shriver himself is as much a target of the militant groups here as Daley. When Shriver spoke in Chicago last December, the Woodlawn Organization picketed his appearance. Its members marched and waved such signs as "The War on Poverty Is Pure Brutality," "Your American Dream Is My Nightmare," and "End the War on the Poor."

The demonstration was not without its cynical aspects. One might conclude that TWO is not so much against the war on poverty as it is against not getting more money.

(At present TWO operates in part on a $70,000 poverty grant, funded through the Chicago, or Daley, program, and has pending a $700,000 leadership proposal.)

CITY'S PROGRAM MOVING AHEAD

While the struggle between the ins and the outs continues, Chicago is proceeding with its multimillion-dollar program.

When they set out to plan an antipoverty campaign, Chicago officials began with the general viewpoint that poverty stems from many factors, not merely lack of money or jobs. Education, health, housing, environment, recreation, cultural opportunities—all these are a part of the problem.

In addition, there are special problems in slum areas. As Dr. Deton J. Brooks, the executive director of the city's antipoverty organization, said in an interview:

"Long before I took this job I was writing the social philosophy that people had to be involved in their own destinies. You don't have to go far in Chicago to see that people are isolated.

"One of the basic problems had been an erosion of social and leadership services in their communities. When 5 o'clock comes in those areas, the social welfare forces leave and all that you have left are the forces of control—the police and firemen.

"Before people can help themselves, they have to have a chance to get the services, and I mean around-the-clock services, because a city like this never sleeps. The problems don't wait for a time when it's convenient for us to be there."

The solution, for Chicago, was the establishment of urban progress centers. These are outposts in the heart of the worst poverty areas of the city which bring services to the people.

CENTERS OPEN EVERY DAY

There are seven such centers. They range in size from a three-story building complete with a gymnasium to smaller structures with less elaborate facilities. Each center houses a number of public and private agencies. Among them are the county public aid department, the city housing authority, the youth welfare commission, the board of health, the State employment service and legal aid lawyers.

The centers are open 7 days a week, from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. Soon they will be open on a 24-hour basis. They provide more than the basic social welfare services. Some, depending on needs in the specific area, are staffing mental health or retardation programs. In other, preschool and home economics classes are operating. Still others have programs for "senior citizens."

Each also has an office for making available small business loans to local firms.

What is most impressive about the centers is the sense of action and drive. You can visit any center, at any time of the day, and find people hard at work dealing with people in that community.

The response in the areas has been gratifying, if not overwhelming. People are coming, voluntarily, off the streets to find out about jobs, or housing, or educational programs, or with complaints about landlords or garbage collections.

In one center, for example, 43,000 persons came through its doors in exactly 1 year.

WORKERS LIVE IN AREAS THEY SERVE

But the most important part of the center concept lies outside its physical structure.

Each center employs a group of community representatives. Like most of the other employees of the center, they live in that area and they themselves were either unemployed or "underemployed."

The community representatives spend their time away from the center. Their job is to go from house to house finding out what the specific problems are. Then they attempt to bring those people to the center where they can be served.

These representatives are available on a 24-hour basis. Since they live in the neighborhoods, they have a better chance to gain the confidence of the residents. The centers now are publishing their own community newspapers of 4 pages with photographs and stories about the programs and people in their area.

As only one of the programs, teams of representatives are collecting urine samples from children in homes in an attempt to detect and treat cases of lead poisoning. Other groups are surveying buildings as part of a rat control program. Holes and cracks are marked, and then covered.

PRO AND CON ON ELECTION

An intensive effort is thus being made to reach the people in most need. A house-to-house survey is now underway to identify the people who live in poverty, and to pinpoint their problems.

To some critics, such activity is only skimming the surface of the needs. The Reverend Lynward Stevenson, president of the Woodlawn Organization, has said:

"The northern power structures running the so-called war on poverty have dressed up the system a bit, but the idea is fundamentally the same: the Negroes must stay in the ghetto, because they are not human beings * * *. They are like animals in a zoo (and now) * * * it has been decided to dress up the zoo a bit with poverty funds."

Stevenson then sounds again a call for elected representatives of the poor.

Deton Brooks' answer is:

"I say you don't need a convention to kill rats. You may need an army, but not a convention. As long as we stick to bread and butter issues that people understand, these critics have no impact."

Support for U.S. Policies in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the charge is frequently heard that President Johnson is losing the support of American citizens in our fight for freedom in Vietnam. This is entirely contrary to the facts. But since the charge is often repeated and much publicized, it is in the national interest for such irresponsible accusations to be frequently and firmly refuted.

I have seen no finer expression of the true feelings of most Americans about the situation in Vietnam than an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Virginia Gazette.

The Gazette is one of the oldest newspapers in the Nation, having been founded in 1736. It is published in Williamsburg—a community with traditions extending back to before the founding of our Republic.

In this editorial the editor and publisher, Mr. John O. W. Gravely III, tells of a recent community declaration in support of our men in Vietnam. The declaration—which was signed by 4,000 citizens of the Williamsburg area—also expresses their "dismay, shock, and shame at the small groups of misguided and frightened people who criticize U.S. actions in Vietnam."

The Virginia Gazette sets forth these facts to illustrate its conviction that the people of Williamsburg are not losing sympathy with the cause of the valiant Americans fighting in Vietnam, and that thousands of other communities in this great Nation of ours feel the same way. That is also my conviction, and in support of this conviction, I insert this splendid and patriotic editorial in the Record:

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We write to you not as a constituent but as an American.

You have been quoted in the press quite frequently of late as saying that President Johnson is rapidly losing the support of millions of American citizens with regard to our fight for freedom in Vietnam. We have a growing conviction that this simply is not so. Here are a few local facts that feed that conviction.

Some weeks ago two Williamsburg citizens, an insurance agent and a barber, came into this office and said they were worried about all of the publicity being given to the draft card burners and bearded protestors criticizing U.S. involvement in Vietnam. As individual citizens they wanted to voice their wholehearted support for the American fighting man over there. They were convinced a lot of other people wanted to do the same thing, if there were only a way. We hatched the idea of a petition, a community declaration of support for our men in Vietnam, which would be available for anyone and everyone to sign. No big rally, no fireworks—just a simple declaration. The three of us composed the following:

"A DECLARATION

"We citizens of the cradle of democracy—the historic Williamsburg-Jamestown-Yorktown area—feel a special duty and privilege to proclam publicly our support of present U.S. policy in Vietnam.

"Caring for the torch of freedom never has been an easy job. Americans first lit the flame with determination and great personal sacrifices at Jamestown, added more fuel at Williamsburg, and made it permanently bright at Yorktown. Since then despots and dictators frequently have threatened to extinguish this symbol of man's God-given right to liberty. Each time Americans have been among the very first to go and help keep freedom's flame burning. They have answered this calling down through history, whenever and wherever it took them—to such places as New Market and Gettysburg, San Juan and Santo Domingo, Belleau Wood and the Argonne, Okinawa and Bastogne, Berlin, and Lebanon, Inchon and Saigon.

"Today we look with dismay, shock, and shame at the small groups of misguided and fightened people who critize U.S. actions in Vietnam. Our fighting men over there are doing what has become a sacred obligation for all straight-thinking Americans, what so many forefathers did before them—protecting the torch of freedom from those who would snuff it out.

"We, the citizens of this community, want the President, the Congress and the Nation to know that we support 100 percent our sons, relatives, and friends who are fighting and dying in Vietnam. They are acting in the finest American tradition, defending that precious torch so that those at home may live in the secure warmth of its flame. Their actions will not go unremembered."

The Williamsburg declaration was published in this newspaper. Copies were printed up and displayed at various public places around the community. Signers were welcomed. The response was immediate. The mayor of the city of Williamsburg and the chairman of the board of supervisors of James City County became the first signers. Virtually every civic, social, and church organization in town lent their endorsement. In an amazingly short time, the declaration collected more than 4,000 signatures. A copy of the declaration, together with all of the signatures, is now being sent to our Virginia representatives in Washington.

Last November this community received word that Glenn Dill Mann, a Williamsburg resident and graduate of the College of William and Mary here, was killed while serving as a Marine helicopter pilot in Vietnam. There was an immediate upsurge of sentiment to do something in his memory. In a single day students at the college donated 501 pints of blood to the Red Cross in a brief salute to this departed alumnus. The urge for a more lasting tribute continued. Last month the idea for a Glenn D. Mann Scholarship Fund was born, and already students at William and Mary have raised $2,300 for this cause. The community at large is now rallying behind the fund, and it is certain to become a permanent memorial to Captain Mann.

Last fall newspaper publicized the fact that many American servicemen in Vietnam missed getting enough mail from home. Students at the public schools in Williamsburg and James City County, acting more or less on their own, responded with a letter-writing campaign. Youngsters in all grades began writing hundreds of letters (no one can know the exact count) to servicemen they did not know.

One Army sergeant wrote back to an elementary school child in December and mentioned that he knew a lot of South Vietnamese children, tragic victims of the war, were not going to have a very happy Christmas. The letter was published in this newspaper. Again the response was immediate. Williamsburg school children donated several truckloads of toys, clothes, etc., which were sent to Vietnamese orphans.

We mention these local facts, Senator not to bring undue credit to our community, but merely to illustrate that there are citizens here who are not losing sympathy with the cause of valiant Americans fighting in Vietnam. We are personally convinced that thousands of other communities in this great Nation of ours feel the same way.

But you, apparently, think otherwise. As a U.S. Senator you must travel to a lot of places to get your information. One thing is for sure. You haven't come to Williamsburg lately. Maybe you should.

Very sincerely yours,
John O. W. Gravely III.

The Economic Development of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the story of economic development in Puerto Rico is one of the great success stories of this decade. It is a tale of which that island can well be proud; and the citizens of the United States, who have helped to make that progress possible, can share in her pride.

In a speech in Washington on February 24, 1965, the Honorable Santiago Polanco-Abreu, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, compresses the island's history into a very few, eloquent paragraphs. Our colleague notes in his conclusion:

> In the 5 years since Castro has ruled rich Cuba, its per capita income has declined by 15 percent. During these same 5 years, Puerto Rico's per capita income has risen by more than 50 percent. I can think of few statistics which are more sobering.

The progress of Puerto Rico is indeed sobering. It is also heartening. Our distinguished colleague, Mr. Polanco-Abreu, has told it well. The text of his speech follows:

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF PUERTO RICO

(By Santiago Polanco-Abreu)

There is probably no group in the world which is more dedicated to the goal of economic development of less wealthy nations than the membership of this society. I feel very much at home with men who are personally and professionally wrapped up in the vast problems of the two-thirds of the world who still live in great poverty.

Certainly all of us are perturbed by the enormous gulf which separates the "have" from the "have nots" nations, and even more perturbed by the fact that this gulf seems to be growing, rather than diminishing.

Happily, there have been some noteworthy exceptions to this trend of the rich getting richer, while the poor get poorer or barely hold their own. The rates of economic growth in Japan, Israel, and Puerto Rico, for example, are now much higher than the growth rates of more highly developed countries. In contrast with most underdeveloped countries, moreover, their growth has been nothing short of spectacular. Today, Japan, Israel, and Puerto Rico are on the other side of the fence, sending their technicians and providing technical assistance to their less fortunate neighbors.

Recognizing that Puerto Rico is no more a typical case than Japan or Israel, it is nevertheless worthwhile. I believe, to understand something of its economic development history in order to see more clearly some of the problems characteristic of underdeveloped countries and some of the solutions that have proved workable in Puerto Rico.

In 1898, when Puerto Rico was ceded by Spain to the United States, the island was indeed underdeveloped. Most people lived in poverty on small subsistence farms. Families were large and few children could be educated. Coffee was the only important export, and the total volume of overseas trade was small, indeed. The beginning of a modernized Puerto Rican economy was the development of sugar as a major export industry.

Growth of the sugar industry provided a necessary base for the more diversified economic development that was to come much later. The method of its development, however, was most damaging to the people of Puerto Rico. The sugar industry, largely owned by U.S. interests, took out from Puerto Rico far more in profits than the amount it invested or reinvested.

The depression of the 1930's hit Puerto Rico with great severity. Sugar and coffee prices tumbled to ruinous levels. Many coffee plantations, which had been severely damaged by hurricanes in 1928 and 1932, were not replanted. Everywhere there was deep social and political unrest. Puerto Rico was on the brink of revolution. Federal relief programs, although substantial in size, were not sufficient to offset the collapse in the economy.

When it did come in 1940, the revolution was a peaceful one. A newly-formed political party, led by Luis Muñoz Marin, won a slim victory at the polls. Muñoz had campaigned, not on the traditional basis of Puerto Rico's political status, but on immediate and pressing economic and social issues. He promised bread for the hungry; land for the landless peasant; and freedom from political domination by the absentee sugar companies. His victory brought hope to a people that had for many years been mired in hopelessness.

During the war years, Muñoz and his new Popular Party administration laid the groundwork for the economic and social development programs which were later to be put into high gear. They also had a revenue windfall of $160 million from countervailing excise taxes on rum, which sold in large quantities in the United States during the war. And although this was badly needed for public assistance and a score of urgent, immediate problems, the Government made the decision to invest this revenue in a number of public corporations intended to spearhead Puerto Rico's economic development.

Included among these publicly-owned corporations were utility companies in the fields of power, water supply, transportation, and communications. There were five others that had specific economic development objectives—the Government Development Bank, the Industrial Development Company, the Land Authority, and the Agricultural Company. Today, there are 22 public corporations in operation. Most of the larger ones are self-financing and today their assets total well over a billion dollars. Their establishment early in the program and their continued record of sound and constructive management have been major factors in the success of the development program as a whole.

To appreciate the strategy of the development program that was being planned and started in the 1940's, one needs to know something about Puerto Rico and its resources. The island is only about 100 miles long and 36 miles wide. We have sunshine, beaches and the sea, mountain, and a tropical rain forest.

Coffee and tobacco, and fruits and vegetables are grown in the mountains; and we have a rapidly-expanding livestock and poultry industry, which produces about as much farm income as sugar cane, our traditional crop.

It began to be clear even in the 1940's that Puerto Rican economy could not depend primarily on agriculture. The entire surface of the island has less than an acre of land per person and only about a third of its is suitable for crops of any kind. Even forestry is limited by the rugged terrain and by the great variety of trees and undergrowth typical of forests in the tropics. Prospecting for minerals started years ago and continues actively, but none has yet proved exploitable.

With limited land and no commercial resources of fuel or minerals, industrial development has had to be the key element in Puerto Rico's economic development program. But there were many people in the 1940's, including some of the experts, who believed that an industrial program was doomed to failure in a small agricultural country with such limited physical resources. In any case, it seemed quite clear that private investors would not initially undertake so rash a venture unless the government functioned as a very active catalyst.

At first the government constructed and operated five factories, but it soon became evident that it would be impossible for the Industrial Development Company to create jobs for Puerto Rico's rapidly rising population by this method. Some way had to be found to enlist private capital on a large scale in the industrial program. A sound program of tax exemption, which was legislated in 1948, has proved to be the key incentive necessary for the development of private industrial enterprise in Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico's program of tax incentives and assistance to private industry rests on two basic elements in Puerto Rican-United States relations. In accordance with its association with the United States, Federal taxes (with minor exceptions) do not apply in Puerto Rico and there are no tariffs or other restrictions on the flow of trade and money between the two areas. Since most Federal taxes, including the Federal corporate income tax do not apply in Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rican Government, by exempting a corporation from its own taxes, is able to grant complete tax freedom. Under present legislation, it does so for manufacturing and hotel enterprises for a period which ranges from ten years of tax exemption in the San Juan metropolitan area to 17 years in less-developed parts of the island.

Free trade with the United States, the other key element in United States-Puerto Rican relations, meant that a manufacturing operation in postwar Puerto Rico was not limited to what was then a very small local market. A plant efficient enough to compete with U.S. producers and also able to pay ocean freight costs, was in a position to sell without any other restrictions in what was, and is, the world's largest common market.

Our promotion efforts were at first slow in yielding results. By 1950 only about 80 new, privately operated plants has been promoted, and most of them were relatively small. By 1955, 300 new privately owned factories had been established. Today, 10 years later, there are more than a thousand new, privately owned factories operating in Puerto Rico. Most of them are affiliates of U.S. manufacturing concerns.

These factories produce over 300 different products. Apparel, textiles, electronics, machinery, and petrochemicals are among the largest and fastest growing of the new Puerto Rican industries. About three-quarters of their output is exported, mostly to the United States. Last year (1963–64), exports of the new industries totaled $556 million, more than three times the value of our shipments of sugar and other agricultural products. Manufacturing industries now employ 105,000 workers at an average wage of $1.15 an hour.

Puerto Rico is no longer a one-crop agricultural economy, moreover. Agricultural production has continued to expand and diversify. The value of livestock and poultry products, for example, is now about equal to sugar. But even with a growing total of agricultural production, manufacturing is today more than twice as important as agriculture as a source of income and as a stimulus to the general economy.

To develop manufacturing to the point it has already reached has taken considerably more than tax exemption, free trade, and promotion. The Puerto Rico Economic Development Administration and our vocational educational system have had to train thousands of workers and supervisors. Many manufacturers have needed and have received marketing, engineering, and other forms of technical assistance, as well as laboratory and testing services. For nearly a decade, the Industrial Development Co. has maintained a stock of about 50 new factory buildings throughout the island ready for immediate occupancy. The company and the Government Development Bank stand ready to participate in almost any kind of financing arrangement that seems mutually beneficial to the prospective manufacturer and to the people of Puerto Rico.

Tourism development was another logical target for Puerto Rico. The island's kind climate, its golden beaches, and its beautiful scenery provided the natural resources on which a major tourist industry could be built. Nevertheless, tourism was a relatively slow starter.

But in the past 7 years the growth of Puerto Rican tourism has been spectacular. We have about 7,000 hotel rooms, two-thirds of which have been built within this 7-year period.

Primarily because of the swift expansion of manufacturing and tourism, the growth of the Puerto Rican economy as a whole has been among the most rapid anywhere in the world. Discounting price increases, the increase in real Commonwealth gross product during the past 5 years was 58 percent, an average of 9.5 percent, compounded annually. The largest gains in real gross product or real national income recorded elsewhere by the United Nations were 9.6 percent for Israel between 1952 and 1960, and 9.5 percent for Japan between 1954 and 1960.

It is, of course, a great flow of capital investment that accounts for Puerto Rico's record, or near-record rate of economic expansion. For 7 years, gross investment in fixed capital has been 20 percent or more of Commonwealth gross product. Last year it was 24.6 percent. Such a high rate of investment is characteristic of highly developed countries like Holland, Sweden, Canada and the United States but not of underdeveloped countries where capital is ordinarily very scarce.

Recognizing the high productivity of new investment in our economy, Puerto Rico has not only welcomed but actively promoted the investment of outside capital. As a result, about half of the funds invested in Puerto Rico have come from external sources, mainly the United States. There are three principal channels through which these funds flow in: first, direct investment, mainly in factories, hotels, and commercial establishments; second, the sale of bonds and other obligations of the Commonwealth and municipal governments and the public corporations; and third, the purchase of Federal Housing Administration guaranteed mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association (called Fanny May) and other investors outside Puerto Rico.

Direct investment of externally owned funds in Puerto Rican factories already exceeds half a billion dollars. Outstanding obligations of the Commonwealth and municipal governments and of Puerto Rico's public corporations total nearly a billion. Nearly two-thirds of this is accounted for by the public corporations, of which the Water Resources Authority is the largest.

I have been speaking in economic abstractions. Now let me translate this into human terms. In 1940, Puerto Rico's per capita income was $121. By 1950 it had inched up to $279. In 1964 it reached $832, almost triple the figure of 14 years earlier. Even allowing for price increases, this meant that real per capita income had more than doubled in the past 14 years. In 1950, per capita income in Puerto Rico was barely 18 percent of the U.S. average, but by 1960, it had risen to 30 percent. So even in comparison with the United States, the gap has been closing rapidly. These per capita figures have, of course, deep human meaning. They mean that a man who was worried about being able to afford a pair of shoes 25 years ago, now worries about finding a parking space for his Chevrolet; and that the woman who then wondered if she could feed her children, now is concerned with providing them with high school or college education.

Let me cite some revealing indexes of this new, relative prosperity. In only 6 years, the people of Puerto Rico raised their per capita consumption of animal proteins from 54 percent of the U.S. average to 82 percent. In these same 6 years, the registration of motor vehicles increased twofold, while the number of telephones has doubled in only 3 years. University enrollment is twice that of 9 years ago, and per capita expenditures for public health are now about the same in Puerto Rico as in the United States. One of the most dramatic results is that a Puerto Rican baby at birth can now expect to live to 70 years.

All these are impressive gains, but it is certainly logical to ask how much of Puerto Rico's experience has any relevance to the needs of other developing areas, and how much is peculiar to its own special conditions. Primary among these, of course, is the special economic-political relation with the United States.

Let it be said from the outset that Puerto Rico's spectacular growth could never have been achieved without its special relationship to the United States. But it is equally true that this relationship did not automatically give Puerto Rico a passport to prosperity. The fiscal and trade relations with the United States which exist today are almost precisely the same as those which existed from 1898 to 1940. Yet prior to 1940, the economic situation of Puerto Rico was desperate. The great change in productivity and per capita income has taken place only in recent years, and despite the fact that the economic intrinsics have not changed. "Why?" you may ask.

And here let me say frankly that I will give you a personal opinion, rather than a scientific evaluation. I believe that the heart of Puerto Rico's spectacular growth lies in the sterling quality and unshakable stability of its Government; in its true, genuine concern for social as well as economic development, and in its constant consideration of the human element.

Puerto Rico has been fortunate in having a stable, dedicated, democratic local Government, whose chief executive and leading figure was Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin until his retirement this year. It has been a government characterized by unfaltering devotion to the public welfare, by noteworthy sentiment of honesty, and by the tireless participation of a number of men of unusual competence and imagination.

Secondly, the Puerto Rican Government never lost sight of the fact that its economic development programs were for "people," and that they had to be translated into social and economic benefits for people as rapidly as possible. The people, in turn, having confidence that the Government was deeply responsive to their needs and hopes, were willing to make necessary sacrifices over many years while the development programs were getting slowly underway. It was essentially a political challenge and, in all developing areas, one of the most critical and most difficult—to provide insipration and hope of the type which unleashes a sustained, creative outpouring of energy, even when early, visible returns are meager. Providing this kind of inspiration was one of the outstanding accomplishments of Governor Muñoz-Marin and his government.

Finally, both in Government and in other fields, there has been an extraordinarily rapid accumulation of education, of expertise, and of skills. Barely 15 years ago, there were virtually no industrial skills or tradition in Puerto Rico, for example. Today, most of the highly sophisticated industrial plants have Puerto Rican managers, to say nothing of Puerto Rican engineers and technicians. A whole new generation of industrial and commercial entrepreneurs has sprung up with astonishing speed. This is only one facet of Puerto Rico's vast effort in education.

In sum, the basic reason for Puerto Rico's rapid growth has been good government, a genuine concern for people, and a passion for education. Stirred together, these have accounted for the explosion of energy which has allowed Puerto Rico to tackle successfuly a job which many regarded as impossible.

Indeed, it is fair to say that the economic benefits of Puerto Rico's special relationship with the United States have barely compensated for its dearth of raw materials, lack of local market, and its former lack of industrial tradition or capital. These special benefits merely gave Puerto Rico fighting chance. Many other developing countries have, on balance, a far more promising pattern of intrinsic circumstances than Puerto Rico has, even today.

In final analysis, which countries succeed and which ones flounder, usually reduces itself to the human element. The great natural riches of any country, in the absence of good government, are only a mockery. Yet basically poor countries can, with good government, achieve remarkable feats, seemingly in defiance of the laws of economic gravity.

Although perhaps the case of Puerto Rico is unusual, this, in my opinion, is the really important lesson of Puerto Rico's development. There are, of course, a number of specific Puerto Rican techniques and experiences which could be studied—and are studied—by other developing countries. I refer, for example, to Puerto Rico's highly effective promotional techniques for attracting maximum amounts of investments and tourists, and the mechanism of the Economic Development Administration for translating these into income and jobs at an accelerated rate. But in essence, these techniques are meaningless unless there is honesty, dedication and competence in government, to provide overall planning and leadership. Alongside such prime requirement, all else pales into insignificance.

While the Puerto Rican experience merits the study of underdeveloped countries, in my belief, it also illustrates a very valuable lesson for developed countries. It is these countries which are asked, through various channels, to help finance the development of the poorer countries. For them to do so willingly and enthusiastically it is useful to be able to appeal to their self-interest, as well as to their conscience.

For years the theory of development has been that, once an area was well on the way to higher income, it would become a sufficiently attractive market that the countries contributing to its development would profit economically, as well as morally and politically. Here Puerto Rico has become a telling example.

In 1940, when its per capita income was only $121, Puerto Rico's outside purchases were negligible. Today they are well over $1 billion a year from the United States alone. The 2,500,000 people of Puerto Rico buy nearly as much from the United States as the 56 million people of highly developed West Germany and the 53 million of Great Britain. They buy substantially more than any our European country, and in fact more than any other country in the world except Canada and Japan. Puerto Rico's purchases in the United States now generate substantial amounts of income and create many thousands of jobs in dozens of States of the United States.

In sum, a formerly poor area was an insignificant market. As a direct result of its rapid economic development, however, it has become one of the really important world markets, despite its small size and population. This suggests that, if other underdeveloped countries could also increase their per capita income, even at a much more modest rate, the growth in new and profitable markets for the developed nations could become almost staggering in scale.

I would like to end on a frankly political note. In the Caribbean, historically, Cuba has been a rich island, happily endowed with great expanses of fertile fields, raw materials, and other natural blessings. Puerto Rico has been the poor cousin, whose heavy population pressure against scarce natural resources is one of the most unfavorable in the world. Yet in the 5 years since Castro has ruled rich Cuba, its per capita income has declined by 15 percent. During these same 5 years, Puerto Rico's per capita income has risen by more than 50 percent. I can think of few statistics which are more sobering. And, for developing areas, I can think of none that are more meaningful.

The Need for Tire Safety Legislation, and a Tribute to Ken Roberts for Pioneering Leadership in Auto Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday morning to appear before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at hearings presided over by Chairman HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, to urge prompt action on H.R. 688, a bill which I introduced on the opening day of the 89th Congress, and which former Congressman Ken Roberts and I jointly sponsored in the 88th Congress, prohibiting the manufacture and sale in interstate and foreign commerce of unsafe automobile tires.

Under the legislation, the Secretary of Commerce would be directed to determine standards for safety in automobile tires and these standards, after a necessary transition period, would become minimum mandatory standards for interstate commerce in tires.

Since this bill was originally introduced—it was the first such bill in either House—many Members have sponsored similar bills or others going to the question of safety in all components of automobiles. The interest in this subject is now so widespread and intense that I am extremely hopeful we can enact legislation in this session. The Senate Commerce Committee has approved a safe tire bill and President Johnson, in his message on transportation, specifically called for passage of such a bill along with other legislation on traffic safety.

THE ROLE OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IS OFTEN IGNORED

In my testimony before the committee yesterday, I felt it only fair to give credit where due on this issue—to Ken Roberts, who pioneered the crusade in Congress for safety on the highways. No Member of Congress worked harder or accomplished more in this field than our former colleague from Alabama. My reference to Mr. Roberts obviously touched a very responsive chord in the hearts of many of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who felt, as I did, that too often the work done by conscientious and dedicated Members of Congress as pioneers in a new field is too quickly forgotten or ignored once they leave the House.

Even while we are still here, our efforts are sometimes lost sight of when—after a long battle to break through the apathy on some new issue—the results are just taken for granted, and those officials who administer the programs, or the experts who participate in the conferences and seminars and discussions in connection with the operation of the laws, often seem to be completely unaware of the part played by the Congressmen who pioneered the whole thing.

I think the sensitivity of Members of Congress to this sort of thing was evident from the comments of members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on my references to a former colleague. I had no idea he would be present in the hearing room when I made my statement, but I was indeed glad to discover after I testified that Mr. Roberts had been sitting in the back of the room—once again demonstrating his great interest as a citizen in legislation he did so much to help shape in the field of automobile safety while a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my testimony yesterday on tire safety legislation, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN ON H.R. 688, HER TIRE SAFETY BILL, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON AUTO SAFETY LEGISLATION, TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1966

Chairman STAGGERS and members of the committee, I am deeply grateful to the chairman and to the members of this committee for turning your attention once again as a committee to the dangers which confront every American on the highways of this country, and to legislative solutions for the frightful harvest of death and crippling injury in traffic accidents.

Countless Americans today owe their lives to legislation handled by this committee—in the whole broad field of health. And, to the extent that we now have Federal standards of safety and performance for automotive parts and accessories—particularly seat belts and brake fluid—this committee is responsible.

For a long time, the leadership on the committee in this field was taken by Congressman Kenneth Roberts, of Alabama, as chairman of the subcommittee which had jurisdiction. His defeat in 1964 in the startling Republican sweep of Alabama was a blow to all of us who admitted the conscientious manner and the effective manner in which he pursued the goal of greater highway safety.

As a matter of fact, the bill for which I testify here this morning was originally drafted by Ken Roberts. He and I had discussed the mounting toll of highway crashes directly or indirectly attributed to defective automobile tires and I asked him to have an effective bill drafted which I could cosponsor, if he agreed with me that the question of tire safety was serious enough to warrant this kind of legislation.

When introduced by Mr. Roberts and myself in the 88th Congress, this was the first piece of legislation introduced in either House, I believe, to prohibit the manufacture and sale in interstate commerce of unsafe tires, and to require the Government to establish standards which tire manufacturers must adhere to.

If Congressman Roberts had returned to the 89th Congress, I am sure he would have reintroduced the measure and pushed it vigorously. When I reintroduced it on the opening day of the new Congress, I was proud to put my name to the bill—and I am proud now to speak for it—but I have always felt that Mr. Roberts' authorship of the measure should be made clear.

Since he and I took this initial step on tires, many, many additional proposals have been introduced in the Congress to assure greater safety on our highways, and to set up Federal programs to protect the public from bad drivers and faulty equipment. I am sure that no matter how much legislation we pass, however, or what standards are set, we will still have traffic accidents and traffic fatalities, for a weapon as powerful as the modern automobile—and it is a weapon under the right circumstances—is not easily controlled by laws. The youth who drives too fast, the salesman or truckdriver who drives long distances without sufficient sleep, the driver—male or female—who daydreams about personal problems while at the wheel, the individual who uses pep pills or other drugs which have dangerous potential on the highways—all confront us when we get in our cars to go across town or across the country.

MURDER BY TIRES UNSAFE ON THE DAY THEY WERE MADE

They are hazard enough for us to contend with. But when you have to gamble, too, with the possibility that a 2- or 3- or 10-ton projectile hurtling in our general direction in the next lane, or across a level median strip, at 60 or more miles an hour may suddenly go out of control because of mechanical deficiencies in the structure of the vehicle, I think we are entitled to more protection.

As I have followed the controversies over the years on automobile design and construction, it is obvious that no automobile which will travel at turnpike speeds can be made completely safe and foolproof under all circumstances.

But what excuse is there—what possible excuse—for permitting on such vehicles tires which will explode or collapse at prolonged high speed, turning the automobile into an unguidable torpedo which could kill any of us who might happen to be on the same highway at that exact moment?

The Federal Trade Commission has spent years investigating the merchandising jungle of new automobile tires—the misleading quality designations which trick the customer into buying a tire which cannot possibly be safe over its tread life at the speeds at which it will probably be driven. To say to the customer: "Buy a better tire; pay more and be safe" often is not the answer, either.

But tire prices would have a greater relationship to tire quality if there were clear-cut Federal standards for tires, and if unsafe tires could not be manufactured and sold under any circumstances, for use on highway vehicles.

As the members of this committee all know, I have introduced many bills over the past 14 years which have come before this committee dealing with the health and safety of the American people. Many of those proposals eventually became law, but only after years of consideration, review, discussion and debate. It is well to have patient and painstaking investigation of the need for legislation, before acting on it; but sometimes the needs are so overwhelmingly evident—so compelling—as in this instance, that to delay would be to make Congress, in effect, an accessory to every murder by automobile caused by tires which were unsafe on the day they were made. Let's stop that kind of unnecessary carnage.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Remarks of Earl Boyd Pierce, East Texas State Historical Society, Commerce, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1966, an outstanding address was delivered before the East Texas State Historical Society by one of Oklahoma's outstanding trial attorneys, Mr. Earl Boyd Pierce, of Muskogee.

Mr. Pierce, who is general counsel for the Cherokee Nation, is also a long-time student of the history of the Cherokee people.

A Cherokee himself, he has been instrumental in presenting his tribe's claims before the Indian Claims Commission. He has also taken a leading role in the organization of the Cherokee Neighborhood Youth Corps, which has contributed a great deal to the progress of several of our northeastern Oklahoma counties.

Mr. Pierce, in his speech in Texas, outlined some of the highlights of the dramatic and interesting history of the Cherokee people, whose leaders have throughout the years made a great contribution to the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, and because of the interesting subject matter covered in the address, I am making this speech available for the RECORD:

REMARKS DELIVERED TO THE EAST TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY, COMMERCE, TEX., MARCH 12, 1966, BY EARL BOYD PIERCE

Mr. President, members and guests of the East Texas State Historical Society, ladies, and gentlemen, a recent event in Oklahoma limits the nature of the remarks I had intended on the subject listed on the program. Presently, the Oklahoma Bar Association is engaged in wide discussion of certain canons of the ethics which govern the members of our bar. Among these is Canon No. 20, limiting pubic statements by attorneys concerning matters either in actual litigation or which may at some future time be litigated. The rule is not restricted to criminal matters. Therefore, I have requested one of our young Cherokees to present a matter which could, on merit, be accepted by you. It is my hope that my remarks, limited in scope as they shall be, will not be considered as a deliberate infraction of any rule of professional ethics, and hereafter frowned upon for any reason.

Due to the kindness of Dr. Flaccus, of Austin College, and of his friendship for the husband of my daughter who lives in Sherman, I have been asked to speak upon a subject, which because of its origin is, perhaps, better known to many of you than it is to me.

Succinctly stated, the facts of the Cherokee claim are these. Sixteen years or more before the commencement of the struggle for Texas liberty and the erection of the Republic, a respectable band of our Cherokees, under the leadership of Richard Fields and the bowl, had settled in east Texas, upon lands pointed out to them by emissaries of the Spanish regime. Later, their occupancy was recognized by the Mexican authorities. Their settlement in Texas preceded by 1 year, at least, the appearance of the Moses Austin Colony from Missouri. Col. Ethan Allen Hitchcock, who traveled extensively among the tribes in present eastern Oklahoma, on a mission for the War Department in 1841, speculated that the Cherokee entry was made into east Texas in 1818. Others have said, however, that their actual arrival occurred in the following winter of 1819–20.

The Texas Cherokees occupied and farmed an acreage lying northwest of Nacogdoches, in the region of the Neches and Sabine Rivers, north of the San Antonio Road. Dr. Dorman Winfrey, some time ago, in his very valuable "Monograph on the Texas Cherokees," published a map fairly indicating the boundaries of the property involved.

The declaration of the consultation of all Texas, done in convention at San Felipe on the 13th of November 1835, and the unratified Texas-Cherokee Treaty of February 23, 1836, together with the legal opinions of the Republic's attorneys general, Birdsall and Terrill, provides the moral, if not the legal, basis for rights the Cherokees confidently believe to be fixed and certain. To this day, no official act or other deliberate conduct of the Cherokees has been committed to justify a valid belief that these rights have either been disposed of or abandoned. Their expulsion from their lands and from Texas in 1839, by military force, seems to have resulted directly from the Republic's change in Indian policy under President Lamar. The Cherokee refugees crossed Red River under escort and eventually came to the Cherokee domain in present Oklahoma. There they and their descendants ever afterward have been regarded as native Cherokees. Not until March 7, 1964, 125 years after their expulsion, was any official recognition given to the matter by the government of Texas, save and except that of President Houston and his two attorneys general.

This brief statement of the case prompts the thought that this occasion should not be misused to attempt to present a legal claim against Texas, a claim which arose 7 years before the advent of your statehood. Until the State legislature provides a forum to hear the case, as the United States has done for the American Indians generally, a discussion of our claim per se is purely academic. The long denial of a forum should not prejudice the claim by lapse of time. However, we propose, with your indulgence, to lay before you, before we finish, some of the salient facts of history which appear to support the claim.

Those of you who have become well acquainted with General Houston's fidelity to the Cherokees need no argument to convince you that it was one of the sorrows of his life that his friends had been injured, and their property rights in their Texas land ignored. Hundreds of our people, today, revere the name of Sam Houston, as much as that of any tribal member whose deeds may ornament our history. As long as he lived, he defended the Cherokees; and certainly he was no stranger to our people. Self-exiled from his own, and in the depths of despair in 1829, he returned to us. Here, overcome by sickness, he was nursed back to health by his Cherokee friends, from what he thought was his deathbed. The Cherokees not only officially adopted him as a member of the tribe, and, until his death in 1863, considered him our only ambassador and protector; also our history teaches that he asked for, and the Cherokees gave to him, one of its fairest daughters. Tahlahina, or Tiana Rogers, his Cherokee wife was a member of perhaps one of the most notable and distinguished families of all our people. In 1833, he came to Texas and to a destiny unparalleled in American history.

You have a right to know who were and are the Cherokees with whom the liberator of your great State became so firmly and so steadfastly attached. Since 1939, I have been an adviser to the constituted authorities of the modern Cherokees. At present, I am their general counsel. Native born among them, with my name included upon their rolls, I have never forsaken them, or denied them. As a student of history, I have come to know some of the facts pertaining to their unique relationship to the people and State of Texas, as well as to the Government and the other citizens of the United States, with whom by treaty and other law the Cherokees have been bound since 1785.

The first treaty between the United States and the Cherokee Nation was executed on November 28, 1785 (7 Stat. 18, 2 Kapp. 8), and provided in part as follows:

"Article III. The said Indians for themselves and their respective tribes and towns do acknowledge all the Cherokees to be under the protection of the United States of America, and of no other sovereign whosoever."

Article II of the treaty of July 2, 1791, between the Cherokee Nation and the United States (7 Stat. 39, 2 Kapp. 29) provided in part that, "the undersigned chiefs and warriors, for themselves and all parts of the Cherokee Nation, do acknowledge themselves and the said Cherokee Nation to be under the protection of the United States of America; and of no other sovereign whosoever."

Under the above treaty provisions, and under article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States the Cherokee Nation became a dependent Indian nation under protection and control of the United States (*Cherokee Nation* v. *Georgia*, 30 U.S. (5 Pet.) 1, 17–20; *Choctaw Nation* v. *United States*, 119 U.S. 1, 28; *United States* v. *Creek Nation*, 295 U.S. 103, 109–110; *Seminole Nation* v. *United States*, 316 U.S. 286, 296–297).

The Cherokees are now, and have been for more than 130 years, a literate people. Hundreds of them today are college graduates. Representatives of the tribe may be found in almost every vocation and calling in the United States. Like other Americans a few, for example, the venerable Sequoyah, and the late Senator Robert L. Owen (who, with Carter Glass, of Virginia, wrote the Federal Reserve Bank Act in 1913), and Will Rogers, are renowned. Some are moderately rich; others are fairly well to do; and a large number in affluence and ability, are regarded as average American citizens. The great majority of our full bloods, however, though blameless, have not kept fully in step with the march and progress of their fellow citizens. But even this condition is not peculiar to the Cherokees. For this, we truly regret to say, is the fate of others also.

In 1827, 12 years before the resettlement of the largest band, numbering 18,000, in present Oklahoma, the Cherokees had successfully adopted the customs, usages, ways, laws, and religion of their white neighbors in Georgia and Tennessee. Without any cost to the Government, and completely upon their own resources, they established and maintained in Georgia, and brought to Oklahoma the first free system of public education for their children in world history. Notwithstanding the tragedy of removal, in 1839, and the reduction of their country to ashes in 1861–65 by the War Between the States, at statehood in Oklahoma in 1907, they turned over to the new State a college and 126 public schools, and filled practically every courthouse and schoolhouse in their counties in eastern Oklahoma with men and women of talent and competency. From that year until now the Indians of Oklahoma, including the Cherokees have provided leadership in every vocation and calling and have added immeasurably to the educational, socioeconomic and cultural development of our State.

In Georgia long before coming to Indian territory, they had formulated and erected a political government suitable to their needs, under a written constitution, with three branches patterned after the governments of the surrounding States, under the name and style of the Cherokee Nation. Their chosen leaders were intelligent, articulate, and dedicated to the highest elevation of civilized culture, and to the absolute protection of their property rights.

With the acknowledged understanding and respect of some of the most eminent leaders of the National Government, including Senators Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, and Henry Clay, the Cherokees were able to forestall ouster from their ancient domain east of the Mississippi River for more than a decade; even against the iron will of Andrew Jackson. Finally, in 1838, by force of arms, and inferentially in defiance of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Cherokees were rounded up, and in the fall and winter were removed in 13 detachments over the trail of tears to their present homeland in northeast Oklahoma.

Their line of march and destination ended at a place where, by virtue of the terms of a previous treaty with the Government, dated May 6, 1828, a large band of the tribe known as the western or old settler Cherokees, some 6,000 in number, under the leadership of Oolooteka, or John Jolly, the foster father of Sam Houston, had voluntarily emigrated 9 years before. This band held to the belief backed up by treaty that all of the Cherokee land in Indian territory, more than 13 million acres, for which their 4 million acres in Arkansas had been exchanged, were exclusively their own. For 63 years they were compelled to wait before a forum was provided in which to test the validity of their treaty, only to be told that they had been mistaken. But then Sequoyah and the other signers had long before passed away.

In the 1830's, apparently the great aim of the Government was to settle up and civilize as speedily as possible the Louisiana Purchase. The Five Civilized Tribes were removed, against their will, and placed with fee titles along the southwestern frontier. They constituted a buffer and protection against the Indians of the Plains, to insure the settlement without difficulty of Arkansas and other States. Viewed solely from the Government's standpoint, it was a wise and effective policy. In our case, however, the Treaty of Removal has been denounced by the Court of Claims as early as 1891, as being the act and deed of neither the eastern nor western Cherokees. It was, indeed, an imposition of the gravest character, if not a fraud, upon our people. It's execution led directly to the assassination, on June 22, 1839 of its leading signers, friends of Jackson, and the Government, many of whom were the most brilliant of our tribe. Then followed, as a dreadful consequence, a period of tragedy and turmoil within the tribe, touching every leading family, and ending in 1846, after, it is said, over 400 of our finest men had met their deaths, in a conflict where it appeared the Cherokees were about to commit national suicide.

In 1802, 33 years before the execution of this treaty, history teaches that the Government, under President Jefferson, had promised Georgia that it would extinguish the title of all lands of the Cherokees and Creeks within her chartered limits, in consideration of Georgia relinquishing title to its western lands to the United States—the present States of Mississippi and Alabama. Georgia ceded her lands, but since the promise to remove the tribes was made with the double condition that tribal consent would be first obtained, and the title of the Indians' extinguished upon peaceable terms, the Government procrastinated until the election of Jackson in 1828. Georgia then moved by enacting repressive legislation against the Cherokees, thereby making their existence in Georgia unbearable, and hastening the execution of the ill-fated treaty of 1835. This treaty was executed by leading Cherokees who were not possessed of any delegated authority to bind either the Government of the Cherokees or its people. By a one vote majority in the U.S. Senate, this treaty was ratified in March 1836, and under its terms, President Van Buren, Jackson's successor, employed Federal troops to enforce it, and brought on the exodus.

The not wholly unexpected result of the Government policy to remove the Cherokees actually created three powerful divisions within the tribe, whose problems, for a century and a half thereafter, and until this day, have engaged almost the constant attention of several branches of the Federal Government. Historically, the eastern or emigrant Cherokees, the western or old settler Cherokees, and the treaty party, so-called, comprise three very large components within our tribe, and each as separate bands have been congressionally recognized.

In addition to the above mentioned federally recognized bands, there exist eight other important intratribal business, social, and religious bands, whose rituals, traditions, and affairs, and leaders are generally known and respected by everyone deeply acquainted with the Cherokee people. These bands, together with the approximate dates of their respective origins, are as follows:

The Seven Clan Society	Ancient
The Four Mothers' Society, with some fullblood Creek members	Ancient
The Texas Cherokees	1819
The Keetoowa Society	1856
The Nighthawk Keetoowahs	1861
The United Keetoowah Band, a Federal corporation	1950
The Delaware Cherokees	1867
The Shawnee Cherokees	1868

The latter two bands are the descendants of those Delawares and Shawnees who purchased property rights in the Cherokee Nation, pursuant to the terms of article 15 of the Cherokee Treaty of July 19, 1866. All of these bands are familiarly known to the Government, and together with the three federally recognized bands mentioned above, who in the aggregate number more than 35,000 on the rolls of the tribe, are commonly known as members or citizens of the Cherokee Nation or tribe of Indians by blood. They actually constitute the tribe today. Considerable overlapping of membership within these bands is generally well known.

When the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, also known as the Dawes Commission and its successors took over the tribal government, including its enrollment records, pursuant to a series of Federal statutes aimed for the dissolution of the tribal government, commencing in 1893, two other groups, political citizens of the political government known as the Cherokee Nation, of non-Indian blood: The intermarried whites, and the freedmen—the latter ex-slaves formerly owned by individual Cherokees and their descendents, were listed upon separate rolls, prepared by the Dawes Commission, which had been directed by statutes and Federal court decisions; thus allowing to these people equal interest and participation in the distribution of Cherokee tribal property, including lands and money. Texas would be confronted with the same situation if, today, its public lands and buildings were ordered sold and distributed per capita among all the citizens of the State. For the interest of students of government, I mention here the citations to the statutes which accomplished this Federal purpose: 27 Stat. 612; 28 Stat. 910; 29 Stat. 321; 30 Stat. 62; 30 Stat. 495; 32 Stat. 716; 33 Stat. 189; 34 Stat. 137; and 35 Stat. 312. All references are to the U.S. Statutes at Large.

As should have been expected, as the reported cases will show, considerable Federal litigation arose out of this situation, and from the Cherokee standpoint, many of the legal problems to this day remain unsettled, some of which are now pending in the courts in Washington.

The original final rolls of all political citizens of the Cherokee National Government, when closed by order of Congress on March 4, 1907, contained in the aggregate 41,889 persons, including full and lesser degrees of Cherokee blood, adopted Delawares and Shawnees, intermarried whites and freedmen. Congress further directed that allotments of lands in severalty from our fee title tribal domain to the political citizens of the Cherokee Nation be based upon these Federal rolls.

The final act of the Congress, in the series designed to end the Cherokee government, and to pave the way for statehood, dated April 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 137), for reasons then best known to Congress, but which, indeed, are disclosed in the legislative history of the act, in its last section, section 28, made a distinction between the tribe itself and the tribal government, and continued indefinitely both institutions as they exist in the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma in the following words:

"SEC. 28. The Tribal existence and present Tribal governments of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole Tribes or Nations are hereby continued in full force and effect for all purposes authorized by law, until otherwise provided by law."

This provision of Federal law has remained unchanged from the date of its enactment in 1906. Under its authority the Cherokees, through the years, by direction of special jurisdictional acts, and especially since 1946, when Congress, for the first time in all its history, established a general legal forum for the purpose, have been enabled to litigate some of its legal and moral claims against the people and Government of the United States. Recently, one of our most noted cases, after 15 years of legal effort before the Federal Indian Claims Commission in Washington, resulted in a judgment in our favor for $14,789,000.

The Commission held on the basis of the trial record that in 1893 the Cherokees, against their will, and for an unconscionable consideration, had been forced under duress to deed to the Government 6,022,000 acres of their fee title land, known as the Cherokee Outlet, in northwest Oklahoma. This land was the object of the famed Oklahoma run in September 1893. In that run 40,000 American citizens were given homesteads of 160 acres each, while later in 1902, the 41,000 citizens of the Cherokee Nation were allotted the remainder of their fee domain in eastern Oklahoma, an average of 110 acres each, including the flint hills where so many of our full bloods then and now live.

For lack of merit, the Attorney General, Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY, decided not to appeal the outlet case. Thereafter, Congress paid the judgment and directed the Treasury to set up the account on its books in trust for the tribe.

Further, in 1962, Congress directed per capita payments to be made from these trust funds to all persons or their heirs whose names appear upon the final rolls of the Cherokee Nation as finalized by the Dawes Commission in 1907. The Bureau of Indian Affairs under direction of the Secretary of the Interior was entrusted with this duty, and the work presently is being concluded at Muskogee. More than 100,000 individuals, it is said, have received benefits from this judgment, while a sum in excess of $2 million has reverted to the tribe under the express terms of the bill. The Distribution Act of 1962 further provided that the reverted funds could be advanced and expended for any tribal purpose determined feasible by our principal chief and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

At the moment, our chief, the Honorable W. W. Keeler, of Bartlesville, and the executive committee, with departmental approval, are engaged in an effort to rehabilitate the less fortunate members of the tribe with proper use of our own funds. We did this very thing for 75 years unaided, before statehood, and, if need be, we can do it again. Programs to meet housing needs and educational loans for our worthy youngsters are being implemented and other like programs are planned, in the hope and expectation to relieve the welfare load among our own people and to improve the Cherokee economic picture, which generally has evoked the anxious concern of many discerning citizens at home and throughout America. The question is, are we too late? The chief and the Government do not think so.

Elements of President Johnson's wise and far-reaching, humane, and economic program have already reached the Cherokees. In September 1964, Washington asked the tribe to sponsor a Neighborhood Youth Corps for our high-school youngsters and dropouts. It accepted the responsibility, and over a million dollars since then has been spent in the NYC program. Well over a thousand youngsters from extremely low income families, with many families earning less than $1,500 per year, have been benefited. Ninety-five percent of this sum has been earned by the students and has been paid to them. Far too many of the students had never before had the opportunity to earn a single dollar, and you can well imagine what these benefits have meant to them. Before NYC came, the girls, as well as the boys, were dropping out of school for lack of decent, wearable clothing. In many families soap was a luxury, and the endless routine of being compelled to seek welfare commodities for their total subsistence, and other kindred causes and conditions, which for so long has prevailed in the area had taken its shocking toll among this deeply religious and now most gentle and enlightened people. NYC has helped to improve the whole picture. At least, our youngsters are now inspired to stay in school. Their teachers all agree that relief arrived in time to save several who now are in college continuing their education. Of the NYC graduates last June, 52 percent went on to college as compared to the national average of 40 percent for all graduates in the United States.

The citizens of Oklahoma and especially the Cherokees are proud of this achievement, and we trust the Government will see that it is continued. Among these youngsters will be found not one, unpatriotic enough to burn his draft card, or to march in defiance of the determined will and policy of our Government. Indeed, a considerable number, as volunteers, are now in Vietnam. And others like the splendid young man who will speak to you now, will go when and where America calls, if need be, even before he finishes the 12th grade.

I am proud and honored to present to you one of our NYC enrollees, an 18-year-old senior with a B-plus average, in Stilwell High School, Johnny Eagle, who aspires to become a lawyer someday, and to render service to the United States and to the Cherokee people.

The President's Message on Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal points put that the President has called for legislation to halt "blind, unquestioned mail-order sales of guns" and to check "the easy availability of deadly weapons to professionals—criminals—to delinquent youth, and to the disturbed and deranged." Because I am convinced that many of my colleagues will want to read the editorial, I offer it for inclusion in the RECORD:

FIREARMS CURB URGED ANEW

"The ease with which any person can acquire firearms," President Johnson told Congress a year ago, is a significant factor in the national crime rate. He urged passage of legislation to curb the scandalous interstate flow of lethal firearms. Two administration bills were introduced.

Now the President has again called on Congress to halt "blind, unquestioned mail-order sales of guns" and to check "the easy availability of deadly weapons to professionals (criminals), to delinquent youth and to the disturbed and deranged." It was his strongest statement yet on the matter.

In the year between messages, precisely nothing has been done by Congress. The bills have been smothered in vilification, often downright misleading, mounted by such organizations as the National Rifle Association and abetted by thousands of letters from individuals and groups, often grossly misinformed as to what the legislation actually calls for.

Some critics have hinted or even baldly stated that the proposed laws would require registration of all firearms. They wouldn't. Some have implied that the ultimate result of this legislation would be to eliminate all private ownership of guns. This is pure nonsense.

What the laws do is prohibit interstate mail-order sales of firearms to individuals; interstate shipments could be made only among importers, manufacturers, and dealers. The laws would control interstate shipments of such weapons of mass destruction as bazookas, antitank guns, grenades, and bombs. They would curb the flood of imported surplus military weapons. These laudable goals have been supported by the International Association of Chiefs of Police and by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association.

The dalliance by Congress on this urgent matter of public safety is a blot on its record.

Address by Governor Burns of Florida at Florida Board of Conservation Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks made by the Governor of Florida, Haydon Burns, at the Florida Board of Conservation luncheon at Tallahassee, on January 25, 1966.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. HAYDON BURNS AT FLORIDA BOARD OF CONSERVATION LUNCHEON, JANUARY 25, 1966, TALLAHASSEE

Mr. Chairman, Congressman FUQUA, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to see this great number of people from all areas of the State and the Nation who are here to consider a matter of vital importance to Florida's future—the development of water resources. I use this term to include all water-related programs of flood control, water conservation and water management, navigation improvements, both waterways and ports, beach and shore protection, and water pollution as it affects our water resources.

Our public works program concerning water resources development met with remarkable success in 1965. We enjoyed the confidence of our State legislature, our congressional delegation, and were favored by our President and the Congress as a whole. All of our essential programs were well supported. I wish that we could be sure of equal success this year.

We now have a flood control or water management program in half the counties in Florida, protecting about two-thirds of our State population. This is probably the most important of all resource developments in Florida to date. Here we harness the destructive floods to our needs for water conservation and allow full use of the otherwise uninhabitable lands of south Florida. Thanks to this water program, we have the prosperity in south Florida today that accommodates a great portion of our population.

Deepwater ports and inland waterways to serve all areas of Florida, interconnected with other waterways of the Eastern United States, should soon be a reality if we can maintain the momentum of our current progress. The great economic advantages available with low-cost water transportation have been the proven catalyst in other areas of the country where similar natural resoures are available to attract industry and encourage heavy investments in new plant construction.

Studies and plans being developed in the public works program to stabilize our beaches and shores may provide the answer for saving many coastal areas of Florida that are now seriously endangered. Other public works which are designed to provide protection for people and property against natural disasters are offered to local communities on a participating basis. Each of these projects and programs is designed to add recreational benefits whenever possible for the community served by the project.

Significant achievements in the development of Florida's natural water resources are possible for several good reasons. First, we are blessed with your knowledge and your support for a unified State program of public works. It is your program. We only put together your suggestions in a package and offer them to the State legislature, to our congressional delegation and to the national administration, including the appropriate Federal agencies. Second, we have a good program, economically sound and feasible in all respects.

It is essential to the State and the Nation in supporting our growth on a sound economic basis. That is why it earns the support of our State legislature and why it is promoted by our Congressmen in Washington. And third, we have an effective and capable working team in our congressional delegation. They have supported the unified program because it is good for Florida, and ultimately good for the Nation.

The importance of the water resources development program has not always enjoyed its current degree of acceptance. The initial efforts resulted in a series of ups and downs, with more damage than progress being achieved during the early years. Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, during his term as Governor, realized the need for a long-range water resources development program. Studies completed during his administration are the basis for many of our existing policies and laws in the area of water resources development. As you well know, he has maintained a continued interest in this field and has been one of our strongest supporters.

Florida, like many other States of our Nation, has been water rich compared with many areas in the world. In the past no one worried about conservation of water. Everyone believed our water supply was plentiful and always would be. After centuries of uncontrolled pollution and precious little water conservation measures, we now must face up to the problem. During the next 40 years the present population will be doubled. Our water requirements will increase beyond limits that now appear reasonable. Water resource developments are time consuming to construct and staggering in cost. As an example, our C. & S.F. project has been underway since 1948. Yet, it is not even half completed and has already cost more than $325 million.

As you know, Congress is studying many possible means of meeting future water requirements of the United States. One such study entails moving water from the arctic rivers to the parched Western United States. A preliminary cost estimate of that project made by the Corps of Engineers is in excess of $100 billion.

For years, experts have tried to alert the people of the United States about the water problems that have developed. Only now is their message getting across.

Recently, a series of water disasters, including the floods in the Midwest, the drought in the Northeastern United States, and the growing pollution in the Great Lakes, have made apparent the need for a realistic consideration of our national water problems.

Several important items of water legislation were enacted by Congress last year, and additional action is being considered for the current session. Most of the proposed legislation appears to be in the best interest of our Nation but I have misgivings about some action suggested for congressional approval.

The water quality law enacted by Congress last year allows individual States until July 1, 1967, to establish standards to reduce pollution in their streams. If any State fails to do so, the Federal Government will take over that responsibility. Industry desires to cooperate with State and local officials in this respect because it is to their interest to do so. Local governments should realize that, if they do not cooperate in establishing these standards and in their enforcement, they stand to be dictated more stringent measures and tighter controls in addition to forfeiting their present authority. I can assure you our State government will do its share and take all appropriate actions.

It is expected that Congress will be asked to impose a user tax on our waterways. There cannot be sufficient income from this tax to be of any real value to the Federal Government but it can—if passed—destroy the value of waterways for economical transportation. Our hope of being able to expand the industrial base in Florida is—to a substantial degree—dependent on establishing an economical water transportation system interconnected with the industrial areas of the Nation east of the Rocky Mountains. Imposition of such a tax could seriously hamper our hopes of bringing industry to Florida.

This control, if enacted, will strengthen the influence of the National Administration on waterway development but at the expense of the people, the States, and the economy of the Nation. Secretary of State Tom Adams, on behalf of the board of conservation, is spearheading a national effort to overcome this waterways uses tax proposal.

I am also concerned about another decision by the Federal Government in the area of navigation improvements. I refer to the establishment of special criteria for use in evaluating economic benefits for authorization of proposed navigation improvements. Instructions issued by Congress for determining economic benefits of proposed navigation improvements have recently been shelved by unilateral action of the administration in directing use of new criteria which can eliminate consideration of or control decision on any waterway improvement requiring Federal participation. This action is of vital concern to the waterways of Florida and could mean the end of most waterway developments in the United States. The Congress is well aware of its loss of control of this phase of public works by this procedure. The outcome of this action naturally is of great importance to the future of Florida.

There is another pending bill in Congress which, if enacted, will present a serious threat to the continued development of our water resources in Florida. That is the Moss bill. Under this bill, all responsibilities of the Federal Government for natural resources development would be transferred to the Department of the Interior, under direct Cabinet control. This is the purpose of our being here today. Florida is well organized in this respect thanks to good legislative action. But Florida is the exception. There are very few other States or regions of the United States that are prepared to evaluate their needs and take necessary action to have the works constructed. Their history is a duplicate of our earlier efforts in Florida—lack of unity, sectional jealousies, and inability to obtain adequate local support to pay the non-Federal share of costs.

The current trend by the administration in Washington appears to be an effort to concentrate all authority concerning water resources development within the hands of the Federal Government. Costs will inevitably be higher and we will give up the local control that our Congressmen now exercise for us.

Under the proposed system, for example, it could be decided by the President's advisers that California, New York, and Illinois have greater or more urgent water needs than does Florida. The cost of our program may be only a fraction of their costs but we may be subject to the bureaucratic decision of the proposed national water czar. I know that President Johnson is sympathetic and mindful of the water needs of this country. He has made many important public commitments on this matter and has talked to me personally on the subject. However, there are people in Washington, who occupy responsible positions and appear determined to transfer all policy decisions to our National Capital.

The present laws and existing procedures are adequate to meet all foreseeable requirements. Those regions which are not so well organized as Florida and whose people think they will be able to get their improvements accomplished at someone else's expense will probably be the first to fall in line with support of a water-czar plan under Cabinet control.

Florida cannot gain anything under such a plan—all we can do is lose the momentum and hard-earned progress which has been achieved during the past 20 years in our water-related programs. It behooves each of us to let our Florida Congressmen know our beliefs on this matter. We do not need any new laws or a Federal water czar. We should continue to be able to enjoy our existing democratic freedoms by exercising our responsibilities.

Our Florida delegation in Congress has performed a superb job in meeting Florida's requirements on water resources development, as requested by State and local interests. There would be no advantage for us under the proposal to transfer this responsibility to an appointed Cabinet official. Florida's advantages depend on the continuation of the procedures now authorized by Congress.

You who have come here today to help plan the continued development of Florida's water resources, so essential to the growth and economic development of our State, are the ones who had the foresight to help organize our efforts and laws which made it possible to achieve the progress that I have reported to you today. You have faithfully supported the organized efforts that you helped to establish. The people of our State owe you a debt of gratitude for your loyalty in these efforts. The results have been all that we could hope for. But we must continue our efforts now with greater determination to realize further progress and to prevent loss of all that we have gained to date. The battleground is no longer at home—it is our Congressmen who will be under pressures and they need encouragement and need to know of our concern on these issues.

I have given you a realistic appraisal of our progress and of our problems. We must defeat the interests that would allow the natural resources of this State to be neglected until it is to their benefit to develop them.

Each of us has a personal responsibility to improve conditions in the world of our influence so we may look with pride at the inheritance we leave for our children and for those who succeed us. You obviously have selected the State's water resources as a primary sphere of your influence.

I appreciate your great contribution to the State and I believe the people of Florida are equally appreciative of your dedicated service in this effort to develop our resources for the benefit of the people of the State as a whole.

Thank you.

Congratulations to Hawaii

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues in congratulating the great State of Hawaii on the seventh anniversary of its statehood.

When Hawaii became the 50th State of the Union, the boundaries of our Nation were extended westward into the Pacific to include the seven major inhabited islands which comprise Hawaii. The new State, though far removed from the mainland in distance of miles, has consistently demonstrated its oneness with the Union by rapid and constructive progress economically, socially, and politically since the achievement of statehood in 1959.

The population of Hawaii since that date has increased by 20 percent. Local manufacturing has increased 4 percent. Hawaii's per capita income has increased from a rank of 22d to 14th in our Nation. As a vacationland, it is renowned throughout the world. Today its development as a commercial and cultural center of the Pacific is equaling its fame as an island paradise.

The 50th State of our Union is a wondrous combination of the exotic and the jet age, the ancient and the world of tomorrow. It is meeting every challenge of statehood and is a credit to our country.

Transcript of Radio Broadcast of Edward P. Morgan on March 11, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record a transcript of the broadcast by Mr. Edward P. Morgan on March 11.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Transcript of Broadcast by Edward P. Morgan, March 11, 1966

Washington's atmosphere these days reminds you a little of a college dormitory before midterm exams. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, J. William Fulbright, has suddenly launched a crash program in the art of cramming. As a Rhodes scholar and former president of the University of Arkansas, the Senator konws something about these matters. He had hoped that his committee hearings on U.S. policy in Asia—especially vis-a-vis Peiping—would stimulate public discussion. They are. Everybody is belatedly trying to bone up on a mysterious subject called China.

The spectacle is somewhat fantastic. Here in Washington, the mighty central power base of the western world, plugged in on all the communications marvels of the age from spy-in-the-sky satellites to the hot line to Moscow, still rendered almost helplessly ignorant about nearly one-fifth of the human race. Now comes the hectic scurrying for answers. This need not be Operation Futility. Preposterous as the frantic exercise is for a nation that prides itself on being "informed," it reflects a need and a determination, at long last, to discover the most populous nation on earth, governed by a powerful and one of the least known ruling cliques in any era of civilization.

It isn't that we've blown our past homework on China completely. We have a modest quota of China experts—sinologists—in and out of government. True, we surely would have had more but for a blight called McCarthyism which withered the crop of scholars 15 years ago with a burning wind that spread the "villian theory" of history. We Americans still suffer from that savage folly. But it would be another folly to wallow now in guilt and cry that this red dragon would already have been a household pet, curled contentedly on the United Nations' hearth, if we hadn't been such a beastly neighbor—at least since 1949.

There is no way to prove this theory true and there are a lot of reasons to support the conclusion that it is false—not the least being the virulently xenophobic behavior of old Mao Tse-tung himself. Neither he nor his colleagues are apt to be voted the world's most promising internationalists on the basis of their 17-year record in power in Peiping. Nor is one of them likely to walk off with next year's Nobel Peace prize on the basis of present performance or propaganda line.

It turns out that the rest of the world—except perhaps for the Russians and some other unhappy ideological relatives—don't seem to know much more about China and the Chinese than we do. Vice President Humphrey on his Asian swing got more expressions of fear toward, than facts about, China. The Western nations with whom Mao & Company have deigned to establish diplomatic relations, including Britain, have learned a little, but not much, through their lonely outposts in Peiping. Heaven and the CIA alone know how much we have spent on professional intelligence gathering in and about China, or how much it's worth.

The controlling fact is that all this probing has been done on behalf of a nation which for nearly 20 years, at least, has been building up an emotional block about China. If tomorrow morning we were suddenly handed all the salient facts about these 700 million people and their leaders we might not be able to evaluate them correctly because we have been looking at them for so long through the peepholes of prejudice, ignorance, and fear.

Now, finally, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has started some courses of its own in China watching, free and desegregated public instruction, as it were, open to the Government and ordinary citizens alike. It may be that these hearings, if they replace ignorance with knowledge and prejudice with balanced judgment, will still only intensify our fears of this strange and brooding power. That does not seem likely, however. The most panicky, unreasoning of fears are those of the unknown.

Knowledge alone, of course, won't be enough to close the gap of misconception, misunderstanding, and mutual hostility between the leaders—if not the peoples—of the strongest "free" society and the biggest and most militant closed society of Marxism. Our patience, once we cultivate it, will be sorely and repeatedly tried. We may have to give in some to get anything. What, one wonders for example, will remove Peiping's strident demands for Formosa as a precondition for any improvement in relations?

When China suffered a serious cholera epidemic not long back, Secretary of State Dean Rusk personally offered to send American serum for the Chinese people, secretly, so it wouldn't look as if the "Western imperialists" were trying to expoilt the crisis. Peiping refused the shipments. This behavior is hard to understand. But most of us have forgotten—if indeed we ever were taught—about the ghastly, greedy cruelty of western policy which for generations divided, exploited, and subjugated the proud Chinese. Senator Fulbright's School of Sinology should help remove some blind spots in the Nation's view of Asia. Then if some bold professor could be found and persuaded to open a seminar in Peiping on how to understand America, we just might be in business.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

Control Slips Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a significant editorial appeared recently in the Pioneer Newspapers of Illinois, relative to President Johnson's proposal to extend the term of office for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to 4 years. It stresses the fact that this proposal would diminish the control the people have over their elected representatives.

The editorial, which follows, urges that extensive study and consideration be given to this proposal, with which I agree completely.

Control Slips Away

President Johnson continues to argue that our Congressmen would be better off if their terms of office in the House of Representatives were doubled from 2 to 4 years. The longer term, the argument goes, would cut in half the efforts and energy Congressmen must now expend in having to conduct an election campaign every other year.

The change would also cut in half the control the Constitution insists the people are to have over their elected representatives.

The Constitution specifies that at least one House of the Congress remain close enough to the people to enable them to exercise their right of redress as easily and as quickly as possible. As many as 6 years must pass before a grieving electorate can remove a U.S. Senator from office. To balance this aloofness of what was designed to be an Americanized House of Lords, the Founding Fathers determined that the House of Representatives, our "Commons," would remain frequently subject to the voters' judgment.

The Founding Fathers, "those wise souls who produced the incredible document, sought checks and balances wherever they could find them so that no one man or branch of government could force a foolishness permanently on the common people," observed the Saturday Review last month.

The magazine reasoned well: "Members of the House have always been elected every 2 years by popular vote, but Senators were elected by the State legislature as recently as 1913. And the continuous overlap of the 6-year Senate with three separate and much more sensitive Houses did not result from chance or whim, but came about after great deliberation and as a careful compromise between the big States and the small."

Nor should political motivation escape scrutiny. The President has asked that the proposed 4-year terms for Congressmen begin in 1972, which, coincidentally or otherwise, happens to be a presidential election year. It scarcely is a secret that Democrats have done remarkably well in presidential elections for the past three and a half decades. It seems doubtful that an opportunity to elect more party members to longer House terms (that coincide with the presidential term) can have escaped the President's mind in proposing the constitutional change.

One aspect is certain: If the President is successful in getting the change effected, voters who now must wait 2 years to do something about an elected Representative they no longer want, will have to suffer twice as long.

And that prospect, we submit, ought to be considered grave enough to demand extensive debate and consideration before government is allowed to be placed still further beyond the control of the man who pays for it.

Associated General Contractors Hear Inspirational Message From Gen. Carl C. Turner, Provost Marshal General, U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is encouraging and gratifying to note the genuine religious conviction and abiding faith of many of the leaders who are responsible for charting our Nation's course in these troubled days. One such dedicated Christian layman and patriotic American is the Provost Marshal General of the U.S. Army, Maj. Gen. Carl C. Turner.

On Tuesday, March 15, 1966, a contractors' prayer breakfast was sponsored by members of the Associated General Contractors of America as a part of their 47th annual convention. General Turner gave the principal message before approximately 750 persons at the Washington Hilton Hotel. Speaking with abiding personal commitment, this seasoned soldier related a compelling and moving experience from his own life which was received by an attentive audience.

It was my pleasure, together with other Members of Congress, to participate in sessions of this convention.

General Taylor's words made a lasting impression on those privileged to hear him. Believing that his message is deserving of the widest possible readership, I request unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. CARL C. TURNER, PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL, U.S. ARMY, MARCH 15, 1966

God's people, inhabiting almost every spot on this globe, have sought to achieve a greater degree of mutual understanding through the establishment of certain diplomatic entities—by the development of political and economic understandings—and through the expedient of similarity of cultural interest. The state of the world today is persuasive evidence that these centuries of effort have failed to achieve that which we seek.

In this day when jet aircraft span the oceans in hours, when voice and graphic communications are reflected back to earth from satellites, when men circle the globe in space vehicles, it seems almost unbelievable that we still lack a capacity for true communication between men.

We meet and speak on a political and intellectual plane, our many languages embrace the intricacies of scientific jargon, but we have not availed ourselves sufficiently of the single medium which can bridge the chasm between men's souls—the word of God.

There is need in this world of a spiritual bond between men and among nations: In this bond, the word "brotherhood" will come to have meaning, men will find purpose, and nations will prosper.

Men who meet together in the name of their Creator will always find ways and means of resolving their differences. Diplomacy cannot substitute for prayer.

I have no words of self-generated wisdom, I do not presume to advise you, I have no witticisms to amuse you, nor have I the power to stimulate your intellect with profound observations.

Instead I wish to relate to you briefly—and simply—a personal experience I have never before publicly disclosed.

Several years ago, after having made well over 100 military parachute jumps with both my fellow Americans and our gallant allies, I became interested in a sport called sky diving.

In a normal military jump a static line, attached to both the aircraft and the top of the parachute, automatically opens the chute after the jumper has fallen free of the aircraft. In sky diving there is no static line. The jumper opens his chute at whatever time he chooses by pulling a ripcord.

After certain preliminary instructions I found myself in the doorway of a light aircraft 3,200 feet in the air contemplating the beauty of the earth below and the blue sky above, waiting for my first free jump.

I was happy, proud of my family, satisfied with the course of my chosen career, anticipating eagerly the thrill and sense of accomplishment to be generated by the imminent leap into space.

If I was limited to a single word to describe myself at that moment, that word would be "confident," perhaps even complacent.

The words "get ready" were welcome to my ears.

The jumpmaster's hand touched my shoulder, and I was instantly away into the cool rushing air.

Counting 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, 5,000, pull the ripcord.

The air whistles in my ears as I wait for the opening shock. No shock. I look up, the chute is fouled, a malfunction. Instead of the billowing canopy of sturdy, air-supported nylon, there is only a partially opened limp, flabby, spiritless fluttering of twisted cloth against the blue sky.

I grab quickly for the ripcord of my reserve chute and pull with unaccustomed strength, the emergency chute rushes by my face as I fall past its unfolding yards of lifesaving nylon; but, still no opening shock.

I look up in horror and see that the top of the emergency chute has penetrated the open gore of the main chute and cannot open properly.

Knowing that I must pull it free immediately or die, I pull the risers and then the canopy of the reserve chute toward me with all my strength.

The motions cause me to spin and—to my utter dismay—I'm wrapped like a cocoon in the disabled emergency chute.

I can do nothing more physically—no straining of muscle, no agility or skill, can save me. Death is certain—death is imminent.

Falling earthward like a shrouded stone with an instant end only split seconds away, I screamed into the wind the most fervent prayer of my life—"God help me."

An unexplained—in terms of natural phenomena—change in my spinning motion whipped the nylon shroud from my face and arms and the reserve chute snapped open with a spine-snapping jolt—a scarce 400 feet from the earth below me.

In the few seconds remaining before a reasonably normal landing on the ground—a single thought penetrated my consciousness.

Not, surprisingly, thoughts of thanksgiving, nor even relief, not overwhelming joy of life, nor concept of miraculous salvation.

Only a single thought, Galilee.

Galilee, the handicaps and back slapping of my comrades, the shouts signaling the easement of their terror, none of these things erased this thought from my mind as they gathered up my chutes and during the truck ride back to camp, only Galilee.

With a deep feeling of overwhelming need to understand I pondered this thought, why Galilee. Finally as the adrenalin released its grip on my mind and body, I began to consider what I knew, rather had read and heard, of the sea of Galilee. This is what I recalled.

There are two seas in Palestine, I understand. One is fresh, fish are in it, splashes of green adorn its banks. Trees spread their branches over it and stretch out their thirsty roots to sip of its healing waters. Along its shores the children play, as children played when the Lord was there. He loved it. He could look across its silver surface when he spoke his parables—and on a rolling plain not far away He fed 5,000 people.

The River Jordan gives this sea life with sparkling water from the hills. Men build their homes near to it, birds their nests. Every kind of life is happier because it is there.

The River Jordan flows south into another sea. Here there is no splash of fish—no fluttering leaf—no song of birds—no children's laughter. Travelers choose another route, unless on urgent business. The air hangs heavy over the water and neither man nor beast nor fowl will drink. What makes this mighty difference in these neighbor seas? Not the River Jordan. It empties the same good water into both. Not the soil in which they lie, it is the same as in the country around both.

This is the difference: the Sea of Galilee receives but does not keep the water from the Jordan. For every drop that flows into it another flows out. The other sea is shrewder, hoarding its income jealously. It will not be tempted into any generous impulse. Every drop it gets, it keeps. The Sea of Galilee gives and lives. The other sea gives nothing. It is named the Dead Sea. As there are two seas in Palestine, there are two kinds of people in this world.

This recollection may have been a subconscious recall of a sermon by our minister during my boyhood in Oklahoma—I don't know.

But I do know that before I slept that night, and as part of my prayer to God when I thanked him for my life—I charged myself with certain lifelong responsibilities.

I believe the word "service" best explains my first charge. During my years in the military I had noticed that those men who are really alive and enjoy life—and living—are those men who believe in serving their God by serving their fellow men and not only believe in it but do it.

Christ established this precedent and this ideal when he said, "I am among you as one who serves." There could no longer be any doubt in my mind that I must do my best to follow a standard of service to my God, to my community, to my country and to my fellow men that would reflect my unmatched gratitude for my delivery.

I charged myself with the full responsibility of that portion of an officer's duty which is called leadership. I decided without reservation to be additionally conscious of those about me who might consciously or unconsciously be influenced by my example. I realized, perhaps for the first time, that the fatal power of leadership is inescapable and that no one is so insignificant and commonplace that he does not influence, by example, the life of someone else. People do things because others do, for more than any other reason.

This is the strange force of crowds, where we are swept along by the cumulative power of example, and do what in our sober judgment, we would never have done had we been alone. I realized that our little nameless, unremembered acts, are the ones that will weigh most heavily when the final books are balanced. I realized that in order to travel a true path so that the leadership that I give will cause others to take the right turns down the pathway of life is my most weighty responsibility.

When I tell you of my determination to be these things—to do these things with my life—I plead for your understanding that these have been my goals—not my accomplishments. I must confess to something less than total success—sometimes even forgetfulness—but I can say—in humility—I am trying to give of myself with a better understanding of life's purpose than that which I had in earlier days.

During the intervening years I have come to understand that this giving is not limited to things of obvious value—is not limited to money and time, although we must give of these things too; but more specifically we must—as does the River Jordan—dispense our share of God's blessings that we receive from Galilee—into even the Dead Sea—and if we give not—we flourish not.

During the years that have passed since that day when I fell through the air—wrapped in the despondency of a nylon shroud—only to have my life given back to me by God's generosity—I have done my best to bring the lesson I learned so dramatically into my life as a christian, a citizen of our glorious Nation—a husband and father—and an Army officer charged with the responsibility of leading the sons in the defense of our Nation.

In the instant that chute finally opened, I learned to really count my blessings. I have not forgotten.

May I conclude by saying that among my many blessings I am very mindful that not the least is my privilege to live in a country whose christian leaders will take time out of their arduously busy days to meet together, like this, in testimony to their faith in God.

So I stand before you a soldier, a christian soldier, who steps forward, unflinchingly, taking my place with our christian leaders saying, "God, here I stand. My body strong to fight your battles. My spirit true to uphold your ideas. To you and to America, I pledge my service."

Know Your America Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Virginia State Elks Association has been sponsoring a "Know Your America Week" program for a number of years and has made a magnificent contribution in alerting American citizens to the many wonderful things for which America stands.

The Northern Virginia "Know Your America Week" Committee did a particularly outstanding job in our area, and under leave to extend my remarks I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a memorandum from the chairman of the committee to the members of the committee concerning their program for 1965.

To: The Northern Virginia "Know Your America Week" Committee.
From: H. C. Anderson, chairman.
Subject: Report of the 1965 "Know Your America Week" program.

INTRODUCTION

The Honorable R. Leonard Bush, the grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks requested all subordinate lodges throughout the United States to join with local citizen's groups to publicly display thankfulness for the blessing of the freedoms we enjoy today as Americans. In compliance with this great American's plea, the Americanism Committee of Arlington-Fairfax Lodge No. 2188 sent requests to some 50 organizations in Northern Virginia asking their help in launching this patriotic program. The organizational meeting was held at the Arlington-Fairfax lodge home on Thursday, October 28, 1965. Fraternal organizations, civic clubs, ladies' groups, school systems, churches, and newspaper representatives were present for this initial gathering. The program outlined by the All-American Conference to Combat Communism was adopted by the Northern Viriginia Committee. This observance was designated as "Know Your America Week" and it was scheduled for the Thanksgiving week as recommended.

The committee proclaimed this week as one for all Americans to retell the story of the price that we have paid for the freedom and prosperity we enjoy today. Tell them that only by eternal vigilance can we preserve our way of life, and guarantee for our children the benefits of life where the integrity of the individual is respected and a man is not a vassal of the State. Each of the cooperating organizations were called upon to observe this week in some manner befitting our heritage as citizens of this great country. Each day of the Thanksgiving Week was set aside for suggested recognition as follows:

Sunday: Religion. Churches. The faiths by which we live.

Monday: Government. Freedom under law.

Tuesday: Citizenship. Our rights and responsibilities.

Wednesday: Education. The schools our children attend.

Thursday: Thanksgiving. Consider the blessings of freedom.

Friday: Labor-management. The jobs at which we work.

Saturday: Religion-synagogues. The faiths by which we live.

This paper is primarily a report of activities by the Arlington-Fairfax Lodge; however, I will briefly enumerate some of the programs of the other participating community groups:

The American Legion Posts in this vicinity gave out lapel pins displaying the American flag and cards pledging support of our Nation's decisions in Vietnam. The Jaycees advanced their programs dedicated to God and country. The Catholic War Veterans and Knights of Columbus made flag presentations to churches and schools. Sermons in churches were patterned according to the suggested theme. Patriotic speeches, essays, exhibits, and other similar activities were carried out in the school systems. Civic organizations obtained representative speakers for the occasion. Ladies' clubs made presentation of flags and other patriotic material. State, county, and city governments proclaimed the week as "Know Your America Week" and urged all citizens to take part. Service organizations supplied patriotic material, and actively participated by furnishing color guards, bands,, etc. Newspapers, radio, and TV stations published the scheduled events, and many other related activities were sponsored by participating organizations.

As stated by the Americanism Committee of the Grand Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, "This is a happy order—this is a benevolent order—but this is first and foremost a patriotic American order. This is an order of faith and courage, faith in our American way of life and courage to fight for its continuance."

The committee further stated that all Elks should be leaders in sponsoring local patriotic activities in all of the 50 States.

Arlington-Fairfax Lodge No. 2188, located in the shadow of the Capitol of our Nation and having previously won national acclaim for outstanding programs in 1963 and 1964, made extensive preparations for even greater participation in 1965.

ARLINGTON-FAIRFAX LODGE NO. 2188 AMERICANISM PROGRAM

The exalted ruler, Cornelius J. Cahill, appointed Herman C. Anderson as general chairman of the Americanism committee and Keith Moyer as treasurer. Eight separate committees were formed under the guidance of the general chairman. They were: Publicity, promotion, entertainment, churches, schools, youth activities, music, and food arrangements. After several meetings the following procedures were initiated:

1. Requests were forwarded to members of Elks Lodges in Congress asking for donations of patriotic material for distribution to schools and libraries.

2. Leaders were selected in the schools and churches to coordinate programs and activities as prescribed by the committee.

3. Miss Cathy Holter (Miss Virginia) was selected as "Miss Know Your America Week" to represent the Arlington-Fairfax Elks Lodge at all planned functions.

4. The Americanism Ball was scheduled for Saturday, November 6, 1965. It was dedicated to American music and dances. Trophies were to be given to outstanding dancers.

5. A ceremony decidated to Know Your America Week was scheduled for Sunday, November 21, 1965, at the Arlington-Fairfax Elks Home.

The Honorable JOEL T. BROYHILL, Representative from Virginia, graciously consented to speak on this occasion. He also assisted the committee in obtaining the services of the U.S. Navy Band. An excellent program was arranged by the committee as follows: Miss Cathy Holter (Miss Virginia 1965), Fairfax Jubilairs, Boy Scouts of America, baton exercise by the Americanettes, Carl Brockway at the organ, Irwin Steuke singing the pledge to the flag, the Catholic War Veterans, and others.

This entertaining affair was scheduled to launch the week's patriotic exemplifications. The program was to be open to the public.

6. City, county, and State governments were requested to proclaim the week November 21–November 27, 1965, as "Know Your America Week" and to encourage all citizens to join in the observance.

7. A historic program was compiled to announce the week's events and to furnish an account of the accomplishments for future reference.

8. Exhibits were requested from the FBI and other Government bureaus. The FBI furnished a representative to help promote the week's activities.

9. Speakers were requested from civic, government, service, and other groups to fulfill engagements during "Know Your America Week."

10. Locations for exhibits, posters, and other displays were obtained through shopping centers, schools, community centers, etc.

11. Radio, TV, and newspapers were requested to cooperate in activating the week's programs.

DETAILED REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES

Following the organizational meeting of October 28, 1965, press releases announcing the proposed plans were forwarded to newspapers of the area, and radio and TV stations. Items were included in the Elkhorn, a bulletin published by Arlington-Fairfax Lodge. Local, city, and county governments and the Governor of the State of Virginia were requested to proclaim the designated week as "Know Your America Week." Announcements were made at gatherings within the community and at lodge affairs informing of the proposed plans. About 5,000 publications relating to the history and heritage of the United States were distributed to school systems throughout Arlington and Fairfax Counties and the city of Alexandria. Elaborate plans were established for the Americanism Ball and the ceremony to kick off the week's observations. The final stage was then set to activate the 1965 "Know Your America Week."

The Americanism Ball was held on Saturday, November 6, 1965, in the ballroom of the Arlington-Fairfax Elks Home. This affair was open to Elks and guests. It was dedicated to the history of music and American dances. Trophies were presented to the winners of the various contests as selected by a panel of judges including Miss Cathy Holter (Miss Virginia). Exhibits of American dancing by professional entertainers highlighted the evening's events. Decorations were designed to the patriotic theme as a reminder of the upcoming "Know Your America Week."

In the period following the Americanism ball, meetings were held to firm up plans. Books and other material were distributed to the school systems. Letters were forwarded to area churches urging their participation. Programs were finalized; publicity was released through newspapers, radio and TV, and other related procedures were accomplished.

The anniversary ball was held on Saturday, November 20, 1965, in the Arlington-Fairfax ballroom. This event marked the third anniversary of the Elks home and also the fourth anniversary of "Know Your America Week" in northern Virginia. During this evening Miss Cathy Holter (Miss Virginia) was officially crowned as Miss "Know Your America Week."

On Sunday, November 21, 1965, all churches in northern Virginia designed their programs to reflect the great blessing of Americans to have the privilege to worship as they please. The chairman, H. C. Anderson, participated in a flag presentation by the Knights of Columbus. Other similar presentations were being made at other Catholic churches of the area. Later reports testified to the success of the first day of the week's observances. Arlington-Fairfax lodge home was opened to guests throughout the day. An exhibit by the FBI was placed in the lobby for all to see. Giveaway material describing our many rights as Americans was distributed throughout the week. Our historical programs were also distributed to those in attendance. This program included a brief history of cities and counties in northern Virginia, literature of Government and State, Elks principles, the schedule of the week's observances, and other information of interest.

Approximately 400 people assembled on Sunday afternoon at 4 p.m. for the kickoff program. The U.S. Navy Band opened the entertainment with several renditions of patriotic music and continued to furnish music throughout the afternoon. The flags were posted by the Catholic War Veterans followed by the pledge to the flag to music by Edwin Steucke, Jr., who was accompanied by Carl Brockway at the organ. The pledge was then given orally by the assembly led by the Boy Scouts and Cub Scouts of America. The Americanettes entertained with an exercise of baton twirling. The Fairfax Jubilairs again contributed a series of songs for the enjoyment of the patriotic gathering.

The Honorable JOEL T. BROYHILL was called upon to present the Arlington-Fairfax trophy to Miss Cathy Holter, the reigning Miss "Know Your America Week." Neil Cahill, the exalted ruler of Arlington-Fairfax Lodge No. 2188, reminded us of the Elks great love of God and country and then presented Congressman BROYHILL as the guest speaker. The talk by Congressman BROYHILL will long be remembered by those present. It was designed for the occasion and furnished inspiration and pride of heritage to the committee and to everyone present. The entire program met with great favor and accomplished the purpose for which it was intended: To remind each of us of our great blessings as Americans. Open house for Elks and guests was observed throughout the evening in honor of "Know Your America Week."

Monday marked the beginnings of the week's observances with the theme, "Government—Freedom Under Law." Appropriate exercises were carried out in the schools, service organizations, fraternal orders, civic groups, and communities. Such was the case throughout the week in accordance with the scheduled events designated by the All-American Conference To Combat Communism. The results of many outstanding activities were reported throughout northern Virginia, a testimonial to the success of the overall program.

The FBI exhibit was displayed at the Arlington-Fairfax Elks Home and the Korvette department store throughout the week. Patriotic and historical material was available at these locations for the asking. Miss "Know Your America Week" was present on several occasions to present this material and represent our organization as a symbol of charity and love of country.

CONCLUSIONS

The scope of the overall program cannot be determined until the results have been received through letters, newspaper articles, reports, and other related media which may take weeks or even months. To date, "thank you" letters have been received from all school systems for patriotic material given to Them. They have also submitted a résumé of school activities during "Know Your America Week" including copies of speeches, essays, pictures of displays, and other pertinent information. As requested by the chairman of the church committees, most churches in northern Virginia sent copies of sermons and programs used during the date of their observance. Letters of commendation were received from service organizations, Government bureaus, civic groups, and others. Of special note were letters from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, and the national president of the JC's. Each letter was highly complimentary of our efforts, pledging their support for future exemplifications of this observance. In summing up the 1965 program I feel that the following goals were attained:

1. Outstanding participation.
2. Donation of excellent material.
3. Publicity through newspapers, radio, and TV.
4. Coordination of all community patriotic groups.

Through the achievements of "Know Your America Week" the entire community has been reminded of the many blessings that we share as Americans.

Respectfully submitted.

H. C. ANDERSON, *Chairman.*

Joe Grandee: Outstanding Texas Artist of the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the best artists Texas has ever produced is Joe Grandee, who lives in Arlington, Tex.

Joe Grandee is already a tradition himself, as he lives in the same manner as his frontier ancestors and is familiar with the historical events and people which are subjects for his paintings. Painting with painstaking detail and exact realism as a result of intense research, Joe Grandee has come an excellent chronicle in oils and watercolor of the action and life and color and violence and glamor of the Old West. We have another Remington or Russell growing up artistically in this generation.

As an account of this great young artist, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Dallas Morning News of Thursday, March 10, 1966, entitled "Museum Called Home; Arlington Artist Lives in the Past," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUSEUM CALLED HOME: ARLINGTON ARTIST LIVES IN THE PAST

(By Kent Biffle)

ARLINGTON, TEX.—Meeting Joe Grandee is like shaking hands with the 19th century.

Grandee, 36, is an artist who lives in the past. His house is a museum filled with old firearms, spurs, sabers, saddles, jack boots and Indian relics.

Right now Grandee sports the kind of mustache and goatee that Indian-fighter George Armstrong Custer wore.

He's soaking up details of Custer's life and those final 20 minutes of glory at the Little Big Horn.

"I know a psychiatrist would have a field day with me," Grandee said Wednesday. He pointed to a wall covered with Indian garments and buckskins. "But I love every bead of this. Every stitch. It's possible to recapture the past. And I like the past better than the present."

Actually, there's little madness in Grandee's method. He'll paint five works relating to Custer. And customers are waiting who'll pay thousands of 1966 dollars for each canvas.

Grandee's last of Custer won't be the traditional one. The blue-eyed artist said, "Custer rode to the Little Big Horn with a burr haircut. His wife had warned him that his famous yellow hair would make him a target. Besides, Custer was beginning to bald rapidly and he was vain enough to hope the haircut might improve things.

"A battle scene is the most difficult and yet the most beautiful of all scenes," Grandee said. He visualizes Custer riding to glory in a tailored blue shirt with the sleeves rolled. He wasn't wearing his buckskin jacket, said the artist-researcher.

"It was June. Frederic Remington painted overcoats on the soldiers at the Little Big

Horn. Remington was great. But he was a busy man."

Grandee charges high prices but fills each canvas slowly and only after painstaking research. He likes to hold a prospector's canteen in his hand before including it in a painting.

His painting—"The 20 Mules of Death Valley"—is currently being shown across the country by the makers of Borax. That work, reproduced in color in the January 30 issue of TV Channels magazine in the Dallas News, will hang in the Cowboy Hall of Fame in Oklahoma City.

Dallas-born Grandee began painting as a teenager. Some of the early stuff he turned out bothers him. He's quietly trying to buy up many of his early works. He doesn't want them to end up in a museum.

He is so keen on authenticity that he often poses his wife, Murlene, in century-old buckskins. Murlene is authentic, too. She's part Cherokee.

A great-grandfather of Grandee was Judge Henry Hill, who presided over trials stemming from the Sutton-Taylor feud in DeWitt County.

Another great-granddaddy came from Spain and fathered Benito Grandee who, in turn, fathered the biggest saloon and dance hall in Corpus Christi.

Lives of Good Brave Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Astronauts Elliott See and Charles Bassett and the earlier death of Astronaut Theodore Freeman have brought home to every American the inherent dangers of men who advance the frontiers of space and aviation. Mr. William J. Coughlin, editor of Missiles and Rockets, has summarized well in his editorial of March 14, 1966, the philosophy that must sustain us all in our conquest of the unknown. This sensitive and thoughtful article is a fitting tribute to our astronauts in the new and better life that they are forging for our country through their great sacrifice. I commend this important editorial to your reading:

LIVES OF GOOD BRAVE MEN

(By William J. Coughlin)

The death which came to Astronauts Elliott See and Charles Bassett in the crash of their Northrop T-38 at the McDonnell Aircraft St. Louis plant seems a wasteful and tragically abrupt end to a future of shining promise—as did the earlier death of Astronaut Theodore Freeman in a Houston crash.

But consideration of all aspects of the tragedies indicates that these sacrifices were not in vain, that the three brilliant young men served their Nation in a way which has gone unrecognized. This is of little consolation to those left behind; but acknowledgment of their contribution to the country's future may serve to soften grief.

Sooner or later, a similar tragedy can touch the space program itself. Despite the most strenuous safety measures, including a traceability program which does much to insure the integrity of space hardware, the day may come when disaster strikes the Gemini or Apollo projects, taking the lives of one or more of the Nation's astronauts on the launch pad, in space, or on the lunar surface.

By emphasizing the everyday risk taken by all the astronauts in the course of training, the deaths of Captain Freeman, Mr. See, and Major Bassett have almost certainly lessened the outcry against the space program in the event of similar losses during space operations.

Each time an astronaut steps into a military jet aircraft, he is running a risk perceptibly greater than that he takes in space. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration takes the greatest of care to assure that manned spacecraft launches are as safe as the best engineering talent in the Nation can make them. A launch atop a Titan II, hazardous as it may be, cannot compare with the danger inherent in groping through low fog for an elusive runway in a jet aircraft.

This is not to deprecate the risk involved in a space launch. But the military fliers and civilian test pilots in the space program are no strangers to danger. They have faced it many times. They would be the last to want a delay or cancellation of manned space projects in event of a tragedy.

By lessening that possibility, the astronauts who lie in Arlington have done a service to their comrades and to their Nation.

This may be the time to take a close look at the early tragedies in aviation to see what impact similar disasters in the space program may have on press and public opinion.

The first aviator killed was Lt. Thomas E. Selfridge, who died September 17, 1908, at Fort Myer, Va., in a crash which seriously injured Orville Wright.

The Army was quick to emphasize the importance of the aviation program in the face of the tragedy. "Of course we deplore the accident," said the head of the signal office of the War Department, "but no one who saw the flights of the last 4 days at Fort Myer could doubt for an instant that the problem of aerial navigation was solved * * * these accidents and setbacks will occur as they occur in every new field of endeavor, but the main problem has been demonstrated."

Gen. Luke E. Wright, Secretary of War, stated promptly: "It is a very sad happening and one to be deeply regretted. (But) I see no reason why this accident should give any serious setback to the experiments in aeronautics being made by the Army."

Despite widespread coverage of the crash, the Army's prompt explanation of the importance of the project was reflected in the editorial comment on the accident.

The Washington Evening Star said the following day: "Whatever is the verdict (on the cause of the accident) there is no question in the minds of Army officers that the flying machine experiment will be continued and that the ultimate development of the machine will be successful."

The Washington Post said: "The death of Lieutenant Selfridge and the serious injury of Mr. Wright is a grim reminder that man's conquest of the air is not to be achieved without danger and death. * * * Men will not be daunted, however, in their efforts to fly. They will learn something from this accident, thus turning even misfortune to account in the tireless quest for the secret of aviation."

The New York Times took the same approach.

There is an important lesson in this for NASA. If disaster strikes the space program, it will not be in the comparative isolation of a Fort Myer in a world of limited communications. Chances are it will be within the sight or hearing of millions tuned in throughout the world. NASA spokesmen must be well drilled in their role to overcome the widespread shock of the tragedy. History shows it can be done. To prepare for such an eventuality is not to raise a specter; it is the same commonsense precaution which calls for the training of airline stewardesses in emergency procedures.

Commenting on the deaths of two early-day aviators, the Los Angeles Times said: "Aviation is a great and waiting step in human progress, and without its practicalization the destiny of humanity will never be fulfilled. * * * This high development cannot be attained without pioneers, and while the science of flight is in a state of experimentation many lives of good brave men will be sacrificed."

Whatever lies in the future, that valedictory is as fitting for the first three astronauts to die in the service of the country as it was for John B. Moisant and Archie Hoxey in the year 1911.

The Right To Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert a letter in the Appendix of the RECORD which appeared in the Washington Post, from Samuel H. Hofstadter, entitled "The Right To Speak."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHT TO SPEAK

"I cannot be silent * * * the war was unnecessarily commenced by the President * * *. As to the mode of terminating the war and securing peace, the President is equally wandering and indefinite * * *. All this shows that the President is in no wise satisfied with his own position * * *. His mind, taxed beyond its power, running hither and thither * * * finding no position on which it can settle down.

These are Abraham Lincoln's words—denouncing the Mexican War. Many patriotic Americans regard them applicable now to the Vietnam war. Equally apposite is Mark Twain's observation at the time of the Spanish-American War: "Fair men will argue and reason against the war * * * others will outshout them."

It is a grave disservice to the cause of freedom to attempt to silence dissent from our present course in southeast Asia. And unworthy of those entrusted with the lives, the treasure, and the honor of our people. Freedom for Asians cannot be achieved by suppression of freedom for Americans. Limiting the free interplay of thought can never be conducive to winning our goals whether abroad or at home. To be sure, there is what the President has called "the freedom to attempt to persuade"; but this must be balanced by the equal freedom to disagree—even with him.

Only full public debate can help democracy work. The participants will serve the Nation best by remembering the inevitable imponderable that ambiguities are inherent in all public action—and reaction. In any view, however, recent instances of "insolence of office" at local and national levels are inadmissible.

It was disgraceful for a police officer to disturb a town hall meeting of protest in New York City; and yet more so for his confreres to support his action. And, on the national level, the course of the Director of the Selective Service System in encouraging local draft boards to reclassify 1-A college students who participate in demonstrations against the war in Vietnam is equally so.

The first amendment—Cardozo said—is "the matrix of nearly every other form of freedom." It nourishes the spirit of civility by conducting into peaceful channels men's instinctual violence in disagreement; and thus serves as a safety valve in times of stress and strain. But a right which is effective only when not needed in scarcely a right at all.

SAMUEL H. HOFSTADTER.

NEW YORK CITY.

Defending Freedom With Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the current economic situation is becoming a matter of increasing concern to all Americans. With the mounting cost of the war in Vietnam, and the threat of inflation at home, it becomes evident that the question of Federal controls again is being raised.

The need for stability in prices and wages is evident. How to accomplish this stability without imposing Government control is the vital question to which we must seek an answer. We are fighting for freedom on all fronts abroad and must maintain freedom at home.

Recently at the Founders Day banquet at Washington University at St. Louis, Mo., Mr. Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp., discussed the economic situation and its solution through the use of the free market. I commend his address which follows titled "Defending Freedom With Freedom" to the Members of the House:

DEFENDING FREEDOM WITH FREEDOM

(An address by Roger M. Blough at Founders Day banquet, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., February 19, 1966)

Founders Day in any university provides a welcome opportunity to indulge in recollections of past achievements. It serves to recall the humble beginnings of what, in this case, has proven to be a monumental educational venture that was undertaken more than a century ago. Everyone associated with Washington University may well be proud of its history, its traditions, and of its past performance which weighs so heavily as a promise for the future.

People have come to expect great things of this university and of its graduates; and if I do not dwell upon the commendable degree to which these expectations have been fulfilled, it is only because I am understandably reluctant to do anything which might contribute to inflation—even of the ego.

But Founders Day, as you observe it on this campus, has a current purpose which transcends the mere recognition of a fine and noble tradition. It provides a unique occasion to contemplate contemporary issues of mounting importance. Many of you will recall that last year, the Chief Justice of the United States discussed with you the "Foundations of Freedom" as those foundations are imbedded in the law, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. And in doing so, he shed much penetrating light upon an issue of profound importance to the future of this Nation.

I should like to consider with you another aspect of freedom which seems to me to be of imminent importance and which certainly touches the lives of all of us. It concerns the preservation of economic freedom in America while we seek to defend the political freedom of other peoples throughout the world.

As we meet here, we are confronted by the fact that despite prodigious efforts to reach a negotiated peace, our Nation is engaged in what might—if you wish—be called a negotiated war. Two hundred thousand American men are now fighting in Vietnam. Each month, some thousands of others are receiving their "greetings" from Uncle Sam. And present indications are that before the year is out the number of American troops engaged in this conflict will have more than doubled.

So for the fourth time in this century, American youth has answered the call to repel aggression in foreign lands, to protect a foreign people against subjugation, infiltration, and subversion, and to help them find a solution to their own problems. In this effort our men are heavily handicapped by a jungle-type existence, by a climate and terrain that is alien to anything they have known, by extended supply lines reaching half-way around the world, by inadequate help from most of the other free nations, and by extreme barriers to understanding.

Meanwhile, among our people here at home, there are some who question vehemently the necessity, the wisdom, or even the morality of our involvement in this war. And this, too, is an exercise of freedom that few of us would seek to deny, I suppose, however deeply we may disagree with such expressions.

But there is one basic point, I believe, upon which true Americans can never disagree: that everything needed to protect the lives of our soldiers in Vietnam shall be provided to the limit of our national resources, both material and human. If the sacrifice of economic freedom will, in fact, hasten the winning of the peace in Vietnam and reduce our casualties there, there can hardly be any "loyal opposition" to such a sacrifice. But if, on the other hand, the economic freedoms which have made this Nation the most productive in the world are—as I believe them to be—a unique source of our military and economic strength, then we should, and must, defend, and preserve them in the national interest.

In short, the question before us is: To what degree may we assist in the fight for freedom by relying upon freedom—freedom in production, freedom to buy and sell, and freedom in occupation? Or must we revert to wartime types of wage controls, or price controls, material controls and even controls of movement among occupations in order, as a nation, to wage the defense of freedom?

The question is a grave one; and it is none too early to explore it now in the cool, unemotional light of reason and fact; for the good sense and the patriotic endeavors of the American people will have much to do with determining its solution. What the people think, and what they say to their representatives in Congress, is certain to influence the final decision since eventually—under our system of laws—Congress must make that decision.

Let us consider, then, three aspects of this question. Do the pressures generated by the war in Vietnam, plus those created by a rapidly growing economy, make controls necessary now or in the foreseeable future? Do the economic disruptions caused by controls themselves negate or outweigh the benefits to be expected from them? Are other, less-disruptive means available for use in dealing with these pressures?

Turning first to the question of necessity, we recall that in World War II and again during the Korean conflict controls were imposed upon production, distribution, wages, and prices in order to channel the necessary portion of our gross national product into the war effort. How then do conditions today compare with those that existed before?

Well, at the peak of World War II, defense expenditures averaged about $84 billion a year and exceeded 40 percent of the total GNP. At the height of the Korean war, they were almost $49 billion and accounted for 13⅓ percent of the GNP. Last year they amounted to $50 billion; but they represented only 7½ percent of the GNP. That is because the GNP itself has more than trebled since World War II, and has nearly doubled since the peak Korean year of 1953.

During the present year it is estimated that our total defense expenditures may rise to $60 billion which would still be less than 8½ percent of the anticipated GNP; and they would have to mount to an astronomical $100 billion in order to reach the 13⅓-percent rate that prevailed at the height of the Korean war. That is far beyond any projected requirement of the action in Vietnam.

As for manpower, it must be noted here also that the national labor force has substantially increased in numbers during the past 20 years.

At the end of World War II there were 11½ million men in our Armed Forces—or 17½ percent of the total labor supply. During Korea, there were 3½ million men in the military, representing over 5 percent of the labor force; and about 475,000 of these were actually engaged in Korea.

Last year, some 2.8 million men were in the Armed Forces and this accounted for only 3.6 percent of the labor supply. Future requirements, as presently projected, could call for an additional 300,000 men in the services; but even if that number were to rise to 500,000, the military drain on the national labor force would amount to only about 4 percent as compared to more than 5 percent during the Korean conflict.

And as for Vietnam itself, the 200,000 men now stationed there constitute only one-quarter of 1 percent of our national labor supply; and President Johnson reports that the total production of goods and services for the war "accounts for less than 1½ percent of our gross national product."

So it is evident, I think, that Vietnam is not the primary source of the economic pressures we are experiencing. Vietnam may provide an excuse for the advocacy of controls, but it is not a reason for them; and if we seek out the major cause of these pressures, we must look to the unusually rapid rate of our economic growth in the nonmilitary areas.

Last year, the American economy grew at a greater rate than that of any other major industrial nation in the world. After correcting for rising prices, the "real" rate of growth was 5½ percent; and all of this new activity increased the demand for manpower, and the upward pressure on wages and prices.

During the 1960's, the expansion of the supply of money and credit has been at twice the rate prevailing in the late 1950's. Government expenditures at all levels—Federal, State, and local—have increased 65 percent since Korea even though there has been no appreciable rise in military outlays. Thus virtually all of this increase has occurred on the nondefense side of the ledger.

As a result, a head of economic steam is building up to a point which is beginning to cause national concern lest it break out in a burst of rising wages and prices. And this concern is understandable at a time when we are confronted by a stubbornly continuing imbalance of international payments, a worrisome outflow of our dwindling gold supply, the need to widen the narrowing gap in our favorable balance of trade, and the necessity of preserving the integrity of the dollar as a medium of international exchange.

Trying to find out how long we can contain this mounting head of steam while continuing to heat up the boiler is something like playing Russian roulette. Certainly we cannot continue indefinitely no matter how hard we try to hold back the hand on the pressure gage. For the present we are pinning our faith upon the willingness and the ability of both industry and labor to comply voluntarily with the governmental guideposts established some years ago; and while a considerable degree of price stability has been achieved during this period—especially in the more "visible" industries where a certain amount of persuasion could be applied—the boiler is clearly beginning to leak.

For the entire nongovernmental sector of the economy, employee compensation per man-hour has risen more than output per man-hour in each of the past 3 years; so unit labor costs have kept mounting. Across the economy generally, labor settlements last year exceeded the guidepost limits of 3.2 percent; and a recent release by the Department of Labor reports that in the construction industry, for example, wages and benefits rose 4.8 percent during the past fiscal year, while their study of a limited number of these labor contracts negotiated in 1965 revealed increases averaging 6.1 percent and ranging up to 8.3 percent.

Under the pressure of these rising costs and of the increased economic activity generally, the Consumer Price Index has risen 11 percent since 1957–59, and the tempo has accelerated recently. In fact I might add, parenthetically, that during the 7 years since the end of 1958, the cost of living has gone up about six times as much as the price of finished steel. But I mention that only in passing.

Further energizing this trend toward higher wages and consequent rising prices is the fact that we now have practically full employment, and there is an actual shortage of skilled workers. Only about 4 percent of the labor force is presently classified as unemployed, and the Council of Economic Advisers reports that this figure will drop to 3¾ percent for the current year and will be well below that level at year's end. Among married men, unemployment is now down to 2 percent and is still declining.

Under all of these circumstances, it will clearly become increasingly difficult to maintain an acceptable degree of wage and price stability through the publication of guideposts and the powers of Presidential persuasion; and the question arises: "What next?"

So the situation that confronts us today is much like that which prevailed at the end of 1950, when the United States had started down the road to wage and price controls. Then, as now, the road was paved with requests for a voluntary freeze; and standards for the freeze were being drawn up. Under the pressures of that day, the prices of many products were rising; and the prospect of price control, itself, added greatly to these pressures as producers and merchants sought to cover their rising costs before the freeze hit them. Production shifted from lower price lines to more expensive, and more porfitable goods; and retailers built their inventories to a record high, thus adding to demand in an already overheated economy.

But before we travel that road again, let us stop, look, and listen, for it is one thing to talk of controls and quite another thing to survive them. There is no doubt that for a limited period they can and do hold down the lid on prices. There is also no doubt, however, that they create scarcity and thus add to the economic pressures that caused their adoption in the first place. Some of us whose memory goes back to the controls of 20 years ago will recall the butter that was sold from under the counter to favored customers, and the deterioration in the quality of merchandise that occurred as producers and merchants were often forced—at the peril of their own survival—to pay higher than ceiling prices on purchases in order to get the materials to keep their businesses running.

Then, too, there is the wasteful deployment of manpower at a time when a shortage of manpower already exists. Under the normal operation of a free market, the people themselves—as buyers—determine what manpower will be allocated to what production. If they do not choose to buy a certain product, then that product will no longer be made and the manpower will go elsewhere to produce what is wanted and needed.

Controls not only wipe out this self-adjusting, competitive mechanism, but—by their almost unbelieveable complexity—they create enormous new manpower demands in the administration and the application of the regulations.

To illustrate, let me recall that during the Korean war, United States Steel's operations were under control by eight different Federal agencies, the most important of which were the National Production Authority and the Office of Price Stabilization.

Regulations and directives of the National Production Authority aggregated about 300,000 words and underwent approximately 400 amendments, supplements, revocations and directions.

The Office of Price Stabilization issued 37 different regulations applying to our business. One ceiling price regulation alone consisted of almost 30,000 words and was amended 41 times with 20 supplemental regulations. So estimate if you can the number of accountants, lawyers, engineers, and others required to keep up with these regulations; expand that to cover all the businesses in the country, big and small; add the thousands employed in the administration of these controls on the Government side, and you come up with some idea, at least, of the great wastage of manpower that is inherent in the mere application of controls themselves.

But, you may ask, can the Defense Department—in the absence of controls—get what it needs to carry on its military efforts? The answer is that it can and it does. We already have a system of priorities under which defense has first claim on essential production.

But will not the Government have to pay more than it should? And the answer to that is also simple; for the Government is the sole buyer of war materiel while there are many sellers competing for its business. Thus we have the opposite of a monopoly—a monopsony. And as a monopsony, the Government imposes conditions of purchase under which it exercises the right to renegotiate contracts and to reclaim and adjudicate part of the purchase price if the profits on the sale are deemed too large.

But then, you may ask, how about the average fellow, the pensioner, or the widow living on a fixed income. Without controls, is there any better way of keeping prices from skyrocketing? And here, I can only think of the ardent young suitor whose proposal of marriage had been firmly rejected by the girl of his dreams.

"Tell me," he pleaded, "is there any one else?"

"Oh, Elmer," she replied, "there must be."

So it is with controls. There must be better solutions; and I believe that there are.

In the first place we must recognize that our productive capacity in America is expanding substantially every year; so there is an ever-increasing supply of goods and services to meet our Nation's demands, both military and civilian.

The President has called upon business to exercise restraint in its pricing policies; and has asked labor unions to keep their demands within certain bounds. Here it must be said that the two problems are somewhat different. Among businesses there is a high degree of competition which tends to repress prices; but among unions there is also a high degree of competition—more in the nature of political competition—which tends conversely to escalate wages.

For example, transit workers in New York recently won wage and benefit increases far in excess of guidepost limits; and now it is announced that the New York City police will seek pay boosts that will also shatter the guideposts concept.

It goes without saying that among labor unions you will find just as many patriotic and dedicated men as in any other segment of our society. These men, however, have a real problem. They feel compelled by force of circumstances to demand more in behalf of the individuals they represent. That is their function and their job; and it is asking much of them when they are called upon to exercise restraint.

Similarly it is the inescapable obligation of business managers to keep their enterprises healthy and to generate the profit necessary to keep America's industrial facilities modern and competitive—not only in the interest of the owners but in the national interest as well. So there must be some wage and price flexibility to accommodate the myriad changes that occur from day to day. Yet I believe that the wiser heads in the leadership of both labor and business will recognize that the exercise of restraint in the highest possible degree is imperative at a time when the probable alternatives are rising costs and runaway prices or disruptive controls.

But restraint is not a one-way street, and no matter how diligently and patriotically business and labor may try to plug the leaks in the economic boiler, they cannot succeed unless someone stops pouring on the coal. And that, I believe, is where Congress comes in. On the monetary side, the Federal Reserve Board is authorized and equipped to retard the expansion of currency and credit; and I would not anticipate that Congress would seek to oppose the necessary exercise of these powers.

On the fiscal side, Congress can ease the pressure by the judicious use of taxation; and the President has already recommended the reinstatement of certain excise taxes and a speedup in the payments of personal and corporate income taxes.

But it is in the area of restraint in appropriations and other legislation that the hard-working "men on the Hill" face both their most difficult problem and their greatest opportunity to prevent a further heating up of the economy; for it is they who control the purse strings.

Today we dream of an America where there will be no slums, no pockets of poverty, no illiterates, no unemployed, no discrimination, no lack of medical facilities for all, and a minimum of crime. And, being Americans, we are impatient to reach those shining goals—which is as it should be. But excessive impatience at a time of great economic pressure can be disastrous and produce the wage and price explosion which neither guideposts nor controls can permanently prevent. And it is up to all of us to recognize that we cannot have what I call instant affluence.

Certainly it should be possible to defer a number of programs which call for the pouring of additional dollars into the economy from Government sources, however meritorious those programs might be under other circumstances.

Is it necessary, for example, to press forward with make-work types of projects at a time when manpower is already scarce and growing scarcer?

Is this a time to undertake other large governmental expenditures which will divert manpower from more immediately necessary production? No one discounts the value of training the youth of this Nation and providing jobs for them; but is it not better for them to be trained on the job while earning their own keep and doing useful work? And does not the growing shortage of skilled workers create new opportunities for the unskilled to acquire skills?

Then, too, is this the year to enact, for example, a law increasing the minimum wage by 40 percent, and at the same time talk about a 3.2-percent limit on increases under the guideposts? Will this not tend to elevate the entire wage structure when the increased social security and medicare taxes that went into effect last month have already added at least two-thirds of a percent to employment costs generally—an addition, incidentally, which the guideposts do not take into account?

Is 1966 the year in which to federalize unemployment compensation by legislation that will add still further to the cost of employment in hundreds of corporations all over the country?

In short, is this the time to enact—in the name of social progress—far-reaching programs that are costly, inadequately managed because of the lack of trained manpower, and in many instances designed to correct situations that the present economic buildup is already tending to correct without governmental intervention?

The answer is up to the Members of Congress. It is their prerogative to authorize expenditures. It is their obligation to view the economic picture as a whole and act in their own best wisdom.

Summing up, then, this is a plea for recognizing where we are as a nation—a nation which necessarily must meet its commitments abroad and maintain its economic strength at home.

It is a plea for practical restraint by both business and labor.

It is equally a plea for restraint on the part of Congress which will finally determine the extent of the pressures unleashed in our economic system.

It is even more a plea to recognize that the most effective way to help our Government achieve its purposes is not through the imposition of controls—and that even the suggestion of controls breeds apprehensions which induce scare buying and, in turn, increase the upward tendency of wages and prices.

Above all, this is a plea to recognize the free market economy for what it is: the most efficient, productive source of our material freedom; and to acknowledge that interference with the market's operation leads to inefficiency, inequity, and to shortages.

In a word, it is a plea to defend freedom with freedom.

Where Lie Detectors Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the public's access to Government information is being impeded by the increasing frequency of "news management."

I reiterate my often stated belief that our system of government will serve us well only if the public is well informed. The Government has a responsibility to not only tell the truth, but also to adopt policies which will insure the flow of information to the American people.

An editorial in the March 16, 1966, edition of the Chicago Tribune discussed the matter of news management. The editorial follows:

Where Lie Detectors Are Needed

(The newspaper is an institution developed by modern civilization to present the news of the day, to foster commerce and industry, to inform and lead public opinion, and to furnish that check upon government which no constitution has ever been able to provide.—The Tribune Credo.)

The widespread distrust of the Johnson administration's news management activities was illustrated yesterday at a hearing conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The committee was considering the nomination of Dixon Donnelley, a former newspaper man, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, and the committee members wanted to know if he would be truthful with the press and public.

Chairman J. W. Fulbright asked him:

"A few years ago, Arthur Sylvester, as Assistant Secretary of Defense, asserted 'the Government's right, if necessary, to lie to save itself when it's going up into a nuclear war.' What are your views of the Government's right to lie?"

Donnelley said he couldn't recall such a statement by Sylvester, and he added:

"I have never knowingly lied to a newspaperman. This is something I would try to avoid."

"You don't approve of it as a general practice?" asked Senator Fulbright.

"No, sir," Donnelley replied.

This seemed to satisfy the committee, and Donnelley's nomination was approved unanimously. But it doesn't satisfy us. Any candidate for the job of top information officer in the State Department who doesn't recall the Sylvester statement about the Government's right to lie either is lying himself or lacks the knowledge required for this job. Sylvester's statement started a national debate which is still continuing, because newsmen suspect that the Johnson administration invokes the right to lie when there is no threat of nuclear war or any other crisis.

The Senate committee should have continued its questioning of Donnelley by asking him if he agreed with a former occupant of his office, Robert J. Manning, who complained that the people are permitted to know too much about their country's business. In a speech in Boston in 1964 Manning declared the Government is often handicapped in carrying out its foreign policy because of what he called the unlimited freedom of the press to pry into and print Government secrets.

More recent criticism of the press has come from Bill D. Moyers, the White House Press Secretary, who defended news "leaks" to favored reporters and denounced the press in general in a speech to Columbia University journalism school alumni.

"You are unable to accept motivation in quite the same way we believe we in the Government are motivated," he said. "We so often do things out of the purest of motives. The heart of the tension is that it is difficult for you to understand our motives have been as pure as they are."

Moyer's predecessor as the closest confidant of President Johnson was one Bobby Baker, the purity of whose motives is open to question.

As for the policy of managing the news, it is taken for granted not only in Washington but throughout the country. It is one of the reasons for the widespread confusion about the war in Vietnam.

Walter Cronkite, the CBS commentator, summed up the situation recently in a speech to the Inland Daily Press Association in Chicago.

"The political lie has become a way of bureaucratic life?" he said. "It has been called by the more genteel name of 'news management.' I say here now, let's call it what it is—lying."

When a nominee for information officer takes an oath to Congress not to lie, it might be useful to test the quality of his sincerity in advance by subjecting the applicant to a lie detector test.

The Dialog of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at the recent VFW dinner one of the highlights was the awarding of five scholarships to the winners of the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies' auxiliary.

I am proud to say that John Baudhuin, of Sparta Senior High School, Sparta, Wis., a resident of my district, was one of the contestants.

This excellent program by the VFW stimulates an appreciation of democracy and inspires patriotism in many people. A fine example of the excellence it provokes is the stirring dissertation by contestant John Baudhuin which I place in the Record for the benefit of the other Members of the House:

The Dialog of Democracy

(By John Baudhuin, Sparta, Wis.)

Listen Athenians, Moscovites. Hear me, Londoners, Dubliners, New Yorkers, Minneapolitans, Berliners, yes, listen, people of the world.

I heard two Americans talking; one was a professor, and one was a student. They were talking of the greatness of America, and of why America is great. And in the progress of this discussion, the professor asked the student, "tell me, young man, what is democracy?"

Pictures of great Americans doing great deeds appeared in the student's mind. He saw Jefferson writing the Declaration of Independence, and he saw Lincoln freeing the slaves. He saw Roosevelt propose the New Deal, and he saw Kennedy propose the New Frontier. And the student finally said, "democracy is freedom. That's what it is—freedom."

The professor smiled and said, "yes, and you are right. Democracy is freedom. But freedom is a very general term which is often tossed to the people like a fish to a hungry seal. So you must be more definite, more specific."

"Well Professor, it's a sort of organized freedom. Yes, organized freedom. It's giving a guy who likes privacy a chance to have privacy. Giving the guy who likes to speak a chance to speak. And giving the discontent a chance to legally change things. And yes, that's it—giving the people a chance to be human beings."

"Well put, my boy," the professor said. "Now that you have told me what democracy is, tell me what democracy—this organized freedom means—tell me what democracy means to you."

The student was confused. Before this he had thought in terms of the masses. And now he must think in terms of just one person, himself.

But he thought very hard, and soon there came an answer: "Well, Professor, democracy to me is an opportunity. It's a chance to get out into the world, to study and to learn; and to someday be a vital part of America."

"Yes, of course," the professor agreed. "But that isn't all democracy should mean. Organized freedom, you called it."

"Yes, Professor, I did say that." The student thought for a moment. "Then democracy isn't just privileges. It means responsibilities, too. It means obeying laws, and paying taxes, and reading the newspapers, and voting carefully, and——"

"So far," the professor interrupted, "you have answered me well. You have told me that democracy is organized freedom, that it is rights and privileges, and an opportunity, and that civic responsibilities are a part of organizing this freedom. But you are young, and perhaps all the implications of democracy are not sufficiently clear—perhaps——"

"Now I see," the student said. And he seemed to grow a little bit older as he explained: "To me, democracy is organized freedom, and opportunity, and civic responsibility, but that's not all. Democracy can also mean having to pick up a gun and crawl through an enemy-infested jungle; and it can even mean having to patrol a stone wall or a great ocean. And, it can even mean having to give up my life."

The student paused a moment to absorb what he had just said, and then he continued. "But somebody has to do it. Somebody has to preserve our organized freedom, and I guess we're the ones. Hmmm. Then democracy is all those other things, and it can also mean dying to preserve it."

And at this the professor knew that his job as a teacher was done. So as he prepared to leave he smiled and said, "Young man?" "Yes, Professor?" "I think it's worth it. I—I really do." "And so do I, Professor, so do I."

And so it was that they parted, each with his own destination, each with his own goal in life, and each with his own ideas. All of that given to them—and to us—by our organized freedom, our rights and our privileges, our laws and our votes, our fighting and our dying. Yes, by democracy.

Great Society's Projects Need Time, More Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Sacramento, Calif., Bee, of March 9, 1966:

Great Society's Projects Need Time, More Money

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his proposal for a far-reaching Federal program to cleanse the Nation's rivers and waterways, has set down another guideline for the Great Society.

It is similar to the President's antipoverty program and his plan to rebuild 75 selected American cities, unfolded last month.

A word of caution should be sounded, however, for public understanding of these programs. While the projects have received tremendous headline attention, the proposed appropriations for them have been far short of the amounts necessary to fulfill them.

For instance, the President proposed to rebuild 75 selected American cities over a period of 6 years. The total appropriation suggested was $2.3 billion. The original outlay this year was contemplated to be only $6.5 million for planning.

Seventy-five American cities cannot be rebuilt for $2.3 billion. Probably the assessed valuation of properties in the slums of New York alone comes close to this figure.

The President's antipoverty program of less than $2 billion cannot begin to eradicate the Nation's poverty.

L.B.J. proposes for his clean river program a modest initial demonstration program to cost $60 million. He said every waterway in the Nation which passes through urban areas is polluted to some degree.

The Potomac River alone, which flows through the cherry orchards of Washington, D.C., is one of the dirtiest rivers in the Nation. One television commentator said it was so filled with pollutants that a man could almost walk across it. The Hudson River which bounds New York City on the west is as bad.

This is not to say the President is not pointing the Great Society in the right direction. It is not to detract from vital and meaningful progressive programs like medicare and the civil rights laws.

It is to alert the people that the evils being attacked will not be cured overnight and that much more money than has been asked will be required before the projects are completed.

The President is hobbled by enormous costs for the war in Vietnam. And the $800 billion which has been spent by America since 1947 for defense and foreign aid explains much of this situation. The President is doing all he can within these imperatives but the people should know of these limitations placed on the Great Society.

Intergovernmental Cooperation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, few of the measures which come before the Congress have the support of all the groups which are affected by the proposed legislation. When such consensus exists, it is obvious that the provisions of the legislation represent some commonly agreed-upon policies which should demand the interest of all Members.

Such is the situation with regard to the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act which is currently awaiting the House approval on Government operations. This bill is designed to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities between the levels of government in order to improve the operation of our federal system. To demonstrate what I mean when I say that this bill has the united support of all the groups and individuals concerned, let me list a few of the supporters of this proposal:

President Johnson has called for the enactment of this bill in his 1967 budget message as follows:

> Favorable action should be taken on the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, already before the Congress. This act would improve the administration and facilitate congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid. It would also provide a means for coordinating intergovernmental policy in the administration of grants for urban development.

Forty-three Members of the Senate from both sides of the aisle cosponsored the bill and it passed the Senate unanimously.

The four national groups which represent State and local governments—the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the Council of State Governments, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors—have made clear their unified support for it.

It has the full endorsement of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a body created by Congress in 1959 to study intergovernmental relations and problems and on which representatives of all levels of government sit.

Many national groups concerned with the sound development of our urban areas have endorsed the measure.

Following is a summary of its provisions:

Assure that Governors could obtain full information on grant programs in their States for budgetary purposes. This title, prepared by Bureau of the Budget staff, also provides a uniform method of handling grant funds and scheduling Federal transfers to the States; and allows the waiving of the single State agency provision and use of other suitable administrative arrangements subject to Federal approval.

Establish a congressional policy to reexamine new grant programs after 5 years that do not otherwise provide for a termination date.

Authorize Federal departments and agencies to render technical assistance and training services to State and local governments on a reimbursable basis. This will enable State and local governments to avoid the expense of unnecessary duplication of specialized or technical services, and permit more economical use of Federal facilities.

Establish a coordinated intergovernmental urban assistance policy. It grants priority to general local governments in eligibility for Federal aids, and requires that applications for Federal loans or grants affecting urban development be reviewed by general local governments and metropolitan area planning agencies for consistency with existing plans and objectives.

Prescribe a uniform policy and procedure for urban land use transactions undertaken by the General Services Administration. Acquisition, use, and disposal of land in urban areas by this agency shall be consistent, to the extent possible, with local zoning regulations and development objectives.

In addition to S. 561, the Senate-passed version of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, H.R. 6292 which I introduced, and a number of similar bills introduced by other congressmen, are pending before the House Committee on Government Operations and we anticipate early conclusion of the hearings on these bills, including H.R. 10212 introduced by my colleague from Maryland [Mr. Sickles]. That bill contains an additional title seeking action to meet the problems of hardship and inequity due to the lack of consistency in the relocation provisions of Federal urban development grant programs. It establishes a uniform policy for the treatment of people and businesses displaced by direct Federal and grant-in-aid programs. Uniformity would apply to relocation payments, advisory assistance, and assurance of the availability of standard housing on a basis generally similar to those in the present Federal urban renewal program.

The proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act favors no one group over another, no one region over another, no one program over another, and has, as it had in the Senate, bipartisan support, I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Historic Fort San Lorenzo, Canal Zone: Rehabilitation Project—Sequel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the Record of January 13, 1966, I quoted a newsstory from a leading Isthmian newspaper about a joint effort by the Boy Scouts of the Canal Zone and Panama to rehabilitate historic Fort San Lorenzo.

Conceived by Maj. Gen. J. D. Alger, commander of the U.S. Army Forces of the Southern Command, the idea has proved popular on the Isthmus and, as information about this activity spreads in the United States, it should win still wider support.

Already, the undertaking has attracted the attention of Ambassador Emilio Pan de Soraluce of Spain to Panama, who has written to the director of the naval museum in Madrid in an effort to obtain full information on Fort San Lorenzo for General Alger.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may be informed about this cooperative venture, I quote another newsstory from the same Panamanian newspaper and the indicated letter of Ambassador Pan de Soraluce as parts of my remarks:

[From the Star and Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama, Nov. 2, 1965]

HALF-BURIED CANNON AND STONE WALLS BARED AT HISTORIC FORT SAN LORENZO

Cannons half buried in the earth and sections of centuries-old stone walls came to light Saturday as members of Scout organizations of Panama and the Canal Zone hacked away at the jungle in historic Fort San Lorenzo.

A joint Panama-United States effort to rehabilitate the old fortifications got off to a good start with the work of the Scouts. Under the supervision of Hugh H. Gardner, historian of U.S. Army Forces Southern Command, Saturday's work was in clearing dense jungle vegetation from the "outer bailey." This is the main outside protective wall along the inland side of the fort. The fort lies on a promontory overlooking the mouth of the Chagres River along one side and the Caribbean Sea to the front.

Present to initiate the project, which is to continue every Saturday for an indefinite period, was Maj. Gen. J. D. Alger, Commander of U.S. Army Forces Southern Command. He conceived the idea and obtained the endorsement of Dr. Reina Torres de Arauz, Chairman of Panama's National Commission of Archeology and Historical Monuments. Dr. Arauz offered the cooperation of the Commission when their advice is needed.

The Scouts came from Panama City, Colon and both ends of the Canal Zone. For those from Panama City and the Pacific side of the zone the day began at the railroad station in Ancon. The Scouts assembled with their leaders for a short talk by Prof. Ruben Dario Carles, eminent Panamanian historian and member of Panama's Archeology and Monuments Commission. He reviewed the history of Fort San Lorenzo and its place in the early development of Panama.

The group then traveled by train to Colon, where they joined Scouts from that area. Buses provided by USARSO transported the party to the fort.

General Alger made a short talk in Spanish and English and then with a brightly polished machete appropriately engraved to commemorate the occasion, he took a cut at a vine to symbolically initiate the restoration project.

With axes and machetes provided by the Army, the Scouts enthusiastically set to work. Guiding their efforts was Gardner, the historian, who had a diagram of the original fort.

What had formerly looked like nothing more than a jungle-covered knoll turned out to be a large fortification with thick stone walls, trenches and gunports of the parapets. The Scouts even uncovered two ancient cannons lying below the ports from which they once had pointed—and possibly fired—at pirate ships attacking from the sea.

Observing the Scouts at work were interested spectators from Panama and the Canal Zone. Even those with no previous experience with archeology found themselves fascinated as old battlements were uncovered from dense vegetation.

A hungry crew took time off for dinner brought to the fort by cooks of Headquarters Detachment of the Army 's Atlantic Area Installation Command. After a short rest they returned to work. By the time they halted in the afternoon, a large section of the old fort's outer defenses had been cleared.

The group then went to the beach on the main part of Fort Sherman for a swim. The Panamanian and United States Scouts talked of the day's activities, and obviously took pride in the beginning of their efforts to restore one of Panama's most important historical landmarks.

Work is expected to continue every Saturday by different groups of Scouts. Later, when the time comes to rebuild some of the old stonework and to restore cannons and other artifacts to their original places, work will be supervised by trained archeologists representing Panama and the United States. Construction equipment and men with specialized engineering and construction skills will be provided whenever possible by U.S. Army Forces, Southern Command.

[Translation of letter]

PANAMA,
February 9, 1966.

His Excellency Adm. JULIO GUILLEN,
Director of the Naval Museum,
Madrid, Spain.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL AND FRIEND: After such a long silence, interrupted by news from mutual friends who have brought us word of you which, thanks be to God, has been good, I am bothering you to ask a favor which I greatly hope you can grant, since it will enable me to give satisfaction to my good friend, General Alger, chief of the U.S. Army Southern Command, a person to whom I am greatly indebted for the many attentions which this Embassy, and particularly I personally, have received from him.

Well, General Alger is determined to rescue from the jungle a great part of San Lorenzo fortress at the mouth of the Chagres River which is now covered with earth and jungle growth. For this work it would be most useful to know the plans and all the information on the fortress which we could provide him.

I am sending you a copy of his letter on the subject I am addressing and I await with great interest your good news which I am anticipating beforehand will be good.

With a warm embrace from your affectionate and good friend.

Ambassador of Spain.

Blinding Disease Strikes American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, for many years, one of the most dreaded scourges of Indian peoples, particularly in the Southwestern United States, was a sight-destroying eye affliction known as trachoma.

Shortly before World War II, sulfanilamide was found to be an effective treatment for trachoma and it appeared that the battle was over.

Unfortunately, however, nothing could be further from the truth. Trachoma is back and striking hard.

Recently, Chairman WINFIELD K. DENTON of the House Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations heard requests for a $250,000 appropriation with which to again do battle against trachoma. Chairman DENTON is deeply concerned with the problem, as are all of us who maintain close and direct contact with Indian reservations. One of the hardest hit tribes in the United States is the San Carlos within my Third Congressional District of Arizona.

On March 13, 1966, the distinguished journalist, Ben Cole—Washington correspondent for the Arizona Republic—wrote a definitive column about trachoma. I commend it to my colleagues.

TRACHOMA, SIGHT-DESTROYING DISEASE, RETURNS TO INDIAN RESERVATIONS; BATTLE FUNDS SOUGHT

(By Ben Cole, Republic Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Just before World War II, sulfanilamide was driving trachoma, an eye affliction, of the southwestern Indian reservations.

Now the sight-destroying scourge is coming back.

Gentle, serious-minded Chairman Winfield K. Denton, Democrat, of Indiana, of the House Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, is concerned.

"It seems that we have about got tuberculosis whipped, but we can't stamp out trachoma," he said fretfully.

Trachoma inflames the lining of the eyelid and produces a sandy, granulated material that causes the patient to suffer. His eyes are rheumy and swollen; and if the "sick eyes" are neglected long enough, the victim is condemned to blindness.

The Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., sent its Indian health expert, Dr. Carl Muschenheim, before the Denton committee to appeal for a $250,000 a year, 5-year program to fight trachoma.

Dr. Muschenheim observed that the disease is rare among the general population (its incidence is high in Egypt and Palestine), but that it is a major cause of blindness among Indians.

It was fourth among the 10 most frequently reported disease in Indians in 1964 when 7,043 cases were listed, an increase of 124 percent over 1963.

In the 1930's the doctor recalled, one-fourth of the Indian population suffered from the disease. Then sulfanilamide was introduced in 1938. Trachoma was put to rout and almost disappeared. Then came the war and the program stopped.

Dr. Muschenheim reported that of the 7,043 cases reported by the Division of Indian Health in 1964, most—4,517—occurred in the Phoenix health area, and 2,352 in the Window Rock health area.

Abandonment of the trachoma program during the war years, and failure to resume it afterward, had allowed the suffering to return.

A survey on the San Carlos Reservation showed that children 5 to 18 years old are the main victims. In the Window Rock area, infection is at the rate of 15 out of 100 in school-age children.

A San Carlos study showed 83 percent of blindness resulted from trachoma.

"Trachoma is a profound personal tragedy for its victims; and it is linked to the economic plight of the people," Dr. Muschenheim said, "for the visual impairment and blindness caused by the disease are an impediment to the acquisition of skills required to improve their economic lot.

"Trachoma is a preventable disease. Infection is due in large part to the scarcity of water on many reservations and to the lack of health education concerning proper hygienic practices in the home."

The 5-year expenditure of $1.25 million would, the doctor said, roughly equal what it would cost to provide care for trachoma-blinded victims.

Legislation To Increase the Per Diem Expenses for Mobile Employees of the Post Office Department Is Certainly Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for mobile regular and substitute employees assigned to road duty. The last time an adjustment was made in travel status have had the maximum per was in Public Law 68, effective on June 10, 1955.

We are all aware that living expenses have increased considerably since 1955, at home and while traveling away from home. Other Federal employees in a travel status have had the maximum per diem raised to $16—3 years ago—but no adjustment was made at that time for mobile employees of the Post Office Department.

Mobile employees eat in the same restaurants and except where they, as a group, maintain their own quarters at their outer terminal, they stop at the same hotels and pay the same rates.

If this bill is enacted it would mean that if a mobile employee is away from his headout for more than 10 hours, he would receive $3 instead of $2.25 for each 6 hours he is away from home. This adjustment would provide that the mobile employee would be eligible for per diem expenses on the same basis as all other Federal employees.

I feel that this change in the law is necessary and equitable.

Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, proposals to reduce agricultural appropriations for fiscal year 1967 affect numerous vital and worthwhile programs. The Soil Conservation Service, which is responsible for protecting and improving our soil and water resources, is one such program making great contributions to progress in rural America.

I would like to share with my colleagues a statement I presented to the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations urging full support for the Soil Conservation Service.

STATEMENT PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BY MASTON O'NEAL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SECOND DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, Georgia is one of the leading States in the Nation when it comes to efforts to protect and improve our soil and water resources. All of our farms, for example, are in organized soil conservation districts. More than 100,000 of our farmers are cooperating with these districts. More than 89,000 of these cooperators have developed basic conservation plans for their land. These plans cover nearly 17 million acres of land.

And Georgia stands near the top among all the 50 States in its interest and active participation in the small watershed program.

Georgia is second in the United States in the number of applications for assistance in watershed projects. We are second in the number of watershed projects authorized for planning assistance. We are third in the number of watershed projects authorized for operations.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this entitles Georgians to a prominent voice in the budget proposals for the Soil Conservation Service, especially the items relating to technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts, and small watershed projects.

I am particularly concerned about restrictions proposed in the budget for watershed projects. The proviso that only 35 watershed projects can move into the construction stage in 1967, compared to a current rate of 80 per year, would be a great setback to this worthwhile program if approved. I hope your committee will delete this restriction.

Similarly, the budget proposes to restrict to 50 the number of watershed projects that can be authorized for planning in 1967, compared to a current rate of 100 per year. The current rate should be continued. I hope your committee will eliminate the proposed restriction.

I wish also to express my opposition to the budget proposal to reduce soil survey work of SCS by $3.6 million in 1967. This would be a definite step backward, for soil surveys are the key to virtually all of our soil and water conservation efforts.

I urge your committee to restore the reduction proposed in this important item.

Mr. Chairman, the Soil Conservation Service, furnishing as it does technical assistance is one of the most important activities of our time—the preservation and improvement of our soil and water resources for the future of this Nation—deserves the full support of this Congress. I hope you will see fit to provide for a continuance of this great work at a rate no lower than the present level.

Vote of Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Houston Chronicle states editorially:

> President Johnson's decision to establish a new Senior Interdepartmental Group (SIG) under Rusk's direction can be viewed as a strong new vote of confidence in Secretary Rusk and his department.

The Chronicle points out that vital foreign policy decisions will be made by the Department of State, as originally intended: It adds:

> Under Secretary of State George Ball also will assume new authority and stature under this arrangement.

The thinking of the Chronicle writer will be of interest to my colleagues, and I therefore insert the article in the RECORD:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Mar. 9, 1966]

A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE IN RUSK

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, now in his sixth year as top man in the State Department, has had more than his share of ups and downs during the past year. Last summer his departure from office was being widely predicted. To dispel such talk, President Johnson told newsmen that Rusk was "one of the most competent and most dedicated men that I've ever known * * *. He ranks first in the Cabinet and he ranks first with me."

President Johnson's decision to establish a new Senior Interdepartmental Group (SIG) under Rusk's direction can be viewed as a strong new vote of confidence in Secretary Rusk and his Department. Johnson has given Rusk full responsibility "for the overall direction, coordination, and supervision of interdepartmental activities of the U.S. Government overseas"—the only exception being certain types of military operations.

The White House hopes the arrangement will "bring greater method into the conduct of foreign affairs, permit a sharper and more rapid focus of the efforts of several departments on complex overseas problems and assure that no sector * * * is neglected at a time of preoccupation with some overriding problem * * *."

This means that vital foreign policy decisions will be made by the Department of State, as originally intended, rather than by high-level White House advisers, such as the recently resigned McGeorge Bundy.

Under Secretary of State George Ball also will assume new authority and stature under this arrangement. He will be the new group's executive chairman answerable to Rusk. Ball is known to be a loyal Johnson supporter but one who has frequently differed with the President over Vietnam.

Secretary Rusk has been justly praised for his ability to get along with Congress. He is modest, deliberate, quietly determined and unflashy. He is a skilled negotiator and an excellent articulator of American policy. But he has been criticized for concentrating too much on day-to-day operations and for neglecting the long-range, overall strategy of foreign policy.

This new arrangement affords Rusk the opportunity to disprove that charge. Among other things, the new procedure should mobilize the considerable creative talents of senior State Department officers, and it should anticipate global trouble spots before they blow up in our face.

Indeed, President Johnson not only has displayed confidence in Secretary Rusk and the State Department, he also has given them a supreme challenge to show what they can do.

John McCormack Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly glad to have this opportunity to join my many colleagues in the House in congratulating our beloved and respected Speaker on the high honor and recognition accorded him by the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in proclaiming March 16, 1966, as John McCormack Day.

I know of no more appropriate day to be set aside in his honor, as preparation for the traditional St. Patrick's Day festivities reach their peak. I know of no more fitting or deserving Irishman to be honored in this manner. I know of no man who has greater love for and respect for our governmental institutions than the one so honored.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK's career will stand as a shining example of what can be accomplished by a man of courage, of integrity, who works hard and walks the path of righteousness and who loves his God and his fellow man. JOHN McCORMACK's nobility of character has been an inspiration to us all who have had the high privilege of associating with him. His service of some 40 years in the House of Representatives is a monument to his character and his ability. The youth of America can look to this great leader, this great statesman for inspiration and as an example which they can strive to emulate. There is no man who has had a greater faith in the great democratic institutions of government than JOHN McCORMACK. There is no man who has a greater respect for and who has worked more valiantly to protect and promote this great body as one of the great institutions of our American form of government.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is fortunate to have such leaders as JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts. May future generations be as blessed as we are. This great man, this man of humility, of patience, of loyalty and of devotion is beloved by us all. We all extend to him best wishes on this much-deserved honor accorded him by the citizens of his own great State.

Systems Approach to Mass Rapid Transit—Pittsburgh Offers Its Resources to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, restoring the cultural vigor of our cities has been called one of the greatest adventures in inventive self-government that any people has ever had a chance to pursue. It will require the imagination, leadership, and participation of the Federal Government, organized labor, professional groups, representatives of business and finance, and voluntary agencies.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the very stimulating remarks of Mr. Fletcher L. Byrom, president of Koppers Co., Inc., on the occasion of the First International Conference on Urban Transportation held at the Hilton Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., on February 3, 1966:

It is an honor to be asked to address this distinguished and thoughtful gathering near the close of a historic and productive conference. It is also a pleasure. It is always a pleasure to be among competent people.

I would like to build a kind of framework for my remarks today by offering you some facts.

Back in 1946, in the first year of peace after World War Two, the national debt of the United States was larger than its gross national product. In other words, the Federal Government owed more than the value of everything the entire Nation produced in that year.

Today, 20 years later, the national debt is one-half our gross national product.

In 1946, the average hourly wage of the American worker was $1.48. Last year—measured in consumer dollar purchasing power—the average hourly wage was $3.07. That's more than twice as much—and, even so, it does not reflect the substantial but unmeasurable factor of improvement in the quality of the products purchased.

We have been creating an average of 1½ million new jobs each year in this country. We have been troubled with unemployment, but throughout the past 20 years, 97 out of every 100 adult married men have had steady work.

Early next year our population will cross the 200 million. Despite this population increase, we are all struggling now with an acute shortage of skilled labor.

Since 1946, we have invested about $175 billion in research and development. We have spent some $15 billion in a civilian program to explore space.

Now, what, if anything, does all this prove? Why bring this up?

We might conclude from these figures that the whole generation of economists we grew up with was somewhat in error, since none of them foresaw these developments. Even those who were the most optimistic on the performance of the American economy were too conservative in their forecasts. Obviously, the American economic machine is a great deal more dynamic and resilient than its critics and even its admirers had thought.

This is not my reason, however, for offering you these figures. I cite them in an effort to give some definitive measurement of the astonishing capability for achievement this country has demonstrated over the past two decades.

We have worked two miracles in these 20 years. One miracle was economic. We have laid down a new industrial base for the Nation. On this base we have created new products, new industries, and an improving standard of living for most of our people. With this base we have been able to support a whole new range of very costly programs that lie outside the profit economy, from aid to underdeveloped countries to Federal subsidies for education and agriculture. Many of these subsidies reflect a new attitude of responsibility we have evolved in this country—an accepted sense of obligation for the well-being of our total society.

The other miracle was scientific. We have taken tremendous leaps forward in science and technology. One development, the electronic computer, has penetrated so deeply into all phases of industry and commerce that economists and management engineers are hard pressed to assess its potential total significance.

I hasten to add that I realize that the surge of economic and scientific development has been an international, not an American phenomenon. Wherever an industrialized nation has allowed a free play of human energy and ingenuity within a workable economic system, that nation has grown, developed and prospered; has provided the material base on which to build a better society offering better education, better health, and an enlarged spirit to its people.

I realize, too, that we Americans have had our economic and technological triumphs throughout most of our history, and that we have always been inclined to brag about them, as I appear to be doing now. This was brought home to me the other day when my daughter Carol brought home from school an essay by Ralph Waldo Emerson, written in 1871, when he was 68 years old.

Emerson listed eight developments in his lifetime that had worked miracles and changed man's relationship to man. They were: The steamboat, the railroad, the electric telegraph, the application of the spectroscope to astronomy, the photograph, cheap postage, the mowing machine, and the horse rake.

We must respect historical developments like these, and the breathless admiration with which our forefathers welcomed them. This, after all, was the age when energy generated by human muscles was being everywhere replaced, at last, by energy generated from machines. But even so, the fact is that today's developments are having so profound an effect on our society that they make the industrial revolution of the last century seem relatively modest. And things are happening so rapidly, and at such an accelerating speed, that we can see the world change radically before our very eyes. We are the first generation in human history of whom this can be said.

There is a symbol of this rapid change. It is called ENIAC—the world's first modern electronic computer, built in 1946. Next month, ENIAC will be placed on permanent exhibition in the Smithsonian Institution. It will stand there as an instrument of historic significance, along with Eli Whitney's model of his cotton gin and Cyrus McCormick's pilot model of his reaper.

I would like to turn now to one of the most heartening of all developments that has come with the surge of growth of these past two decades.

Architectural Forum, in 1957, described it this way: "The United States is embarked on the most exciting and ambitious project that it has ever undertaken; the creation of a more agreeable and attractive society, which is to say, a new civilization. * * * A start has been made at restoring the cultural vigor of the cities, as well as assuring this physical survival." Jane Jacobs has called this one of the greatest adventures in inventive self-government that any people has ever had a chance to pursue.

If you meet a stranger from another place and don't know what, you have in common—what to talk about—ask him, "How's your city's redevelopment program coming along?" Wherever he's from, he'll tell you a story of slums torn down, new housing going up, new office buildings, downtown apartment skyscrappers and parking garages, new garden apartments and malls and shopping centers. He may tell you of Philadelphia's Society Hill project, or of San Francisco's Golden Gateway work, or Boston's Back Bay, or Cleveland's Longwood, or Oklahoma City's 240 acre medical center program, or of the major renewal projects in Chicago, or St. Louis, or Seattle, or Atlanta, or Toronto, or wherever.

And I would tell him about Pittsburgh's Renaissance program—in some detail and certainly at great length. You may remember that we began early, in 1946, well before it became the thing to do. We had a complete master plan ready and waiting. We had the enabling legislation in the hopper. We had an organization—the Allegheny Conference—to see that the work was done.

For the first postwar decade, national attention was focused on the program here. Some two dozen major articles on Pittsburgh's progress appeared in as many national mass-circulation magazines. In 1947, one of them, Fortune, gave the reason for this interest—gave it bluntly: "Pittsburgh is the test of industrialism everywhere to renew itself, to rebuild upon the gritty ruins of the past a society more equitable, more in the human scale."

I think you know how it has turned out. Engineering News Record, may have said it best 12 years later in a 1959 editorial: "Pittsburgh is a shining example of what engineering planning, political leadership and business support can do to initiate and carry out a program of reconstruction and development. Moreover, since few cities are in a worse state than Pittsburgh was, and no city has any more difficult or varied terrain into which to fit new developments, the example that Pittsburgh provides can cover almost any set of circumstances." And then it added: "If Pittsburgh can fit itself for a bright future, any city can do the same."

We liked the praise, but we had mixed emotions about that last comment. It was what logicians call " a negative pregnant." It reminded some of us of the story of the first mate who did not admire his captain, and so wrote each day in the ship's log, "The captain was drunk when he came on deck today." On finding this out, the captain very naturally ordered him to cease and desist. The mate thereupon fell back on a negative pregnant. Each day he wrote in the log, "The captain was sober when he came on deck today."

Unfortunately, there are some disbelieving visitors to Pittsburgh today who are still writing, "There was no smoke in the skies above Pittsburgh today."

You know, of course, that the Pittsburgh redevolopment program is a very large piece of unfinished business. We have more projects underway today, or with firm plans, than we have carried out to date. As your hosts, we hope that those of you who are from other cities, and especially from cities in other countries, will recognize this. If you see residential slums, or a blighted commercial area, or a new bridge that goes nowhere and ends 30 feet in the air above a river bank, or an obsolete, inadequate mass transit system, if you see these in Pittsburgh—and you can—give us a little time. Come back in a few years. We'll lick these problems, too.

"An obsolete, inadequate mass transit system." We share this phrase, in degree, with just about every other large city there is. From wherever we come, we all have this problem in common. Up to now, urban mass transit and rapid transit have been largely bypassed in the great surge of economic growth; in the burst of scientific progress, in the magnificent urban renewal programs; and in a transportation revolution that has given us an Interstate Highway System; and has provided machines that can carry 125 people from New York to Los Angeles in 6 hours or less.

The time has now come for attacking this most urgent of all transportation problems: that of moving large numbers of people inexpensively and rapidly in, out, and across our cities; from home to the downtown area, to plants, to airports, to shopping districts, and back agaain.

In all that I have read on this matter, in everything I have heard—including the stimulating material offered at this conference—six major conclusions seem to stand out clearly. I think you would all be willing to accept these as guidelines, or postulates, or self-evident facts—or better yet, what the legal profession calls stipulations.

Stipulation No. 1 is that this problem must be solved. We have no choice. No—we do have a choice, of a kind. It is a choice between greatness and mediocrity, between doing and not doing, between having dynamic central cities or cities that are dying at the core. On these terms, we have no choice. The question now is not whether, but how. And how soon?

Stipulation No. 2 is that we have the means to solve this problem. We can solve it with the technology we have available to us now.

I would not want to seem to underestimate the difficulties. They are very great, very complex. This has become a problem of a kind and scale the world has not faced before. It is absolutely new: an extended, sprawling urban area for millions of people built around a dense central city. But we have solved great problems before, and we have the knowledge, the economic base for financial support, the materials, the complex control elements, the power units, and the legal machinery for solving this one. Our need is not for ideas or resources—but rather for will and execution.

Can we afford to do it? Is it economic? The answer will vary from city to city and from country to country. Each must estimate what it is worth to save the central city: to reduce waste motion and travel time of its citizens. Each must compare the cost with that of building still more highways into the city. Each must weigh against the costs the large and rapid increase in property values and tax revenues that inevitably seems to come all along the periphery of a new rapid transit system.

Perhaps the simplest answer to the question is another question: Can we afford not to do it?

Stipulation No. 3 is that we must solve this problem without taking over more and more urban land to build ever more costly highways to bring and deposit more and more private vehicles into an increasingly congested city. To build more and more highways into the city is self-defeating. We soon will come to that point where we will have to hang a sign on every such highway, "Sorry—City Filled Up."

Stipulation No. 4 is that we will not solve this problem simply by changing the ownership of our mass transportation services or the structure of the body responsible for their operation. This is one of the oldest deceptions that man has practiced on himself—the belief that a problem of government, or social order, or technology can be solved simply by a change of ownership or of organizational structure. We may well have to make such organizational changes, but we must not allow ourselves to think that this, of itself, has solved anything.

Stipulation No. 5 is that we can never solve the mass transit problem simply by improving and extending the equipment we now have. We can't solve 20th century problems with 19th century concepts. The transportation units must move in new ways, at more frequent intervals, at greater speed, in more direct routes, along uninterrupted rights-of-way, under new systems of control. For this, bold new ideas must be employed. We must use new concepts in materials, tracks, stations, control, power units, and rolling stock. What this means, simply, is that we must use the systems approach to mass rapid transit.

Stipulation No. 6 is that, since this is both a community and a national problem, all appropriate elements of the economy and all levels of government—Federal, State and local—must work together to solve it.

The Federal Government must participate in this work, but must not dominate it. If we create a Federal agency to take over urban transportation and attempt to solve it solely with Federal funds and Federal direction, we are in real trouble. The reasons for this are written in principle, in practice, and on the record of our times.

The voluntary groups found in each community—the private organizations managed by full-time professionals and supported and directed by a broad representation of people from business, finance, organized labor, public office and the professions must participate in this work.

We should never take these voluntary organizations or their work for granted. They play an essential part in any community or regional project of this kind. Seven years ago, in this city, Mr. Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, then serving as president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, said this: "By voluntary association of like-minded persons, we sway events. We exercise individual leadership best when we act in concert.

"This principle of voluntary association runs through our national fabric like a thread of gold. It is in large measure the element that holds us together."

The Pittsburgh experience has provided an early classic example of what voluntary, broad-based association can accomplish. Some scores of organizations in this county, public and private, worked here under the nonpartisan umbrella of leadership of the Allegheny Conference as the agency of central action. No existing citizens' group was undercut or replaced. Each contributed its special talents in its own area. No one ever used, or tried to use, the agency of central action for personal or corporate profit. In similar manner the entire community has united to produce the conference under the sponsorship of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh.

Finally, the full resources of American industry must be harnessed to this problem of urban transportation.

Wherever and whenever there has been a national problem of production or technology, industry has been vital to its solution. Very often there has been an interweaving and commingling of industry, voluntary agencies, and the government at all levels. This is the way the system works best.

American industry has massive resources to draw upon in fighting the battle of urban transit. It has manpower, production facilities, and research laboratories. It has the management talent required to coordinate a complex input of ideas, materials, and components in the solution of a problem—in other words, the ability to approach mass transit on a systems basis. The problem will not be solved in any other way.

I will tell you frankly that we in Pittsburgh are determined to master our urban transit problems, and that we intend to build here a transit system of the most modern, advanced, and efficient design.

Our first purpose is simple: to take care of the needs of our city and its commuters. Our second purpose is to mobilize and channel into the field of urban transit a complex of resources that will be an asset and a help to the entire Nation and maybe the world.

This will not happen overnight. The basic transit study for our city will not be finished until early next year, and it will not be finished for our southwestern region until 1970. But it will happen.

It may well be that, in the course of our work, Pittsburgh will become a kind of test case—a transit laboratory—from which we and others can learn. There are several reasons why this is so. Terrain is one reason. Real estate men say there are two extremes in the lay of land—Houston horizontal and Pittsburgh perpendicular. We know that we have special problems here, with our rivers and bridges, our tunnels and narrow valleys, our communities sitting on top of hills. (And sometimes on the sides of them.) We will take these problems in stride. And we will not mind at all if, in 10 years, people are saying of our transit system, as they have said of our renewal program: "Pittsburgh did it. If Pittsburgh can do it, then anybody can."

We believe that Pittsburgh is unique for the depth and variety of resources it can bring to bear on transit problems. In this country—in what Abraham Lincoln once called the great State of Allegheny—we have more than 30 corporations with facilities, products, technology, and knowledge important in this field. Many of these companies are now directly engaged in basic and pioneering work in urban transit. Others are producing a wide range of supporting products, from paint and protective coatings to glass and lubricants. Some of the companies have yet to fulfill their significant potential capacity to contribute. But they do have that potential.

The Pittsburgh companies which are now active in this field are designing and fabricating cars, buses, and their components. They are producing automatic train electrical control systems, air brakes, power equipment, transit car propulsion equipment, automotive drives, as well as switching and signaling equipment. These companies built the Skybus system. They provided much of the electrical equipment and metals for the BARTD system in San Francisco. They are building car propulsion and automatic train control systems for Montreal.

Mass transit for the future is basically a research and development problem today—and Pittsburgh has extraordinary research and development facilities. Research is in fact our third largest business, after primary metals and electrical machinery, and just ahead of education. We have 150 research laboratories here, representing an investment of more than $350 million and with a staff of more than 14,000 scientists, engineers, and technicians. The reactor for the atomic submarine was researched, developed, and built here, as was the Nation's first large-scale central station nuclear powerplant.

United States Steel has its research laboratories here, and Gulf Oil, Alcoa, Westinghouse Electric, Wabco, Jones and Laughlin, National Steel, Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Koppers, Allegheny Ludlum, Robertshaw Controls, Mine Safety Appliances, Rockwell, and many others who are going to give me trouble tomorrow for not mentioning their names. With these labs are the very extensive research facilities of Mellon Institute and two universities: Pitt and Carnegie Tech. This adds up to a concentration of research work unmatched anywhere else in the world, on whatever basis these things can be measured, whether number of installations, variety of work, amount of money being spent, or number of persons directly involved.

I've tried to tell you some of the reasons why we know we can master our urban transit problems here in Pittsburgh.

We think you will want to interest yourselves in this capacity that we have here in Pittsburgh to help you solve your urban transit problems. We are going to presume on this belief and send you a copy of a catalog which presents these capabilities in far greater detail than you would want to me to present here. You will receive one of these shortly when you get back to your offices.

We offer these resources to the Nation. These services can be dovetailed with those of other cities. The result can be made available, in organized, practical, usable form, to everyone working in and responsible for urban transit programs—planners, engineers, public officials, manufacturers, financial agencies, and all the others.

As important as the physical resources is the collection, collation, and dissemination of knowledge. We hope to make a contribution here. Our slogan is contained in the title we have given this talk: "Ken-Axis." It comes from Scotland and its means center of knowledge. I admit it may suffer a little in the translatifon.

We are hopeful that we have made an affirmative contribution in calling this International Conference on Urban Transportation. We know that this, the first Conference, is only a beginning. In about 3 minutes you will hear an announcement of still another forward step in the developing world of mass transit.

In closing, I will remind you of the facts I cited at the beginning of these remarks—the evidences of the astonishing growth and development and material progress that have taken place over the past 20 years.

I submit that any people who can accomplish what these figures reveal can and will build for this country a system of mass and rapid transit on a level with their other achievements, and one worthy of men living in the last third of the 20th century. I submit that it is not becoming of us to wonder whether we can solve these problems. I say that it is not wise of us to delay any longer in moving forward.

We invite each of you in this audience to help us here in Pittsburgh solve our urban transportation problem through the exchange of ideas and solutions to the complex problem we face as we have been doing for the last 3 days. In return, we here in Pittsburgh, promise you the dedication of our industrial strength, our research capability, and our educational institutions to help you solve your problems.

Collectively, how can we fail?

Connecticut Is Proud of Sergeant in Green Beret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House the record of soldier who comes from the district I have the honor to represent and from my hometown—Bristol, Conn.

S. Sgt. James Powers wears the respected green beret of the Army's special forces. He has served 14 years in the Army. Recently he returned to Connecticut to visit his family. He was interviewed by the Bristol Press. I submit that interview for the RECORD. It seems to me that Sergeant Powers is typical of the thousands of young men in uniform, who around the globe hold secure the ramparts of the free world.

THE GREEN BERET: LOCAL SOLDIER HONORED

A Bristol man will arrive in the Nation's Capital today, where he will be commended for his outstanding work in South Vietnam as a member of the Army's special forces.

He is S/Sgt. James P. Powers, 34, son of Mrs. Anna Powers of 80 West Street.

Staff Sergeant Powers visited relatives here yesterday prior to leaving for Washington. The special forces soldier, who wears the green beret, is a 14-year veteran of Uncle Sam's Army.

While in Vietnam, Powers covered such well-known battlefields at Plei Mei, Da Nang, Saigon, Pleiku, Quang Ngai, Quang Tri, and Ashau. The latter was recently overrun by North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops, who wiped out much of that special forces garrrison.

"I was at Ashau last April," Staff Sergeant Powers reported. "It is located close to the border and is an ideal observation post for movements down the Ho Chi Minh Trail, reportedly heavily traveled by troop and supply convoys of the Communists.

"You really cannot understand why we are in Vietnam until you see what we have to see," Powers said. "Sure I believe what we are doing is important. Again it's hard to believe, but our mission there is vital."

He attended local schools and Bristol High School before joining the Army. After basic training at Fort Riley, Kans., and a tough stint of airborne training at Fort Benning, Ga., Powers went to Fort Bragg, N.C., and began instruction and drills with the elite special forces units.

Graduates of this tough guerrilla training are awarded the green beret, symbol of this Nation's finest soldiers.

Powers underwent 16 testing weeks of grueling counter insurgency tactics with emphasis on survival and fighting in almost every type of environment.

The Bristol man, after completion of his training was shipped to Badoltz, Germany, and took up an assignment with the 10th Special Forces Group. He stayed at Badoltz for 5 years.

In 1958, Powers returned to the United States and to Fort Bragg for refresher courses in new and more advanced types of guerrilla warmaking and then was ordered out to Okinawa for a 4-year hitch with the 1st Special Forces.

The mild-mannered, almost shy, young man is the third oldest of a family of eight. A younger brother now is with the Army.

From Okinawa, Powers then began TDY assignments in Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. TDY hitches are brief 6-month periods of assignments. Staff Sergeant Powers served for the most part as an adviser to Laotian, Thai, and Vietnamese troops.

In South Vietnam, he based his operations with the primitive Montagnards, a people he said made fine warriors.

"We learned as much from them as they did from us," Staff Sergeant Powers related. "We attempted to instruct them into the more technical aspects of waging guerrilla warfare, while they taught us a great deal about how to survive in the lush jungles of that country."

Next stop on his itinerary Powers said is what is hoped to be a lengthy educational period in Washington at the Special Warfare Center.

"I'm going to see if I can get my orders changed so I can enter a 47-week language course. No, I don't think I will be going back to Vietnam. I probably will get what I'm after, but if I have to go back I will."

Besides a short visit with his mother, Sergeant Powers also dropped in on his aunt, Mrs. Florence Noyes of 97 West Street, and his sister, Mrs. Ella Marks of 108 Geary Avenue.

Now You Can Complain About TV Commericals—Some Advice From One of the Top Women in Advertising in the United States, Bea Adams of St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Beatrice Adams of St. Louis, a vice president of Gardner Advertising Co., is one of the top women in advertising in the United States, and we in St. Louis are proud of her as a person and as a businesswoman. I am personally proud to count her as a friend.

Recently, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried an excellent article by Peggy Johnson about Bea Adams and the work of the Committee for Improvement of Advertising, on which she is one of two women members.

I think the advice given by Miss Adams, as relayed by Peggy Johnson in the Post-Dispatch, is good advice for any parent, and for any television viewer, to follow. If the commercials are offensive—or worse—as they sometimes are, the complaints should go to the advertising industry as one way to clean up practices within the industry.

As a consumer spokesman in the Congress, I do not join those who attack advertising for all ills; I think advertising—good advertising—serves a highly useful purpose. Our economy would never have grown to today's fabulous heights without it.

But advertising should be held responsible for its actions—under law, wherever necessary, and under effective standards of good practice and high ethics within the industry.

Many of the commercials on television are good fun. Some are horrible, just horrible. I intend to follow Bea Adams' advice hereafter when a commercial offends me, and I hope other citizens will do the same thing and contact the Committee for Improvement of Advertising of the Association of National Advertisers and the American Association of Advertising Agencies. The address of the committee, as given in this article, is 155 East 44th Street, New York City, attention Mr. William Heimlich, secretary.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Peggy Johnson's Post-Dispatch article of March 11, 1966, about Miss Beatrice Adams, as follows:

NOW YOU CAN COMPLAIN ABOUT TV COMMERCIALS

(By Peggy Johnson)

Do certain television commercials make you long to throw your coffee cup through the screen? Does the drip-drip-drip of stomach acid spoil your morning bacon and eggs?

Then complain to William Heimlich, secretary of the ANA-AAAA Committee for Improvement of Advertising. His group comprises representatives of the Association of National Advertisers and the American Association of Advertising Agencies, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

This advice comes from Miss Beatrice Adams, a vice president of Gardner Advertising Co., 915 Olive Street, St. Louis, and one of the two women on the committee. She says that if the offending advertisement is printed, it should accompany the complaint with name and date of publication. If it is a radio or television commercial, the station call letters or network and the time and date of the broadcast should be given.

She believes that advertising that offends the standards of good taste and decency, that deliberately misleads or that appears to smear rival businesses is bad for the entire advertising profession. Therefore the committee was set up as a clearinghouse for complaints.

Members of the committee are experienced ad men and women. As soon as the majority have looked into a complaint, the secretary notifies the advertiser and its agency. Complainants are never identified to members of the committee, to the advertiser, or to the agency. The committee found that nearly 25 percent of the complaints represented justifiable criticism. Findings are relayed usually through friendly personal meetings with offenders. In the latest reported year, seven out of eight (advertisers criticized) quickly fell back into line.

"It must be noted that the committee's is not a fact-and-figure job. Misleading or illegal advertising is handled by Government regulations or the Better Business Bureau," Miss Adams pointed out.

The most flagrant offenses are suggestiveness, excessive nudity, repulsiveness, illness too graphically displayed (audiences sometimes object that drug and hygienic ads appear on television during their dinner hour). Improper reference to patriotic or religious themes is sometimes an offender, as is implied endorsement of bad habits. A television commercial builds dramatic impact by showing a tantrum, but it may make parents wince because they fear that their children may copy the behavior.

She pointed out that, as a whole, producers of commercials try to be in good taste and not offend anyone.

"A good deal of thought and psychology go into producing a television commercial," Miss Adams said. "Most commercials are aimed at the middle-class housewife, and 85 percent of all goods are bought by women. There are still more in the middle than on the top or bottom.

"The emotional reaction to your product is what makes all the difference. Women react strongly to the stunning white knight on the white charger. Psychologically he takes them back to their fairy tale days. They also like to think of the muscular Mr. Clean helping them in the kitchen. But they can react just as strongly against a commercial which offends their good taste."

Miss Adams was asked about one of my favorite commercials for a packaged soup mix. It starts out with a catchy little tune; "How do they do it at the price?" Then a little man pops up and says (confidentially) out of the side of his mouth, "They steal the rice."

Miss Adams explained that only a very imaginative advertiser would buy this sort of commercial.

"Some commercials are conversation pieces," she continued. "They are so well done that people talk about them. The Museum of Modern Art in New York periodically selects commercial classics and shows them in the museum like old movies."

She modestly refrained from telling us of her own commercials that became classics, but a friend remarked that one Adams commercial featuring a baby and a lullaby for an evaporated milk company ran for more than 8 years.

"I'll bet that kid is in college by now," Miss Adams said.

She is working on television commericals for the Australian market. "It must be hard to do when you're so far away," I ventured.

"Ouch my pouch," she roared.

Mr. Sparling's Views on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William A. Sparling, Jr., is currently working in Vietnam as assistant personnel manager for Morrison-Knudsen on their very important construction projects there.

Recently, Mr. Sparling, in a letter to his father, set forth his impressions on the American position in Vietnam. The young man, who is the author of this statement, has had a great deal of experience in living and working abroad and I believe is quite learned in matters of this kind.

In view of this, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that portion of Mr. Sparling's letter which gives his candid views on our Vietnam policy.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTER FROM W. A. SPARLING, JR., TO HIS PARENTS, MARCH 6, 1966, FROM SAIGON

Don't doubt our being in Vietnam—one set of circumstances, defense against agression, got us in here—and other circumstances have come to bear on the situation since—these, our doubters and detractors seem to prefer to regard as the whole issue, and conveniently overlook what got us here in the first place—but while they may quibble and lie by omission, you can be assured no one here is suffering from such confusion or delusion. There is an enemy; he does come from the Communists; he is a terrorist and oppressor; and our fighting him is the last chance for the whole population of South Vietnam. This the South Vietnamese understand well. It can be confusing at home, because the real enemy never gets hit; and because of the American-South Vietnamese effort to salvage the enemy's pawn, not destroy it; but let me just assure you of this—the more I see, the more I'm convinced that not only are we right—but even a little more than that—and the prouder I am of Americans.

Resignation of David Dubinsky as President of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker. David Dubinsky, one of the true titans of the American labor movement, has stepped down and he will be hard to replace. For 34 years he has been president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and under his direction the union workers and the industry have prospered.

In 1932 when he assumed command of the union it was bankrupt and the sweat shop was a way of life in the industry. Today the ILGWU has almost a half million members and finds itself financially in the position of lending money to the Rockefeller interests for civic projects in Puerto Rico.

In his years as president, the little giant of the ILGWU fought and defeated a strong Communist element that sought to bleed the union and which had brought it to the verge of extinction. He fought for and won a host of social reforms in the industry including better working conditions, reduced hours, retirement and medical benefits and low rent housing. The union built, under David Dubinsky's leadership, an orphanage in China, a trade school in France, and lent large amounts of money to the fledgling Israeli Nation, while at the same time fostering training and apprenticeship programs for American workers. Last year, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion while in Mondello, Sicily, to visit an orphanage and school known as Instituto Franklin D. Roosevelt, a project heavily supported by the ILGWU. I wish that every Member here could see the fine work that is being made possible to a large degree by the ILGWU support of this orphanage and school.

In New York the garment industry is a major industry and around the world, the New York garment center is regarded as the pacemaker. But it could not be so without the stability that Mr. Dubinsky and his union have provided to the industry.

Today's new labor leaders, Mr. Speaker, are not of the Dubinsky heritage, and in fact how could they be? They did not have to fight in the streets for what are now considered the normal rights of the workingman nor did any of them spend time in a Czarist jail in Poland for leading a strike against their father's bakery. This is not meant to denegrate today's labor leaders, it is just that, as it always must, the old order changeth.

I have been privileged over the years, Mr. Speaker, to make many friends within the ILGWU. I am sure they join me in a genuine sadness at the sight of David Dubinsky stepping down and I am also sure that they join me in wishing David Dubinsky an affectionate mazel tov.

New Policy Lifts Restrictions on Government Personnel Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service Commission last week made a major contribution toward the removal of Government secrecy when it issued a policy statement which, for the first time, sets forth Government-wide guidelines for access by the public and the Congress to the names and salaries of Federal employees. This is an area which long has been criticized as an information vacuum in many departments and agencies. A glaring example occurred only a few months ago when the Post Office Department refused to release the names and salaries of summer employees, even to Members of the Congress.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, of which I am chairman, made its first investigation of the availability of names of Federal employees in 1956. The Civil Service Commission recognized at that time that basic information about employees was clearly within the public domain and it responded by establishing a set of internal information guidelines that provided for the release of the names and salaries of its own employees. Unfortunately, these guidelines were ignored by other departments and agencies and they continued to lay down their own rules and regulations which, in many instances, permitted in my opinion an unlawful information blackout about their employees.

Throughout the years as the subcommittee chipped away—agency by agency—at employee information restrictions, the Civil Service Commission gave its full cooperation in helping to set the stage for a Government-wide policy which would make it mandatory for departments and agencies, with few exceptions, to release information about their employees to the public and to Congress.

The Commission's policy statement of March 17, 1966, which is patterned after its own internal guidelines, achieves this long sought objective.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the Civil Service Commission policy statement and guidelines:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1966.

Subject: Issuance of General Policy on Responding to Requests for Names of Employees and Identifying Information.

Heads of Departments and Independent Establishments.

From time to time a Federal agency may be asked for the names alone, or for the names and certain identifying information, of some or all of its employees. The Civil Service Commission holds that the names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations of Federal employees are public information. As an example of the public nature of this information, the Official Register of the United States for many years contained the names of all Government employees, with title, salary, State of origin, and duty station.

The Commission believes, therefore, that standard Government policy generally should be to release names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations in response to requests.

For assistance in carrying out that broad policy when lists are requested, the Commission has issued the following guides, based on its own experience and after consultation with interested groups:

The agency should comply promptly with every request for the names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations of Federal employees unless (a) there is a definite showing that the release would be contrary to the public interest; (b) it is evident that the list is sought for purposes of commercial or other solicitation; (c) there is reason to believe that the names would be used for purposes which may be in violation of the Hatch Act; or (d) the costs or labor involved in the preparation of the list would require an unwarranted expenditure of agency funds or interruption of the work of the agency. If unwarranted time or cost would be involved, the person requesting the list should be told that and what costs must be paid or work arrangements made by him before the list will be furnished.

The guides may be applied to specific requests along the following lines:

From Congressmen or congressional committees: The information should be furnished promptly; if furnishing lists precisely as requested would entail undue cost, this should be reported to the requesting party along with suggestions of any possible alternatives that would be helpful but more economical.

From the press and other information media on behalf of the public: The information should be furnished promptly if it is available without unreasonable public expense or interruption of regular work; otherwise, estimate the necessary time and costs, inform the requesting party what is involved, and determine if the needs can be met with information that can be furnished at reasonable cost or expenditure of time. When information media desire lists for solicitation purposes, they are treated like other commercial firms.

From commercial firms and individual solicitors: Such requests should ordinarily be refused; exceptions should be made only when it is clear that the public interest will be served (for example, requests from compilers of widely used directories) and there will be negligible public expense or interruption of work. In no event will names be furnished for solicitation purposes.

From charitable organizations: Few if any requests should be received from charitable organizations since the arrangements for charitable fundraising in the Federal service are prescribed by the Federal Fundraising Manual. Mail solicitation of employees at place of employment is not authorized, and this should be emphasized to any group requesting a list of names. If a charitable organization desires a list for other than solicitation purposes, it should be treated like other nonprofit organizations.

From nonprofit organizations such as professional societies, schools, unions, veterans organizations, State societies, etc.: In general, it should be the policy to cooperate fully with these organizations when it is evident that little cost to the agency or interruption of work would result. Otherwise, estimate the necessary time and costs, inform the requesting party what is involved, and determine if the needs can be met with information that can be furnished at reasonable cost or expenditure of time.

By direction of the Commission:

NICHOLAS J. OGANOVIC,
Executive Director.

Milwaukee County Property Owners' Association Makes Its Case Against the Property Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee County Property Owners' Association, in a recent issue of its publication, the Property Owner, listed 25 reasons why the property tax should not be the sole source of revenue for local government. In the thought that many of my colleagues may be interested in this thought-provoking analysis of the drawbacks of a property tax, I include it herewith:

A STRONG CASE AGAINST THE PROPERTY TAX

To all of those, who have not given this much thought heretofore:

1. The property tax is no longer a public tax, since it does not cover all persons equitably.

2. It is only a selective tax because $750 million of tax assessed property is tax exempt. The amount is 29 percent of total assessments in Milwaukee.

3. Property tax does not carry any credit refund like the sales tax for heads of families, who were forced to build or buy living accommodations.

4. It carries no exemptions for large families like the income tax, but only a complete exemption for certain institutions and corporations that could very well afford to pay it.

5. It is unfair, because it may be possible to put a price on property, but not a true value. A dollar has the same value for all.

6. It is not a direct tax to all people. To many it is only an indirect tax.

7. An indirect tax does not carry the same bite as the direct tax.

8. The property tax is not based on ability to pay.

9. The Constitution does not say anywhere that a property tax be used as support for the bulk of our Government costs.

10. A property tax should cover only the costs of city services to property owners, and not also benefits, that all property owners do not get.

11. A change to a nonproperty tax does not shift the tax load from one pocket to another, but from the pockets of the few to the pockets of the many or all.

12. A man with a high loan pays a high property tax on the portion of the property he does not own.

13. Persons depending upon the public tax for a living should not insist that their earnings come only from a property tax.

14. The cost of administration and collection of the property tax is most cumbersome and expensive and subject to political maneuvering.

15. A man's home is subject to government seizure, if the tax for it is not forthcoming.

16. Only one-third of the heads of families in Milwaukee are property owners, but foot 80 percent of the local government costs.

17. The property tax is decreasing in importance in many States.

18. Property assessments are not flexible enough to adjust themselves to fluctuating values.

19. Standards of property assessments vary with the various units of government.

20. Income-producing property is taxed two ways: (1) through property values, (2) through income produced, which is illegal.

21. A sales tax is said to take the milk and shoes from babies. The property tax pulls the pants off the old man.

22. Properties are depreciated in value through high property tax, and special assessments.

23. High property taxes only prevent proper maintenance and modernization, causing slums.

24. No income tax deduction is allowed for property tax on homes in the State income tax law. So we pay in the State a property tax on our homes and also an income tax. That is double taxation.

25. Too many doctors of economy are trying to juggle conditions around to bring forth a larger tax return, but they will continue to fail, because all economy is based on proper balance in competitive factors.

Message From a Teenager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, such has been written and demonstrated as to the irresponsibility of the modern teenager.

Fortunately, the great majority of high school and college students in America are dedicated, hard working, clear-thinking individuals and theirs is a voice which must be heard and heeded. The following letter received from a teenager constituent demonstrates this clearly and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

Congressman JOE SKUBITZ,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: There has been, as you well known, an extreme amount of controversy over the Vietnam war.

It is my firm belief that it is the duty of the United States to curtail communism in southeast Asia. Communism is an extreme and real threat to all of us. We, as a people who love and honor freedom must not allow these masses of people to be conquered and imprisoned by a totalitarian state. Of course, there will be those who will suffer and die, but we should be proud that we as Americans have a cause worth fighting, suffering and dying for. War is never pleasant, but on the other hand which is worse—living in a world without freedom or fighting for the rights of all men?

I, as a citizen, do not even suggest what steps need to be taken militarily or diplomatically, but steps must be taken. I urge you to do whatever is necessary to assure victory.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM T. NORTH,
Vice Chairman,
Chase County Teenage Republican.
STRONG CITY, KANS.

The Dividends Accruing From a Strong Stand Against Communism in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Roscoe Drummond, in the following column from the March 16, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune, lists some of the important changes in policy on the part of Asian countries during the past year.

Although no one claims that our policy of resistance to Communist aggression in Vietnam is solely responsible for them, it is quite clear that our actions have certainly contributed to those changes.

Mr. Drummond's column follows:

U.S. CAUSE ON OTHER FRONTS ADVANCED BY VIET SHOWING—LAOS, CAMBODIA CITED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—One thing the American people do not want about Vietnam is false optimism. We know the road ahead will be anxious and painful.

But since it became clear that the United States is prepared to stay the course in Vietnam, there have been heartening dividends.

What has happened during the past year following the strong stand—and successful battles—by the United States and South Vietnam?

The evidence is showing up in many nations in Asia and the far Pacific. When you add them up, they begin to show how significantly events have begun to move during the very period the once immiment Vietcong victory has been moving farther away from their reach.

The record tells its own story:

Laos: Twelve months ago the Laotian Communists were a mounting peril to the government. Today they are badly splintered.

Cambodia: Twelve months ago it seemed that Prince Sihanouk was trying to win merit points with the Communists as a hedge against the future. Today he is warning his own people that, if North Vietnam prevails, they can expect no mercy from their own Communist Party.

Philippines: Twelve months ago the Philippines were wracked with riots in protest against even the small support the government was giving to Saigon. Now the government is preparing to send troops.

Korea: Twelve months ago Korea had contributed only token forces to the defense of South Vietnam. Now it is at the point of bringing the total of its combat troops there to 44,000—more, in proportion to its population of 28,500,000, than the United States itself.

Peiping-Moscow: Twelve months ago the American and foreign critics of U.S. policy in Vietnam were in unanimous chorus declaring that one consequence of the U.S. decision to defend South Vietnam was bound to happen: it would end the Sino-Soviet feud and drive Moscow and Peiping back into each other's arms. It did just the opposite.

Japan: Twelve months ago Japan was moving toward a new modus vivendi with Red China and was the center of harsh criticism of U.S. policy. Today the Japanese Government is helping to focus world pressure on Hanoi to accept peace talks.

Indonesia: Twelve months ago the unpredictable Sukarno held total sway; he was surrounded by pro-Communist associates and buttressed by the third largest Communist party in the world. Indonesian policy was pro-Red China and anti-Western.

Today Indonesian policy is anti-Red China and less anti-Western. The Indonesian Communist party is no more. Sukarno has either lost most of his power to the anti-Communist leaders of the army—or all of it.

And on top of these events, not a single dissident South Vietnamese political leader who left Saigon for involuntary exile in protest against past regimes has given his support to the Vietcong.

I am not suggesting that the overturn in Indonesia or that all of the other events stem directly from the strong U.S. stand in Vietnam. That is honestly arguable. What I believe is not arguable is that the evident will of the United States to stay the course in Vietnam made these heartening dividends more attainable.

National Wildlife Federation Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution of the National Wildlife Federation in opposition to unwise legislation which would infringe upon the rights of law-abiding citizens to buy and use, for lawful and legitimate sporting purposes, firearms of different kinds.

This outstanding national organization of outdoorsmen, sportsmen, and conservationists has taken the wise and proper position that it is much better to use rigorously the provisions of the many criminal laws for punishment of crimes by criminals armed with guns than it is to deny honest and law-abiding citizens the right to purchase firearms for lawful and legitimate sporting purposes.

The resolution, adopted at the 30th annual meeting of the National Wildlife Federation on March 12, 1966, is as follows:

The National Wildlife Federation reiterates its conviction that the constitutional right to possess, bear, and use firearms for lawful purposes must not be infringed and that the registration of guns beyond that already required would serve no beneficial purpose. This organization, however, supports greater controls which would impose mandatory prison sentences upon those who commit crimes when armed with guns and prevent the interstate sale and mail-order shipment of handguns to felons, juveniles, and other unfit persons in circumvention of State laws. The sale of destructive devices, excluding sporting arms, should be prohibited.

How To Up Taxes and Not Say So

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern both inside and outside of Congress that the President is playing politics with taxes.

This concern is expressed in the article, "How To Up Taxes and Not Say So," by Charles Nicodemus, Washington bureau correspondent for the Chicago Daily News. The article, which appeared in the March 16, 1966, editions of the Daily News, follows:

HOW TO UP TAXES AND NOT SAY SO

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—Lyndon Johnson is treating the people to another of his major public relations gambits, this one designed to have the Nation itself persuade a reluctant President that he should raise taxes still further.

Mr. Johnson is, of course, well aware that taxes are going to have to be raised, and sooner rather than later. Every economic indicator shows the economy is becoming superheated.

The Vietnam war is becoming more costly every month and will need more taxes to fuel it.

Virtually every politician on Capitol Hill, on either side of the aisle, acknowledges this. In fact, in debate on the recently passed stop-gap tax measure, many of them came right out and said it.

Economists of every philosophical stripe are now crying for it. Columnists are raising desperate alarms, warning that the President had best act before inflation runs away with us all.

Yet the President tarries. Why?

Any good politican—and the President is a very good politican—knows that raising taxes in an election year can be deadly, particularly when saddled with another problem—Vietnam—that is bound to cost substantially at the polls.

So the problem that faced the President at the turn of the year was how do you ease ino a needed tax increase, while causing as little political damage as possible?

Obviously, the best way is to (1) wait until everyone appreciates that the increase is necessary, and (2) until everyone who is anyone is urging the action.

Then, you (3) spread the impact of the boost as broadly and as thinly as possible.

The first two are what Mr. Johnson is now doing. The chances are strong that the third is what he will do shortly.

In fact, many astute Congressmen believe he has already begun. They're convinced that the newly enacted potpourri of excise tax adjustments and tax collection speedups is just the first part of a preplanned package which the President decided he'd best ease through first.

What's next?

Liberals have called for revocation of the 7 percent investment credit as the best way to pick up some cash while slowing down the boom. Conservatives have called for a 5-percent increase in personal income taxes.

It would be typically Johnsonian to split the difference—raising income taxes 2½ percent; cutting the investment credit by half; jiggering a few other items. All on a temporary basis.

And when he finally acts, he'll stress, emphasize, and accentuate that he's doing so reluctantly, and only because nearly everyone—and particularly Republicans—insists that the harsh move must be made.

The administration's handling of the whole affair—the ambiguous, cautious statements by Cabinet officers; the leaked speculation on what approaches are likely, when and if the time comes—are typical of previous Johnson public relations gambits.

But there is a difference this time.

Tax cuts can't be instituted overnight, and their impact is several monts in coming. Nor can they be begun quietly in advance, like troop movements and budget policies.

There is always the danger, therefore, that the President's public relations gambit on taxes can be carried on too long—and that by the time he finally decides to move, the actions he takes may no longer be sufficient remedy for the problems they were designed to solve.

Hoosier Journalist Explodes a Number of Irish Myths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, every American regardless of his national ancestral heritage celebrates St. Patrick's Day each year. The reason is obvious. St. Patrick is the symbol of Ireland and Ireland's history is studded with glorious examples of devotion to freedom.

During this year's celebration there came to my attention an excellent article by the distinguished Hoosier journalist, Mr. John Ackelmire. In this piece he explodes a number of the unfortunate myths regarding the Irish and puts their noble heritage in a better perspective. This article, which appeared in the Indianapolis Observer, merits the attention of the entire House:

JOHN ACKELMIRE: THE IRISH

Ireland is the real or imagined homeland of all who will march or toast in honor of St. Patrick next Thursday. Being Irish for the day is like being a Notre Dame television alumnus. It isn't a matter of national origins or diplomas; it's the spirit that counts.

Ireland is one of the smallest of the world's nation-islands, being just about the size of Indiana. It is smaller than Iceland, and considerably smaller than Cuba. It also is a solitary island, a big toe of Europe stuck out in the cold Atlantic.

The first thing that strikes any visitor to Ireland, even before the plane lands, is its unspoiled beauty. It is even greener and lovelier than it is supposed to be, and much greener and lovelier than any country has a right to be.

The beauty of the land is matched by the quality of the people. Ireland is one of the great bastions of the individualist. Every Irishman is different, and there isn't a jig-dancing chowderhead or a bog-trotting harp plunker anywhere in sight.

The Irish of Ireland, are lively, courteous people and among the handsomest and most literate in the world. They are a people whose spirit never has been extinguished by all that has happened to them.

Nor have they lost touch with the old traditional earth memories that invest air and land and water with awe and wonder. God made the green grass, the clean air and the abundant rainfall; the grass and air and rain made the Irish, and the Irish turned the grass, air and rain back into God, the writer Sean O'Faolain once said. And so it seems. In any event, the Irish are a people who always have lived by the instinctive life of the soul and the passionate life of the body.

They are poised, quick and possess a rare ability to think on their feet, which has made them justly famous for repartee. But this does not mean they are comedians or clowns.

There is a certain kind of American and Englishman who expect all Irishmen to be funny, and the Irish of Ireland resent the assumption. The myth belongs to the "stage Irishman" with the clay pipe, baggy trousers and green bowler and to loudmouth "professional" Irishmen in America who reach their peak of misrepresentation each St. Patrick's Day.

And where are the "shures" and "beogorrahs" that many St. Patrick's Day speakers will employ Thursday to spice their jokes? They simply don't exist. It is commonly agreed among those who know what they are talking about that the English spoken in Dublin and some other Irish cities is the finest in the world, and the endless conversation of the man in the street is of a far higher and more delightful order than is to be found in Indianapolis or New York.

Another myth that needs shooting down is that Ireland is a nation of drunkards. A few Irishmen do drink too much. Others drink moderately. A few, perhaps, don't drink enough. In three extended stays in Ireland I have seen no more than a half-dozen persons too deep in their cups.

It is true, however, that the Irish of Ireland do sometimes become discouraged with their environment, where economic opportunity remains somewhat limited despite tremendous advances in recent years and a future full of shining potentials.

But when the same Irishmen move to America, they regain their confidence. Their charm, wit and intelligence find scope and flower, for the American system puts a high value on personality and ability.

When the immigrant Irish swarmed in their hundreds of thousands into the slums and jungles of coastal American cities more than a century ago, a writer in the Boston Pilot said, "Out of these narrow lanes, blind courts, dirty streets and suffocating garrets will come forth some of the noblest sons of our country, whom she will delight to own and honor."

This has proven true. The Irish have made a mark in America in which all Americans may take pride.

Oren Harris

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1966, the House of Representatives lost the services of one of its most able and dedicated Members with the resignation of the Honorable Oren Harris of Arkansas However, this outstanding public servant will continue in the service of his country as a Federal judge.

It was my privilege to have served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under the brilliant leadership of Chairman Harris. During his tenure as chairman of this committee his diligent and effective efforts resulted in the passage of legislation essential to the progress of our country.

I am sure my colleagues will agree that the Federal judiciary will be well-served by the addition of this man who has proven his capacity for wisdom and courage during his 25 year service in the House of Representatives.

I join with my colleagues in extending to Judge Harris my warmest regards and best wishes in his new career.

Toast to President Johnson at Hibernian Banquet in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, at its annual St. Patrick's Day banquet, last week being the 163d, the Hibernian Society of Baltimore always begins the affair with a toast to the President of the United States.

This year Theodore McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore, was privileged to propose the toast and because it was such an appropriate one, I think it should be inserted in the Appendix of the Record for the benefit of all:

Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin's Toast to President Lyndon B. Johnson at the 163d Annual Banquet of the Hibernian Society of Baltimore, on St. Patrick's Day, Thursday, March 17, 1966, Emerson Hotel, Baltimore, Md.

More than 1,500 years ago, in Roman Britain, there lived a Christian—

So committed to his Christian principles that he upheld them even when carried off into Irish slavery by a band of raiders.

So devoted to his Christian beliefs that he remained true to them through years of captivity.

So inspired by them that he implanted the Christian religion in the hearts of Irishmen throughout the length and breadth of the Emerald Isle, and for hundreds of generations to come.

That Christian man of long ago was St. Patrick, whom we honor today.

Now, in the year 1966, we salute another good Christian who practices his Christian preachments about the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God—

Who assumes responsibility for 200 million of his fellow Americans and yet is mindful of the rights, equality, and Christian dignity of the individual citizen.

Who marshals our strength but also cultivates our Christian concern and compassion for fellow humans who need our help.

Who, in the midst of the tribulations of war, seeks a Christian peace.

Who illuminates the gloom of our times with the brightness of his Christian spirit.

That other good Christian leader whom we honor today is our great President Lyndon B. Johnson. No man is more eager for an end to the conflict in Vietnam and a peace with honor than the President of the United States. On the shoulders of Lyndon B. Johnson has fallen the terrible burden of finding a solution to a problem that his predecessors could not solve; of saving the lives of our soldiers without sacrificing the lives of allied soldiers; of correcting policy misjudgment without suffering military defeat; of helping our friends without aiding and abetting our enemies of winning a limited war in one small country without losing many wars here at home and jeopardizing our position in more vital areas of the world; of waging war in order to achieve peace.

What a heavy load and how magnificently he carries it for all of us.

What prodigious efforts he has made to bring the enemy to the negotiating table—in the Johns Hopkins proposals, suspension of bombings, missions by Humphrey, Goldberg, Harriman, and so many others.

What patience and perseverance he has shown in the face of frustration and disappointment.

What statesmanship he has demonstrated in his discussions and dealings with friend and foe alike.

What a heroic struggle he is waging to end this war he did not start, in a world he did not make.

For calm under tension, for bravery under fire, for greatness of leadership, we salute Lyndon B. Johnson, who is going all that any human being can do to preserve freedom and protect the lives of ourselves, our children, and generations yet unborn.

There is only one consolation in the fearful storms that are raging all around us. That one comfort is the knowledge that the captain of the ship has a steady hand on the helm, a clear eye, and a courageous heart. I give you this toast to the long life and leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson.

A Quiet Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker—

This Nation was built, survived and came to world leadership because its people have always been willing to pick up a burden simply because it was the right thing to do.

This is the editorial opinion of the Chicago Sun-Times, which reports there is a steady upsurge of voluntary enlistments in all branches of the military services.

I believe this short editorial will be interesting and heartening to my colleagues and I make it a part of the Record:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 9, 1966]

A Quiet Answer

A quiet answer to those who have noisily advocated draft-dodging and draft-card burning is being heard nationwide. There is a steady upsurge of voluntary enlistments in all branches of the military services.

Chicago recruiting officers report they are flooded with applicants. The reasons given for the increased numbers of those who wish to enlist seem to be of a piece. The volunteers prefer to select their own branch of the service. They are aware of the post-military benefits of training in the highly technical and electronic specialty branches of the Armed Forces. They recognize the advantages of the new GI bill, signed by President Johnson last week. There is yet another reason. According to one recruiting officer, "These are proud people. They want to serve."

That may sound corny to some but it should not. This Nation was built, survived, and came to world leadership because its people have always been willing to pick up a burden simply because it was the right thing to do. That quality has not been lost; it grows. Fortunately, those who run from responsibility remain an insignificant minority.

Urgent: The Need for Changes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act To Protect Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as I told the House today in my remarks immediately following the reading of the President's message on consumer interests, I welcome with all my heart the renewed expression of Presidential support for legislation to further protect the American consumer.

In this statement, I now want to outline in more detail the provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 which urgently need amendment or improvement, as proposed in the omnibus bill which I first introduced in the 87th Congress in January 1961, and which I changed and reintroduced again on the opening days of the 88th and 89th Congresses under the same bill number, H.R. 1235. It is my hope that when hearings are scheduled on the proposals made in the President's message today on foods, drugs, and cosmetics, that all of the sections of H.R. 1235, except the one which has already become law in this Congress, will now be given full consideration.

Only once in the six sessions in which this omnibus bill has been pending has there been any committee hearing on most of these proposals, and that was for a brief few days in 1962 prior to the thalidomide episode. After the disclosures about thalidomide, there was renewed attention paid to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in the 87th Congress but the hearings were restricted only to prescription drugs. Last year, hearings were held only on the barbiturates and amphetamines. So, in six sessions, we have passed what were two of the key provisions of the original H.R. 1235 of 1961 but nothing else in the omnibus bill has been touched on in legislation.

Because of the importance of the subject matter, and in view of the President's reiteration today of the support of his administration for many, if not most, of the reforms which I have called for in H.R. 1235, I am sure the Members will want to study the approach of this bill and derive a better understanding of the scope of the problems it covers.

PURE FOOD AND DRUG LAW OF 1906

The Food and Drug Act of 1906 was our first foray into protecting the American consumer against adulterated or unsafe American products in the two fields of foods and drugs. It took a scandal involving the sale to the Army of meat treated with formaldehyde, and revelations about tonics and medicines—supposedly for women but consisting mostly of alcohol or opium or other ingredients no lady would have knowingly used—to spur the public into demanding remedial legislation and Congress to pass it.

COSMETICS REGULATION BEGAN ONLY 28 YEARS AGO

But cosmetics did not come under Federal supervision until only 28 years ago, in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, after numerous women had been blinded by unsafe eye preparations. If you read the old congressional debates on that bill—a milestone piece of legislation then, but terribly outmoded today—you will come across speeches predicting that the measure would bankrupt every business in the field, discourage research in medicines, and make every woman get permission from some bureaucrat in Washington before she could powder her nose or use lipstick.

LOOPHOLES IN THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

The 1938 act was a good law for its time, but time quickly eroded holes in it, through court decisions and changes in technology. Not all of those holes have been repaired. Other loopholes still in the act were deliberately put there when it was originally passed, in order to assure neutrality on the bill on the part of some business interests, like the soap manufacturers, for instance, who otherwise would have joined in the bitter battle to defeat the controversial legislation in 1938. I will mention later a few of those special exemptions dating back to 1938.

But what about the loopholes Congress did not anticipate, and had no intention of creating? One of the first bills I introduced in my first term in the Congress was directed at closing such a gap created by court decisions. The courts had ruled that the Government's food and drug inspectors could not inspect the operations of a plant if the owner or manager did not want to admit them. Well, this was not the intent of Congress at all, so we had to amend the law to make it explicit.

In 1954 we first took notice of the great danger of our food supply which was developing from unregulated use of pesticides on raw agricultural commodities—that was only 12 years ago.

UNTESTED CHEMICALS IN FOOD

It was only 16 years ago that the Delaney committee in the House, a special committee headed by Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY, of New York, first spotlighted the dangers to consumers from a proliferation of new chemical additives being used in food processing without prior testing and certification as to their safety. It took Congress 8 years thereafter to act on the Delaney committee revelations in the Food Additives Act of 1958, which I cosponsored. By then, responsible leaders of the food industry were acknowledging the need for corrective legislation, but the battle over the details of the bill were often bitter ones. The 1958 act was a great forward step. Under it, the manufacturer now has to prove an additive is safe before he can use it in foods. Previously, the burden of proof had been on the Government; if the Government could not provide legal proof that the additive was harmful, the manufacturer could continue to use it, even if the weight of scientific evidence indicated the safety of the product was seriously in doubt.

BURDEN OF PROOF ON COSMETICS SAFETY IS ON GOVERNMENT

The burden of proof, however, is still on the Government in the law's sections on cosmetics. There is no requirement that cosmetic manufacturers must pretest their products for safety. The consumer thus can easily be a guinea pig on a new cosmetic item. If enough consumers get hurt—burned or scalped or disfigured or scarred or infected from a new and untested cosmetic—the Government eventually hears about it and moves against the product and takes it off the market. But, oh, the agony in the meantime. Remember the false fingernails which caused such anguish several years ago, when it was discovered that removing them could also remove the nails? Or the hair dyes which made women bald? These things can happen under our present law on cosmetics.

So I say to women in this country: "This is an area in which every woman—every woman—had better begin to play politics in every way she knows how, because your skin and your hair and your nails and your eyebrows and your lips and even your lives may be at stake some day."

COSMETIC COLORS MUST BE SAFE—BUT NOT IN HAIR DYES

The only significant improvement made in the cosmetic sections of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in the last 28 years had to do with the coloring matter used in cosmetics. How it came about is a long story, and a somewhat ironic one, but color additives must now be proved safe in the manner used before incorporation in a food, drug or cosmetic. Even if considered safe in the manner used, a color additive can still not be approved if it could cause cancer in man or animal. That is the so-called Delaney clause, which we also wrote into the law on food additives in 1958.

But outside of the coloring matter, no other ingredients of cosmetics have to be pretested for safety or subjected to any preclearance by the Government before use. Only when the Government can produce legal proof that a cosmetic is unsafe or contains unsafe ingredients can it act against it. Legal proof, as you can guess, must go far beyond reasonable doubt as to safety—it must be proof of harm. And often that is impossible to ascertain without years of laboratory research.

In the case of hair dyes, it does not matter how dangerous they are—they can be sold anyway, as long as the label clearly warns the purchaser that the product may be dangerous to use. That is all the law requires. In a beauty shop, how many women ever get to see the labels on the bottles or drums in which hair dyes are shipped?

GAPS IN OUR FOOD LAWS

The law we passed in 1960 on cautionary labeling of hazardous household products such as bleaches, paints, insecticides, and so on, does not apply to foods, drugs, and cosmetics; including those packaged in pressurized containers, which can be dangerous when carelessly handled. Furthermore, the section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act dealing with informative labeling of foods—giving the consumer information she is legally entitled to have—has been held by the courts to be too vague to prevent some processors from hiding the information in tiny type in a cluttered panel, or in pastel inks on noncontrasting backgrounds, defying the housewife's efforts to find the information on weights, ingredients, and so on.

I am not a lawyer, so I cannot argue with the judges on whether the present language on labeling is too vague. It sounds clear enough to me. It says the required information on a food label must be "prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness—as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling—and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use."

READ THE LABEL—IF YOU CAN

As I said, that sounds pretty clear and straightforward to me. But the courts have nevertheless blocked Food and Drug Administration efforts to crack down on some flagrant violators. The law therefore needs a simple amendment authorizing the Government to issue regulations specifying—as is done now in the prescription drug sections of the law—how the required label information must be presented on the label—the location of the data on weights and on ingredients, the comparative type sizes to be used, and so on.

Otherwise, the housewife will continue to find it difficult, if not impossible, to find the net weight on some bags or boxes, or cans or bottles, if only to try to figure out the better buy between different sizes of the same brand. And she will continue to find it a real challenge to find the listing of ingredients to make sure the contents do not include anything to which some member of the family is allergic.

There is not widespread enough violation of the spirit of the labeling law to an extent that it is a serious national crisis, but violations are common enough to constitute an unpardonable nuisance to the careful- label-reading shopper—who must take extra hours to do her marketing. These violations also victimize the casual shopper who is quickly discouraged from making the complex price computations to determine the more economical among competing products or among different size packages of the same product. So she buys the "large economy size" on faith that it is the better buy—and often it is not as good a buy as a smaller size—believe it or not.

LOOPHOLES ENDANGERING HEALTH

Much more serious, however, are the gaps in the food, drug, and cosmetic law which affect not your pocketbook and disposition so much as your life and safety. I have described the free and easy manner in which cosmetics can be manufactured and put on sale without pretesting or clearance for safety and the fact that coal tar hair dyes are subject to no regulation, no matter how dangerous, as long as the label warns you of the possible consequences of using them. The cosmetic and hair dye manufacturers won these special exemptions for their products during the battle over passage of the original act in 1938.

They have been successful ever since in fighting off attempts to make them prove the safety of their products before marketing.

THERAPEUTIC DEVICES

Let us look at another loophole in the law. Therapeutic devices—medical devices of all kinds—can also be marketed, as cosmetics are, without safety clearance, and can be removed from the market only if proved dangerous or fraudulent. In this case, we should require not only proof of safety but also proof of effectiveness, too—particularly when someone with a serious illness or disability delays seeking medical attention in the hope some useless machine or device can cure him. But the problem is serious also in the devices and materials used in good faith by physicians and dentists. What a tragedy it has been for some patients who underwent surgery involving the use of artificial bone material only to have the material deteriorate in the body; then they have had to go through the ordeal all over again—merely because the material used had not been sufficiently tested for safety and effectiveness before being put on the market.

H.R. 1235, AN OMNIBUS BILL TO REWRITE THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

Rather than catalog all of the possible dangers of living in today's fast-changing world with its amazing new technology, I would like to list what my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 would actually do. Its number is H.R. 1235. I introduced it originally on the opening day of the 87th Congress, in January, 1961, 5 years ago. Brief hearings were held in June 1962 on the whole range of issues covered in the omnibus bill, after President Kennedy's consumer message that year endorsed most of its provisions. As originally introduced, the bill provided the procedures later adopted by Congress to safeguard prescription drugs, in his historic Drug Control Act of 1962 which was enacted after the thalidomide tragedy came to public attention.

IT HAS EVERYTHING IN IT, INCLUDING THE KITCHEN SINK

I revised and reintroduced the bill in the 88th Congress, 3 years ago, but no action occurred in the House on any of its features. I have now reintroduced it in this Congress, bringing it up to date once again. It is 45 pages long and covers everything you eat, all the medicines you use, anything rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, introduced into, or otherwise applied to the human body for the purpose of cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance, to give you the official definition of a cosmetic; it applies also to therapeutic devices, fake cancer cures, worthless ingredients in special dietary foods; over-the-counter drugs, animal feeds.

In other words, it has everything in it, including the kitchen sink, along with the refrigerator, the bathroom medicine cabinet, the dressing table, and the nursery. I am going to spell out some of the provisions, Mr. Speaker, so that the Members can decide whether the loopholes which this bill would close are serious enough to warrant action. I also hope that through publication of this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, many citizens, particularly women, are able—through newspapers, radio, and television programs, magazine articles, and through their churches and clubs and organizations—to learn more about the need for this legislation, for I am convinced that they then will insist and demand that Congress act.

As I have told consumer groups repeatedly, along those lines, if enough women are made aware of the deficiencies in our basic consumer law and are encouraged to write to their congressional delegation about these deficiencies and the need for corrective legislation, such legislation will be enacted promptly. As I explained, "Congress is like the accelerator of your car—that is, very sensitive to pressure. You make it go by putting your foot down."

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF H.R. 1235

Now here, in the order in which they are covered by H.R. 1235, are some of the things on which all of us, and particularly the women of this country, must put their foot down hard.

Section 1 is the title of the bill.

MAKING THE LABEL SERVE ITS FULL PURPOSE

Section 2 deals with amendments to the required labeling provisions of the present law—to make sure the consumer can readily find the net weight and ingredients and other information she is entitled to have on food, drug, and cosmetic labels; also to require cautionary labeling on pressurized food or cosmetic containers so as to prevent accidents, and on medicines and drugs to prevent unsafe use by children or by adults with pathological conditions. Labels would have to carry instructions for first aid treatment, when necessary.

For instance, in the case of cosmetics which are frequently swallowed by children, the doctors just have to guess as to what is in the products. This section would also apply to hair sprays, which are usually dangerously flammable—but you see women using them while smoking, and in the beauty shops you see clouds of the spray with no one apparently aware of the fact that they can be dangerous to inhale.

Section 2 also removes a 28-year-old loophole put in by the dairy industry, exempting butter, cheese, and ice cream from having to reveal on the package or label the presence of artificial color. Every other food label must show the presence of artificial color; why not butter, cheese, and ice cream? Of all of the provisions of my bill, I guess this one on artificial color in dairy products is probably the least urgent from the standpoint of health and safety, but I included it because this exemption is typical of how every industry wants to hide from the consumer facts which are perhaps a little embarrassing—such as the fact that the beautiful yellow color which butter claims as its own is often put there with a chemical.

Some consumers, for reasons of their own—and sometimes they are good reasons—want to avoid artificial coloring matter in food whenever possible. The color additives in use in food are proven to be safe in the manner in which they are used, but it should be remembered that the law had to be changed several years ago to repeal a previous requirement that these colors must be absolutely and completely harmless under any and all circumstances. The Government discovered that many of the coal tar colors were no longer able to pass this requirement of the 1938 act because the testing devices, like those used to find pesticide residues in milk, were so much improved and so extremely sensitive.

SPECIAL DIETARY FOODS

Section 3 of my bill deals with worthless ingredients in special dietary foods. This is a very controversial issue among health food manufacturers. It prohibits the use in a product represented as a special dietary food of exotic-sounding ingredients which have never been shown to have the least nutritive value, or any dietary usefulness whatsoever. Sale of the ingredients themselves would not be touched; the bill would apply only when the products are represented as having special dietary value.

PRETESTING OF MEDICAL DEVICES FOR SAFETY AND EFFICACY

Section 4 applies to the pretesting of therapeutic devices for safety and proof of effectiveness before they can be sold. I covered that earlier.

CERTIFICATION OF ALL ANTIBIOTICS

Section 5 requires the certification by the Food and Drug Administration of the purity and potency of veterinary antibiotics, similar to the requirement we wrote into the law in 1962 applying to antibiotics intended for use by man. When these powerful, and often unstable, drugs are used on meat animals, we should be certain they are from certified batches, tested and approved by Uncle Sam.

THE MIND-AFFECTING DANGEROUS DRUGS

Section 6 deals with the barbiturates, amphetamines, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulants—the sleeping pills, and the pep pills, the "goof balls" and "bennies," and other drugs which were so widely bootlegged as to constitute a national menace. How many deaths on the highways that can be attributed to the use of these pills we can never know. They are dangerous, and doctors who prescribe them treat them with respect. We passed this provision of H.R. 1235 last year in a separate bill, H.R. 2, which became Public Law 89–74.

FAKE CANCER REMEDIES

Section 7 of *H.R. 1235* deals with fake cancer remedies, and drugs or devices intended for the prevention or cure of cancer. This is an area of widespread trickery and fraud, and it is tragic. On the other hand, we do not want to discourage the search for any really effective treatment for this disease, on which so much research money and time and effort are now being spent.

This is a section of my original bill of 1961 which I have retained in succeeding versions of the measure, even after the passage of the 1962 Drug Control Act which covered the testing of new prescription drugs in comprehensive fashion. I left this section in, however, because I think that in evaluating drugs or devices intended to prevent or cure cancer, the Government must have every possible assistance—the complete facts—everything about the treatment—without any holdback of information, so a determination can be made of the circumstances under which it can be tested and used. This section, by the way, would apply primarily to racketeers in health, not legitimate researchers.

PRETESTING COSMETICS INCLUDING A DELANEY ANTICANCER CLAUSE

Section 8 is the basic foundation on which the rest of the omnibus bill was originally built 5 years ago: the pretesting of cosmetics for safety. It contains an anticancer clause such as we have in the food additives and color additives acts—under it no ingredient could be used in a cosmetic if it could cause cancer in man or animal. The law on cosmetics does not now say that. Under the present law, the Government, as I noted, must prove a cosmetic harmful in order to block its sale; under H.R. 1235, the manufacturer would have to prove the product is safe to use, and, in addition, that it does not contain any carcinogens, whether used in a safe fashion or not.

THE SOAP AND HAIR DYE EXEMPTIONS

This section would also repeal the old special interest exemption for soap, which, since 1938, has been held by the law not to be a cosmetic. Soap manufacturers are therefore subject to nothing more than their own consciences and the risk of possible damage suits for what they might include among ingredients of a soap, and they do not even have to tell you the net weight of a bar of soap.

More importantly, this section of H.R. 1235 also repeals the hair dye exemption now in the law. Hair dyes, too, would have to be proved safe for use before being placed on sale.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF COSMETIC INGREDIENTS

All of the significant ingredients of a cosmetic item would have to be revealed on the label under H.R. 1235. Actually, there are few secrets in the cosmetic industry; most competing products use similar basic ingredients. But for the woman who is allergic, there is no way but painful trial and error—and sometimes it is very painful—in finding suitable cosmetics. When a formula is suddenly changed in a product she has been using, she is back in the dark, and perhaps also back in the doctor's office. Even the Food and Drug Administration sometimes has to guess what is in a particular cosmetic. The Government should be informed about ingredients, and so should the buyer.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPENAS

Section 9 provides for administrative subpena powers, particularly in developing information for the establishment of food standards. Food standards issued by the Government, in cooperation with the processors, spell out exactly what ingredients must be included in a processed food once it is covered by a particular standard. Subpena power may be needed, too, in pesticides hearings.

CARRIER'S EXEMPTION IS TOO BROAD

Section 10 repeals an exemption enjoyed for many years by the railroads, trucking firms, and other common carriers, which are now relieved of responsibility under the act for transporting adulterated foods, drugs, or cosmetics even when the adulteration occurred as a result of their own actions or omissions. Under my bill, the carriers would continue to be exempt only in those cases where they did not cause the adulteration.

A TOUGH FACTORY INSPECTION PROVISION

Section 11 is a tough factory inspection amendment, giving to the Food and Drug Administration stronger powers in inspecting facilities used and methods used in the manufacture, processing, warehousing, packaging, and distribution of foods, cosmetics, and nonprescription drugs. The Food and Drug Administration already has these stronger factory inspection powers in checking on prescription drugs, under the 1962 act. These powers include the right to see all relevant files, including complaint files, and to check on the professional qualifications of personnel responsible for performing certain technical functions in the plant. Factory inspection is a vital area of consumer protection, even though food and drug inspectors can still touch only a tiny fraction of the existing plants in the country each year. But when they do go into inspect, the inspectors must have sufficient powers to determine whether the products are made in a sanitary, wholesome, or safe manner and if the production controls are adequate to maintain the necessary standards.

CANCER-CAUSING COLORING MATTER IN MEAT ANIMAL FEEDS

Section 12 repeals a special interest exemption in the law for cancer-causing coloring matter used in animal feeds. I have never been able to get an understandable story from anyone on why this exemption was written into the law or what purpose it is to serve. If the Government finds any residue of a cancer-causing feed ingredient in the carcass of meat animals it can order a halt to the use of the animal feed responsible; and it is on this basis that the growth stimulant hormone stilbestrol is now widely permitted to be used in animal feeds. But why should we permit the use of cancer-inducing coloring of animal feeds? The coloring matter serves no nutritive purpose, and no economic purpose. It is certainly not intended to make the feed more appetizing to the steer. It merely helps the farmer to identify different feeds by color. But permitting the use of carcinogenic coloring matter for this purpose is a completely unnecessary and unjustifiable additional hazard. H.R. 1235 repeals this glaring exemption.

U.S. INSPECTION OF FOREIGN FACTORIES

Section 13 would require foreign manufacturers of foods, drugs, or cosmetics who export substantial quantities of their products to the United States to permit on-the-scene inspection by U.S. officials of their plants overseas. At present, only a small percentage of the food, drug, and cosmetic imports into this country are inspected on arrival—on a sampling basis, but not necessarily a random one—to make sure they are safe, wholesome, uncontaminated, and otherwise eligible for admission under our laws. This spot check at the docks is often concentrated on the exports of firms whose products have frequently reflected a high percentage of violations. Under H.R. 1235, the United States could send inspectors to inspect the plants of foreign firms it has reason to believe are not observing proper sanitary or production control practices on foods, drugs, or cosmetics sold here. We would inspect on the same basis as we now inspect American plants. If the foreign plant cannot pass our domestic inspection requirements, or if it refuses to permit our inspectors to enter on request, its products would be denied admission to this country. I think this is a useful reform.

A BAN ON FLAVORED ASPIRIN FOR CHILDREN

Section 14 of H.R. 1235 prohibits the sale in interstate commerce of flavored or sweetened aspirin. This is a new provision, just put into the bill last year for the first time. It grew out of a letter from a St. Louis resident on a completely different matter, but in checking into some facts on household accidents in connection with inquiries made in that letter, I discovered to my amazement and horror that candy aspirin, the special baby aspirin, is far and away the leading cause of accidental poisoning of children under 5.

Aspirin poisoning is the most frequent cause of death among young children from accidental ingestions. The children learn to regard flavored aspirin as candy, and thousands of them each year risk death by eating an entire bottle of flavored aspirin in the belief it is candy. If the mother or the babysitter discovers the empty bottle in time, the child's life is saved, but in 125 to 150 instances a year, the child dies.

There is no reason in the world why a parent cannot crush half of a regular aspirin tablet on a spoon, using the bottom of the bowl of another spoon to do the crushing, and then add sugar and water, or jelly or some other sweetener to the crushed aspirin to help push the medicine down, if the child needs aspirin. The child would at least know this was medicine, not candy. If a smaller dose is desired, there can be "baby" aspirins, *but not sweetened to resemble candy.*

Since adding this aspirin provision to H.R. 1235, I have heard from mothers from different parts of the country telling me of hair-raising experiences in their homes when children or grandchildren found the flavored aspirin bottle, pried off the so-called safety cap, and ate the contents.

If there were no chance whatsoever of the product being misused by preschoolers—who, after all, cannot read warnings on labels—my bill would permit certain exemptions and waivers under this provision, but otherwise flavored aspirin could not be sold in interstate commerce, except for stocks manufactured prior to a specified date.

CONSUMERS MUST MAKE THEIR VOICES HEARD

I do not think the aspirin makers will like section 14 of H.R. 1235, just as the cosmetic manufacturers do not like section 2 or section 8, and other affected interests do not like other sections of H.R. 1235. The big question to me, however, is whether the people of this country like this bill—enough to join me in fighting for it.

Consumer battles can be won in the Congress only when consumers make it clear they want them won, and will work at it. I call upon consumers everywhere to help pass this urgent legislation, by making their voices heard.

Settlement of Election Contests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1965, I introduced House Resolution 698 which would reform the procedures under which the U.S. House of Representatives settles election contests. My resolution would require that a speedy decision be made when a contest is filed.

I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial from the Cedar Rapids Gazette which states:

> In fairness to the voters, as well as the participants, House procedures should provide for prompt settlement of contests for seats in that Chamber.

The editorial follows:

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Feb. 7, 1966]

NEW CONTEST RULES ESSENTIAL

One of the many areas of reform needed in Congress—and needed promptly—is that dealing with election contests for seats in the House of Representatives.

This became obvious once again during the long-delayed settlement of the contest brought by Democrat Stephen Peterson of Waterloo, against the reelection of Republican Congressman H. R. GROSS, also of Waterloo, following the 1964 election.

Representative GROSS was declared winner of that election by 419 votes, it will be recalled. Peterson filed notice of a contest a few days after the election. But in its usual *dilatory* manner in dealing with contests, the House never got around to settling the issue (in favor of GROSS) until October of 1965, when the first session of this Congress was nearing an end. This was possible because present procedures for deciding contests are antiquated. They should have been shelved years ago.

Congressman NEAL SMITH of Iowa's Fifth District introduced a resolution in the House recently to modernize outdated contest procedures, observing in the process that they were "designed to delay and block contestants and as a result, no incumbent contestee has been unseated in the 20th century.

Representative SMITH's resolution provides that any contestant who deposits $5,000, to be used to the extent needed to pay election contest costs, would have the right for an immediate recount of the votes cast at the election in question. If the recount changed the election result, his $5,000 would be refunded. Posting of this amount, Representative SMITH believes, would rule out the filing of frivolous contests. His resolution also stuplates that the nine House Members named to the election contest committee would have to be broadly representative of various areas of the United States.

Representative SMITH said his resolution is necessary "to avoid the terrible result that could occur it we had a close enough division in the House so that passage of, or failure to pass, legislation would depend on who holds contested seats."

Amen, Mr. SMITH. In fairness to the voters, as well as the participants, House procedures should provide for prompt settlement of contests for seats in that Chamber.

Winning the Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the war to give the people of Vietnam a better life, with social and political reforms, is hailed by the Lincoln, Nebr., Evening Journal.

"It is this second phase of the war that justifies the U.S. presence in South Vietnam and is the phase that will make the containment policy work," the paper believes.

The short editorial which deals with this all-important phase of winning in Vietnam is offered for publication, in its entirety, in the RECORD:

[From the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal, Mar. 10, 1966]

WE'LL WIN THIS WAR

The war in Vietnam is more than killing Vietcong, though that gets most of the headlines. There has been restrained optimism that the military end of the war is going better.

It is refreshing that the optimism extends to the war of changing "the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese peasants and the cynicism of 150 years of war, corruption, and broken promises."

It was this war Jim May, senior American aid official in Quang Ngai, talked about to Joseph Galloway of the United Press International.

In the 10 months he has been province representative, working with 2 American assistants, between 45,000 and 50,000 refugees have been helped. Most have returned to their native provinces which in the meantime have been pacified.

With military help, the government over the past few months has gained control over about 40 square miles of new territory. Last June, Americans could not drive more than a half mile outside Quang Ngai. Today May drives a yellow truck throughout most of the new territory.

"We're going to win out here," May said. "It's just like the President said, appeasement won't solve the problem. If the military can help us clear the area and help us hold it, give us time to work with the people, we'll win this war. And it won't be too long either."

It is this second phase of the war that justifies the U.S. presence in South Vietnam and is the phase that will make the containment policy work. It is this aspect of the war that the doves seem to overlook.

For the Merchant Marine: No Guns, No Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in America's merchant marine is a matter of great concern to all of us. The fact that the Johnson administration has cut the budget of the Maritime Administration 11.1 percent at the very time when we are facing a shipping difficulty in Vietnam bears examination. For the information of Members of the House I submit the following excerpt from a publication called Maritime Newsletter of March 1966:

[From the Maritime Newsletter, March 1966]

MarAd's Budget for 1967: For the Merchant Marine, No Guns, No Butter

The Maritime Administration's portion of President Johnson's budget for fiscal year 1967 comes to $299,395,000. Of this amount, $85 million has been requested for ship construction and $165 million is sought for operating subsidies, although MarAd's expected expenditures are actually $91,530,000 for construction and $179 million for operating subsidies.

The requested appropriation of ship construction is $47,150,000 less than was appropriated for construction for 1966, and represents only enough money to build 13 new ships as compared with the 16 ships provided for in the 1966 budget.

REPLACEMENTS LAGGING

MarAd's vessel replacement program first got underway in 1958 and has fallen behind by approximately 90 vessels due to budgetary limitations. Fiscal year 1967 appropriations, unless they exceed MarAd requests by a significant amount, will cause the replacement program to fall even further behind schedule.

These statistics, as well as statements in the task force report and statements by Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and President Johnson, indicate that the President's drive for economy is being pursued to some degree at the expense of the American maritime industry. In fact, MarAd's budget request for 1967 is even less than the amount recommended in the task force report, which has been widely criticized for its pinchpenny approach to maritime needs.

It is significant, we feel, that the maritime industry has apparently not been included in President Johnson's Great Society plans and is not being tapped as a source of new jobs in the war on poverty. The industry, presently depressed and fighting for its economic life, could provide thousands of jobs at a time when they are sorely needed. With a little imagination, foresight and planning on the part of the Federal Government we could have a healthy and viable industry again, an industry able to provide this country with a modern and competitive fleet at minimum subsidy cost.

Dollars invested in the maritime industry now will save many dollars in subsidy costs in the future. Present Government economy drives save only small amounts of money and tend to perpetuate, even worsen the state of economic chaos that exists in the industry today.

FISCAL SLEIGHT OF HAND

President Johnson's budget for fiscal year 1967 is a masterpiece of financial legerdemain. Before the budget was released to the public there was much speculation as to whether it would be a "guns" or a "butter" budget. The public was interested to know if Mr. Johnson would spend more on defense and Vietnam in fiscal year 1967 at the expense of domestic programs, or if he would continue to push forward with his Great Society and war on poverty policies.

A close examination of the budget reveals that he is attempting to do both. Defense spending in the next fiscal year will go up approximately $3.2 billion over fiscal year 1966 levels. Vietnam spending will increase by $5.7 billion; foreign aid, including military aid, will rise by $287 million; spending for education will be up $516 million; expenditures for the war on poverty will be up $250 million, and expenditures for health services will be up $3.6 billion.

The Maritime Administration budget, however, has been cut 11.1 percent from fiscal year 1966 levels, and appropriations within this budget for shipbuilding have been slashed a whopping 35.7 percent. Apparently the American merchant marine qualifies neither as "guns" nor as "butter" in administration thinking.

But the American maritime industry is both a "guns" and a "butter" type of industry. That is, it is an industry that should provide both defense and commercial capabilities to the Nation. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is clear and unequivocal about this.

Does our fleet meet the legal requirements of the act of 1936? We think not. A fleet which is carrying less than 9 percent of our foreign oceanborne trade is not carrying a "substantial" portion of that trade and is not meeting the commercial needs of the Nation.

FOREIGN FLAGS GET LION'S SHARE

In 1964 we were forced to rely on foreign-flag ships for the carriage of 94.4 percent of all our foreign oceanborne commercial dry cargo, 96.4 percent of our commercial tanker cargoes, and 70.3 percent of all foreign oceanborne commercial liner cargoes. Heavy reliance on foreign-flag ships for the carriage of these cargoes does not only affect our economy but its defense posture as well.

Dry bulk ships carry high-grade ores and other strategic materials, and the U.S. economy now devours 50 percent of the world's raw materials. In 1963, we imported 98 percent of our manganese, 86 percent of our nickel, 85 percent of our aluminum, and 44 percent of our zinc.

NO ALLEGIANCE TO THE UNITED STATES

The foreign-flag ships that import 95 percent of these materials owe no particular allegiance to this country and the slightest change in the international situation could have a drastic influence on the availability of vital raw materials.

The Vietnam situation has exposed other weaknesses in the defense capabilities of our fleet. Twice in 1965, the Military Sea Transportation Service looked to foreign-flag ships to meet Vietnam needs, because U.S. ships were not available. Two subsidized operators were forced to request permission to charter foreign-flag ships to fulfill commitments because their vessels had been chartered to MSTS for Vietnam service. The U.S. fleet is simply insufficient to meet the defense needs of our country.

Yet, despite the dire condition of our merchant fleet, its current weakness in U.S. commerce, and its severe defense inadequacy, Maritime Administration continues a policy of cutting its budget.

Culver Notes Accomplishments of Collins Radio Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, residents of Cedar Rapids and the second congressional district are extremely proud of the important advancements in the field of communications made possible through the efforts of the Collins Radio Co.

A recent article from the Cedar Rapids Gazette notes the remarkable growth in sales and stature achieved by Collins Radio in the past 30 years, and properly calls attention to the outstanding contributions made by the company to commercial air travel, our Nation's defense efforts and the unexcelled accomplishments of our space program.

I would at this time like to bring this fine account of the successes and contributions of the Collins Radio Co. to the attention of my colleagues and insert the article from the Cedar Rapids Gazette of February 27, 1966, in the RECORD at this point:

Around the Town

A great many people around the country were aware of Collins Radio Co. the last week, if they never had been before. Announcement of increased earnings made Collins stock one of the leaders in sales on the New York Stock Exchange. The stock rose from around $50 a share to as high as 69¾ Friday. Even Dallas, with whom Cedar Rapids shares most of Collins management and production, became more conscious of the interesting industry in its midst (at nearby North Richardson). The Dallas Morning News last Sunday published an eight-column spread showing a drawing of the new office building being erected in North Richardson, pictures of W. William Roodhouse, executive vice president, and Edward A. Williams, vice president for controls and finance. At one time Dallas was sure that the entire Collins operation was being moved to Richardson. Now it claims to be corporate headquarters, but the Dallas Morning News concedes that "Cedar Rapids remains the biggest operation, with 10,932 persons on the $66,515,799 annual payroll there. The Dallas operation runs about half the size of Cedar Rapids, with 4,987 persons on the payroll, which ran to $36,640,966 in 1965. There's a plant at Newport Beach, Calif., employing 1,432, and another 1,067 were scattered around the world when the company counted its personnel January 15." The Morning News story goes on to relate how "the voice of every orbiting U.S. astronaut so far has reached earth via equipment designed and manufactured by Collins. Collins equipment is aboard 80 percent of the commercial airliners of the world. And in the jungle battlefield of Vietnam, a soldier sits in an armored communications box manufactured by Collins." Sales of Collins equipment for the current fiscal year are expected to be nearly $370 million. That's quite a jump from the small ham radio business that Arthur Collins started out with in his Cedar Rapids shop 30 some years ago.

Demand To Feed World's Hungry Will Require Massive U.S. Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, many times over the years I have expressed the conviction that our agricultural surpluses are a source of strength to this Nation if properly employed. Our ability to produce more than any other nation in the world is an asset unmatched anywhere and should be fully exploited. The President's recent announcement indicates his intention to exploit that asset to its fullest. The following editorial from the March 13, 1966, edition of the Sacramento Bee sets forth the details of this situation with great clarity:

DEMAND TO FEED WORLD'S HUNGRY WILL REQUIRE MASSIVE U.S. EFFORT

The U.S. food industry has entered upon the most challenging era of its history. The last third of the 20th century will place greater demands upon this Nation's farmers and food distributors. A massive effort will be required to meet the problem of feeding the world's hungry and to help them produce more by themselves.

Consider these facts: Experts figure the population of the world will double from the present 3 billion to 6 billion by 2000, just 35 years away. Food production is not keeping up with the population explosion. The nation which conquers the complex difficulty of raising and distributing sufficient food to maintain living conditions will be the leader of the world.

Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of agriculture at Purdue University, in a recent talk before the International Industrial Conference in San Francisco, said the world must duplicate in the next generation the production record that man has achieved since the dawn of history.

The yield per acre in North America has increased in the last 25 years by 109 percent. In the same period, there has been only a 7-percent increase in Asia. The United States in the last decade has provided over 140 million tons of food for needy nations. Americans have committed their public conscience to the proposition that no one should go hungry while there is surplus here. While this is a commendable social concern, it also has tremendous implications upon international diplomacy.

In a speech in Philadelphia last year, W. B. Murphy, president of the Campbell Soup Co., stressed this point. He observed that the Achilles heel of communism very likely is production and marketing of food. On the other hand, private enterprise, with governmental assistance, has made the standard of living in the United States unequaled in the world.

Murphy pointed out that if Russia and Communist China cannot satisfy their people on foods it is unlikely they will be able in the long run to maintain their present forms of highly centralized economic control and dictatorship.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his food-for-freedom message to Congress earlier this month, called for increased movement of food to needy areas but also stipulated this aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it.

The clear superiority of democratic food production over that of Communist countries places this Nation in the forefront of what will in the last third of this century be the major international political battle of history—the feeding of the world's hungry and showing them how they can help themselves.

Those Public Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the public gaining access to Government information is not restricted to the Federal level of Government.

The following editorial from the March 16, 1966, edition of Chicago's American discusses Illinois' public meetings law and efforts to improve upon it. I look forward to the day when similar comments can be made about the Federal public records law.

The editorial follows:

THOSE PUBLIC MEETINGS

One of State Representative Anthony Scariano's long-held objectives is to have governmental agencies obey the State's law against conducting public business in private. That is one of our ambitions too, and we're happy that Scariano is continuing to fight for it.

Illinois' public meetings law was passed in 1957 and tightened up last year through amendments submitted by Scariano, a Democrat, of Park Forest. Some governmental bodies, however—among them the Chicago Board of Education—are still evading the law with almost casual ease, and further tightening up is plainly called for. Scariano is now planning new legislation to amend the law, and has asked the help of the Illinois legislative reference bureau in drafting it.

The law declares it to be State policy that all public agencies supported by tax revenues shall take their actions openly and that "their official deliberations shall be conducted openly." Certain specific exceptions are made, among them jury sessions, deliberations of the Illinois Pardon and Parole Board, and meetings where the acquisition or sale of property are discussed. The overall ban on holding private sessions just for convenience's sake, though, certainly seems clear enough.

Unfortunately, it isn't. One gimmick employed more than once by the school board is to use the word "official" as an escape hatch. In its contract dealings with the Chicago teachers union last year, for instance, the board held secret meetings for 2 days, during which it hammered out a new offer for the union. Its explanation was that the meetings hadn't been official, just "informal discussions."

The distinction is quite meaningless, but it served to get around the law. Using this reasoning, any public agency could reach all its decisions in private and hold public meetings merely to announce them.

Scariano proposes to close this loophole by deleting the word "official," which appears to be redundant anyway. He also wants amendments to tighten up a section providing that writs of mandamus may be obtained to force compliance with the law [that process takes too long to do much good], and to block the "special session" tactic by which a controversial issue is tabled at a public meeting, then settled at a hurriedly summoned special session that the public doesn't know about.

These suggestions seem to us excellent. One other gimmick that we hope can be discouraged is that favored by the park district's board of commissioners—scheduling public hearings for maximum inconvenience to the public. In discussing the 1966 park budget, for instance, citizen's groups were given just one chance to put their views on the record; that was December 24, Christmas Eve.

It may be impossible to plug every conceivable loophole in the public meetings law. Scariano's amendments, though, would make evasions more difficult, and more obviously evasions. And that is well worth doing.

Opportunities Industrialization Center West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Opportunities Industrialization Center West is a splendid example of industry-community cooperation in providing a self-help program whereby underprivileged individuals may seize upon an opportunity for economic improvement. This program is sponsored by community leaders of Menlo Park and Palo Alto, Calif.

I think all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find the following information of great interest:

THE STORY OF OPPORTUNITIES INDUSTRIALIZATION CENTER WEST

Opportunities Industralization Center West will be a training program where business and industrial skills leading to full-time employment may be acquired. It will be established for men of all employable ages who are unskilled, unemployed, underemployed, or working at jobs beneath their total capacities. Its establishment will give equal opportunity for economic and social development to those to whom this opportunity has thus far been denied.

Plans call for location of the school in East Palo Alto, although men may be drawn from all over the peninsula for training. Target date for opening of the center is the late fall, 1965. Foreseen for the program at present is a large building in which the machinery of industry may be installed and factory experts may teach. At one end of the program would be the publicity and motivational operational for listing large numbers of applicants; at the other end would be the job openings waiting for the qualified applicants who have completed the training.

Sufficient flexibiltiy to enable the center to teach the broadest variety of skills to a maximum number of pupils qualifying for the widest selection of full-time jobs is envisioned. The training need not be confined to a single building, but may be developed at a wide variety of locations, teaching everything from sheet metal work, drafting, chemistry lab, electronics, and microwelding skills to mimeograph work, restaurant practices, packaging, loading, handling and shipping operations, and the use of machine tools. Adequate size, high standards of motivation and training, adaptability and flexibility of program will be a continuing means of opportunity for all.

Through pulpit and press, radio and television, civic, service, and fraternal programs, veterans' and labor activities—through speakers' bureau and school programs, billboards, placards, pennants, and merchants' window displays—motivational information to create the incentives needed will be set before all the people to bring out the desire, hope, and self-assurance necessary on the part of the potential applicant.

Advantages of establishing such a center in the midpeninsula area are boundless. For the people, securing of jobs, hope and economic independence is undeniably a tremendous creative contribution. For industry, a pool of skills will be formed. For merchants in the area, a new payroll will be born creating thousands of craftsmen, artisans, and mechanics who will make the area attractive to future industrial development. The burden on every form of public institution from law enforcement to public health and safety will be lessened by the hundreds of thousands of dollars. The center will benefit not only the minority who receive training but also the majority who will grow in unity and tolerance as they participate in its establishment.

The basic principle of self-help will underlie every policy and every activity of the program. In a project the initiative for which comes from the people to be served, pride of creation will engender self-confidence and self-respect ultimately giving way to ambition and concentrated drive for a better way of life and a successful career.

These objectives now have been made a part of a national effort through the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Work toward these ends is now part of a vast national patriotic program.

To be set into operation will be a committee for securing a faculty and center administration, a recruiting operation to inform the public and to create a steady stream of applicants, a committee to secure buildings, a finance committee, a committee for the listing of available jobs and for curriculum, a public information and motivational arm and a committee to secure equipment and machinery for the school.

Sources of funds would be four: the people at large, industry, philanthropic foundations, and the Government. Ideally, the organization and establishment of a complete and functioning training center at the local level would be the proof of interest desired by Federal agencies of the securing of Government support.

Sixth Anniversary of Hawaiian Statehood

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good, wise, and eloquent friend, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], in noting with pride and rejoicing the sixth anniversary of the State of Hawaii, and from the bottom of my heart I extend greetings and congratulations to Governor Burns, a former beloved Member of this body, to Senator INOUYE, also a former colleague whose popularity with his colleagues was unsurpassed, to Senator FONG, to Congressman MATSUNAGA, Congresswoman MINK, and to all the men, women, and children who impart a warm, human touch to the beautiful island in the Pacific.

Twice since I have been a Member of the Congress I have voted for Hawaiian statehood and the occasions were 10 years apart, on March 7, 1950, and on March 12, 1960. My humble remarks 16 years ago in this historic chamber were commented upon favorably in the press of Honolulu and were reproduced in full in one of the Hawaiian dailies. These remarks I am repeating today on the anniversary of the statehood that came over 10 years after the remarks were voiced.

They follow:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 6, 1950]

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in the statehood bill for Alaska which we have passed and the statehood bill for Hawaii which I anticipate we will pass, a new pattern is being laid for that association of sovereign States formed at the beginning of the Republic to attain through union the highest measure of welfare for the citizen and of security for the Nation.

For the first time we are accepting into the family of sister States those territories that are outside of continental United States and not contiguous thereto. Where this will end, to what extent conceivably the pattern may be carried in the realization of the dream of our generation of a permanent peace through a world union of states, only the future can tell.

I think it is proper here to place emphasis on the fact that the step we are taking has not been decided upon hastily. It is altogether too important a step to be left for decision alone to the Members of this body. However able and conscientious they may be, nevertheless in common with all humankind their judgment cannot be infallible. Woat we are doing is merely making effective the decision arrived at by the American people. That is the way democracy functions with us. The question of statehood for an island in the Pacific and for a mainland not contiguous to continental United States, with a long stretch of island running into the Orient, has been discussed for a long time in every city, hamlet, and crossroads in the country. My colleagues and I must accept it as the judgment of the American people as a whole—or that substantial majority which under our democratic system controls—that this step should be taken and in a new world, bound much closer by radio transmission of the thoughts of men and aerial transportation of persons and products, the pattern of the Old World of the horse and buggy should be modernized even in the matter of selecting territories to be taken into the Union as States. I say we must accept this as the judgment of the American people because when the delegates met at the national conventions of the two major political parties, with scarcely a dissenting note, they pledged the support of their respective parties to Alaska-Hawaii statehood. We Democrats and Republicans may differ in our interpretation of how far the majority vote in a closely contested election is to be construed as a mandate. There can be no question, however, about the validity of the mandate when it emanates from the voters of the two major parties.

I respectfully suggest to my colleagues, with no desire to pose as a prophet, that the new pattern we are setting up may prove a more vital factor than we imagine in bringing the world closer together in peace and the common pursuit of human happiness. Many in this Chamber, in their ardent desire to advance the cause of understanding and of permanent peace, have sponsored the World Federation resolution. It at least is worthy of note that what we are now doing, although certainly it is not in the minds of any of us here, may furnish in the future the basis for a United States of America expanded, on the petition of other peoples, into a United States of the World.

I am not advancing this thought with the idea that having moved in the direction of taking in territory far from continental United States we actually may, as the world grows closer and closer together, add to our sisterhood of States territories still farther removed. For one thing there is the difference in languages and in customs, which even if distances were annihilated would still present a formidable barrier. But there is no escaping the import of the departure we are approaching. Considered in connection with the development of the backward areas of the world under point 4 of President Truman's plan—an undertaking the success of which hangs on the removal of trade barriers—it at least should furnish the subject for intriguing speculation and lively discussion in the way the American people have of thinking and talking things over even when such things are still in the realm of the improbable and the unexpected.

That we are making history today I think there can be no doubt. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of these days of the Alaska-Hawaii statehood debates very likely will be consulted by historical researchers long after the last of those participating in these debates has had his hour in the traditional memorial services in this Chamber. For that reason I am putting in the RECORD, with especial emphasis, that the pattern for the future admission of States, when no longer required to be of contiguous territory or a part of continental United States, came to us from the sound judgment of the American people arrived at after long discussion and deliberation and so wholly on a bipartisan level that both major political parties incorporated in their respective platforms expression of that judgment arrived at by the American people.

On the occasion of the *Maine* memorial anniversary, I called attention to the fact, sometimes overlooked, that the explosion in Habana Harbor on February 15, 1898, started the United States of America on the road to world leadership. I ventured the suggestion that future historians would term the period of the Spanish-American War, World War I and World War II—the half century or so from the destruction of the *Maine* to the bomb of Hiroshima—as the 50-year war that ushered in the golden era of American world influence.

Now that Hawaii is on the threshold of statehood and a new pattern is being adopted in conformance with the unquestioned mandate of the American people. I think my colleagues will be interested in the remarks of Senator Teller in the U.S. Senate on February 16, 1898, the day following the sinking of the *Maine*. I am quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day:

"Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, there has been some interest manifested throughout the world over the question whether or not this Government was about to take the Hawaiian Islands and make them part of the United States * * *. The people of all the world have been looking to see what we are about to do. I picked up the other day a copy of the London Globe of last June * * *. The article was commenting on our desire to annex the Hawaiian Islands, if they should become ours: * * * it was very apparent that the Globe was not friendly to that movement on our part. This is what the Globe said, and it is so truthful that I think it may be worth while to read it:

"'The American Navy is absolutely unfit to protect the islands (Hawaiian) which lie at the mercy of any Spanish ships appearing at Honolulu while Japan's sea power is so immeasurably superior to that of the United States that a Japanese naval demonstration would place President McKinley in a difficult and perilous position * * *.

"'Viewing the great strategic value of the group to England, it is a matter of regret that the islands were not added to the British Empire long ago. Lord Salisbury should stiffen his back and tell McKinley plainly that Great Britain claims the right to be consulted before the matter of annexation is decided.'

"Mr. President, Japan is a small power. Small, I mean, when compared to the United States, small in resources compared with the United States, though it is strong in its Navy when you consider the results it might accomplish as a nation. Yet, when there was a note of protest from Japan against the annexation of Hawaii, it was urged by a great many people in this country as a bar to annexation that we were not free to exercise our own judgment because it would not do to get into a quarrel with Japan."

Mr. Chairman, I am voting for statehood for Hawaii as I voted for statehood for Alaska. With every new State that joins up with us, to share under free government, the benefits and the responsibilities of joint effor in advancing human welfare, greater strength is given us to carry on. My faith is in my country and the purity of its purpose to ask nothing for its own people than it does not seek to make possible for all men to attain in a world of brotherhood. My faith is in the people of the United States and when after discussion and deliberation they have reached a judgment, by that judgment I will abide.

Albert Thomas

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with other of my colleagues in their tribute to ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas. In his 29 years in the House ALBERT THOMAS distinguished himself as an able and conscientious legislator. All of us who were privileged to have known him feel a real loss at his passing.

As an outstanding expert in the field of economics his service in the House was most impressive. His many achievements could not be covered in a few words. Suffice to say that the American people and the Nation were always well served by his prudent and wise judgments as a member of the House Appropriations Committee.

In addition to his abilities as a legislator, ALBERT THOMAS was a warm and friendly man. He was held in admiration and respect by every Member who served with him. All of us are better for having known him.

Mr. Speaker, I add my personal message of sympathy to his widow and family. I share their sense of loss and sorrow.

Financing Steelmill for Red China Like Helping Burglar Buy Better Tools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have requested the State Department to make a formal protest against the plans of five free world nations to lend Red China $150 million and provide the technical know-how for construction of a mammoth new steelmill.

Secretary of State Deán Rusk has criticized the plan because it would "add to the strength of Peiping" but indicated that the Government would probably go no further than expressing its opposition informally to our allies.

We should emphatically go on record as formally protesting and opposing this scheme to add 2 million tons of steel a year to the industrial capacity of Red China.

It is quite apparent that the primary purpose of such a steelmill would be to enhance Red China's war potential. This could prove catastrophic at a time when the belligerent Peiping warlords are menacing many nations and constitute the major threat to world peace.

It has been reported in the news that a consortium of West German, Swiss, French, British, and Italian firms were negotiating to sell the giant steel plant to Communist China.

A spokesman for the West German ministry of economics at Bonn was quoted as announcing that his Government would guarantee an $86 million credit being extended to Peiping by two German manufacturers of steelmill equipment.

China's Communist comrade, Soviet Russia, has obviously refused to provide this steelmill because the men in Moscow mistrust the motives of the Peiping regime.

Financing this steel mill for Red China would be like lending money to a bank robber so he can buy better burglary tools.

It is fantastic that nations which have benefited handsomely from American economic aid, and which profess to be friends of the United States should even consider such assistance to a regime which boasts that brute force and violence are instruments of its national policy.

Although I have been informed that the United States could not block the transaction, even so, we have a moral obligation to our soldiers in Vietnam—many of whom have been killed by guns and ammunition supplied to the Vietcong by Red China—to make a formal protest against this strengthening of an international bully.

Red China is now controlled by a fanatically aggressive group of arrogant troublemakers under whose leadership their nation is devoting a larger percentage of its productive and scientific capacity to military purposes than any other country in the world.

To assume that they want a great new steel mill to provide their peasants with autos, washing machines, and kitchen cabinets would be the height of folly. They obviously want more steel for tanks, guns, warships, and rocket launchers.

By lending Peiping the money to buy this mill, the five countries involved are endangering every neighbor of Red China, and also endangering world peace.

From Cracker Barrel to Computer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a speech presented by our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, at the International Consumer Credit Association Conference on February 20, 1966, at Sacramento, Calif.

Congresswoman MAY's speech, entitled "From Cracker Barrel to Computer," presents a timely and informative discussion of the consumer in America today at the food market.

She points out that modern packaging and marketing have resulted in large-scale gains to the consumer in improved products and lower costs, and that the vast majority of those in the industry are conscientiously and sincerely trying to do the best job possible in serving the public.

I invite attention to Congresswoman MAY's speech. She does an excellent job of "setting the record straight":

FROM CRACKER BARREL TO COMPUTER

(Address of Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, International Consumer Credit Association, 29th Conference, Credit Women's Breakfast Club, Sunday, February 20, 1966, Sacramento, Calif.)

First of all, may I say thank you for this opportunity ot participate in the International Consumer Credit Conference. You in your profession have been working with the consumer for many years. So, we have something in common. I was in Congress when the Government discovered the consumer. This was a fascinating experience, especially for a housewife who had been natively assuming that I had been around all the time. Today, however, I can proudly announce to you without fear of contradiction that Mr. and Mrs. Consumer of America have the Government seal of approval and are now officially in existence.

At this point, may I say that my attempts at levity in these opening remarks are only partly serious. I realize that many people view the consumer movement today with both cynicism and suspicion. This is certainly not to be wondered at because so many self-appointed spokesmen for consumers just don't seem to know what they are talking about and so many self-appointed protectors of the consumer have proposed a number of very impractical—even improbable—legislative solutions. But, nevertheless, the consumer movement gains its impetus and popularity because of a vacuum in consumer information—because the abundance of our age has quite honestly brought bewilderment and confusion to the men and women who shop our fabulous modern-day stores. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the food industry. So, this morning I'm going to talk about the consumer and her grocery store.

The National Commission on Food Marketing was created by Congress in 1964 for the purpose of making an 18-month study of our entire food marketing structure. I am a member of this Commission and I have found that one of the most absorbing aspects of the study has been in the area of the tremendous changes that have come about in the way we get food from farm to dinner table as compared to 20 years ago. A little recognized but very important fact is that one day back in 1953 the United States became the first country in the history of the world to develop to the point at which a larger percentage of its work force was engaged in the tasks of distributing goods and performing services than were engaged in the tasks of producing goods. Modern home economists point out that their jobs have changed because the home has ceased to be a production unit and has become instead a consumption unit. What is true for the American home today is also true of the American economy. In the sense of the employment of most of our population, we are a consuming and a marketing Nation, not a producing Nation and there is a very big difference, which is dramatically illustrated in what has happened to our food industry. In a few short years we have come to the place where only 8 percent of our population is engaged in producing food—and fewer than 10 percent of all the farms in America account for fully half of total American farm sales. In this same span of time, we have seen the disappearance of corner grocery stores—known as the "Ma and Pa" stores—as they are being replaced by the huge one-stop convenience shopping centers. Change in this field is still occurring rapidly and we have no idea yet what the future will bring.

Come to think of it, maybe we do have some idea and I'm not sure that the prospect is so pleasant if it goes this far. I read the other day about a new supermarket in West Germany which has become fully automated. Everything is displayed behind glass. The customer presses a button when she comes in the store. This button turns a turnstile and gives milady a shopping token. She wanders through the aisles looking at the various displays. When she sees something that strikes her fancy as a good idea for the family dinner, she drops the token into the vending machine, punches a button and the machine delivers the product while marking the price on the token. When all her various food items have been chosen, she drops the token into a payment slot and receives her bill. She then puts her money into another machine and it delivers her change. The owners pointed out that this automated type of shopping protected the little woman from "temperamental clerks, coupons, salesmanship, and shoplifting temptations." Columnist Phyllis Battelle made a whimsical comment on this store in one of her columns the other day when she said, "drop your token in the slot and don't be surprised if you hear, 'I'm sorry; the calf's liver you have dialed is not a working liver—please dial a pork roast'."

Well, however little the prospect of this type of progress may please—in food shopping we have come from cracker barrel to computer. And, in the process, the great public issue called consumerism has had a meteoric career.

I think most of us thought we were pretty well off until our protectors began to tell us that our supermarkets are jungles and our department stores usurers. Now people are lining up to get the chance to protect us from all this—and from ourselves. For a number of reasons that I will spell out in some detail here today, I'm beginning to believe that we may need protection from them.

This is not to say that these self-appointed consumer spokesmen are not sincere and nobly motivated. Yet I think that in their zeal to protect us all in the marketplace, they have failed to grasp a number of fundamental truths about the way in which our economy works, and about the nature of poverty, which many of their actions are said to alleviate.

Turning to the marketplace first, it seems to me that my protectors have failed to recognize either the motivations or limitations on businessmen in a consumer-driven society.

Businessmen are not, we should all undersand, either better or worse, or more honest or less so, than any other group of human beings. The vast majority are simply trying to do an honest job for their companies, and to earn a profit by performing a service for which a number of people will pay. There are, of course, some quick-buck operators who profit by deceit. There always will be. But most are not dishonest, and much of the appeal of the so-called consumer spokesmen is based on the misconception that most businessmen are cheats.

By the same token, these critics of business have, I believe, badly underestimated the practical, existing legal, and competitive limitations on the ability of a businessman seeking long-term growth for his company to do so through deception.

It should be pointed out for the record that our Nation today is not without laws designed to protect consumers in the marketplace. The Federal Government is involved in 296 programs to help the consumer—118 of these activities directly protect and advance consumer interest. Costs of these programs total over $100 million a year and employ over 7,000 Federal workers full time.

Just as an example, the Federal Trade Commission, after testifying in support of a new packaging and labeling legislation because, according to its Chairman, it was powerless to act in the field, found only a couple of months ago that it has always had, after all, the power to stop cents-off labeling when its effect is misleading.

Important as these existing legal restraints are, however, of equal importance is the power of free choice in a competitive, consumeristic economy.

Most consumer goods industries today are highly competitive and individual items usually earn very small profits per unit of sale. I'm told that in the food industry, for example, it takes 3 years for a typical new product to earn enough money to pay off the initial investment and begin to generate a real profit.

This means that selling this item just once isn't going to get anyone anywhere.

Enough consumers must prefer it over alternatives and choose it regularly—not just once—in order for the manufacturer to get his money back. In other words, it's repeat business—not the one-shot sales—that pay off. And I am convinced by my own experiences as a shopper that businessmen try hard to earn this repeat business, and that those who do not earn it don't get it.

This protection, regulated by competition in the consumer interest, is the very heart of our free enterprise system. I think it's a good system, and one that works.

Yet it is precisely this system which the consumer spokesmen so distrust that they would subtitute for it their own judgment about what it is that I, as a consumer, most want. I do not question their sincerity of purpose. I do question their ability to make my value judgments for me. And when faced with a choice between regulation by a system and regulation by men, I'll take the system. It's slow and cumbersome, in many cases, but it is not susceptible to whim or prejudice, and it works.

The second truth about the marketplace that our new consumer spokesmen have often failed to grasp—and this is the reason I'm afraid we may need protection from them—is that it is possible to get more consumer protection than we are willing to pay for.

For another built-in protection we get from our system has resulted from the development of efficient, high-speed machinery and other cost-cutting manufacturing procedures designed to bring consumers the things they want at low unit costs. Since many of the self-styled improvements consumer spokesmen say they want me to have would arbitrarily overturn many of these economies, they would add to the cost of the merchandise I buy. This might give me more protection and certainty, but I question whether it's really worth it.

For example, mass production techniques require that packages be filled and weighed in bulk, rather than individually. This means that 100 1-pound packages of something will weigh 100 pounds, but each individual package may weigh slightly more or less. Actually, in practice, many manufacturers tell me that they purposely overfill their packages so that any errors will be more likely to occur by overfilling than by underfilling. One cereal manufacturer adds a pound of product to every 24 pounds, so that the total weight of a case of any of his products will actually weigh more than the total listed weight of the contents.

Most regulatory agencies have recognized that this mass weighing is an absolute necessity if we are to have the cost-cutting benefits of mass production. It is a compromise that I find easy to understand, but many consumer spokesmen have labeled it a form of economic cheating. In some cases, movements have been started to abolish the current systems of tolerances. I don't think it's worth the cost.

Another example has to do with the size of consumer packages and their net contents. Few consumer spokesmen seem to recognize the fact that the system I find doing so well, and they find so dangerous, has built a high degree of standardization in package size. Again, the reason businessmen have done so is to give their companies—and, because of competitive forces, the consumer—the full benefits of mass production.

Let me give you one classic example on this point. In an attempt to drum up support for Federal control for packaging and labeling one of our chief spokesmen for the consumer in Government refers to a survey she made some time ago. She sent a number of housewives out and asked them to choose from a super market the cheapest—in terms of price per ounce—products in several categories. These ladies found a lot of trouble when it came to buying tunafish and now this is being used as an illustration of packaging fraud. I'll be the first to tell you that when you stop by the tunafish display in the average market you are going to have to make some decisions on selection because there are so many different kinds of packs of tuna. And the reason there are so many different kinds is because one is designed to one job and another, another. I buy one kind of tunafish for salad and another type if I am going to use it in a creamed dish. The tunafish packer knows that this is what I want in the way of selection. So, he packs tuna in whole pack and chunks, in oil, and in brine. But each of these different kinds of products is put in the same size can. Naturally, the weight between cans is going to vary because of the way they are packed. Whole tuna in oil, for example, will have a different weight than chunk tuna in oil, even though they are both in the same size can. Why do manufacturers do this? Well, simply so that they can get maximum use out of their can making and can filling machinery and still offer variety to consumers. This makes for good consumer values. Yet, many of the consumer spokesmen cry that this causes confusion and that the weight should be standardized instead. And, they make no mention of the fact that this will add to costs. Again, I question whether this kind of protection is worth the price.

The main thing here is that there has been a sizable and regrettable misunderstanding in the minds of these very well-meaning people about what consumers actually want in terms of value. Most of the consumer movement today is involved in trying to push through legislative and administrative measures to assure that consumers can always find the thing that costs them least per ounce.

But speaking for myself—and, I believe, most other shoppers—I can assure them that, while price comparisons are important, they are only part of the way in which I judge value. Of far greater importance, it seems to me, is the intangible, subjective question of whether or not a product is going to satisfy myself and my family.

If we want bran flakes, for example, the fact that oatmeal may (or may not) be less expensive per pound doesn't really make any difference to me. The value really lies, in that case, in the more expensive product. And making it easier for me to make this—to me—essentially meaningless comparison isn't going to earn my appreciation, especially if doing so has raised the cost of both products.

But, the consumer spokesmen say, this is of vital importance to the poor, and should be done for them. Yet while it is unquestionably true that helping the poor get more for their money is a worthy enterprise, I sincerely question whether the mass of consumer protection ideas will really do the job.

I question this because I believe that the most common consumer protection measures are designed to solve essentially imaginary problems, ignore the real problems, and in any case, mistakenly assume that treating poverty's symptoms will somehow cure the disease.

It is a fact, I believe, that supermarket shopping today does present some problems. But the problems are not those of simple price comparisons. A more basic problem is the fact that businessmen's sheer inventiveness and ingenuity has spawned such a great variety of new and tempting products that how to best use them presents some very real shopping problems.

These are problems of abundance, not foisted off on an unsuspecting public, but offered us in an atmosphere of free choice. Many consumer spokesmen say this itself is a bad feature of the American marketplace and that the confusion this creates should be diminished by somehow restricting the number of new products that come on the market. How this would be done, I do not know. I am convinced that shoppers are more grateful to the businessmen who found they could package au gratin potatoes in convenient packages than they are to their spokesmen who, in the hysterical discovery of the obvious, complain that the packaged form is far more expensive than the ingredients.

The real problem is not standardizing boxes or contents. The real problem is educating and training people to make the best use of the abundance that is available to them. And solving the problem begins with an effort directed at the people, rather than at the products.

The fact that a shopper can instantly recognize the lowest cost item available to her in a certain ctaegory is meaningless if she hasn't got enough money to buy the product in the first place. The fact that a buyer of something on credit can instantly recognize a high rate of interest is meaningless to him if he needs the product and can't get the credit at a lower interest rate.

Concerning credit, the pressure is building for passage of credit control bills.

You should know and be pleased that your California statute regulating credit and installment sales of goods and services, which I believe is known as the Unruh Act, is looked up to nationally as a model law. In it, we see reasonable legislation that has met the needs of the consumer and industry exceptionally well. It has furnished to the consumer adequate information upon which to make a decision on choosing the businessman to whom he will offer his credit.

Likewise, conformity with the law has presented no problem to the seller who wishes to follow the precepts of good bsuiness. The proof of the Unruh Act's sufficiency is in the fact that it has withstood the acid test of years. Proposals to amend it—allegedly for greater protection of the consumer—have been rejected when the spotlight showed up the fuzzy thinking behind such proposals. These, in fact, were poorly concealed efforts to put a straitjacket on the granting of credit to service retailing's customers and to facilitate merchandising.

For many Americans, poverty is a very real and grinding truth. What can be done to mitigate it should and must be done. But careful listing of price comparisons or interest rates are of little help to someone who can't read or judge. And it seems to me that if anywhere near half the effort currently being expended in the name of consumer protection were spent instead on educational efforts aimed at helping make smart shoppers out of today's buyers, something far more valuable would be accomplished.

Supermarket people tell me that the real secret to wise buying in their stores involves simply building a shopping list around a set budget, and then sticking to the list when you get to the store. Additionally, a recent U.S. Department of Agriculture study shows that shopping a store's specials will allow a consumer to chop 16 percent a year off of her food expenditures.

My point is that manufacturing and retailers, competing for our patronage, offer us values. We will be best off as we best learn to turn these honest competitive efforts to our own advantage, turning the attributes of the system to our own use. Only this way can we get the protection we really need.

I think by now you have gotten the point that I do not believe that we should look at today's supermarkets as a vast wasteland. As consumers we should look with grateful eyes on the supermarket as a bountiful, even though often confusing and bewildering, symbol of the inventiveness and ingenuity of the food industry and the abundance of the Nation's farms. In trying to make a balanced judgment of value, I ask myself, "Am I willing to pay the price of some confusion and doubt for the tremendous variety of wonderful food that is being brought to me and my dinner table in an ever-increasing palatable and convenient form?" My answer is. "Yes, sir," without qualification. I'm glad to pay the price of some doubtful decisions rather than have our American farmers pay the high prices of seasonal and sharply reduced markets. And, as a working wife myself, I would be the last to suggest to 8 million women who divide their time between a home and a job that they can't have the convenient food forms that make their tasks less burdensome. And those are only a couple of the alternatives that would arise if some of the regulators of the marketplace had their way.

Instead, there is a very practical and possible way to reduce the price of confusion in choicemaking—not by turning the Nation's supermarkets into a stultifying panorama of bland stimularity but rather educating consumers to the point that they can best use the variety which is offered.

There is a great challenge here to many persons in our country—to the food editors, to the home economists, to our schools, and to our consumer education services at various levels of our government. Too few people are trying to help our consumers buy wisely in relation to their needs. One housewife's "giant economy size" can easily be another housewife's waste. Consumer education should be oriented more to the buying and using of foods than to cooking. Formalized education in our schools has a tremendous challenge to keep pace with new products and services and changing methods or distribution. In only a few schools are they meeting this challenge. As one critic commented the other day, "Virtually all courses in the field are cup-and-teaspoon oriented while we live in a thaw-and-serve age." Yet, just last year, half the population of the United States became 25 years old or younger—40 percent of our population is under 20. Studies show that 80 percent of all teenage girls shop for their family's food and spend one-fourth of the entire family food budget—97 percent of them help plan the meals and help cook them. This is a real challenge in consumer education starting at the teenage level.

And I would like to give the knuckles of industry a gentle rap in this connection. What are they doing in the field of consumer education? As one industry spokesman admitted the other day. "We have, perhaps, become so interested in engineering change that we have neglected to tell anybody about the significance or implications of the changes in terms of the basics of shopping cart and kitchen economics, rather than dated statistics."

The whole point I am trying to make is that an educated consumer is a protected consumer. And a dynamic, changing, keenly competitive food industry makes a happy and fortunate consumer.

To quote myself from a speech made some time ago.

"All the government officials and all the government laws in the world are as nothing compared to the impact Mrs. America has on Mr. Manufacturer and on Mr. Storekeeper when she makes up her mind to buy one brand over another. And when she makes that decision, no power on earth can save the businessman or the producer of the product who made the mistake of displeasing her. She has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring, and in regulating American business enterprise.

"And, to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more government regulations and laws—I want to protect her freedom of choice."

St. Patrick's Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today we honor St. Patrick.

Were you in Boston, one would say, "Top of the morning to you." And your response would be, "And the rest of the day to you."

It was in the year 387 that St. Patrick came from Heaven on the mission for which he was preordained which was, of course, the conversion of the Irish people to the faith of Christianity.

At that time St. Patrick used the sprig of the shamrock as his symbol.

Today we have had shamrocks flown here to Washington from Ireland. They came as a courtesy of the Irish Embassy and to the Irish Embassy all of us are indeed grateful.

Last year Congressman James Burke read a little poem which I would like to read to you now:

A little sprig of shamrock
  Is a symbol we hold dear
A little sprig of shamrock
  When we wear it every year;
A little sprig of shamrock
  So many things convey
As it travels out across the world
  To be worn on St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, all of us today are wearing carnations and for these carnations we are extremely grateful because they were donated by the National Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

May I wish to all of you a happy St. Patrick's Day.

Australia Recognizes Importance of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Australia recently announced its intention to triple its forces in South Vietnam. An editorial appearing March 12, 1966, in the Houston Post, a well-known Texas newspaper, commented on this action taken at the request of the South Vietnamese. The editorial suggests that Australia, with its proximity to the conflict in Vietnam, has a vital interest in its outcome. As this editorial points out, the struggle in Vietnam is not totally an American enterprise and those who are closest to the problem realize the danger of Communist expansionary aims in southeast Asia.

I feel this concise editorial, which follows, will be of interest to my fellow colleagues:

AUSTRALIA BOOSTS VIETNAM FORCE

It is clear that Australia understands the importance of the war in South Vietnam, even if some Members of the U.S. Senate do not.

The government of the great island continent has agreed to triple its forces in South Vietnam to 4,500 men. The increase is in response to a request by the Saigon government.

Some 1,500 Australian combat troops have been serving in South Vietnam since June. They will be replaced in May by a task force of 4,500 men. These will include two infantry battalions, a special air services squadron, and support units. Helicopters will also be sent to Vietnam to fly support missions for the task force units.

A glance at the map reveals quite clearly Australia's vital interest in the war in South Vietnam. Should Vietnam fall, the way to Malaysia, Indonesia and, finally, Australia, lies open to Communist grasp.

Australia's contribution is small, but significant.

It is a clear demonstration that those closest to the problem recognize the danger of Communist expansionist aims in southeast Asia.

It should not be forgotten that the struggle in Vietnam is not totally an American enterprise.

Good Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Hartford Times praised the recent get-together of the Governors with the President to discuss domestic and foreign issues.

The item of most immediate impact was the Governors' unanimous endorsement of the President's handling of the Communist containment in Vietnam—

The paper points out. It adds that as a move for unity in our stressful times the session was important and meaningful.

Others may want to read the article to which I refer, and I therefore suggest that we include it in the Record.

[From the Hartford Times, Mar. 14, 1966]

L.B.J. AND THE GOVERNORS

Reputedly the President, politically astute and thoroughly informed, always knows what is going on back home in the various States.

But if President Johnson has not lost touch with the Governors and officials of the States, many of them feel that they have lost contact with him since he began to concentrate so intently on the problems of international affairs.

The weekend session at the White House, attended by 38 Governors, including Governor Dempsey, served therefore as a sort of reget-together meeting, an all-purpose chance to discuss domestic concerns, to pass the word either up or down, to peddle a little influential observation and to reestablish internal diplomatic relations.

The item of most immediate impact was the Governors' unanimous endorsement of the President's handling of the Communist containment in Vietnam. This must have been heartening to the administration, for besides its evidence of bipartisan support the resolution expressed the political judgment of the various State houses which are in direct local contact with sectional public sentiment.

It is natural that a chief executive who likes to make his own judgments should bring in the Governors now and then to check their opinions against what the Congressmen and the pollsters are telling him. And one expects that each Governor will go away braced by a considerable acquisition of the presidential sentiments and opinions.

There was some speculation that calling in the Governors indicates serious developments abroad that require conference. Nothing along those lines came up. Still, as a move for unity in our stressful times, the session was not unrelated to the pressures that exist.

The Problems of America's Merchant Marine Are Important to All Americans, Not Just the Shipping Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure last month to attend a meeting of the Propeller Club of New Orleans and, in my capacity as ranking member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, discuss some of the problems of the merchant marine. These problems are of vital concern to all of us, as events in Vietnam have demonstrated particularly.

Under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the Congressional Record my remarks in New Orleans on a subject which is now before the Congress and will be of increasing interest and importance to the Members.

The address referred to is as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN BEFORE THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE PORT OF NEW ORLEANS AND THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY ALUMNI ASSOCIATION AT A LUNCHEON ON FEBRUARY 16, 1966, AT ROOSEVELT HOTEL

I am delighted to be here this afternoon, both as a member of a propeller club myself, and as ranking member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, a committee which has a great deal to do, I realize, with how happy you people are—or how unhappy, perhaps—about maritime conditions and issues.

As you know, I am a Democrat, but to give a bipartisan flavor to the occasion, I must thank a Republican for my being able to come here today. The Republican I refer to is Abraham Lincoln, in whose name the Republicans in Congress always insist on a congressional recess at this time of year in order to try to raise some money for the forthcoming campaign. Later on, we Democrats give them a few days off from congressional chores while we celebrate and do some money raising of our own in the names of Thomas Jefferson and the hero of New Orleans, Andy Jackson.

But thanks to the extended Lincoln's birthday recess, I was finally able this year to arrange my schedule so as to accept at long last the flattering and repeated invitations I have received from the Propeller Club over the years to come and meet with you. Hale Boggs, our majority whip and one of the outstanding leaders of this Congress, has been urging me for a long time to come to New Orleans, and so has my closest neighbor in the Rayburn House Office Building, Eddie Hébert, who has a huge photographic mural of your city forming an entire wall of one of the rooms in his office, and who never loses an opportunity to boost this city. Across the hall from the photographic mural of New Orleans he has a huge painting of American soldiers fighting in the jungle, with murderous fire streaming from machineguns and rifles—and I got the message—come to New Orleans or else.

Hale Boggs and Eddie Hébert were close friends of my husband when I first went to Washington in 1941 as a congressional bride and Eddie, in fact, was a fraternity brother of the late Congressman Sullivan. Since my election to Congress in 1953, the family friendships have continued, and my admiration for their legislative skills has grown as they rose in stature and seniority and effectiveness in the House of Representatives. Another tie I have had with you was the late T. A. Thompson, who ranked next in seniority to me on the Merchant Marine Committee, and we spent many, many hours in adjoining chairs in hearings and in executive sessions working on bills of importance to this area as well as to the Nation.

I feel at home here, furthermore, because the mighty river which passes through New Orleans as a gateway to the sea, carrying vast cargoes from the fabulous heartland of America, flows past my city too, and for 200 years has been a bustling channel of two-way communication between us, linking not only our industries but our cultures. The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, featuring the tallest manmade structure in the Nation and the second highest in the world—the magnificient stainless steel arch designed by the late Eero Saarinen—symbolizes on the St. Louis riverfront the path of civilization westward from New Orleans, whence our first St. Louis settlers came.

Yes, I am glad to be here. I hope all of you will return the visit in the near future, while we are celebrating our bicentennial in St. Louis, a city which, like yours, lived under several different flags and absorbed the best of many cultures in developing its own distinctive flavor and uniqueness.

But I did not come here in my ex-officio capacity as one of St. Louis Mayor Alphonso Cervante's ambassadors; I came primarily to talk about maritime issues which are of grave concern to you, and which should be of grave concern to all Americans, but are seldom recognized as such.

The Merchant Marine Committee, on which I have enjoyed serving for 14 years, is, as I am sure you are well aware, strongly oriented to the marine environment—to the oceans and freshwater lakes and inland waterways and to the things and people affected by them. In addition to waterborne commerce in all of its aspects, our legislative and oversight responsibilities extend to the operations and activities of the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Panama Canal—which is of particular importance to me as chairman of that subcommittee for the past 11 years—also to our commercial and sport fisheries, and, within the past few years, to the exciting and vital new field of oceanography. These legislative responsibilities are all related to one another, and each is important to our welfare, for our progress as a great nation, and perhaps our survival as well, depend more and more upon our ability to project our power and influence in and under the world's oceans.

In looking over the scene at the beginning of this session of Congress, I believe the area of our greatest emphasis within the committee this year will undoubtedly be in the field of the merchant marine. For our merchant marine is in trouble—in deep trouble—or rather, we as a nation are in deep water because of the decline in our deep-water shipping.

The national maritime policy of the United States was set forth 30 years ago in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It laid the groundwork and the guidelines for overcoming the depression-day neglect of ocean commerce, and for providing for long-range programs for the future. It is a matter of history that this remarkable measure, conceived during peacetime in an era when we were still pulling ourselves up off the economic floor, served as a most timely and fortunate preparation for World War II.

In those early days of the New Deal, our domestic shipping and tanker fleets were reviving, but our liners were sick. We were then carrying, and I quote, "only about 35 percent of our waterborne commerce." (Today, I should add, we carry less than 9 percent.) Yet at a time when our gross national product was less than $90 billion, we embarked in 1936 on a program of building 50 modern cargo, passenger and combination liners each year for a period of 10 years—interrupted, of course, by World War II and the crash program that by 1945 had produced the miracle of an average construction of about 1,000 large merchant ships per year over a period of 6 years.

However, compared to the 1936 objective of 50 subsidized ships a year, we constructed only 17 new American-flag vessels last year, and the target for the coming fiscal year is only 13—none of them bulk carriers.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union has been building ships at a fast pace, and now has a fleet of 7 million tons, which is already in excess of our active fleet, with the expectation that by 1971 Russia's superiority over the American merchant marine will be 2 to 1. Furthermore, two-thirds of their ships are less than 10 years old, with 58 percent of their tankers being less than 5 years old. Much of our shipping, on the other hand, according to the president of the Longshoremen's Association, Thomas W. Gleason, in reporting to us last Thursday on the Vietnam unloading bottlenecks, comes under the heading of what he contemptuously referred to as "old rustbuckets."

The President of Delta Lines here in New Orleans, Capt. J. W. Clark, in his capacity as chairman of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, put it very well, I thought, in a talk in Washington a week or so ago to the Mississippi Valley Association when he described the American merchant marine—American-flag shipping—as the "key to our national security" and then added that at this particular time it is only "a skeleton key," as we lag in a poor sixth place today far behind Great Britain, Norway, Japan, Russia, and Liberia.

These are some of the things the Merchant Marine Committee plans to investigate in depth this year. Our new chairman, Congressman Edward A. Garmatz, of Baltimore, Md., is a conscientious legislator and a strong partisan of a strong merchant marine—as was the late Mr. Bonner, who devoted his legislative efforts with all of his heart to that subject. I can assure you that the committee is neither complacent nor defeatist about the future of American-flag shipping, but our first job is to dig down and dig out the facts—to dredge them out and look at them objectively, to try to determine the direction in which the facts, guide us, and then act. This will take time—many, many hours of hearings and study which we often feel we cannot spare from our other duties in the Congress, but must. We will certainly need the help and will want the advise of all of you who make your living from the shipping industry and who have an economic stake in the outcome of our deliberations, but your biggest stake in this, of course, is your stake as an American citizen rather than as owner, operator, or customer of shipping. I think all of you realize that.

However, people in business sometimes tend to make the same mistake of the late Charles E. Wilson of General Motors when he was testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1953, on his nomination for Secretary of Defense, and gave the impression he felt that what was best for his particular business firm was best for the country. I don't believe he actually expressed it that way, but that was the impression, and it haunted him throughout his career in public life. We learn pretty quickly in the Congress, from repeated exposure to the problem, how to cut through the testimony to the fine line which separates a witness' self-interest from the national interest; although sometimes, the two do go together, of course, and when this happens we can recognize that, too, I believe . In any event, we welcome advice, suggestions, comments, criticisms, ideas, and cautions, when expressed to us by witnesses who are knowledgeable in the field we are covering. So if you feel—any of you—that you can contribute to our understanding of the problems of our merchant marine, and help us solve them, don't hesitate to come before us and tell us about it—even if you do have a personal or corporate axe to grind. Usually, it's a legitimate one. If it isn't, we'll spot it and react accordingly.

But when and if you do testify—have your facts; do your homework. Don't just come and express opinions; we've got enough opinions of our own.

I sat through many days of hearings last year on a bill of mine to do what some of you might oppose—that is, to require Coast Guard inspection and certification of the safety of diesel-powered towboats and tugs, and the licensing of those crew members responsible for the vessel's navigation and safety. I introduced the bill originally because some of my constituents in St. Louis who work on the barges and tows were getting killed or seriously injured in accidents they insisted were caused by unsafe vessels and untrained crews operating on the Mississippi. When I introduced the bill in 1962 as a vehicle on which hearings could be scheduled—to get at the facts—everyone in management told me I was being taken in by the unions—that the whole thing was a union plot to get members.

By the time the hearings finally took place 3 years later, a lot of circumstances had changed—including the completion by the Coast Guard of several comprehensive studies clearly showing the need for such legislation (which the Coast Guard and the Treasury then redrafted for me so I could introduce it as an administration measure), but many of the industry people were still taking the same position as in 1962—just "agin" it. When we probed for facts, we often got only arguments and opinions, but not facts.

I don't want to argue that issue here. Anyone interested can write to me in care of the committee for a copy of the hearings and you can make your own judgments. My point, however, is this: whether a witness is for or against a bill, or for or against the puny recommendations for merchant marine purposes in the new budget, or for or against proposals for modernizing or improving our American-flag merchant marine, or for or against constructing American-flag shipping in foreign shipyards, or for or against changes in subsidy policies, or for a against the giveaway of the Panama Canal and the prompt and immediate jacking of tolls by the Republic of Panama—if she could take over the canal—to provide further riches for the favored few families there—whatever side a witness takes on legislation, he owes us facts in testifying before us.

Sometimes the facts we want and ask for may be a bit embarrassing to the witness' own position; he may feel we are asking him to testify, in effect, against himself—in violation of the spirit, at least, of the fifth amendment. But, personally, as well as in my capacity as a legislator, I admire a person who will stand up and argue his point of view with all of his might, but still be forthright and honest in answering questions which can help the Congress make honest and informed decisions on legislation. We are not infallible; sometimes we may even sound somewhat stupid in the questions we ask. But we feel deeply an obligation to try to act responsibly, based on facts and not on hunches, so we need all of the truth, not just the part which serves a firm's own interest. It is in this spirit that we are going into these hearings on our merchant marine.

Most of us are rather partisan to American-flag shipping to begin with; for instance, we feel strongly that the 50-50 cargo preference law is basically a national defense policy, and the shipping crisis over Vietnam certainly bears us out. When we increase our dependence upon foreign shipping for Government cargoes in peacetime, we later find ourselves confronted with the unhappy fact that we don't have the ships we need, and some of our fair-weather foreign-flag carrier friends who were so glad to get Government cargoes suddenly pull the rug out from under us by saying thank you very much but we aren't interested in taking any of your cargoes to Saigon right now—as recently happened.

As a result, we have a lot of our best shipping tied up off Saigon—all the way to the Philippines, according to one witness—waiting to unload, and undergoing the most exasperating and maddening delays which I hope the Longshoremen's President and other experienced consultants we have sent over there can help unravel, if only their recommendations are given a chance to work. There are good, fast ships as well as the "old rustbuckets" tied up for many weeks over there, and I wonder—and we want to know—what is happening on the commercial routes they were taken away from. Are we losing that business by default, possibly for good and, if so, what do we do about it?

Along those lines, we are very curious about the repeated claim that cargoes sent by American ships are more expensive than using foreign ships. We all know that the rates are set by conference agreements, and they are supposed to be the same for all ships participating in the agreements. This raises the question: Is there widespread cheating on conference rates by some foreign-flag lines—perhaps in the form of kickbacks? We want to know about that, too.

Speaking of the Vietnam delays, I saw a report from Capt. H. G. Beck, master of the *SS Louise Lykes* out of this port, on the first 2 weeks of his attempts to unload his cargo at Damang, Vietnam. It sounds bad enough to make strong men cry, in trying to match barges with labor and both with the necessary clearance papers and anchorages. The payoff was an episode the day after Christmas—there they were, stuck out there—and finally when everything was lined up for them to unload some of their rice, with the barges in place and the necessary labor on hand, the unloading was abruptly called off after 15 minutes because one Vietnamese official had failed to obtain a permit from another Vietnamese official permitting discharge into lighters. The next day, after this formality was straightened out and some unloading began, the master protested bitterly about the silly and expensive delay, but a self-important local individual pulled himself up to his full 5 feet, and pompously explained that the previous day was a Sunday and "they" didn't work on Saturday or Sunday.

As I got the story, your neighbor replied—and good for him—that he not only worked Saturday and Sunday but day and night, every day, and so did everyone else—the crew, the AID people there, the people loading the ship at home, in fact everyone, and one sure thing, the Vietcong were working, too.

Well, he got some of his cargo off, but the next day he was still hung up there with six empty barges alongside and no labor on the barges to land and stow the rice, or to check it on to the barge and none of his military cargo had yet been touched and he was sadly reporting to the company that if only things could be straightened out there he could unload in a few days, but, he wrote:

"Either there is no labor, or no checkers, or no barges, or the tide is wrong or too strong or even the lack of a piece of paper which nullifies all efforts."

In our committee we are deeply concerned over the shipping tieup in Vietnam, because we don't have the ships to spare for this wasteful use, and if we did, we don't have the trained crews—which is another of my great complaints I'd be glad to talk about for hours some day, going back again to the hearings we held on towboats on our inland waters. But that's another story.

We are now at a critical point of decision on our ocean shipping policies for the future, as we were in 1936, and there is no certainty which way we will go this time. In 1936 we made the right turn. But for some years now, we have been drifting in a calm in ship construction and in American flag operation. Foreign ships have taken over not only most of our commercial cargo, but our passenger business too. Recently we learned once again from the *Yarmouth Castle* disaster that the American flag should have a most important significance to the tourist—in the most fundamental thing of all, safety at sea. So the same American shipping lines which used to protest bitterly over the added costs of conforming to Coast Guard safety requirements, now find it excellent public relations and promotion practice to advertise such conformance. I hope we can now recapture a good deal of the tourist business, and that we will resume the construction of fine new ships to make travel by American-flag passenger vessels even more attractive.

But as to cargo ships, those who may think that the American Flag should—or has to—gradually disappear from the shipping lanes of the world, because it is perhaps an expensive luxury we cannot afford, have either forgotten, or are much too young to know about the recurring crises in recent history when defense needs suddenly made us dependent upon our own ships. I do not feel we should place the main reliance for so much of our vital commerce—vital to our survival—on foreign ships which owe us nothing whatsoever and whose owners are glad to have our business when it is convenient or profitable, but not when it entails any sacrifice. For sacrifice, we know—we've always known—we can depend only on our own. Thank you.

President Johnson Acts on Congressman Tenzer's Jet Noise Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, this is the 12th time I have addressed my colleagues in the House of Representatives on the problem of aircraft noise—on each previous occasion I appealed for Federal action and now for the first time, the President of the United States has answered my plea and has gone on record as favoring Federal action.

On March 2, 1966, the President in his transportation message to Congress, announced that he had directed his science adviser, Dr. Donald F. Hornig, to work with the Administrators of FAA and NASA and the Secretaries of Commerce and of Housing and Urban Development to "frame an action program to attack this problem."

On March 18, 1966, the White House released the summary report entitled "Alleviation of Jet Aircraft Noise Near Airports," prepared as a result of the White House Conference on Jet Aircraft Noise held on October 29, 1965, under the direction of Dr. Hornig. On August 19, 1965, I wrote to the President recommending the appointment of a Presidential Commission to study the jet noise problem and recommend action to alleviate this problem. The October conference was called as a result of my request and I am most gratified that the panel has acted in a constructive and encouraging forward-looking manner. On March 18, 1966, simultaneously with the release of the panel's report I received the following letter from the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 18, 1966.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Today we released a report prepared under the direction of my Science Adviser, Dr. Donald F. Hornig, on the "Alleviation of Jet Aircraft Noise Near Airports." This report provides a valuable starting point for a concerted effort to meet the problem of jet aircraft noise.

I want to thank you for your initiative in presenting many aspects of the jet aircraft noise situation to me and to my Scientific Advisory Committee.

I know that with continued support of outstanding Congressmen such as yourself, we will find new and better ways to improve the quality of the environment in which we live.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Upon receipt of the President's letter, I sent the President the following telegram:

I acknowledge your letter informing me that you have today released Dr. Hornig's report of the White House Conference on Jet Noise. I especially thank you for giving recognition to my efforts in bringing jet noise into proper focus as a problem national in scope meriting your personal attention. Mr. President, you have earned the everlasting gratitude of my constituents and all citizens throughout the Nation who reside in the vicinity of our airports.

HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress.

The major recommendations contained in the aircraft noise report are:

Initiation of federally supported studies of the expected scope of the noise problem through 1975 and of the public and private programs which will be needed to combat the problem.

Creation of a high level Federal task force to undertake, on an urgent basis, a "systems" type analysis of the problem in the vicinity of the Kennedy, O'Hare, and Los Angeles Airports, the analysis to be extended to other affected areas as soon as practicable.

Development of valid, broadly applicable standards of noise measurement.

Pursuit of a definitive technical study pointed toward a reduction in noise levels produced by jet engines and by aircraft, together with a determination of the costs associated with the various levels of improvement which may be technologically possible.

Establishment of a task force to investigate methods for Federal participation in a coordinated program for compatible land utilization in the vicinity of airports.

Starting an effort to identify and place into effect any modifications to operating procedures and takeoff or landing techniques that would reduce noise without compromising safety.

I have made 11 statements in the House on jet noise and introduced two bills to provide coordination of research in aircraft noise abatement and provide Federal funds to reimburse local governments and industry for the cost of land acquisition and implementation of other techniques for reducing jet noise.

It is with a deep sense of gratification that I refer to the letter from the President which culminates 14 months of continuous effort to obtain widespread recognition that jet noise is a national problem. I agree with the President that today's actions provide an invaluable starting point and I will continue to do everything in my power to alert my colleagues in the House to the need for appropriate legislation. I invite all local organizations and elected officials to join with me in a concerted effort to achieve the desired result—the reduction of aircraft noise.

I intend to work as closely as possible with the President's Science Adviser and task force as they develop the action program which the President has directed them to frame. The importance of alleviating the jet noise problem will become much clearer to my colleagues in the House as the number of airport servicing jet planes increases from 75 to 400 in the next few years as a result of the increased use of smaller jet aircraft which can take off and land at airfields with shorter runways.

H.R. 7981 and H.R. 7982 which I introduced May 6, 1965, provides for most of the items contained in the recommendations of the President's Panel. I will renew my appeal to all persons, local elected officials, and organizations interested in the problem of aircraft noise abatement and control to send me their recommendations and suggestions to help perfect the legislation to the end that we may be able to present a common effort to the solution of a common problem.

The time for action is at hand for if we wait until these 400 airfields are servicing jets, it will be too late to develop the action program which the people have demanded. If we are to improve the quality of our environment as the President wants to do, we must begin now.

On March 18, 1966, Dr. Donald F. Hornig also wrote to me and I insert the text of his letter at this point:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 18, 1966.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TENZER: At long last, I am pleased to send you a copy of the summary report of the Jet Aircraft Noise Panel, "Alleviation of Jet Aircraft Noise Near Airports." Also, I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your interest and your helpfulness during our many discussions of the subject.

I look forward to continuing contact with you as we attack the problem and develop the plans and actions which will be needed to produce much-needed progress.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD F. HORNIG,
Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.

The action of which Dr. Hornig speaks in his letter refers to both administrative and legislative action. The executive or administrative action which can be implemented quickly and without legislative authority may be developed by the further studies—and the "systems" type analysis of the problem which will be conducted in the vicinity of the Kennedy, O'Hare, and Los Angeles Airports.

I believe the legislative action should begin at the earliest possible time. I have introduced two bills which if enacted would place the additional authorization in the hands of the Federal Government to back up the attack on this problem with Federal funds and with enforcement authority. The solution cannot be found or implemented until such time as Congress passes legislation placing the responsibility on industry and Government. Then and only then will the economic barriers be torn down and will the road to progress be cleared and the scientific and planning resources of the United States released to attack the problem without restrictions.

I urge my colleagues to review H.R. 7981 and 7982 and join me in calling for congressional hearings on legislation designed to alleviate the jet noise problem so that we may act now for the benefit of the millions of Americans who reside near our airports.

Rosalie Hermanson, of Hawaii, Personifies Spirit of Aloha

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, part of Hawaii's appeal as one of the most popular vacation spots in the world stems from its friendly spirit of "aloha." And the culture that deserves the most credit for this infectious spirit of aloha is the Hawaiian culture. Because of the important role that all Hawaiian mores and customs play in the promotion of our tourist industry, it is not only desirable, but necessary that this colorful and attractive culture be perpetuated. We are fortunate in having community-minded individuals who have dedicated their lives to just such a goal of perpetuating the Hawaiian culture.

The town of Kaaawa on the island of Oahu has such an individual in Mrs. Rosalie Hermanson, past president of the Koolauloa Hawaiian Civic Club. Among one of the club's most notable accomplishments under Mrs. Hermanson's leadership was the organization's first Holoku Ball, which made possible the establishment of a scholarship fund for Kahuku High School graduates of Hawaiian ancestry. But the project in which she retains a most active interest is the building fund. She hopes that the fund will be enlarged under the club's new president, Mrs. Ruby Enos, and make possible the acquisition of land that may be used to raise taro—a Hawaiian staple food—and the building of a community center. She is also planning, with the help of a Mrs. Sadie Kauhine, a communitywide project to encourage people to learn the Hawaiian language.

In addition, Mrs. Hermanson as the wife of Mr. Karl W. Hermanson who is president of the "Swe-Nor-Den" Club of Hawaii, has been spreading the aloha spirit beyond the boundaries of the 50 States. Many colorful pictures of her in her holoku and leis have found their way to the Scandinavian countries.

As a personal friend and admirer of the Hermansons, I am confident that the goals and projects Mrs. Hermanson plans for the betterment of the Hawaiian community will be realized. And the betterment of her Hawaiian community will contribute toward the perpetuation of Hawaiian culture in our State of Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article on Mrs. Rosalie Hermanson which appeared in the Pali Daily Press of Wednesday, January 12, 1966:

HER DREAM MAY COME TRUE SOMEDAY

Mrs. Karl W. Hermanson, of Kaawa, is a genial, charming, Hawaiian woman who has deep concern for the future of her people. She recently completed her term of office as president of the Koolauloa Hawaiian Civic Club, and was responsible for starting several new programs which are beneficial to the community.

In may 1964, the civic club held its first Holoku Ball, raising over $500 which was set aside as a scholarship fund to be awarded to graduates of Kahuku High School according to the standards set by the scholarship committee and approved by the general membership.

Another $300 was added to the scholarship fund as a result of the 1965 Holoku Ball.

At the present time, there is a magnificent sum of $83 set aside in a building fund. This represents the first step on what may be a long journey toward the fulfillment of Rosalie's dream.

She has thought that the civic club members might be able to raise enough money over a period of several years to purchase 20 acres or so of productive land. The members who were not otherwise employed could raise taro and orchids in rotating crops and help pay the cost of the land. Then, as young Hawaiians grow into adults, they could take over the management of the project and perhaps put up a building which would be for the use of the civic club and for rental to the community. Any profits would go toward the education of the children of the Hawaiian community.

Her entire dream is built upon the foundation of helping her people to help themselves.

In the recent installation of new officers, Mrs. Ruby Enos accepted the duties of the presidency. The scholarship fund will be continued under her able leadership. Four scholarships of $100 each will be available to Kahuku graduates of Hawaian ancestry who wish to continue their education in vocational or college-level work.

Mrs. Hermanson has encouraged the study of the Hawaiian language and hopes to create a communitywide interest in future classes. In preparation for such a course, she has reproduced 16 lessons from the Reverend Dr. Kahale's work and Mrs. Sadie Kauhine, retured schoolteacher, would be willing to teach.

When Rosalie retires—someday—she hopes to get the material from the Reverend Kahale's book worked into a primer with illustrations.

Retirement is not in Rosalie's vocabulary right now. She is an active, vital sort of person and in addition to her community efforts is the secretary at Kaaawa School.

Some people may assume that Kaaawa is such a small place, off the beaten path of world travelers, that little happens out of the ordinary. Rosalie can attest that this is not so.

Because of her husband's background, he was born in Scandinavia, many tourists from that part of the world stop to look them up. Mr. Hermanson is president of Swe-Nor-Den, a group with Scandinavian origins, and in the course of time many pictures have been taken of his family in Hawaiian dress with colorful leis, ukleles and other Hawaiiana.

One day a journalist from Finland stopped to meet them because he had seen their pictures back home. Some of the footage had been used in a travel talk and he had made it a point to find them while he was visiting Hawaii.

Perhaps the most amazing story concerns her trip to Washington, D.C., this past summer when she attended the National Convention of the Business and Professional Woman. She had prepared leis of Jobs tears and koa seeds which she wanted to present to the women from Finland who would be attending the international meeting to follow the convention.

She finally located the group and found they could not speak English too well so she just presented the leis, said "Aloha" and was preparing to leave when one woman said, "Oh, you are an actress. I have seen your picture in Finland."

Rosalie assured her this was not so and that she must have her confused with some one else. The lady insisted and said, "But we saw you greeting the President."

Suddenly, Rosalie understood. Mr. Hermanson had been an official greeter when the President of Finland visited Hawaii and the woman, amazingly, had remembered seeing Mrs. Hermanson, along with the Governor and other dignitaries, when he was welcomed.

This Christmas she received a thank-you, written in Finnish, which her husband translated for her. It was in appreciation for her gift of "Hawaiian pearls," the Jobs tears lei she had given to the woman.

Intimidation by Government Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, increasingly the powers of the Federal Government to investigate are being used to intimidate citizens. The image of a friendly Uncle Sam ready to serve the citizen is being replaced by the burly "Big Brother" who is watching each citizen and is ready to clobber him with an investigation if he should challenge the rulings or oppose the policies of the Governmen. Everyone will acknowledge the rightful power of the Government to investigate violators of the laws. But when this power to investigate becomes a weapon of intimidation against innocent citizens, then the Federal Government has overstepped its constitutional boundaries. Mr. Jack Anderson, in the February 20, 1966, issue of Parade magazine, has written a most interesting article dealing with this subject. For the information of Members of Congress I am inserting this article into the Appendix of the RECORD:

A NEW AND FRIGHTENING TREND: INTIMIDATION BY GOVERNMENT—WASHINGTON IS SWARMING WITH INVESTIGATORS READY TO HARASS THOSE WHO CHALLENGE THE UNITED STATES

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In the tradition of the United States the Government's power of investigation is to be used for the good of the taxpayers, to ferret out the dishonest and the disloyal. But in all too many cases today this power is being turned against the citizens. It is being used to intimidate, coerce, and strike back at persons who challenge the rulings or oppose the policies of the Government.

A contractor who won't accept Government terms, a taxpayer who contests a Government ruling, even the associate of another person under investigation—all may now find themselves hounded by gumshoes. In one recent and ominous instance a number of persons exercising their constitutional right to protest the war in Vietnam were ordered investigated. In another case an official used the investigatory power as a club in a private squabble.

Of course, some of the targets of investigation are Reds, racketeers, and others not wholly deserving of sympathy. And in theory an innocent man has nothing to fear from investigators. But few have the resources or funds to stand up against relentless Government prying. Moreover, once investigators have come around questioning a citizen's neighbors and associates, a cloud of suspicion is raised that may never be dispelled. His reputation may be ruined even though he is innocent of any wrongdoing.

The coercive investigation, it should be noted, is not practiced in all cases by any means, nor is it followed by all Government agencies. The examples remain in the minority. But they are multiplying alarmingly.

One reason is that the Federal bureaucracy is literally crawling with investigators who, if they are to earn their salaries, must investigate someone. Many agencies have become top-heavy with investigators. No one can say exactly how many have found their way onto the Government payroll, for they are often camouflaged as attorneys, accountants or consultants. But a top official of one Federal procurement agency confessed to Parade: "We used to have a large staff of engineers and a few lawyers and investigators. Now we have a large staff of lawyers and investigators and a few engineers."

Additionally, this has become an age of investigation, in which the routine background investigation has become accepted, and other forms of prying and snooping are widespread.

The policy of intimidation-by-investigation has many facets. A favorite harassment of investigators is to toss difficult cases, no matter how unrelated to taxes they may be, to the Internal Revenue Service. "A lot of other agencies try to use us," Commission Sheldon Cohen acknowledged to Parade. "We try to discourage this."

When the Government moved to take over private homes on military bases, owners who resisted complained that they were suddenly beseiged by tax agents. The Justice Department's Land Acquisition Section brought tax pressure, for example, on Nashville builder Edward Carmack, who was unwilling to sell 600 homes at Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn., at the Government's price. Ralph Luttrell, then section chief, admitted to Parade that he had drafted an official letter to Internal Revenue, pointing out the possibility of tax evasion in the Carmack case. The builder was subjected to an intensive investigation, which ended in dismissal of the charges. (A civil settlement is still awaiting the judgment of the Tax Court.)

One high official even used the Internal Revenue Service to take revenge on a driver whose car bumped his Cadillac at Washington National Airport. The official copied the license number of the other car, traced it to the owner, then ordered an investigation of his taxes.

Parade talked to several attorneys who defended clients in Federal cases. All but one complained of the Government's tactics. The most outspoken was Urbana, Ill., attorney Joseph M. Williamson, who declared: "The Government is the most unfair and corrupt opponent that you will ever have in a courtroom. Federal agencies have conducted investigations of my clients that were unbelievably improper."

Certainly most Federal officials try to be fair. But the bureaucratic system tends to uphold the abuses of those few entrenched officeholders who regard themselves as the masters rather than the servants of the people. These latter usually are able to summon the massive weight of the U.S. Government behind their rulings and recommendations because most agency heads, unfamiliar with the details of a case, are inclined to accept the judgment of their subordinates.

And once investigators start bloodhounding a case only the boldest bureaucrat would dare intervene. "This is the age of the investigator," said one official. "The investigator is king."

"It isn't safe to stick your nose into an investigation," explained another. "What if the guy turns out to be guilty? The next thing you know, the inspectors will be trying to link you to the case."

BUCK PASSING

When one regulatory agency rejected an investigator's recommendation that a Connecticut company be indicted for fraud, the investigator resubmitted his recommendation in stronger words. The commissioners, nervous that they might be accused of a whitewash, passed the buck to the Justice Department.

The case went to a U.S. attorney, who later admitted there was insufficient evidence for an indictment. But he didn't want to take the responsibility for overruling the agency. Playing it safe, he submitted the decision to a grand jury, which in turn felt he wouldn't have presented the case if an indictment weren't justified. Result: company officials were duly indicted, though no one except the original investigator thought they deserved to be. The trial jury found them innocent—but not until they had gone through 2 years of mental anguish, Federal harassment, and legal expense.

How many individuals can stand up against the awesome power of the Federal Government? No private bank account can match the bottomless vaults of the Treasury. No private staff can marshal the manpower available to the Government. Once caught in the Federal vise, a private citizen must rely upon the restraint and fairness of the authorities to get an even break.

Some contend that the Government should offer no quarter to Reds and racketeers who will twist every comma in the Constitution to thwart justice. But others warn that any tactics the Government is permitted to use against them could be turned against anyone.

Many attorneys who would like to see Teamsters Boss Jimmy Hoffa behind bars, for example, believe the Government has carried its campaign to put him there too far. His every move has been shadowed, his every transaction scrutinized, his every associate investigated. Even two Congressmen who defended Hoffa on the House floor suddenly had their taxes audited.

The Justice Department has indicted some of his business associates, then offered to drop the indictments if they would testify against him. A Miami banker who had never been accused of anything worse than a traffic offense until he got involved in a deal with Hoffa, was hauled before a grand jury on tax evasion charges. The evidence wouldn't support a tax indictment, so the grand jury indicted him for perjury instead. Even this charge was later dropped. But meanwhile the banker was so discredited that he was forced to sell his banking interests at a sacrifice.

A Baltimore insurance man who did business with Hoffa was so harassed that he told Parade bitterly: "5 years ago I would have been willing to die for my country. Now I hate my country for what it has done to me."

There was sworn testimony, disputed by the Justice Department, that agents had even used voodoo in an effort to persuade Thomas Ewing Parks, an uncle of a Teamster official, to testify against Hoffa. A Nashville voodoo doctor, Bishop St. Psalm, was allegedly retained to perform the mystic rites. He lit two candles on a portable altar, according to the testimony, then placed upon the altar an article of Parks' clothing borrowed from a drycleaning shop. But the superstitious Parks, though a believer, apparently didn't respond to the voodoo spell.

Congressional investigators have turned up some astonishing facts about Government snooping. Investigators have planted secret microphones in everything from picture frames and desk sets to lamps and telephones. Listening devices have even been slipped into pillows for eavesdroppers who like pillow talk. Even more remarkable is a set of low-frequency coat buttons that can be fitted to a victim's coat in a matter of minutes. The top button is a microphone, the second a transmitter, the third a miniature battery unit. These will turn the wearer into a walking radio station whose every word is broadcast to the snoopers.

One Government agency made arrangements with Washington trash collectors to turn in all the trash picked up at some 50 addresses. When Representative CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, learned about it, he demanded an explanation from the Sanitation Department. Commissioner C. M. Duke wrote back that the trash was segregated "to determine from typical household units the characteristics of refuse for statistical and design purposes." He didn't explain why the trash for this study should be collected only from people under Federal investigation.

The Government also seems increasingly tempted to use its investigative powers to intimidate its critics. Many a newsman after writing a critical article has suddenly become aware of Federal watchdogs sniffing his trail. Several citizens who wrote to President Johnson expressing sympathy for the Vietnam demonstrators received replies from the Internal Security Division of the Justice Department. A spokesman blandly denied this was an attempt to intimidate anyone. But Jack Ferriss, Jr., of Chattanooga, who exercised his inalienable American right to call the President "tyrannical, dictatorial, and domineering," was promptly visited by Secret Service agents.

Dr. Carlton Fredericks has felt the hot breath of the Federal Government on his neck ever since he started feuding with the Food and Drug Administration 17 years ago. The agency has called him "a crackpot, culturist, food faddist, and dispenser of nutritional nonsense." Yet amazingly, it has never taken him into court to prove the charges but has tried his case instead in the newspapers. The record against him consists almost entirely of press releases. More than once, agents have raided food-supplement producers who had absolutely nothing to do with Fredericks; yet the press releases, announcing the raids, have been devoted almost wholly to attacks on him. Food and Drug officials have warned newspapers and radio stations against him, have enlisted the help of the Federal Communications Commission to drive him off the air, and, of course, have initiated an investigation into his taxes. Laments Fredericks: "Food faddists have a right to their beliefs. They have a right to buy the foods they want. They should not be made half criminals."

PLEASE, $2.35

One of the most insidious Federal weapons is the jeopardy assessment, which is supposed to be used to tie up the funds of taxpayers who might try to skip the country. Agents have used this power indiscriminately to force settlements out of reluctant taxpayers. In Missouri, one agent barged into a bank with a $2.35 assessment on a businessman's account, though the agent could have collected the money merely by calling on the businessman a few doors down the street.

Noel Smith, a Taylor, Mo., farmer, had his funds tied up 4 years after he refused to pay a $570,000 tax claim. He was obliged to live off the proceeds of a business deal in Canada. The Government finally offered to settle the claim for less than 10 cents on the dollar. Though he stoutly insisted he didn't owe anything, he coughed up $54,000 in order to get access to his own bank account again. He complained that the 4-year ordeal had ruined his reputation, broken his health, and cost him $1 million in lost profits. "If I had it to do over again," he says, "it would be easier to go to jail."

Several Government contractors complained to Parade that some agencies have become obsessed with audits and investigations. They have seized upon technical violations and treated respectable businessmen like criminals. In a case that has become all too typical, the Court of Claims recently lectured a Federal contracting official for his arrogance and arbitrariness. "He nearly took a shillelagh and struck the contractor down," declared the court.

For many contractors, Government profits are no longer worth the harassment. More than one told Parade they would never bid on a Government contract again. A top General Services Administration official said he doesn't blame them. "We're fighting with every contractor we do business with," he said wearily.

STRONG ARM STUFF

Frequently Uncle Sam holds up payment until the contractor, desperate for money to meet his bills, settles for less than he was supposed to get. One contractor, in order to rush work on the Bomarc missile, lived for 4 months in a trailer and worked around the clock at the missile site. But the Government was in no such rush to pay him. Eight years after the contract was completed, he is still trying to collect what is due him. Worse, Uncle Sam doesn't hesitate to use criminal charges to coerce a contractor into accepting civil settlement. "You will find," said an attorney, "that a fraud investigation almost always follows civil dispute." S. Harvey Klein, a Philadelphia electronics manufacturer, got into a legal hassle with the Government over the termination of a contract. Not until he had rejected the Government's settlement offer did he find himself under investigation for allegedly filing a false claim.

The Brussel Sewing Machine Co., had a Government contract reviewed by the Renegotiation Board, which concluded that the company's profits had not been excessive. After the case was closed an informer charged that the company had overstated its estimated cost. Investigators immediately swarmed all over the company, and the Government filed a false-claim charge. Unimpressed with the Government's arguments, the court concluded that it wasn't "the intention of the statute (governing such contracts) to make dealing with the Government hazardous, should someone later conceive the notion that the Government had paid too much."

John A. Maxwell, a Michigan manufacturer, was actually fined $30,000 and sentenced to a 3-year prison term because he followed the Government's own suggestion and filed estimated instead of exact costs. It had been agreed that the exact figure would be determined later. Though the Government had been a party to his act, it brought criminal charges against him for submitting estimated, hence false figures. The Appeals Court found the Government's position so outrageous that it set aside the guilty verdict.

Most Americans look upon Uncle Sam as a benevolent Big Brother, which he usually tries to be. But lately our Federal uncle has been developing an alarming vindictive streak.

Elmer Winter, of Manpower, Inc., Urges Merit Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Elmer Winter, president of Manpower, Inc., recently addressed the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in New York. In his speech he put forth suggestions for a positive role for American businessmen in the war against poverty, in equal employment opportunity, urban education, in the school dropout problem, and in urban housing needs.

In the thought that Mr. Winter's thoughtful recommendations will be of interest to the Members of this body, I include the text of his speech:

PRESENTATION BEFORE THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 3, 1965

(By Elmer L. Winter, president, Manpower, Inc.)

At the outset, let me congratulate you gentlemen on the excellent report that your task force issued on "The Concept of Poverty." The report was most informative and thought provocative. Of great importance to me was the fact that in the introduction to the report, it was indicated that this was the first of several reports to be published by the task force and that your group in no way wished to imply by this study that the day of action in alleviating poverty should be postponed.

It is on this latter point that I would like to talk to you briefly today. Let me declare myself frankly and openly at this moment. It is my purpose and intention today to ask you seriously to examine what our role as businessmen should be in what I refer to as the people problem that exists in our individual communities today. You know, we spend a great deal of time and thinking about the brick-and-mortar problems of our communities. We are busily engaged in urban renewal programs, building of expressways, and removing blight in our downtown business sections. This is important. This is necessary, but may I ask are we in truth and in fact thinking sufficiently about the people problems that exist particularly in the inner core areas of every major community in this country.

Let's take a moment and look at the X-ray of most of our cities. We will find a certain number of square blocks in most communities that are heavily populated by Negroes, some of whom have moved there recently.

For example, in my community, Milwaukee, we have an area consisting of 24 square blocks where 85,000, or 95 percent of our Negroes live. In your city, it may be 50 square blocks with 200,000 or 300,000 Negroes. I believe we can agree that the problems that are being generated in these areas are increasing rather than decreasing. The explosions in Watts, Harlem, Chicago, Rochester, and other cities seem to be clear warnings that "it can happen here." Tomorrow, it may happen in your hometown or mine. Can we as business leaders pretend that the inner core area in our town is free of problems—free from hopelessness and despair?

I submit to you that the Negro community in your city or mine is restless. It is demanding action, not next year or the year after, but now. There appear to be two words that the Negro rebels against. These are "committee" and "studies." They want a deed—not a promise.

This really brings us to the moment of truth, the moment when it appears to me that we must ask ourselves some searching questions as to the role that we as business leaders must play in the social revolutions that are taking place in our cities today.

I suggest to you, my friends, that we in business can and must tackle this problem head on. In solving it, we must put into it the same imagination and use the same innovating processes that we use so successfully managing our businesses and marketing new products.

How will we accomplish our goals? Let me suggest some challenges that I would hope that you consider in two ways, (1) as corporate executives and (2) as members of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, trying to assist the chamber in planning its future course of action in this area.

Challenge No. 1: Can the businessmen of America sit out the war against poverty? As you know, the Government is spending billions of dollars to fight the war against poverty in this country. You may not like the approaches that the Government is using in expending these funds but like it or not, we must face up to the fact that these billions of dollars will be spent with or without our approval and cooperation.

As you review these Government programs, you will find that many of them have as their goal, training of people for the jobs of tomorrow. Let me ask you this question if I may, Who is better qualified than the businessmen of this country to participate and counsel Government in the training of the young and the retraining of the old? Certainly we have the expertise in this area. Our business economy has flourished because we have had the ability to train and retrain our people to meet our business needs. Tens of thousands of jobs are going begging in this country.

If for no other reason, isn't it to our own interest to participate in the training programs sponsored by government to make certain that those who are enrolled in these courses are being properly trained for the jobs of tomorrow? Further, we can cut our relief costs materially if we in industry provide on-the-job training for present and potential relief recipients. We have the skills and the techniques in industry to develop our own strategy to fight the war against poverty. Hasn't the time come when the businessmen of this country, individually and through their U.S. Chamber of Commerce, must stand up and say, "the war against poverty is our war too?"

Challenge No. 2: How can we do a more complete job in opening up our employment doors to all people regardless of race, color, religion, or creed? Our Congress has spoken. The law is clear. "Discrimination in employment is illegal." However, these can be empty words unless we in business take the necessary steps to fully implement the law. Fortunately several years ago, a number of business leaders in this country created "Plans for Progress." This group has had, and continues to have, an enviable record in meeting the problems of discrimination in employment in a constructive and forthright manner. Today local "Plans for Progress" groups are being organized in a number of metropolitan cities. Let me take just a moment to tell you a little bit about our Milwaukee Voluntary Equal Employment Opportunity Council.

Two years ago, Bob Stevenson, who was then president of Allis-Chalmers, and Ted Smith, the president of A. O. Smith, called together 35 of Milwaukee's largest employers. We were asked to do a little soul searching to determine whether we were in truth and in fact doing the full job in removing discrimination from our employment practices. At the end of the meeting, 35 employers unanimously decided to organize the Milwaukee Voluntary Equal Employment Council. We set about to develop programs to make certain that our employers went beyond merely taking a pledge to offer equal employment opportunities. We now have 180 companies as members of our council.

These companies employ over 200,000 people. We have conducted numerous seminars for personnel directors and supervisors to train them in the recruiting and selection of Negro applicants, as well as programs to introduce them into the work force, train them, and advance them on the job. We are working very closely with our school system. We have on-going training programs with our guidance counselors in the inner core areas. These efforts are always geared toward attempts to motivate our young people to recognize that the "future belongs to the trained person."

We work closely with our urban league on cooperative training programs. In addition, we have developed programs with our high schools where we have over 100 young people working in our member companies half a day, the remaining half they are in school. We have weekly job clinics to help Negro applicants learn how to better present themselves on a job interview and to help orient them to the job requirements.

We believe we have opened many employment doors that were previously closed. We have many programs for next year. We still have a long way to go. I believe I can say in all candor that the businessmen of Milwaukee understand fully that the mere signing of a pledge is not enough. Positive and continuing steps must be taken to implement and carry out their commitment.

There are 10 other councils similar to the Milwaukee plan that have been organized in other major cities. Isn't this the type of program that the U.S. Chamber, after a brief study, should sponsor in every major community? This is the businessman's way of meeting a problem through voluntary action. Isn't this the means by which we can say to our Government, "We, as businessmen, will assume leadership by developing construction programs which will open the employment door of industry to all people regardless of their race, color, religion or creed"?

Challenge No. 3: Can we as businessmen take a disinterested attitude toward the intercore schools in our community? Now we may say, "We like our school situation. We don't want any change." But again, I think we have to be realistic. We must recognize that while generally we think our school system is just fine, the Negro community by and large doesn't. Across the country we find school boycotts instigated by civil rights workers who are protesting against de facto segregation and in a number of cases, inadequate school facilities in the innercore schools. Can we say, "This is no concern of ours, that this is the sole responsibility of our school boards"?

I believe, as responsible citizens in our communities, that we must take a deep and serious interest in all of our schools to make certain that the educational facilities which we are offering will produce the very best and highest quality students and that this basic principle applies to all students regardless of race, color, religion, or creed. We need to interest ourselves in the physical facilities of our innercore schools—as well as the curriculum, teaching staff, and books.

We must make certain that our young men and women in the innercore area be given every opportunity to get the best possible training so that they will qualify for the many jobs that we have open in our companies. We in industry must provide leadership and support for our schools by recognizing that education pays not only in terms of actual wages but also improves the quality of citizenship.

It would appear to me that we need, also, to interest ourselves in the expansion of such programs as Headstart to provide prekindergarten education for poor children. We need to modernize our vocational training programs in many of our school systems. We need to concern ourselves with the educational deficiency of 8 million adults who have not achieved sixth grade mastery of reading and writing. I suggest that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce could interest itself in developing programs for its members to assist in the training and retraining adults, employed or unemployed. This is an area that appears to have no boundaries.

Challenge No. 4: Can we ignore the dropout problem in this country? I suggest that we can no longer sit back and say in effect, "It's just too bad that so many young people are dropping out of school. They don't understand what they are missing by not taking advantage of the fine educational system that is available to them." That's not going to answer the problem. We need to dig in and learn why these young people are dropping out. Beyond that we need to do something about it. If we don't, we will be faced with increased social problems and crime.

Our relief rolls will swell for the next 30 to 40 years because we have by default let our young people drop out of school. We in business are known for our skills as innovators and motivators. We must develop techniques that will motivate our young people so that they will understand fully the importance of training. We can't do the job by uttering sweet sounding phrases. We need bold and new and dynamic approaches. I am sure we are equal to the task if we set our minds to it.

Challenge No. 5: Can we ignore the housing needs of the Negroes living in our community? Let me ask several candid questions—"Do you really have a full understanding of the housing conditions in the inner-core area in your city? How long has it been since you have driven into the back blocks of this area?" I am afraid that all too often, as we leave our offices, we get on the expressways and drive to our homes in the suburbs. We are quite unaware of the housing conditions that exist in our innercore area.

Paradoxically, we are concerned with the redevelopment of our downtown areas as we make certain that we remove the blight, obsolescence and decay.

But what about the area a mile or two from our downtown area, the 24 square blocks or 48 square blocks where tens of thousands of Negroes live? Are we genuinely concerned with their housing conditions or are we in effect saying to ourselves, "This is a government problem. It is no concern of ours."

I think you will agree with me that as employers, it is of utmost importance to us that our employees not only be well fed and well clothed, but that they live in homes that are decent and modern. They will be better workers if their creature comforts are well cared for. Can we realistically expect our employees to be good workers if they are forced to live in substandard homes with serious overcrowding and in many places, unsanitary conditions? I would think that we as businessmen would want to look upon inner core, or central city, housing problems as our problem.

Might, I ask, "Where are the private entrepreneurs who have made this country so great as they took certain risks marketing new products, building cities, and developing new technology"? Isn't this the time for businessmen to take the necessary steps to build good housing for the Negroes of our communities? Must this be solely the responsibility of Government?

It would seem to me, my friends, that we have in our grasp the opportunity to lead our communities to heights even greater than those ever before attained, provided, of course, we come to grips with these problems and answer the challenges that I have raised here today.

What are my hopes? I would say to you in all candor that I think the time has come—today, because tomorrow may be too late—for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to say, "We recognize that our members, being men of good will and understanding, will welcome our leadership in the broad and expanding area of social development."

Might I ask—Isn't the time ripe for our U.S. Chamber to recognize "the dynamics of the situation" to the point where its leadership will say, "Action in the area of social development is needed now."

Won't it be a proud day in the history of the U.S. Chamber when it says to its membership, "We in the U.S. Chamber have developed our own strategy to fight the war against poverty, a strategy which is not dependent upon Government but one that we have carefully forged out of the tremendous strengths that we in industry possess."

In conclusion, may I say that I believe that the coming year of 1966 will be a very important year for all of us. This will be the year when I am confident business leaders of this country will say with even greater conviction, "I am my brother's keeper," the year where business leaders will rise to even greater heights as they face up to the people problems in their communities.

Filth and the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last year the House of Representatives passed, almost without a dissenting vote, legislation I authored that could stop the free flow of obscenity through the U.S. mails. This bill is now awaiting action by the Senate. I feel, and I am sure many of you agree, it is one way to curb the continuing flood of filth in this Nation.

Those of us who have fought the battle against obscenity are wondering how the Supreme Court will rule this spring on appeals taken from obscenity convictions. I hope the filth business will not be encouraged by decisions of our highest courts.

In this regard, I would call your attention to a recent column by Jenkin Lloyd Jones:

BIG-MONEY FIGHT ON PORNOGRAPHY

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Sometime this spring the Supreme Court will decide appeals taken from obscenity convictions involving Ralph Ginzburg, erstwhile publisher of Eros, and one Mishkin.

At least some convicted publishers of smut are looking with hope toward these decisions on the theory that they may provide grounds for reversing their own misfortunes.

Last fall in Federal court at Grand Rapids, Mich., an outraged jury gave Sanford E. Aday, owner of the West Coast News Co., 5 years and a $5,000 fine on each of five counts, and his associate, Wallace DeOrtega Maxey, sentences and fines totaling 15 years and $19,000.

Last month in Sioux City, Iowa, another Federal jury convicted Milton Luros and eight other defendants for books and nudist magazines judged obscene. The defense had energetically sought a change of venue to southern California on the grounds that the moral convictions of Iowans were "provincial." It proved to be a well-founded worry. The Iowa jury was provincial enough not to be dazzled by impassioned arguments that what Luros, etc., had been putting out was literature in disguise.

In their appeal for a new trial defense attorneys in the Sioux City case pointed to a previous decision by the Honorable Joseph A. Sprankle, judge of the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles, in which he had held that books bearing the titles "Lesbian Sin Song," "Lesbians in White," "Two Women in Love" and "The Three Way Apartment" did not go substantially beyond the customary limits of candor, were not without redeeming "social importance" and did not appeal to the prurient interest of the average person.

It would be fascinating to know what Judge Sprankle would regard as dirty. For I have read some of the books Judge Sprankle defended. As a matter of fact, the district attorneys both in Grand Rapids and Sioux City let me see some of the complained-of exhibits. And if they weren't dirt—plain, unalloyed, purtrescence—than the graffiti and scribblings on the world's privy walls are literature.

There is no better way to judge a case than to examine the evidence. Yet many good people to whose sympathies the smut peddlers appeal don't read the evidence. They are worried about obscenity trials because conviction implies censorship and censorship is easy to abuse. They know that America has passed through periods of outlandish Puritanism. And they know, too, that some apparently pornographic writing has, on occasion, covered up sincere social criticism. The buffoonery of Gargantua and Pantagruel had a purpose.

But the plea by the defendants in Grand Rapids and Sioux City that their convictions would be an assault against legitimate free speech shatters the moment you read their stuff.

One of the Grand Rapids books was an endless, and eventually wearing, detailed description of copulations and perversions indulged in by a couple of crooked cops. Another described bloody and fiendish methods of sexual sadism in a manner that could completely unhinge a loosely hinged reader and send him prowling into the night.

One of the books in the Sioux City case achieved a sort of tour-de-force in that the protagonists tried heterosexuality and/or homosexuality and lesbianism, and after arguing about it they finally came to the conclusion that heterosexuality was preferable. Presumably, this makes it a moral novel.

Some of the books were thinly disguised sales talks for various types of perversions. All of them were miserably written, occasionally even ungrammatical. At best, they were good slavvering material in the barracks and the fo'c'stle. At worst, they would encourage sex crimes and perhaps even murder. Literature they were not.

It is interesting that the defendants in such cases deny that they can be tried wherever their stuff is sold, but insist, instead, that they must be tried in the district where it is published. If one judge could be found who would agree that anything goes the entire pornographic press of America could then set up headquarters in his district and publish under his protecting wing.

This is a big-money fight. The filth business is filthy lucrative. Encouraged by some bubble-headed decisions of our highest courts in recent years, there is an intense drive to remove all restraints upon the anything-for-a-buck boys. If the Grand Rapids and Sioux City convictions should be reversed it will not be a case of the floodgates opening. The dam will go out altogether.

Financing of Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable W. R. "Bob" Poage of Texas addressed the 24th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at Las Vegas, Nev., on February 15. Our colleague, who is vice chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, is one of the great and dedicated champions of REA, that agency of national policy that turned on the lights in rural America. There is now before the Nation and the Congress an issue on the future financing of REA undertakings. Mr. Poage, in his February 15 speech, explored this issue and other aspects of REA with such understanding and in such depth that it is my thought each Member of this body should have the opportunity to study his discussion as we prepare to deal with matters relating to this agency. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I am inserting Mr. Poage's speech in the appendix of the Record. The text follows:

FINANCING OF ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

(Speech of Congressman W. R. Poage at National Rural Electric Cooperative Association annual convention, Las Vegas, Nev., Feb. 15, 1966)

It has been a good many years since I have had an opportunity to speak to the representatives of the rural electric cooperatives of this country, although I have done so many times in years gone by. I have always enjoyed the opportunity to meet with you and I am happy to be able to exchange views with you today.

In the past it was always in order to review the fine repayment record of the cooperatives. It is still in order and that record is still just as impressive—99.99 percent of all outstanding REA electric loans are today current or paid in advance. Out of almost $6 billion loaned to electric cooperatives, REA has, since its inception more than 30 years ago, lost less than $40,000—only $37,230 to be exact. And on January 1, 1966, there was only $106,707 due by cooperatives which was delinquent. These are still impressive figures. I doubt that they can be equaled by any lending agency of comparable size. The only trouble is that the public—including the private utilities who so long predicted financial disaster—has come to accept this really magnificent achievement as routine—but I still think that the co-ops are entitled to a word of commendation for a great performance, and I congratulate every one of you on a job well done.

For my discussion I have been assigned one of those all inclusive titles: "A Congressman Looks at the Rural Electric Program." Maybe we should have said that Congress or a congressional committee is going to look at the rural electric program, for that is what I expect will happen.

I don't have the answers. I just know, as you know, that we better come up with some good answers as to how we expect to finance our program in the future. I know that some committee of the Congress is very likely to look at the program. I think that the Credit Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture is the logical committee to do this. It was the predecessor of this subcommittee which, under the Honorable Stephen Pace, of Georgia, established the 2 percent interest rate. I was a member of that committee. I am chairman of the present Credit Committee. I know that we face some difficult decisions, but I hope that they are referred to our subcommittee. We can't promise any miraculous solutions, but we can promise a sincere concern and a deep desire to solve these problems. We can assure you of a fair hearing.

Basically, the problem of REA financing is: How can the thinnest areas pay the same rate for capital as can be paid by the high density areas? You understand this problem and so do the private utilities, but when the private companies advertise the fact that they are paying 4 or 5 percent for money and that the REA-financed cooperatives are paying only 2 percent, the uninformed citizen is sure to feel that he, as a taxpayer, is being mistreated, and he is very likely to pass that feeling on to his Congressman, who, even today, is far more than likely to come from an urban area, and after a few years of the so-called one-man, one-vote mandate of the Supreme Court, there will be very few rural Congressmen indeed.

The thing which both the taxpayer and the Congressman is likely to overlook and the thing the private utility is certain to ignore is the fact that the electric cooperatives have an average load factor of just under 3 customers per mile, while the private utilities have a load factor of just over 30 customers per mile—more than 10 times that enjoyed by the co-ops. Of course, there are extra costs associated with these heavy loads, but I have yet to hear any reputable engineer suggest that it was not far cheaper to serve 30 customers with 1 mile of line (expensive though that line must be) than it is to have to build 10 miles of line to serve 30 customers.

The brutal fact is that the co-ops always have, and still do, serve the highest cost areas of the nation. A possible solution, but one which would hardly be acceptable to the private utilities, might be to raise REA interest rates and let REA-financed cooperatives serve the more populous cities. I am not suggesting this as a solution, but I think that if it is to be rejected, that the co-ops are entitled to some more constructive suggestions from the utility companies than anything I have yet heard; and if they refuse, then I feel that we should give real serious consideration to bringing the co-ops into town.

The next item which both taxpayers and Congressmen are so likely to overlook—and which no power company is ever going to explain—is the fact that private power companies do not pay interest. Their customers do, but not the stockholders. I don't say this critically and I would not want to leave this statement to be interpreted as a half-truth. What I am pointing out is that under our "utility concept" the private utility has the right to charge a rate high enough to pay a fair return on all of its investment—and I am not finding fault with the concept. I am only pointing out that the greater the investment ("prudently made"), the greater the charge which the company can demand and collect.

Why then should the stockholders of a private utility be relucant to invest an extra million dollars? The cost of that money is a cost of doing business and will be paid by the customers—not the stockholders. And if the company loses money serving these rural areas, all it has to do is to charge those losses to its city customers, not to the stockholders.

In the case of the rural cooperative there are two deterrents. First, of course, is the fact that their stockholders and the customers are one and the same people and they must, therefore, pay all of the service charges on the borrowed money which the stockholders in the private utility pass on to their customers; and, second, and often even more important—with the very thin customer per mile ratio on the rural lines, these extra costs are very likely to drive the price of the service to the point of diminishing returns.

As I see it, the costs of a rural electric cooperative will fall into three categories, each of which will account for roughly one-third. These are: (1) The cost of electricity, whether purchased or produced. (2) The cost of labor. And, finally, (3) the capital costs which are represented by debt service. Certainly, I am not saying that debt service is going to represent exactly one-third of every co-op's costs, but over the country it won't miss it very far. If these interest costs were doubled or tripled, as some suggest they should be, it is obvious that all of the weaker co-ops would succumb.

There are, undoubtedly, some REA financed co-ops which could function on 4-percent interest. But there are mighty few who could today borrow in the money market at 4 percent. Most of the very strongest cooperatives would more likely have to pay 5 percent and the weaker ones would likely have to pay 6 percent. There are a number of co-ops who could doubtless adjust their rates so that they could pay 3 percent, but there are still a great many who must either continue to get 2 percent money or get help from some other source. I do not know just how many will fall in each group and I doubt that anyone knows until we try a change in rates. Of course, everybody will try to prove that he cannot pay the higher rates, but I think that we must demand fair and realistic cooperation from REA borrowers, just as we should require it of the private power companies.

It has long been suggested that the rural electric cooperatives should get their financing just like other farm co-ops do—through the banks for cooperatives. This is a very attractive line of thought and it has been considered by our subcommittee in the past. I think it will be given further study in the future. Probably no one feels that the existing banks for cooperatives could make these loans, but could we not create a new entity on this general pattern?

The real problem is: Now do you transfer such a bank to private ownership? Presumably it would be set up with Government capital as all of the existing farm credit institutions were. How, then, do you pay out the Government capital? All of the farm credit institutions are cooperative in nature. The land banks were at first capitalized with Government money, but they charged enough interest to make a profit. That profit was used to pay off the Government stock. They are today wholly farmer-owned. The FFCA's and the Intermediate Credit Banks have had a rather similar experience, except that they have deliberately added to their rather high interest rates and have sold extra stock to their customers for the specific purpose of retiring the Government's investment and today they are on the verge of complete farmer ownership. There are some electric cooperatives which could buy some of this stock, but unfortunately, most cooperatives have no reserves to invest in such stock.

For many years we all believed that it was impossible for the banks for cooperatives to charge enough interest to pay out any stock, but after we finally undertook the change, we were all happily surprised. The banks for cooperatives are now moving toward user ownership with surprising rapidity. It seems to me that this indicates that there is a real opportunity to apply the same principles to a system of cooperative credit for the long-time financing of the rural electric cooperatives.

Doubtless one approach would be for the Government to guarantee the debentures of such a credit bank. This would enable the bank to get money a little cheaper. Historically, we have charged one-half of 1 percent for such a guarantee. It would seem to me that in the face of such an enviable repayment record as I quoted a while ago, that the Government would do well to forego this charge. This would give us cheaper money but it would still leave the cost far too high for many co-ops, and would seem to offer very little opportunity for the bank to pay out the Government stock.

I know that your association, as well as the REA itself, has been working on these and similar ideas. I hope you will bring them before our committee. We will be glad to consider them and to try to work with you to foresee any pitfalls and to suggest any refinements.

One of the features of our legislative process of which I am most proud is the opportunity afforded by our committee system to secure the combined knowledge, judgment, and experience of legislators and laymen as well as that of the experts. I can again assure you that our subcommittee welcomes the opportunity to study these problems with you, and for that matter, with any sincere representatives of the private power industry.

Maybe there is another and a better approach than that of a cooperative credit bank. If there is, we want to study it. If we are to use cooperative credit, we know, as you know, that there must be realistic appraisals of the interest-paying ability of different cooperatives. Can this ability be fairly appraised? Can it be classified? Can we avoid hurt to the needy cooperatives? Just what rates can different cooperatives pay without putting an unfair burden on their members as consumers? How fast should we try to transfer stock from the Government to the cooperatives? And just how will the less profitable cooperatives ever acquire membership and stockownership in such a bank?

Surely, you can see the multitude of questions which must be answered. You have an obligation to help find the answers, but the obligation is not yours alone. REA has long recognized its obligation, and Mr. Clapp will follow me at this rostrum. I am sure he will make suggestions. Every citizen taxpayer has an obligation and an opportunity to serve himself by serving his country, and possibly, above all, the private power companies here probably have their last chance to prove their sincerity by coming forth with some real broad-gaged suggestions.

They have as much at stake as you do. The time is long since past when they can holler "subsidy" as if that were enough to condemn any other supplier. Surely the day has come, or is about to come, when the public is to understand that no matter how they get their power—whether from a public or private system—that the public must pay all costs, and that the ability of the private companies to lump all costs and a fair profit into the customer's bill can result in just as burdensome subsidy as a favorable Government interest rate. Surely the consumer is more interested in the results reflected in his monthly bill than he is in the name applied to the process used in the billing.

Remarks of the President on Receiving the 1966 Goddard Trophy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday a group of distinguished Americans met at the White House to witness the reception by the President of the 1966 Goddard Trophy Award.

That was a day of great achievement in our national space program. Astronauts Neil Armstrong and David Scott took off on their historic flight into space, a flight that proved to be a demonstration not only in the achievement of our planned objective, the docking of the Agena, but of the outstanding professional capabilities of the two astronauts in overcoming a very hazardous situation. I need not go into the details of the flight because I am sure that we are all familiar with them.

What is important is that the President again reaffirmed our principal objectives in exploring that were enunciated first by President Kennedy in May 1961. The President said:

> In accepting this award this morning, I want to declare once again that so long as I am in public office, I am going to do everything within my power and my capability to prevent us from falling behind. We intend to land the first man on the surface of the moon and we intend to do this in the decade of the sixties.

I think the President has made it clear in no uncertain terms to the rest of the world that we are not faltering in the achievement of our goals in space, and that we remain just as determined as we were in the beginning in the great adventure of landing a man on the moon before the end of this decade. I feel that it is a great privilege to place in the RECORD the remarks of the President delivered on the occasion of the award of the trophy. These are the words of our President in action. They clearly show the intent of the American people that space will be explored for peaceful purposes, for the benefit of all mankind, and for a future that is made more secure for the generations to come.

The remarks of the President follow:

Remarks of the President on Receiving the 1966 Goddard Trophy Award

Mrs. Goddard, Dr. Pickering, Mr. Webb, Mr. Vice President, Congressman MILLER, distinguished guests, I have been visiting with our Ambassador from France, who has just returned. We were just watching the space shot and wondering how Jim Webb was making out. We didnt' realize that we were going to detain you.

Mrs. Goddard, we know this is a very happy occasion for you. Back in 1926 your husband,, with you at his side, launched the world's first liquid fueled rocket on his Aunt Effie's farm in Auburn, Mass.

I have always felt that we have some things in common. My wife has always been at my side in every endeavor of any moment that I have ever undertaken. We had our Aunt Effie and she just came back from her farm in Alabama last week.

Today, exactly 40 years later, you and the billions of people of the world, could see this morning, just a few moments ago, another vindication of the great hopes and great dreams of that great man to whom you were married.

I sat there with the Secretary of State and the former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and others, as we saw this rocket based upon the principles that he discoverd launch men into a new space adventure.

I never see one of these shots without crossing my fingers and saying a prayer for Jim Webb and the men in his organization, because we never know what the outcome will be. I think if I were writing my own epitaph this morning I perhaps would prefer to be remembered for the period I was Vice President more by this one thing than any other.

President Kennedy asked me to attempt to organize and give direction to the Space Agency. I interviewed about 19 men throughout the United States and finally selected Jim Webb. I prevailed upon him to come and begin this undertaking. I remember calling President Kennedy from my office in the Capitol and I said, "I think we have the man. His name is Jim Webb."

He said, "Bring him on in and we will announce it in a few minutes." Within 15 minutes from the time I called the President originally, Jim Webb was out here being announced as the new Space Administrator. I have been very proud of that announcement every moment since.

Your modesty, humbleness, your great executive ability, your great courage, your Marine spirit and determination have made us the envy of all the world, Mr. Webb, and we salute you publicly.

Dr. Goddard was a great prophet, a true prophet. To some it seems almost incredible that a year before Lindbergh had ever flown the Atlantic he was dreaming and working to take us up into the stars. Like so many prophets, he was long without honor in his own country, but he never lost faith because his faith was founded on fact. He could turn aside the rebuffs of the shortsighted; he could laugh at the jokes of his detractors. I just wish today that he could be here with us to observe what we have just seen. I don't think he would be the least surprised by the progress we have made. I think that he would be very proud.

This is a very proud moment for me, too, Mrs. Goddard, and you have helped make it so. I never had the scientific vision that your great husband had. I did not foresee the Space Age nearly as early as he did. I am rather glad I didn't because I was the subject of enough rebuffs and talks about basketballs and things like that that I did many years later. But when it did become apparent that the space age was upon us, I did, with the help of Congressman MILLER and the Vice President and others, try to do something about getting this Nation interested.

I was looking at some of the columns the other day written by our leaders in Government commenting upon our meeting of the Democratic caucus where we devoted our entire caucus to the subject of space and its future. I remember how complimentary they were about that particular meeting. They still are being published, too. They appear in the papers every now and then, these same people.

We said to our Senators, then, that we had to make up for a lot of lost time, time that was lost in part, because this Nation would not listen to your husband. We have now wiped out all the deficencies in our program yet, but we have caught up and we are pulling ahead.

In accepting this award this morning, I want to declare once again that so long as I am in public office, I am going to do everything within my power and my capability to prevent us from falling behind. We intend to land the first man on the surface of the moon and we intend to do this in the decade of the sixties.

The whole Nation now understands the true significance of America's space efforts. The story of man's advancement down through the ages is, of course, the story of his victories over the forces of nature. The health and comfort he enjoys, the leisure he possesses, the abundance of food he eats, all of these are the result of his unending determination to probe the secrets of the world around him.

In 1958 when we introduced the legislation to create the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I said in the Senate at that time, "I believe that the development of the space age will bring the beginning of the longest and greatest boom of abundance and prosperity in the history of man."

Time is bringing out that belief. The future belongs to those of faith, daring, and vision. I am proud, today, to be in the presence of the men who represent that future and who have come here to be with us on this occasion: Vice President HUMPHREY, who has given great seriousness and vital leadership to our space program in the Nation; Congressman MILLER, who from the very beginning has been in on the first launch; Senator ANDERSON, who is not with us; Congressman Albert Thomas, who left us just a few days ago.

All of these men had the faith, daring, vision, and the spirit of adventure that has brought us where we are.

Dr. Pickering, I believe this is the real meaning of the space age which we are in. I thank you and Mrs. Goddard for making this event possible.

Now as we return to our schedule for the rest of the week, I know that each of us is saying a silent prayer for Scott and Armstrong. May God be with you and them.

Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the growing involvement of the Federal Government in the lives of all citizens is obvious. It therefore requires individuals and groups to develop more consistent and practical interest in the functions of Government. In many corporations, unions, civic and veterans groups, publice affairs are receiving a more prominent and practical attention.

One of the pioneers in a proper approach to public affairs is Mr. Charles R. Barr, of Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, who has helped stimulate necessary and healthy interest in Government among many individuals and corporation leaders throughout the country. Mr. Barr addressed the corporate public affairs program conference of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce on March 10, and I include his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

PUBLIC AFFAIRS—HOW IT STARTED AND WHERE IT IS

(By Charles R. Barr)

When I was invited to speak here today, it was suggested that I discuss "Public Affairs: How It Started and Where We Are."

If I were a more sensitive man, I might have been disturbed by the significant omission from that title of any mention of where we are going. It implies a certain lack of confidence in my qualifications as a prophet.

Fortunately, I am neither sensitive nor modest, and I find the future more interesting than the past, so I do plan to talk about it. I don't want to be in the position of that time-worn bird that flies backward because he doesn't care where he is going; he just wants to know where he's been.

Public affairs, as we know it today, is really only about 12 to 15 years old. During the early years, not more than 10 or 12 companies had 1 or more people working a substantial part of their time as public affairs personnel, with a definite company policy to guide them and with specifically assigned duties and projects. Historically, business institutions had relied upon lobbyists to present issues to the legislative and executive bodies, lawyers to represent them before the courts and government agencies, and public relations departments to maintain a satisfactory image with the public.

During the 1930's government, and particularly the Federal Government, began to move very rapidly into the field of business regulation and, in fact, became an ever more active participating partner in more and management decisions. At the same time, labor organizations greatly expanded their active political participation and became an effective political action group. The business community became aware that many of the decisions that its silent partner, the Government, was helping to make were really political decisions rather than economic ones dictated by good business practices.

Thus, because of the increasing impact of Government actions on business decisions, and because of the pronounced influence of labor organizations in political affairs, many businessmen began to become interested and active in public affairs themselves. As a result, several important movements began.

Companies began to put public affairs personnel on their staffs and create public affairs departments, often under a variety of names and titles.

Business-oriented associations—such as the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and recently the National Industrial Conference Board—began to become active in public affairs.

A new organization called the Effective Citizens Organization, designed primarily to train and service public affairs officers and departments and to conduct seminars on practical politics for businessmen, was formed.

Several private organizations were also formed as consultants in the area of public affairs.

In the early fifties many companies and many politicians looked upon this fledgling group with many misgivings. There were fears that participation in public affairs might in some way involve actions contrary to law or cause embarrassment that would hurt the image of a corporation. Sales might be affected in some way, it was feared.

I am glad to say that none of these fears materialized in any significant way. In fact, public affairs has gained considerable stature, prestige, and acceptance among most professional politicians and by an ever increasing number of businessmen. While there have been some casualties along the way, these in fact that been surprisingly rare and usually minor. The public affairs movement and public affairs personnel are now moving steadily forward to a recognized, professional status.

Today, more than 400 companies have a public affairs program with one or more individuals involved, operating under company policy with specific assignments and duties. Many other companies are seriously considering adding public affairs to their staff functions.

The greatest difficulty facing most companies that have decided to enter public affairs is finding suitable, qualified personnel, of which there is presently an acute shortage.

One of the evidences of the success of public affairs is the astounding rise in the number of people who participated in the last major campaign by contributing their services or money to a party or a favorite candidate. For example, it has been reliably estimated that nearly $200 million were raised and spent in the 1964 campaign and that approximately 7 times as many people gave money to their party or to their favorite candidates as theretofore, as recently as 1960.

The fact that the public affairs movement nas gained status and acceptance has tended to make political participation acceptable and even to be the thing to do for many employees. This has been a major pioneering achievement for which the public affairs movement can accept a considerable degree of credit.

Public affairs operations, to date, have primarily consisted of (a) training seminars, (b) the production of visual and audio aids for communication on issues to employees in a manner designed to stimulate them to participate in public life to some extent, and (c) research of facts. In short, the aim has been the development of programs of education, communication, and research.

Some of the problems that have arisen in the public affairs movement have been:

1. Lack of skilled personnel;
2. The tradition of many companies by the employer that participation in political affairs was frowned upon;
3. The doubts of many executives as to the general reaction to a public affairs department; and
4. Lack of knowledge on the part of management in many instances as to how to use public affairs most effectively to get a reasonable return on their investment.

All of these problems are still present to a considerable extent, but there has been steady progress, and I expect considerably more in the immediate future as more experience is gained. The fact that nearly 400 companies have formed public affairs departments is evidence in itself of the momentum of the public affairs movement.

I have now covered briefly "How we started and where we are." Let's take a look at where we may be going in public affairs.

I believe that more and more companies are going to learn how to use their public affairs personnel and budgets in a much more effective way.

I said a moment ago that there had been a substantial rise in the number of people who were participating in public affairs. The greatest lag of which I am aware, is in the participation of the companies themselves. There are many areas in which they can legally and ethically participate. They have made but a small beginning and in the majority of instances are far behind their employees.

Too many public affairs officers themselves fail to recognize many activities they could properly recommend that would be of value to society and to the company itself.

Permit me to give you some specific examples of public affairs activities in which corporations have an opportunity to participate in my own area of Chicago.

First, there is based in Chicago an organization known as BGA, the Better Government Association, which, as certified by the IRS, is a proper tax-deductible organization. Its function is to be a watchdog of government at all levels to ascertain that tax dollars are being properly collected and spent and that Government employees are doing the work for which they are paid. The BGA operates on a relatively small budget and without question has saved the taxpayers hundreds of times the amount of money it costs to operate. In addition it has helped to maintain a wholesome atmosphere in government. The Better Government Association is the kind of organization that should interest every public affairs officer.

The second example, also based in Chicago, is the Citizens for Honest Elections Foundation, which also has an IRS certificate. Its job is to prevent fraud at the polling place by recruiting suitable personnel as watchers and by awakening citizen interest in honesty and integrity at the polling place. It also endeavors to educate people about their voting rights and stimulates interest in the election processes. This, again, is the kind of an organization that should attract the interest of public affairs officers and to whose support their corporations ought to give serious consideration.

On a national basis, the Effective Citizens Organization of Washington, D.C., is an organization designed to aid corporations in setting up public affairs departments, finding suitable personnel, and assisting them in many ways after their departments are organized. Its seminars and roundtables are widely respected, and the costs involved in having personnel participate in its activities are proper tax deductible business expenses from which a company can receive many returns.

I could say the same about supporting public affairs activties of the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. They have developed outstanding programs with highly competent skilled personnel.

There are other organizations like the National Industrial Conference Board which is becoming active in public affairs, whose programs promise to be extremely worthwhile. They are to be commended for the type of program they are developing.

In addition, there are several private forprofit organizations that are offering their services as consultants to public affairs departments and candidates. They are generally specialists, and their activities are accepted as legitimate business expenses.

Many companies would probably be well advised to take advantage of some of the services of the organizations I have mentioned whether or not they have a public affairs department. Certainly the companies should be in touch with these groups if they are considering establishment of such a department.

I want to say emphatically that the free enterprise system cannot expect to save itself entirely with volunteer help and tax-exempt dollars. If the public affairs movement is going to succeed, it must have substantial encouragement and financial support from the business community.

I have some additional thoughts about the future of public affairs:

1. Increased support for public affairs is going to develop in the near future.

2. More young people will be preparing themselves for careers as public affairs officers because of the challenge of such a career and its increasing acceptability. Public affairs officers should now be encouraging young people to get the necessary academic background and political experience with a view to a career in this new exciting and challenging field.

3. Management personnel will, in the near future, be using public affairs officers in a much more effective way in such things as long and short range planning. They will recognize more and more the need for both a better estimate of political situations that may affect their plans and the importance of improving their everyday relationships with political figures in the areas where they operate.

4. Public affairs programs in the future will use an ever increasing number of audio and visual aids. There are presently a good many of these in existence. The "Bill Boynton Story," of which I had the honor to be the author, produced and filmed by the NAM, is a prime example of a good visual aid. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has also produced some very good 35 millimeter slides which should be widely used by public affairs people. ECO has made available some good tape recordings of distinguished speakers. Several other groups have been doing some good work in this field.

5. More and more companies will tend to use their public affairs departments on broader issues. To date, business organizations still tend to be interested only in those things that immediately affect them; often they try to lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen. If the business community truly wants to gain acceptance for its own immediate causes, then businessmen would be well advised to be interested in some of the things which affect their employees, their annuitants, their porducers, their suppliers and their consumers.

For example, many company employees are moved many times during a business career. A ruling of the IRS with regard to moving expenses for employees will impose a serious financial handicap on many of them. Business ought to be interested in corrective legislation.

We could all cite many other examples of issues with which we could properly be concerning ourselves in behalf of people to whom we owe an obligation.

6. The future will see some sort of a development between the public affairs officers and the economists in the field of economic education. There is a great deal of complaint in the country today about business's lack of success in selling the story of the free enterprise system. Many attempts have been made to do a better job, but few if any seem to have been outstandingly sucessful. Selling our economic system is one of the biggest challenges of American business. Public affairs people could and should play a major role in this area. They should be advising management, directing the preparations, and distributing educational material with a view to telling the story of our system in an understandable way.

I would hope that some association or foundation would make money and facilities available to help do this job. I hope they do it soon.

7. Public affairs departments will be expanding their programs to reach more people. From a public affairs and political standpoint, the three most neglected groups in the country today are (1) young people, (2) women, (3) the aged.

There has been entirely too much criticism, I think, particularly by politicians, of some of the participation and activity by youth groups in the political arena. It may be true that there are many instances of ineptness, mistaken policies, and even irresponsibility of some young people, but there could seldom be any doubt about their enthusiasm, dedication, and vigor. Public affairs people could well consider directing some of their energy toward this group to the end that the young people may be better informed about the free enterprise system of our country and therefore be better guided in their activities. I would be hopeful that more public affairs officers and other corporate executives would take part in more seminars and other activities that are occasionally available on college campuses. I have been personally disappointed that businessmen have not developed much more opportunity to participate in these roundtables and seminars. There appears to be an unidentifiable barrier which needs to be broken down. The youth of our country need to hear from all segments of our society, and they are not hearing enough from us.

The franchise for women is less than a half-century old. Most politicians are still afraid of, or at least nervous about, their participation, and the doors are often closed to them. The public affairs movement has no better record.

Nearly a half million people have participated in public affairs seminars or roundtables since the beginning of public affairs as we know it today. I believe that it would be a safe guess to say that less than 2 percent of these participants have been women.

Women are not getting adequate educational opportunity, information, or the stimulation from either public affairs or the politicians. I believe that public affairs in the future will include more ladies as participants. As more women become better informed and motivated, the doubts and fears about their participation will disappear and they will take their rightful place in our body politic.

Older, retired people constitute a great reservoir of energy, talent, and desire to be useful to society. Too often they are forgotten after they receive the watch. I believe that public affairs activities in the future will include the participation of many more of these people.

I would conclude my remarks on this subject by saying that to date the public-affairs movement has been aimed too exclusively at middle management personnel. I believe that in the future there will be a substantial expansion to include all segments of our society.

8. Public affairs activities from an educational standpoint have been substantially directed toward the national level. They have tended to neglect State and local governments.

State and local governments are expanding very rapidly. Their budgets are generally rising much more rapidly than those of the Federal Government and therefore should be of increasing interest to the business community.

The Effective Citizens Organization is now sponsoring some very fine seminars on State and local governments to which I invite your attention and participation.

In the course of my remarks, I have given some kudos to several organizations. Time has caused me to omit some other organizations active in the area of public affairs and will not permit my listing many of the services offered by the organizations which I have mentioned.

Many audio and visual aids are available and should be of interest to people interested in public affairs. There are also many programs going on in the country which public affairs people ought to know about. I am sure that there is no one person in the country who is familiar with all of them.

A comprehensive digest of visual and audio programs available and of services and facilities offered by many organizations in the public affairs area is being compiled by the Public Affairs Service Associates (PASA) located at 211 West Wacker Drive in Chicago, Ill. I am sure they would be glad to send you a copy of this digest upon request.

In conclusion I will say that public affairs has come a long way since its inception. It is now largely through the pioneering stage and is ready to play a major role in the development of a better understanding of the government in which we live and to bring about active participation by hundreds of thousands of additional dedicated, well-informed people. This is an objective worthy of the best consideration of all management.

I believe companies will respond in ever-increasing numbers to the benefit of their own objectives and to the everlasting benefit of our society.

Superior Testimony Cites Need for National Traffic Safety Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the forthright and meaningful testimony of our distinguished colleague from the Fourth District of Georgia, Mr. JAMES A. MACKAY, before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which recently held hearings on legislation to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency.

His testimony not only clearly assesses the need for Federal responsibility to curtail the traffic murders on our highways, but he also articulately focuses on the need for rapid expansion of research and laboratory facilities. His testimony pinpoints the necessity of coordination and cooperation among all levels of government and private industry in order to meet successfully the growing public demand for action.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD Mr. MACKAY's testimony urging the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Agency for all to read in its entirety:

THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY

(Statement of Representative JAMES A. MACKAY, Congressman from the Fourth District of Georgia, March 15, 1966, before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear before our committee this morning to present arguments in support of the 29 bills which have been introduced in the House of Representatives which would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency.

I point out that this proposal also has been sponsored by 15 Members of the Senate, making a total of 43 Members of this Congress who favor our approach. The support for our bill is bipartisan in both the House and in the Senate and the Members represent all parts of the Nation. They come from 28 of the 50 States. A list of them is attached (marked exhibit A).

That there should be such widespread support for this new approach to the old problem of what to do about losses from traffic accidents on our streets and highway is in itself significant.

It is significant, in my opinion, because it reflects a widespread feeling inside and outside of the Congress that whatever we may have done to date my public and private means has not sufficed, that we can do more, that we must do more, and that this Congress should act now to curb and reverse the accelerating death, destruction and disaster which are reported in the daily press as commonplace occurrences.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation currently before this committee is a vital step in the right direction, but it is only the first step if this 89th Congress is going to enact the most significant traffic safety legislation in the 70-year history of the commercial automobile. And it is toward this end that I have labored.

We do not know all the answers. The bills we are considering all need deep study and review by the committee and by appropriate witnesses. There are many questions that remain unanswered.

Nevertheless, we must not permit this legislation to lapse into the void which has swallowed up so many prior attempts. It is almost inconceivable that for over 40 years programs of national action to combat the traffic accident have been proposed by the executive and legislative branches and the result has been only a few minor laws dealing with limited aspects of the total picture.

THE LOSSES

There is no longer any doubt in the minds of our citizens or of the Members of this Congress that the carnage on our highways cannot continue. The National Safety Council reported recently that last year 49,000 American citizens—men, women, and children—were killed as a result of traffic accidents, 180,000 received disabling injuries, and direct economic losses totaled $8.5 billion. Little comfort can be taken from a slight decline in the rate of deaths and injuries when you consider that over 9 million new cars entered our streets and highways last year, and even more will probably be added this year.

The death toll for last December alone was 4,940, up 10 percent from December 1964, and was reported to be the worst single month on record.

In spite of the concern and work on the part of many organizations and individuals there is no reason to believe that these losses will remain steady or will decline without more positive action. After years of effort the President's Committee for Traffic Safety reports that a study of 49 States shows that only 72 percent of what has been called a minimum traffic safety program has been attained; and that 782 cities having a population of over 10,000 show an average performance of only 56.1 percent of the minimum program.

Perhaps the most conspicuous reason for our tragic losses is the fact that not in city, State, or Federal Government are we doing the minimum of what should be done based on our present knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, our present predicament must be considered in the context of the traffic accident, its history, and the nature of our attempts to deal with it.

THE NATURE OF THE TRAFFIC ACCIDENT

The traffic accident is perhaps the most unanalyzed phenomenon in our society. While we have data gathered, data processed and computerized subjects from how to run a railroad to how to select a date, we have failed to gather, process and make use of computers in getting at the primary causes of traffic accidents. Our investigations, such as they have been, have often been made by individuals without adequate training, and their investigations have been considered in the main by insurance officials, lawyers, and police who seek to determine legal liability, or law violations, not true causation.

Furthermore, the traffic accident is usually an individual occurence involving only a few people, one, two, or three vehicles and is undramatic except for those immediately concerned. These accidents occur around the clock, around the calendar and around the country. But they are cumulative.

Someone pointed out recently that if we had a major air crash every day in the year, in which 100 lives were lost, the toll would fall far short of our present traffic losses.

Next month we hope to have 52,000 men, women, and children in our new Atlanta stadium for the opening of the Atlanta Braves. If some unprecedented catastrophe engulfed these people in violent, sudden, agonizing and in some instances flaming or lingering death, we would mobilize our Nation as never before. The same result will happen this year on our highways but the mere fact that these deaths do not occur simultaneously and have had "precedents" seems to account for our inaction.

Finally, and perhaps most important, the traffic accident is the result of the interaction of complex factors in a complex environment. When an accident occurs on a busy roadway, the policeman on duty must contend with such problems as medical care for those injured, maintaining the flow of traffic, removal of the debris and preparation of accident report forms. He has little time to be concerned with the psychological, physical, emotional, engineering, and environmental factors that lead to an accident and little training to aid him in identifying them. Without basic data prepared by highly qualified individuals or even by teams of experts true analysis is not possible.

THE TRAFFIC ACCIDENT—THE BLOODY RECORD

Traffic accidents have quite a history. Although a few motor vehicles were around in the 19th century, the traffic accident was not much of a factor because there were so few vehicles. The first fatal accident is reported to have occurred in New York City in 1899 when a gentleman helping a lady to get off a street car was struck down.

The following tabulation prepared by the Public Health Service shows the steady increase in fatalities although the rate per 100,000 population has declined after reaching a high of 30.8 in 1937:

Motor vehicle deaths

		Rate per 100,000 population
1915	(6,600)	5.8
1925	(21,900)	16.8
1935	(36,369)	28.6
1945	(28,076)	21.2
1955	(38,426)	23.4
1965	(48,000)	24.7

Projection of these figures even with some decline in the rate indicates that by 1975 we may sustain at least 70,000 deaths a year, according to the National Safety Council. It should be noted that the traffic accident has become the greatest killer of youth between 15 and 25 from all causes including war. And the traffic accident is the fourth killer of Americans from all causes—only heart disease, stroke, and cancer take precedence.

WHY WE HAVE FAILED—DEATH BY COMMITTEE

Students of safety say that the traffic accident slipped up on the blind side of the American people and that the appropriate Federal role has been long delayed for the same reasons.

From the beginning rail, ship, and air passengers were obviously traveling on public transportation in interstate commerce. Wrecks were spectacular. Lives were lost while in the custody of others. There were immediate economic consequences to the carriers if speedy action was not taken to prevent recurrences. The Federal Government adopted and enforced rail, ship, and air safety standards. There was public clamor for action. The carriers looked to the economic consequences of inaction and impressive results were obtained. It is no accident that all deaths in interstate transportation other than traffic deaths last year were less than 4,000, while deaths from traffic accidents pressed toward the 50,000 mark.

Illustrated another way the rate can be shown as follows:

Deaths per 10 billion miles traveled

Train	10
Bus	10
Air	14
Automobile	570

The history of what government has done in response to the automobile is interesting. From the beginning, rules and regulations enacted for traffic safety were done in the village, city, county, or State. Local ordinances regulated speed and later States took a hand in adopting rules of the road, licensing and road construction.

Not until 1924, when the traffic accident claimed nearly 20,000 lives, do we find the National Government taking note of the need for protection from this deadly weapon. Then it was that Secretary of Commerce Hoover called the first National Conference on Street and Highway Safety. That Conference was called a "life and death" meeting. In 1926, the Conference was reconvened, and it approved a model for a uniform vehicle code. It was hailed as an outstanding achievement, but to this day no State has adopted it in toto.

Twelve years later in 1936, when 38,000 died, Congress took note of the traffic death toll by requesting the Bureau of Public Roads to make a comprehensive report on the various elements of traffic safety. The report touched on the same deficiencies that plague us today—the inadequacy of statistics, of research, of uniformity of laws, the need for skilled investigation.

That report lay dormant for 12 years, until the end of World War II. President Truman then called a Highway Safety Conference, which adopted a so-called action program. Eight years later President Eisenhower called a White House Conference and established a President's Committee for Traffic Safety which has sponsored periodic conferences and published reports, the last of which I would like to submit for the committee to consider. Thirty-seven traffic safety organizations serve on the advisory council.

Many worthwhile voluntary organizations under the leadership of the National Safety Council and various State and local groups have talked and worked for traffic safety. The very existence of so many groups dedicated to safety belies the charge that the American people are apathetic.

It is more appropriate to say that all of our efforts put together, no matter how favorably evaluated, cannot contradict that the risk of death, injury, disability, or economic loss from the traffic accident is a serious daily exposure for every citizen who ventures forth from his home and we have not achieved an environment as safe as anyone would desire or as safe as many intelligent people believe we can attain.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE FEDERAL ROLE

What then is the Federal role? Thus far it has been limited, poorly defined, inadequate and inconsistent with the realities of today's world.

In other years traffic accidents could be said to be purely local phenomena. However, with the development of a National System of Highways, with the improvement of motor vehicles, and the extension of the driving environment far beyond the village, city, county, or even State, the traffic accident has become a national phenomenon, a national problem, a destructive factor in interstate commerce, and one that clearly deserves the vigorous attention and response of the National Legislature.

Thus, the 89th Congress must decide through legislation what the national response should be, how the Federal role shall be defined by law, and what resources shall be committed to the effort to reduce these giant losses, which in terms of human suffering and loss of human potential have become incalculable.

PAST ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY AND LEADERSHIP

An examination of the United States Code and the activities of the Federal Government discloses that there is not now and never has been any clear assignment of responsibility.

On March 3, 1959, Speaker Rayburn received House Document No. 93, entitled "The Federal Role in Highway Safety." Secretary Strauss of the Commerce Department transmitted the report on the investigation and study made to determine what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States, pursuant to section 117 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, and under the general authority of section 307 of title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways."

In that report there were only two specific proposals for Federal action. Both have been carried out. A driver records clearance center was established and an Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board was established. The latter was set up in response to the statement that, "A pressing need exists for greater national stimulation of official highway safety efforts. The establishment of an effective national focus of leadership, guidance, and a degree of coordination among the many phases of the official highway safety efforts is justified by the large accumulating toll of life and property lost in street and highway accidents." That was in 1959. The Interdepartmental Board was established in 1960 when the death toll was 38,000. In 1965 the death toll was 49,000. These same pressing needs are with us today.

I point out that the establishment of this Board was by Executive order and not by act of Congress.

The report also states that 16 Federal agencies are charged with highway safety responsibilities but on examination you find that only two departments of Government and one independent agency have done much with regard to the general problem. The others are primarily concerned with safety for internal reasons.

The most explicit responsibility is given the Secretary of Commerce who is directed to assist in carrying out the action program of the President's Committee for Highway Safety and administratively there has been established an Office of Highway Safety in the Bureau of Public Roads. This office, which is concerned primarily with safety in highway design and construction, has had little visibility.

The Division of Accident Prevent of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, received an assignment to work on human factors in traffic safety after the Roberts hearings in 1956. It should be pointed out that former Congressman Kenneth Roberts, of this committee, conducted definitive hearings on traffic safety in 1956, since which time Congress has not clearly defined the Federal role in traffic safety and during which period more than 350,000 more men, women, and children have died.

Characteristic of what I call an oblique approach to traffic safety we passed the Baldwin amendment to the authorization act for Federal-aid highway funds in which the House of Representatives authorized the Secretary of Commerce to withhold funds if the States did not enact comprehensive traffic safety programs by December 31, 1967. The conference committee watered the amendment down by substituting the words "should" for "must," and removing the provision under which funds could be withheld.

WHO SETS THE STANDARDS?

The 1959 Department of Commerce report to the Congress stated that, "Another particular need lies in the area of standards, specifications and criteria applicable to the numerous official highway safety functions." Today this responsibility is vested only in the General Services Administration which can determine standards for federally purchased motor vehicles. We merely hope that the industry will incorporate these standards for all automobiles manufactured. I realized that the setting of Federal standards is of vital concern to the automobile industry, but it is also of great importance for the purchaser because he cannot hope to judge whether the car he buys is safe. I have proposed that the standards be for performance of the automobile, not for its total design, because this kind of test places the least restriction on the industry and yet fulfills our need.

Perhaps the members of the committee have noted that our bill does not define crimes or establish sanctions for the setting of standards. Considerable study and thought was given to this issue and resolved in favor of leaving the matter to subsequent sessions of Congress. The plain truth is that data are so inadequate that it is not possible or fair to attempt hard judgments without it. We must avoid recriminations and enlist the support of all who have any part in the total picture. The approach we make is not to look for scapegoats but to recognize that all of us are negligent. The real need is to bring an end to a situation in which thousands of men, women, and children are sacrificial lambs going to slaughter because of our collective social negligence.

WHAT WE SHOULD DO NOW

It is now apparent that this Congress should fix responsibility and establish national leadership for traffic safety. To accomplish this, it is proposed in 44 bills before the Congress that a National Traffic Safety Agency be established.

The purpose is clearly stated in the bill: "It is, therefore, the purpose of this act to reduce the extent of death, injury, and loss of property resulting from traffic accidents by providing the means for a concerted attack on the problem through the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Agency headed by a highly qualified Administrator; the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Center which shall bring together public and private information and research; and through a national program for traffic safety which shall seek to achieve a uniform national traffic safety environment by means of vigorous application of knowledge as to the principal causes of traffic accidents, deaths, and injuries."

What are some of the things the bill would do?

It will clearly assign responsibility and define the Federal role for the first time in the history of the automobile.

It will personify the leadership in this field through the office of a National Traffic Safety Administrator.

It will provide a National Traffic Safety Center which can bring together information which is now scattered, and conduct and contract for research which is long overdue. It can establish the standards, the criteria, the elements of legal and physical uniformity we must build into a safer national traffic environment.

It will continue to operate a National Drivers License Registry to protect the properly licensed driver from the driver whose license has been revoked.

It will provide such an agency whether or not the proposed Department of Transportation becomes a reality this year.

It will provide for the definition of safety performance standards for motor vehicles so that the car owner can be on notice concerning many fine points of safety which he could not be expected to grasp as a layman.

It would provide Congress with an agency which can be accountable to it and to the American people, and which can update safety standards as our technology advances and changes.

Finally, it will provide an instrumentality for an attack on the traffic accident problem—something sorely lacking now. The bill does not attempt to set forth details. It sets forth an approach.

It does not take away from the States; it provides State and local officials something they do not now have—a place to turn with certainty and assurance—for recommendations for local action which will fit in with a national pattern.

President Johnson is to be commended for his expressed concern in this area and for his executive action in trying to fix responsibility, administratively, now.

But only the Congress can do what should have been done long ago. Unless it takes action, we will continue to be fearful each time we venture forth from our homes that this time we may not return.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today. The challenge of traffic safety is before this Congress and I am proud to serve on the committee that has the major role in the development of this legislation. There is no doubt in my mind that the sooner we activate a National Traffic Safety Agency, the sooner we can expect to have a safer traffic environment.

Exhibit A

Cosponsors of Bill To Establish a National Traffic Safety Agency

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Robert T. Ashmore, Democrat, of South Carolina (H.R. 12553).

Frances P. Bolton, Republican, of Ohio (H.R. 12921).

James C. Corman, Democrat, of California (H.R. 12786).

John C. Culver, Democrat, of Iowa (H.R. 12709).

Harold D. Donohue, Democrat, of Massachusetts (H.R. 12556).

Charles P. Farnsley, Democrat, of Kentucky (H.R. 13267).

Sam M. Gibbons, Democrat, of Florida (H.R. 12592.

George W. Grider, Democrat, of Tennessee (H.R. 12557).

John R. Hansen, Democrat, of Iowa (H.R. 12550).

Julia B. Hansen, Democrat, of Washington (H.R. 12558).

William D. Hathaway, Democrat, of Maine, (H.R. 12554).

Paul J. Krebs, Democrat, of New Jersey (H.R. 13475).

Rodney D. Love, Democrat, of Ohio (H.R. 12551).

Richard D. McCarthy, Democrat, of New York (H.R. 12900).

Hervey G. Machen, Democrat, of Maryland (H.R. 12559).

James A. Mackay, Democrat, of Georgia (H.R. 12548).

Spark M. Matsunaga, Democrat, of Hawaii (H.R. 12560).

William E. Minshall, Republican, of Ohio, (H.R. 13008).

John E. Moss, Democrat, of California, (H.R. 12549).

Abraham J. Multer, Democrat, of New York (H.R. 12905).

John M. Murphy, Democrat, of New York (H.R. 13575).

Edwin Reinecke, Republican, of California (H.R. 12561).

Fernand J. St Germain, Democrat, of Rhode Island (H.R. 12674).

WILLIAM ST. ONGE, Democrat, of Connecticut (H.R. 12552).

WILLIAM F. RYAN, Democrat, of New York (H.R. 13488).

JAMES H. SCHEUER, Democrat, of New York (H.R. 13154).

RUSSELL TUTEN, Democrat, of Georgia (H.R. 12555).

J. IRVING WHALLEY, Republican, of Pennsylvania (H.R. 12602).

CHARLES L. WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia (H.R. 12562).

SENATE (S. 2871)

GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado.

E. L. BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska.

BIRCH BAYH, Democrat, of Indiana.

ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada.

JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska.

VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana.

DANIEL K. INOUYE, Democrat, of Hawaii.

GALE W. MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming.

LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana.

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma.

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, Democrat, of New Mexico.

FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah.

CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

Address by Leon Deutsch to Kings County Council of Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the annual brotherhood breakfast of the Joint Council War Veterans Organization held in Brooklyn on February 20 of this year, Leon Deutsch, county commander of the Kings County Council of Jewish War Veterans spoke on the subject of human brotherhood.

I would like to present this excellent talk by Commander Deutsch, who heads one of the most active and forward Councils of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

The speech follows:

STATEMENT BY LEON DEUTSCH, COUNTY COMMANDER, KINGS COUNTY COUNCIL, JEWISH VETERANS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE ANNUAL BROTHERHOOD BREAKFAST OF THE JOINT COUNCIL WAR VETERANS ORGANIZATION, FEBRUARY 20, 1966

Once again, as every year, at this appropriate season, we the members of every major veterans organization in the County of Kings, gather jointly—to break bread together, to exchange and renew mutual pledges of comradeship and association; to celebrate Brotherhood Week; and to advance by our very presence and by our pledge of continued action, the cause of human brotherhood. And it is my great privilege as acting chairman of this Joint Veterans Council to greet you, bid you all a most cordial welcome, and outline the theme and set the tone for this important annual event.

How appropriate it is for Americans, and in particular, for we war veterans, members of the patriotic organizations, to stress the theme of human brotherhood—in the very month wherein we celebrate the birthdays of Washington and Lincoln. For indeed, it was the vision and hope of both the Founder and preserver of the Republic that in this land all men should enjoy the blessings of freedom and liberty and should regard each other as brothers.

We Americans come naturally to our commitment to human brotherhood—by way of a double blessing—our religious heritage and our membership in the fraternity of U.S. citizenship.

The Holy Bible (the Old Testament), the common possession of us all, Jew and Christion, black and white, emphasizes again and again the great truth of the brotherhood of man. The basic theme of all our religions is the Prophets' cry, "Have we not all one Father? Hath not God created us all? Why do we deal treacherously against every man against his brother?" And the injunctions of Leviticus, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and again, "The stranger that sojourneth wtih you shall be unto you as the homeborn amongst you, and thou shalt love him as thyself."

The Christian takes for his mark and his guide the ennobling commandment of the founder of his religion: "that you love one another as I have loved you. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples." And again, when the apostle Paul writes: "All the law is fulfilled in one word—thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And yet again, when the apostle John says: "If any man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar. For he that loveth not his brother whom he seeth, how can he love God Whom he seeth not?"

As legatees, therefore, of this Judeo-Christian heritage, committed as we are to the moral and ethical precepts of our religious teaching, we American war veterans live and practice brotherhood daily.

No mere words for us, comrades. No annual brotherhood message, neatly mimeographer. But a daily ongoing program of deeds, immersed in love, charity, respect, and assistance to all who are needy, veteran and nonveteran alike, which long ago the service organizations and their auxiliaries initiated. Such programs are too well known to all of you to require detailing here, but just witness—our extensive hospital work, our varied youth group activities, our many philanthropic endeavors, our unremitting war on bigotry and violence. These are our daily brotherhood activities. This is the first half of that double blessing of which I spoke.

Yet, our presence here means something more—this is the second half. It means that we war veterans are devoted and patriotic Americans, and as such are enlisted, together with all Americans, in a common enterprise, whatever our origins, whatever our religion, whatever the color of our skins—and that is, the bold enterprise of freedom This enterprise has been characterized as the most difficult, yet most necessary of all arts—the art of living together in a free society. Living together and keeping our society free—this is our emphasis as veterans; this is our theme as Americans.

If a single faith can be said to unite the great American people, if a single faith can be said to unite us here as a joint veterans council, surely the ideal which holds us together beyond any other, is our belief in the worth of the individual, whatever his race or religion. In this faith America was founded; to this faith have millions of Americans throughout our Nation's history, in war and in peace, dedicated and ofttimes sacrificed their lives.

But, my comrades, it is precisely because we war veterans are devoted to this art of living together, precisely because we are legatees of this religious heritage, precisely because we are proud and dutiful Americans, that the greater duty is imposed upon us to proclaim that there is unfinished business in the land; that there remains an unexcised moral lesion in the Nation; that there is no room for complacency and no cause for self-congratulations.

Our justifiable pride in the American heritage of freedom and equality, and the veterans' splendid role in this enterprise is no substitute for continued and ever greater performance; no substitute for a complete cleansing of the heart; no substitute for the total eradication of injustice. And this talk, as well as our mutual task here, would be incomplete if we merely mark the positive and deliberately ignore the negative. The record all too glaringly shows, even today, a wide gulf between ideals and practice. The taint of unbrotherly, un-American, and anti-God practices are yet in our midst, North and South.

Make no mistake, my comrades, the major part of this unfinished business of America is that of our black-skinned brothers. The continuing disabilities and unequal status of our Negro citizens is the major problem confronting domestic America, the major deterrent to the realization of those ideals we glorify this morning, the major obstacle to the fulfillment of America's promise.

And make no mistake, comrades, we had better be far less disturbed by the manifestations of Negro zeal and impatience, than by the root causes of these explosive forces.

In spite of court decisions, Federal civil rights laws, and much recent progress, there yet are places in these United States where qualified citizens are either denied the right to vote, or these rights are brutally interfered with, thus doing violence to the principle of freedom and equality.

The right to safety and security of person is sacred. Notwithstanding, there are places where lawless violence abounds, where the mob prevails, where nightriders terrorize. Just consider one Vernon Dahmer, Mississippi family man and respected businessman, who lies dead (recently murdered), because he dared to believe that a black-skinned American could exercise his right to vote.

Moreover, even with the prospective winning of this battle, it is not enough merely to have an equal voice in the control of government. Every citizen is entitled, as President Johnson has himself noted, to the realistic opportunity to secure these political rights; to make them significant—and that is—to obtain useful employment, and to have ready and equal access to services, public or public in nature, in the fields of education, housing, health, recreation, and transportation.

Without such opportunity, the individual is deprived of his chance to develop his full potential. Without such opportunity, there can be no human dignity. Without human dignity, there can be no brotherhood of man.

Human dignity bespeaks the equal claim to a share of life's goods and services, and the recognition that neither social status, nor color, nor national origin, should constitute a limitation on a man's right to live as other men live. Human dignity also bespeaks our rejection of the false concept of innate inferiority, the recognition that race is an irrelevancy, and our genuine readiness to accept a man simply because he is a man. Failing to fight and strive for human dignity as so defined, Brotherhood Week becomes a sham.

We need not here set forth any particular program of action, as there are other forums for such purpose. Rather, let us resolve to be in the front lines of this fight; and let our plea this morning be for the full understanding by all of that unique, historical background of one-tenth of the Nation, which crushes hope and pride; for the complete acceptance of White America's responsbility; for the discarding of our myths and irrational prejudices; and for the faith, our faith, that a man—any man—has the capacity, if accorded human dignity, to achieve and contribute in the same measure as other citizens.

Such faith on our part, which is the essence of true brotherhood, will fertilize the soil in which the Negro's pride and self-esteem will flower, and thus so vitalize the role of Negro self-help that in the long run, the Negro himself will contribute far more to the elimination of all inequities than all of our statutory and economic programs.

With this plea to white Americans, fellow veterans, let us couple a plea to our Negro brethren. Let us say to them, without embarrassment, and in that spirit of love and brotherhood herein expressed, that they, too must banish hatred from their midst; they to, must discard false and erroneous assumptions that all who differ in approach are enemies; and above all, let the Negro community guard against that fatal sin which has so often and so brutally made a mockery of Western man's pretense to civilization—anti-Semitism.

And so my comrades, brothers all, let us take the leading role in the Nation's effort to remove every last vestige of racial and religious discrimination and their evil consequences; let us in the name of the joint veterans council reaffirm our mutual devotion to the cause of human brotherhood and freedom; let us repledge ourselves to the American ideal—that we are all created free and equal in the image of God, rich and poor, black and white, Christian and Jew; let us determine to translate our religious and national ideals into the reality of everyday living; and let us rededicate ourselves to renewed and ever-increasing efforts, so that we may hasten the day when all men, everywhere, shall consider themselves brothers.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181, Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b, Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Monday, March 21, 1966

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate considered supplemental defense and foreign aid appropriations, agreeing to vote thereon on March 22, and cleared Coast Guard procurement bill for White House.

House passed a bill to provide benefits of faster, more efficient, and less expensive mail service to our servicemen.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 6043–6104

Bills Introduced: 14 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3103–3116; S.J. Res. 147; S. Con. Res. 83; and S. Res. 236. **Pages 6046–6047**

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows:

S. 801, to improve balance-of-payments position by using reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures (S. Rept. 1078). **Page 6046**

President's Message—Truth in Lending and Packaging: Message from President transmitting his legislative recommendations respecting truth in lending and packaging was received and referred jointly to Committees on Commerce, Banking and Currency, and Labor and Public Welfare. **Pages 6040–6043**

Coast Guard: Senate passed without amendment and cleared for President H.R. 12762, authorizing funds for procurement of Coast Guard vessels, aircraft, and shore facilities. **Pages 6060–6061**

Authority To Meet: Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet while Senate is in session on Tuesday, March 22. **Page 6043**

Stockpiling: Senate passed with committee amendments (motion to reconsider tabled) S. 1488, authorizing disposal from the national stockpile of refractory grade bauxite. **Pages 6043–6044**

Supplemental Appropriations: Senate considered H.R. 13546, fiscal 1966 supplemental appropriations for the Defense Establishment and for foreign assistance programs, adopting committee amendments en bloc.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed that on Tuesday, March 22, after the Chaplain's prayer, Senator Clark will be recognized for 1 hour, and that vote on final passage of the bill will be taken not later than 2:15 p.m. **Pages 6105–6134**

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: R. D. Pennewell, of Missouri, and A. Lars Nelson, of Washington, to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration; and three Army in the rank of general. **Page 6134**

Nominations: The following nominations were received: Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, and Bernard Zagorin, of Virginia, to be Governor, Alternate Governor, and Director, respectively, of the Asian Development Bank; Robert LaFollette Bennett, of Alaska, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and two judicial. **Page 6134**

Program for Tuesday: Senate met at noon and recessed at 6:49 p.m. until noon Tuesday, March 22, when it will conclude consideration of H.R. 13546, fiscal 1966 appropriations for defense and foreign aid. **Page 6134**

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on proposed fiscal 1967 budget estimates for the Department of Agriculture, and related agencies, receiving testimony from Senators Carlson and Allott, who discussed funds for various agriculture programs; and several public witnesses.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—PUBLIC WORKS

Committee on Appropriations: On Friday, March 18, subcommittee continued its hearings on proposed fiscal 1967 budget estimates for civil functions items, having as its witnesses Robert G. Storey, Vice Chairman, Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission; and Maj. Gen. Ellsworth I. Davis, President, Mississippi River Commission, and Division Engineer, Lower Mississippi Valley Division, Corps of Army Engineers.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

Appendix

Houston Chronicle Writes of "Mr. Ed": Ambassador Extraordinary to Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Ambassador Edward Clark, "Mr. Ed" as he is known in Australia, has undoubtedly been one of our most successful Ambassadors ever, to the land down under.

His unconventional manner, his unique style, and his personal approach have all endeared the Australian people to Ambassador Edward Clark, just as many Texans have felt closely allied to him in his home State.

To illustrate his accomplishments and success in his service to his country, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Big Smiling Texan Makes Hit as Ambassador: Aussies Cheer 'Mr. Ed'" from the Houston Chronicle of Sunday, March 13, 1966, and the article from the same paper entitled "Texans Have Much in Common With Australians" be printed in the Appendix to today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSSIES CHEER "MR. ED"—FOLKS DOWN UNDER FIND ALERT BRAIN BEHIND AUSTINITE'S FRIENDLY GRIN

(By Brian Dewhurst)

CANBERRA.—The rousing strains of "The Yellow Rose of Texas" floated across the grassy expanse of Canberra's Fairburn Royal Air Force Base as the American Convair plane rolled to a halt.

"Mr. Ed" was back.

"Mr. Ed," a hearty 200-pound Texan, is American Ambassador Edward Clark. His broad grin, broader Texan voice, and hearty but hardheaded manner have taken Australians by storm.

That day at Fairburn was typical. Ambassador Clark was returning from a visit to the United States to consult with President Johnson and report on the first 3 months of his Australian service.

IMPROMPTU BAND

The music came from an impromptu group of trumpets, drums, and bagpipes got together by locals here to welcome back "Mister Ed," as he's been dubbed from the day he arrived.

The choice of the tune was deliberate. As the door of the aircraft opened there was Mr. Ed with a wide smile and, of course, a yellow rose in his lapel.

Behind the grin Australians have found an alert brain that has taken its owner to the top in the professions of law and banking and made him a millionaire at 59.

Mr. Ed announced when he arrived in Australia last August that the then Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies wanted an American ambassador who could call up the President and say "that you, Lyndon? Ed here." As the months went by it looked as though that's what Menzies got.

Government officials and journalists covering this National Capital have noticed an immediacy in communications between the United States and Australian Governments since Mr. Ed has been installed at the rococo southern colonial style American Embassy.

This may be a coincidence but it's had its impact Down Under, where Australia's isolated 11.5 million have found themselves being visited by a stream of top American envoys starting with W. Averell Harriman and going on through Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT to Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNIQUE AMBASSADOR

Fellow Americans employed at the Embassy (who number 86) flatly describe their new Ambassador as "unique." Said one junior employee:

"He's done something that never happened in my experience. Every employee and his wife—say, about 150 people—have been invited up to the official residence at least once. When a new American family arrives here the Ambasador sends flowers to their room. Big Ed tries to get out to greet them personally. It's on a personal level that Mr. Ed really comes through."

An astonished Australian diplomat said, "sometimes you will get the feeling he's not really listening to you. Then a week later he'll repeat back exactly what was said and use it to score a point. You can't relax with this bloke."

Edward A. Clark, Ambassador Extraordinary, was born in San Francisco, Tex. His grandfather fought for the Confederacy. He says his first contact with the private enterprise system, which he enthusiastically espouses, was at the age of 10.

"I used to deliver papers on a horse and made quite a deal of money," Clark recalled.

LAWYER AND BANKER

He rose later to become head of the Austin law firm of Clark, Thomas, Harris, Denius & Winters and chairman of the Capital National Bank of Austin.

A close associate of President Johnson from the days when he ran for his first elective office as prosecuting attorney, Clark became secretary of state of Texas and held many other political offices before taking up his present post as Ambassador to Australia.

Ironically, the man who many claim has been America's most successful—as well as most unconventional—representative Down Under does not intend to pursue his newfound diplomatic career.

He said the other day, "I've surely enjoyed myself here. I find Australians the most similar people to those of my home country that it is possible to imagine.

"But when I have conducted whatever service it is thought I can do here it would suit me best to return to private life.

"I certainly could not trade my post here for a post in London, Paris, or Rome—or anywhere you could think of. I would rather be Ambassador to Australia than any other place in the world but after it's over I guess I'd like just to stop being Ambassador and go back to being a private citizen. I'm comfortably well off—I guess you could say I've got several millions of dollars.

"I don't want to make any more money but I'm glad I've got it behind me. I long since learned money won't buy happiness but it provides the means to look for happiness in a lot of darn nice places."

Clark made no secret of the fact he regards Australia as a "darn nice place."

To judge by the reactions so far, most Australians would be glad to see him stay around quite a while.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Mar. 13, 1966]

TEXANS HAVE MUCH IN COMMON WITH AUSTRALIANS

(Speech of Ambassador Edward Clark)

As you know, I am on a short trip to the United States—enjoying a brief interlude from my new diplomatic profession. Since I have been back in the United States, I have found, happily, much interest among my countrymen in the country which I am serving as the American Ambassador by appointment of our great President—the country of Australia.

Americans seem quite interested in Australia, and I find almost universal curiosity about some of the strange fauna unique to Australia—the kangaroo, the koala bear, the duckbilled platypus, the dingo, and other rare animals and birds found only in Australia.

Apart from these rare and wonderful animals, however, we have a lot in common with our Australian friends. We share common origins, beliefs, goals, and fears, and our governmental systems are similar.

SAME LANGUAGE

The Australian Constitution is a blend of British and American models. We more or less speak the same language—although sometimes I'm not too sure about my own accent.

Despite all these similarities, relatively few Americans know very much about this great country of the Southern Hemisphere, and, conversely, few Australians know much about our country. Australians are very conscious of the fact that only recently, with modern travel, have they really become part of the world.

Before the war, an Australian wishing to visit the United States or Europe undertook a long, arduous and expensive journey. And there was not much incentive for Europeans or Americans to visit Australia.

Exceptions to this were, of course, the great Australian gold rush, in the last century, and the Second World War when over a million American troops were stationed in Australia on their way through to the Pacific battle areas to the north.

GI'S WED AUSSIES

In fact, much of what Americans know of Australia today stems from those experiences of fighting men in World War II. These experiences were almost universally harmonious—so much so that several hundred of our fighting men returned home with Australian brides.

Australians are a bit concerned by the fact that their geographic separation from the rest of the Western World has caused other people to ignore them or misunderstand them, or simply to take them for granted. Australians have told me that they have been complimented in Britain and the United States on the fact that they speak English so well. They say this with a smile, but there is a bit of resentment, too, that they are not yet fully accepted by their

Western cousins. They don't feel yet that we accept them as part of the family.

In case you are among those who think of Australia only in terms of kangaroos, good and ample beer, and tennis players—and these they most certainly have—let me tell you a few things about Australia that I have learned in the very few months I have been your Ambassador down there.

I haven't been able, of course, to see and observe every facet of Australian life, or to meet every Australian, but I've made a good start. I have been able, in less than 5 months, to travel about 13,000 miles and to visit all six capital cities and many inland and rural communities.

Despite the fact that Australia is just about the same size as the continental United States, it couldn't be more different geographically. It is, however, without question the flattest continent in the world. It has no mountains or mountain ranges comparable to our Rockies or High Sierras, or the Swiss Alps, or the South American Andes.

The center of Australia is a vast, barren dessert without an inland water system like our Mississippi, Missouri, or Colorado. Consequently, the 11.5 million people who live in Australia live almost entirely along the coast.

Between them, Sydney and Melbourne, the two largest cities, have almost 40 percent of the population, and the six capital cities taken together account for over 90 percent of the total population of the country.

WOOL, WHEAT, MEAT

Despite this urban concentration, Australia has lived and developed on basically rural production or the production of what the economists call primary products—wool, wheat, and meat—and the exportation of these products account for about half of Australia's foreign exchange income.

When you combine this with the other major agricultural industries, such as sugar, fruit, and dairying, and add minerals—coal, iron ore, and bauxite, which they possess in vast quantities—you are talking about nonmanufacturing industries which account for about four-fifths of their total exports.

As you can well appreciate, this heavy concentration on the primary products has left them somewhat at the mercy of the weather and changing market conditions in the world. Because of this, they have more and more tried to diversify their economy and their export trade.

This has been going on since the end of World War II, and they are making excellent progress. Not only is their industrial plant growing rapidly, but their export earnings are more and more coming from these manufacturing industries.

As we know, however, a growing country needs tremendous amounts of capital to develop large and efficient industries. Australia is very conscious of this and has maintained a policy that encourages foreigners to invest in the development of their country.

With its stability, high standard of living, and educated, literate population, Australia is a very attractive place for businessmen from around the world to invest.

At present, about $500 million a year in overseas capital flows into Australia. Much of this money, particularly American money, has been in high risk ventures.

American companies are spending huge sums of money exploring the continent for oil, which up to now has not been a commercially exploitable resource.

Iron ore reserves are fantastic, and they have the largest bauxite deposits in the world. These are going to be developed as major industries, in large part with American capital.

So you can see that their limitations are not in basic resources, but in manpower, investment capital, and water. These are all serious problems but the Australians are very aware of them and are gradually making progress in solving them.

MANY IMMIGRANTS

Perhaps their greatest success is in the manpower field. Since the end of World War II, when they had a population of about 8.5 million, they have had a large and successful immigration program. About one person in five in Australia—out of their population of 11.5 million—is an immigrant or the child of an immigrant. But this has not yet solved their underpopulation problem by any means, and I'm sure they will continue to support a very active immigration policy.

I don't think I need to go into too much detail about why Australia has in the past few years been our very close ally in some difficult times. I mentioned World War II earlier. The Australians were also with us in Korea and are now with us, fighting side by side with our troops in Vietnam. American soldiers have great respect for Australian soldiers—Diggers, as they are called—and they are always happy to see them by their side in a fight.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Australia last week announced plans to increase her troops in Vietnam from 1,500 to 4,500, all crack paratroopers.)

Their commitment in Vietnam is only one example of how Australia is playing an active and constructive role in that part of the world.

Australia has developed and maintained close and friendly ties with most of the other Asian countries. At present, for example, Australia represents the interests of the United States in Cambodia with whom we do not maintain diplomatic relations. Australia's trading and diplomatic ties with Japan grow stronger every year.

The Australians have been heavy contributors of wheat to both India and Pakistan and they have given economic assistance to many other countries of that area.

STUDENTS TRAINED

For example, recently the 6,000th student, training in Australia under the Colombo Plan, arrived in Sydney; and the Australians have maintained proper and effective relationships with Indonesia during the recent troubles in that country.

The point I would like to leave with you is that Australia, although supporting us in many ways around the world, is also doing many helpful things on their own. They have reached a point where they are playing a very active and constructive role in world affairs, particularly in south and southeast Asia. This is the kind of friend—this is the kind of ally—we want.

I have touched on only a few of the more obvious and impressive features of the Australian Continent. I would recommend to all of you that you try to visit that great country. Come see for yourselves.

I have had the great pleasure of entertaining a surprisingly large number of American visitors in Australia. I hope several of you will be added to that list. I assure you that you will be well treated, and you will be overwhelmed by Australian friendship and hospitality.

"Give it a go," as they say in Australia.

DAR To Meet Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Herald Examiner of March 3, 1966 contained an outline of the objectives and accomplishments of a proud historical woman's organization. The occasion for the article was a conference meeting of the California Society of the DAR, held in Los Angeles. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include in the RECORD this article, the text of which follows:

DAR TO MEET HERE

(By George Todt)

"Home and Country"—DAR motto.

For 75 years the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution has had a proud history of devotion to patriotic idealism designed to keep our constitutional Republic free and libertarian.

The NSDAR has been foremost in the fight to prevent loss of our prized national sovereignty to either the Communists or United World Federalists in the brave new world of the future. Deserves our undying gratitude.

TOP SPEAKERS

The California Society of the NSDAR will hold its annual State Conference in Los Angeles Wednesday and Thursday—at the new International Hotel. Outstanding speakers have been secured.

Among them are Joseph E. Burger, Congressman DEL CLAWSON and Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer. The latter of "Wedemeyer Reports" fame.

There are not nearly enough nice things to be said about the DAR, who ought to be everybody's "DAR-lings" for the devoted service they have given our country. They have largely beaten down the irresponsible one-world concept.

Usually they are studiously ignored in the society columns nowadays.

The real truth is that the DAR is perhaps the most aristocratic women's organization in the Nation today—in addition to being one of the strongest and best of its kind—and deserves star billing.

The NSDAR was founded on October 11, 1890, at 2:30 p.m., at the Strathmore Arms, 810 12th Street, Washington, D.C., at which time 18 women were enrolled for membership. Included the Republic's First Lady then.

She was Mrs. Caroline Scott Harrison, wife of Benjamin Harrison, the President of the United States and a member of the Sons of the American Revolution.

The First Lady was elected unanimously as first president-general of the NSDAR.

DAR CREED

The DAR Creed, by Anne Rogers Minor, is four-fold in scope:

"We believe in patriotism which loves one's country as the dearest and best in the world and does not refuse to defend it.

"We believe in a loyalty to its government which leaves no room for socialism or communism.

"We believe in a love of peace which leaves no room for the pacifism that would buy peace at any price, even at the sacrifice of truth, honor, and righteousness.

"We believe in a living faith in God that leaves no room for atheism."

The three main purposes of the NSDAR are the same today as in 1890.

Historical: ("to perpetuate the memory and spirit of the men and women who achieved American independence").

Education: ("to promote, as an object of primary importance, instiutions for the general diffusion of knowledge").

Patriotic: ("to cherish, maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; to foster true patriotism and love of country").

IN 50 STATES

The NSDAR was incorporated by an Act of Congress in 1896. It was signed by then-President Grover Cleveland, Speaker of the

House Thomas B. Reed, and Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson, Vice President, and also president of the U.S. Senate.

National president-general of the NSDAR is Mrs. William Henry Sullivan, Jr., and California regent of the DAR is Mrs. Harvey B. Lyon. State conference chairman is Mrs. F. George Herlihy. Vice chairman of the conference is Mrs. J. S. (Sy) Fluor.

The NSDAR has 185,000 members located in 2,868 local chapters in 50 States (1965), District of Columbia and overseas. Hats off to these all-American gals.

West Virginia University Medical Center—One of Finest in Country—Supported by All West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, much progress has been made by West Virginia University in the development of an outstanding medical school, since former Gov. Okey Patteson signed bills authorizing construction 15 years ago.

It was through the foresight of Governor Patteson and dedicated West Virginians that the present multimillion structure now stands on the campus of West Virginia University. With the expert leadership of Dr. Clark K. Sleeth, the medical center provides the best possible facilities for the education of students in medicine, dentistry, nursing, pharmacy, and related health fields.

Recently, an article appeared in the Morgantown Dominion-Post which is deserving of recognition. Written by Brooks Cottle, an able editor, it describes the satisfaction obtained by the constantly increasing accomplishments of our medical center.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. Cottle be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HAPPY 15TH ANNIVERSARY

It was just 15 years ago that Gov. Okey Patteson signed bills authorizing 4-year colleges of medicine and dentistry in West Virginia, empowering the Governor to select a location for these colleges to be administered by the university board of governors, and imposing a soft drink tax to pay the cost of establishing and operating them.

In the years that have followed, the good promise of these decisions has been realized to a far greater extent than even the fondest hopes of the most optimistic could have foreseen.

After a statesmanlike study of the whole problem, during which he consulted outstanding authorities on medical education, Governor Patteson came to the conclusion that the medical center should be an integral part of the university and located on the university campus.

Accepting its responsibilities, the university board of governors proceeded with the utmost care to have plans prepared for the physical construction of the medical center on the spacious and convenient site donated by the county court. Simultaneously the board was having the groundwork laid for mobilizing the administrative and instructional staffs needed to operate the medical center after the extensive construction program was completed.

Despite some recurring efforts to have the soft drink tax repealed, it has proved to be a dependable source of revenue without imposing a hardship on taxpayers or anybody else.

So on this 15th anniversary of the first step, everybody concerned is entitled to feel solid satisfaction in what has been accomplished thus far and in the good promise of further developments to come.

Considering the new problems of medical education now arising as a result of medicare and other developments, West Virginia should be gratified that it has a going institution well prepared to tackle those problems as they affect this State.

William F. Arbogast

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my own personal tribute and congratulations to William F. Arbogast, chief of the Associated Press staff covering the House of Representatives, upon the 35th anniversary of his service with AP.

In a way, I have a special claim upon Bill. At one time, he was city editor of the Covington, Ky., Times-Star. Covington is located in the Fourth Congressional District which I have the honor of serving here in the Congress. Bill's first assignment with the Associated Press was in Louisville, Ky., as correspondent. Louisville is the location of the orphans' home where I lived as a small lonely child.

For these reasons alone, I would have a certain feeling of common interest with Bill. However, in addition, my association with him here in the House has given me an opportunity to know him as a professional news specialist of rare ability, of the very highest integrity and consummate skill.

To his already knowledgeable background, he adds, for each story he writes, prodigious and careful research. Then through his easy and graceful facility with words, his news dispatches are communicative in an unusually meaningful way. His is reporting at the very best and he is my favorite reporter. Every word in his articles tells a story—sings a song, and does an act—need I say more of his talents?

Because of his outstanding ability and his personal integrity and affability, Bill Arbogast is a friend and newsman who is held in the greatest esteem and admiration by his myriad of associates both in the press and in the Membership of the House of Representatives. My heartiest felicitations are extended to Bill and my best wishes go to him for many more happy and productive years here in the Nation's Capitol.

National Defense Education Act Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter expresses the sentiment of many college administrators who have seen the dependence of students upon National Defense Education Act loans in recent years. I would hope that the views contained in this letter and the accompanying data will be carefully considered. It surely is in support of the action of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. In that action we unanimously agree that there should be no change in the operation of the National Defense Education Act student loan program and we urge that that program be fully funded at $190 million.

MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGE BOARD,
St. Paul, Minn., March 4, 1966.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
U.S. Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I note with great concern indications that the national defense loan program for the 1966–67 fiscal year may not be fully funded or may be only partially funded. It is my understanding that plans for merging the national defense loan program into the guaranteed loan program are being made. If this is to be the direction of Federal support for needy students, we can accommodate our students' needs provided adequate transitional time is given.

Our fear now is that abandonment of the national defense loan program or even restriction of the program, at this time, will work a real hardship on the large number of students who now have national defense loans and others who have planned their 1966–67 college attendance around the national defense loan program. I do not see how we can be in a position in the Minnesota State colleges to participate as fully and as rapidly in the guaranteed loan program as will be needed by our students. We need time to obtain State legislation so that our participation in the guaranteed loan program can be adequate to the needs of our students.

In my opinion, the national defense loan program has been one of the most effective programs in higher education. Some 7,000 students in Minnesota State colleges had received aid from this source by June 30, 1965. A copy of our report on activity in the program through June 30, 1965, is enclosed for your information.

I would urge that careful consideration be given to this matter and I solicit your support for full funding of the national defense loan program for the fiscal year 1966–67.

Respectfully,

BEVINGTON REED, *Chancellor.*

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM, MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES, FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1965

The following information has been taken from the annual report of the national defense student loan account (form SCB10) for the year ending June 30, 1965. Information is divided into two parts. The first part relates only to the activity during the 1964–65 fiscal year. The second part relates to the whole national defense student loan program from its start in the 1958–59 fiscal year to June 30, 1965.

Prepared by the board office, October 1965.

Facts relating to loans made during the 1964–65 fiscal year

[Distribution of size of loans made during 1964–65 year]

Size of loan	Bemidji		Mankato		Moorhead		St. Cloud		Winona		All State colleges	
	Number of loans	Amount loaned	Number of loans	Amount loaned	Number of loans	Amount loaned	Number of loans	Amount loaned	Number of loans	Amount loaned	Number of loans	Amount loaned
$1,401 to $1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	$1,650.00	0	0	1	$1,650.00
$1,301 to $1,400	1	$1,365.00	0	0	0	0	1	1,400.00	0	0	2	2,765.00
$1,201 to $1,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1,250.00	4	$5,037.00	5	6,287.00
$1,101 to $1,200	5	5,707.00	0	0	0	0	1	1,125.00	6	7,035.00	12	13,867.00
$1,001 to $1,100	2	2,090.00	0	0	1	$1,025.00	1	1,050.00	3	3,188.00	7	7,353.00
$901 to $1,000	64	62,325.00	14	$13,775.00	9	8,875.00	36	35,530.00	20	19,487.00	143	139,992.00
$801 to $900	49	42,730.00	34	30,270.00	38	32,900.00	8	7,125.00	18	15,780.00	147	128,809.00
$701 to $800	100	78,072.00	105	81,360.00	175	131,285.00	111	87,170.00	41	31,715.00	532	809.607.00
$601 to $700	78	52,410.00	40	27,170.00	37	68,780.00	66	44,300.00	54	26,707.00	324	219,357.00
$501 to $600	78	44,600.00	72	43,000.00	75	43,980.00	94	53,250.00	57	33,193.00	376	218,026.00
$401 to $500	84	39,773.00	135	65,620.00	86	41,695.00	75	35,800.00	39	18,478.00	419	201,386.00
$301 to $400	79	29,306.00	63	24,435.00	69	26,140.00	71	27,150.00	42	14,774.00	324	121,805.00
$201 to $300	78	21,131.00	86	24,030.00	69	18,202.00	87	23,900.00	41	11,304.00	361	98,573.00
$101 to $200	54	9,369.00	38	6,680.00	45	6,960.00	46	8,175.00	18	2,574.85	201	33,748.85
$1 to $100	9	790.00	51	4,770.00	14	1,315.00	12	1,175.00	6	515.00	92	8,565.00
Total	681	389,668.00	638	321,110.00	668	371,153.00	610	330,055.00	349	199,790.85	2,945	1,611,776.85
Range:												
High		1,365.00		950.00		1,025.00		1,650.00		1,300.00		1,650.00
Low		35.00		50.00		75.00		75.00		65.00		35.00
Average		572.20		503.31		555.62		541.00		572.47		547.11

Facts relating to loans made during the entire national defense student loan program to June 30, 1965

	Bemidji	Mankato	Moorhead	St. Cloud	Winona	All State colleges
1. Number of students receiving loans	1,631	1,336	1,494	1,699	845	7,005
2. Amount of money loaned	$1,443,111.82	$1,112,203.00	$1,297,907.00	$1,282,675.00	$699,477.85	$5,835,374.67
	Number of loans					
3. Distribution of size of loans made during entire national defense student loan program to June 30, 1965:						
$3,801 to $4,000	0	0	1	0	0	1
$3,601 to $3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3,401 to $3,600	1	0	1	2	0	4
$3,201 to $3,400	3	1	0	0	0	4
$3,001 to $3,200	10	3	1	5	1	20
$2,801 to $3,000	9	8	11	9	7	44
$2,601 to $2,800	21	10	14	8	7	60
$2,401 to $2,600	23	18	15	20	7	83
$2,201 to $2,400	23	28	30	22	10	113
$2,001 to $2,200	38	17	30	18	20	123
$1,801 to $2,000	42	44	46	21	18	171
$1,601 to $1,800	68	44	57	44	25	238
$1,401 to $1,600	79	55	62	71	42	309
$1,201 to $1,400	100	63	87	57	60	367
$1,001 to $1,200	100	72	92	83	46	393
$901 to $1,000	77	58	59	78	43	315
$801 to $900	53	60	51	58	30	252
$701 to $800	119	142	158	153	56	628
$601 to $700	120	53	106	100	62	441
$501 to $600	132	86	117	178	84	597
$401 to $500	145	217	169	176	75	782
$301 to $400	109	116	138	197	65	625
$201 to $300	168	133	134	225	101	761
$101 to $200	153	77	86	149	72	537
$1 to $100	38	31	29	25	14	137
Range:						
High	$3,235.00	$3,400.00	$3,975.00	$3,550.00	$3,188.00	$3,975.00
Low	$35.00	$50.00	$75.00	$50.00	$65.00	$35.00
Average	$884.80	$832.49	$868.75	$754.96	$827.78	$833.03
4. Loans canceled because of death or disability:						
Number	2	2	0	4	3	11
Amount canceled	$2,440.00	$1,000.00	0	$2,895.00	$2,681.00	$9,016.00
5. Partial cancellation of loans because of teaching service:						
Number of borrowers	392	280	293	411	160	1,536
Amount canceled	$74,485.34	$47,283.90	$57,860.12	$75,796.50	$36,000.80	$291,426.66
6. Repayment of principal:						
Number making partial repayments	201	344	164	244	177	1,130
Number making total repayment	42	49	43	83	39	256
Amount repaid	$40,542.94	$99,983.94	$41,304.41	$51,788.78	$49,060.20	$292,180.27
7. Borrowers in arrears:						
Number in arrears	89	8	76	32	23	228
Amount in arrears	$8,974.77	$482.68	$6,169.22	$1,742.00	$1,517.90	$18,886.57
8. Number of borrowers withdrawn from college	347	192	297	286	116	1,238
9. Number of above known to have transferred to another college	86	53	60	55	11	265
10. Number of borrowers graduated from college	534	514	589	635	452	2,724

Impact of President's Budget Cuts on Kansas Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Dr. Glenn H. Beck, vice president for agriculture at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., and published in the February 19, 1966, issue of the Kansas Farmer. Dr. Beck discusses the serious impact of the President's agricultural budget reductions on the Kansas economy.

The article follows:

CUTS IN PRESIDENT'S FARM BUDGET HIT KANSAS RESEARCH HARD

(By Glenn H. Beck)

Kansas' economy will receive a serious setback if President Johnson's proposed agricultural budget for the fiscal year 1967 is accepted by Congress.

Recommendations would reduce total appropriations for agricultural research and services by 13 percent. The cut in Federal support for research in Kansas would amount to $222,352, effective July 1, 1966.

Much of this reduction is directed toward studies dealing with wheat and sorghum. This proposed action comes at a time when two-thirds of the countries of the world face disastrous famine. And, paradoxically, it comes at a time when it is our proclaimed policy to extend our help in trying to solve the world food problems.

Federally supported research activities in Kansas on a direct basis through the Agricultural Research Service will be reduced by $122,000. This will terminate all sorghum breeding work and weed control studies at the Hays branch station.

It also will terminate studies at Manhattan in development of grain varieties resistant to Hessian fly and will greatly reduce research in wheat and sorghum breeding, wheat quality studies and wheat disease studies, all at Manhattan.

It is interesting to note that similar reductions have not been made in research dealing with such commodities as tobacco, cotton, and peanuts even though these crops are in surplus.

Harvest sorghum grain alone in Kansas has cash value of at least $135 million. More important, it serves as the principal source of energy needed to produce meat animals worth $500 million. Much of the remaining feed requirements of the Kansas beef industry is provided by sorghum silage ($35 million farm value) and by sorghum forage ($15 million farm value).

Sorghum breeding research now in progress would provide new and improved germ plasm for more efficient hybrids for Kansas farmers. Immediate benefits of this sorghum breeding research will be lost if the program is interrupted.

Wheat produced on 10.5 million acres of Kansas land yielded about 250 million bushels of grain in 1965 with cash value equivalent to almost $350 million. Kansas' retention of its position as the No. 1 wheat State depends not only on total production but also on quality production. Integrated wheat breeding studies and quality evaluations have shown the way of rather complete genetic control of quality in future wheat varieties and hybrids.

Loss of Federal research support in wheat breeding and wheat quality programs will eliminate possibility of economic gains in Kansas. Our farmers will fall farther behind spring wheat producers of the Dakotas in competitiveness of high quality bread wheat production.

Wheat, our State's No. 1 crop always is threatened by a variety of pests, including especially rusts, virus diseases, Hessian fly and numerous weeds. Protection against these depends primarily on federally sponsored research. Proposed reduction of this support could easily subject our wheat crop to losses of $25 to $50 million annually.

In addition to reduction made in the USDA program, federally supported activities in the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station and the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service are effected. Beginning July 1, 1966, the Federal allotment to the Experiment Station will be reduced by $100,252. Existing extension activities will lose $183,112 of Federal support.

Extension funds will be redirected into projects controlled in Washington dealing with rural resource development and work with low income families. The only way Kansas can qualify for this money will be to submit projects that meet the whims of Washington reviewers.

The 93d Anniversary of Abolition of Slavery in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, March 22, marks a shining moment in Puerto Rico's history—the 93d anniversary of the emancipation of slaves in Puerto Rico.

Slavery was first introduced to Puerto Rico in 1502 when Juan Sanchez obtained permission to bring five caravels Negro slaves into Puerto Rico free of duty. In 1513 the general introduction of salves was authorized upon the payment of a tax of 2 ducats per head, and by 1531 over 1,500 Negro slaves had been imported. By the end of the 16th century, Negroes had largely replaced Indians in the fields and sugar mills, and slave traffic continued to expand during the 17th and 18th centuries. It has been estimated that by 1830 the Negro slaves in Puerto Rico numbered about 34,000.

The relation between masters and slaves in Puerto Rico in the 19th century probably did not differ materially from such relations elsewhere. The most barbarous customs of earlier days, such as branding, had been abandoned, but racial strife continued, as evidenced by the severity of the slaveowners and the resulting sullen resentment of the slaves.

Elsewhere in the world, significant gains were made in man's age-old struggle for freedom. Slavery was abolished in Santo Domingo in 1801; in the British dominions in 1838; in France in 1849; in Holland in 1863; and in the United States in 1865. Such events could hardly fail to have an effect upon the movement in Puerto Rico.

One difference between developments in the United States and in Puerto Rico is worthy of note. The 13 North American colonies declared their independence in 1776 and subsequently won acknowledgment of that independence, but almost a century was to elapse before our Nation saw fit to apply the doctrine of freedom to the Negro slaves. In Puerto Rico, however, the movement toward self-government proceeded hand in hand with the movement toward emancipation.

The great liberal leaders who were in the forefront of this emancipation movement have bequeathed to Puerto Rico a noble heritage. Among these courageous leaders were De Castro, Acosta, Betances, Belvis, and De Vizcarrondo.

Román Baldorioty de Castro was born in Guaynabo and educated in Madrid and Paris. He was elected deputy to the Spanish Cortez in 1870 and concentrated his efforts on the emancipation of the slaves.

José Julián Acosta, primarily an educator, was also a leading patriot and abolitionist. Elected a deputy to the Cortez in 1871, he pleaded for the freedom of the slaves.

Ramón Emeterio Betances, who was born in Cabo Rojo in 1829, graduated with a medical degree in Paris and returned to practice his profession in Mayaguez. He collected money from his friends, bought slave children, had them educated, and set them free.

Segrundo Ruiz Belvis freed all his slaves upon his return from the University of Madrid, where he had received degrees in philosophy and law.

Julio L. de Vizcarrondo, who was born in San Juan in 1830, was forced to leave Puerto Rico at the age of 20 because of his activities in behalf of the slaves. Journeying to Spain in 1864, he founded the Sociedad Abolicionista Espanola and proceeded to attack slavery vigorously in the Spanish press.

In 1873, when Amadeo, a younger son of the King of Italy, abdicated the Spanish throne, a republican government was inaugurated and the cause of human rights triumphed. On March 22, 1873, the National Assembly of the Republic of Spain unanimously voted for the abolition of slavery in Puerto Rico, and made provisions for funds with which to compensate the slaveowners. Bonds were issued, owners were compensated at an average rate of 200 pesos per slave, and slavery in Puerto Rico was abolished.

The hope for human rights and the dignity of mankind was finally realized, and to this day, the island of Puerto Rico remains an undimmed beacon in the record of man's fight for freedom.

The Late Honorable Albert Thomas

SPEECH
OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, the House lost an able Member, the Nation lost a loyal and faithful legislator, and we lost a valued colleague when Albert Thomas, of Texas, passed away recently.

Albert was my dear friend and I miss him here in the House where he served with great ability and distinction. He made an outstanding contribution to his district, his State, and his Nation during his years of membership. He was truly a "legislator's legislator."

He will always be remembered in the House not only for his valuable service but for his famous and familiar handwave and handclasp of friendship. It was a privilege to have known Albert Thomas and the world is a far poorer place for his having left it. This world can ill afford to lose men of his caliber. God rest his sweet soul in peace.

To his family, I would like to extend my deep sympathy, and it is my hope that God will bless each of them and give them comfort.

What People Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial, the Wichita, Kans., Eagle says Americans would be overwhelmingly in favor of getting out of Vietnam—"but not until we have finished the business we went there to do."

The paper quotes the result of a poll which showed that 70 percent would favor a negotiated truce by the U.N. or some neutral power with each side left holding the territory it now holds.

It does not mean that the public mood favors withdrawal willy-nilly, the paper states, adding "for the most significant finding of the poll was this one: When confronted with the choice of withdrawal or an all-out war in Vietnam, the opinion was 60 percent for all-out war."

Believing that many will want to read the editorial, I herewith offer it for publication in the Record.

Now the President Knows What the People Want

Proponents of the soft-line approach in Vietnam will doubtless be making much of the National Opinion Research Center poll released recently. It showed that 88 percent of Americans would be willing to have this country negotiate with the Vietcong if they can be persuaded to negotiate.

Further, it showed that 70 percent would favor a negotiated truce by the U.N. or some neutral power with each side left holding the territory it now holds. And 52 percent said they would favor a new government in Saigon in which the Vietcong had some part.

Does this mean that Americans are tired of this war that is so difficult and often looks so hopeless? Yes, undoubtedly it does, and there's nothing astonishing about that. Anyone would have known that without taking a poll.

But it doesn't mean that the public mood favors withdrawal willy-nilly. For the most significant finding of the poll was this one: When confronted with the choice of withdrawal or an all-out war in Vietnam, the opinion was 60 percent for all-out war.

This cannot be construed in any way except that the American people will not be satisfied with anything less than victory in Vietnam. If this means the complete rout of the Chinese-backed North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, so be it. If it can be accomplished by means of negotiations that will assure free elections and an independent government in South Vietnam, so much the better.

If there has been any doubt in the President's mind about the will of the people, now he knows. We are overwhelmingly in favor of getting out of Vietnam, but not until we have finished the business we went there to do.

Three Poems From Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents, Mr. James H. Holton of Bolivar, Mo., wrote me, saying that he is "66 years old; no education, just plain horsesense," and has been writing poems the last 4 or 5 years to pass the time. He sent along the following poems as samples.

I think we can all benefit from his observations and commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

The Dollar Bill

(By James H. Holton)

Inflation, they call it by name,
Higher prices means the same.
The income seems so slow * * *
But the outgo * * * watch it flow.
We stretch and stretch the dollar bill,
But all the needs it just won't fill.
The dollar bill's all out of shape;
No more stretching will it take.
It looks slim and underfed,
Like a worn out featherbed.

Bad News

(By James H. Holton)

News seem to be all bad;
And many times it is sad.
Troubles of so many kind
Seems troubles are easy to find.

Droughts, storms and wars;
All brings heartache and sorrow.
And we hear most every day,
We have more troubles on the way.

What's wrong with this world?
Seems to be in a whirl * * *
This entire world dissatisfied
With troubles that they cannot hide.

Too many troubles to even name,
And who in the world can we blame?
Each one blames it on someone else * * *
But no one ever blames himself.

Name It

(By James H. Holton)

It's either too much, or not enough * * *
This is what makes it rough.
Prices on hogs go way down * * *
But your bocan's a dollar a pound.
Chickens so cheap
They won't pay for their keep * * *
Very few chickens to be found.
(And look at the price per pound.)
This economy seems hard to control,
Many a hardship has never been told.
It's either too much, or not enough * * *
This is what makes it rough.
The income is not enough * * *
And this really makes it rough.
Now it's your uncle who has the say * * *
Income tax * * * It's time to pay.
Tax is not enough to go around * * *
The answer to this has never been found.

Congressman Horton Praises Linowitz Lecture at Cornell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished constituent and an outstanding American, Sol M. Linowitz, delivered the 1966 Frank Irvine Lecture at Cornell University last month. His talk was entitled "The Obligation To Remain Silent" and admonished those who employ extremes in opposing or supporting controversial issues.

Mr. Linowitz entered the difficult discussion area of freedom of dissent. In this matter that relies so heavily on human conscience, I found his guidelines of honesty, information, and constructiveness very valuable and worthy of respect by would-be dissenters. Too often, I would agree with Mr. Linowitz, dissent is not accompanied by what he aptly terms this "enormous obligation" for responsibility.

In sharing his lecture text with my congressional colleagues, I want to note that Mr. Linowitz is chairman of the board of Xerox Corp., as well as its general counsel. He is a member of President Johnson's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs and Chairman of the State Department's Advisory Committee on International Organizations. He also serves his country as Chairman of the National Committee for International Development, formed under White House auspices to further the advancement of the foreign aid program.

The Obligation To Remain Silent

(By Sol M. Linowitz)

Fourteen years ago, the New York Times made a study of 72 major colleges and universities in the United States. The survey was designed to test the freedom of expression existing in our college communities. The results showed that large numbers of students and professors—uncertain and afraid—were in varying degrees inhibited against speaking out on controversial issues lest they incur social disapproval by doing so.

The New York Times survey merely confirmed what we then all knew: Our higher institutions of learning were in the grip of an intellectual fear and hysteria and were being subjected to a creeping paralysis of thought and speech. Students and teachers alike were huddling together as terrified members of a new league of frightened men and women.

This was, of course, the time of the McCarthy era in our country. Driven by doubt and uncertainty, the Nation was gripped by a peculiar sort of irrationality. One man through the offices of his congressional committee had gained such notoriety and was pursuing his goals so zealously that a cornerstone of American justice—the presumption of innocence—was being threatened, not so much by the man himself as by those who recognized the danger and yet remained silent.

During that period I wrote two articles for the American Bar Association Journal. In the first one, called "War for Men's Minds," I said this:

"The bitterly distressing fact is that precisely in the area * * * where our strength is and must be greatest, we have been sapping away at our own resources. Men of great lung and muscle power in this country, off base and off balance, have sought to equate scholarship and intellectualism with disloyalty. By attack and inuendo, new ideas and free operations of the mind have been made suspect. The word 'intellectual' has become the rallying cry of the bully in our society. And men and women of learning, alarmed by the fierceness of the chase and feeling themselves abandoned by the American people, have scurried for spiritual air raid shelter rather than stand their ground."

I went on to say that I thought we failed as a people and a nation when we became "frightened and unnerved by whispers and shadows; when we assumed that eternal vigilance requires that we become vigilantes; * * * whenever we acted as though we really believed that the best way to prove you are not red or pink is to act yellow."

The other article I called "The Obligation Not To Remain Silent." In it I tried to sum up some of my concern about McCarthyism in these words:

"Posterity will judge us not by the few who sought to despoil freedom, but by what the rest of us said and did or left unsaid and undone when words and actions were called for—by our courage and our posture—by our willingness to stand up and speak truth in the bright light rather than cower half-hidden and silent in the shadows."

Looking back over the years since then and the distance we have come from the dusk of the McCarthy era, I want to speak tonight on what I regard a correlative obligation which is today fully as important and, indeed, far more pressing. I have called it "The Obligation To Remain Silent."

There is a curious irony, by the way, in one of the aspects of the problem with which I shall deal: During the same month in 1954 when I was urging wider dissent in America, 19 nations were meeting in Geneva and nearing an accord that would extract France from Indochina and, hopefully, establish stability in Vietnam and throughout southeast Asia.

In so brief a time the issue—for me—seems to have come full circle.

Anyone who chooses a subject suggesting the imposition of silence has to make some disclaimers and offer some assurances at the outset—and I hereby do so: I am more fully and deeply convinced than ever that freedom of expression is basic to our democratic process in this country. I recognize that it is a vital ingredient in the development of an informed public opinion, as an aid to arriving at an intelligent choice, and as a way of presenting an occasion for such choice. I share Justice Holmes' confidence in "competition of the market" as the "best test of truth"; and I believe with John Milton that we should let "truth and falsehood grapple; whoever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?" I know too, as Learned Hand wrote, that: "The interest protected by the first amendment * * * presupposes that right conclusions are more likely to be gathered out of a multitude of tongues than through any kind of authoritative selection. To many this is, and always will be, folly; but we have staked upon it our all."

Accordingly, to suggest that freedom of expression be curtailed or limited in any respect is a responsibility not to be undertaken lightly. It is not sufficient that there may be a slight risk of harm or misunderstanding—or merely the possibility that the impact of the words will be detrimental. Considerations must be overriding to call for the imposition of such limitation on the freedoms assured by the first amendment.

It is, of course, true that there exist in the law some restraints on freedom of expression which have evolved in certain circumstances when courts and legislatures have felt that the social value involved in imposing such limitation transcended the importance of free expression. Putting it another way, though the language of the first amendment on its face appears uncompromising, it has become clear that a justifiable restriction in order to serve higher social interests will not be construed as an infringement upon the rights guaranteed by the amendment.

It is, for example, now established that freedom of speech and expression may be subordinated in proper instances to the "right of privacy"; to the power of the Government to suppress seditious speech or writing; and to the laws of libel and slander: And perhaps it would be relevant to look at each of these briefly.

Ever since Samuel Warren and Louis Brandeis pieced together their article on "The Right of Privacy" in the Harvard Law Review in 1890 maintaining that there should be recognition of such a right, courts have accorded it legal recognition and have been willing to invoke legal prohibitions and remedies to protect it.

One recognized limitation on the right of free expression, therefore, is that it does not encompass the right to make a public disclosure of private facts where such facts would be offensive and objectionable to a reasonable man of ordinary sensibilities. In this State, as a matter of fact, the right of privacy has been made statutory; and the courts have enforced section 51 of the civil rights law to prohibit the use of a person's name or picture in a story or article about him which is highly fictionalized or with which he has no logical connection.

A second limitation—the right of the Government to impose a restraint on seditious speech or writing—is, of course, well established. The security of the Nation has always been a major consideration in determining the legal limits of free expression. Today, title 18, section 2388 of the United States Code embodies the Espionage Act of 1917 and sets forth as punishable offenses: "(1) Whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully make or convey false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies; (2) Whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully cause or attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny or refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States; or (3) shall willfully obstruct the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service or of the United States." The classic words of Justice Holmes in *Schenck* v. *United States* are both relevant and timely:

"The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting 'fire' in a theater and causing a panic * * *. The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about substantive evil. When a nation is at war, many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight, and that no court could regard them as protected by any constitutional right. It seems to be admitted that if an actual obstruction of the recruiting service were proved, liability for words that produced that effect might be enforced."

A third area of limitation is that of libel and slander. For we have traditionally recognized that freedom of expression does not extend to defaming another or to uttering untruths detrimental to his character.

Other existing limitations are similarly familiar—such as the legal prohibition against obscenity even though the meaning of obscenity is itself at least evasive.

Underlying the legal restraints on the freedom of expression is the basic recognition that the freedom of expression, freedom of speech, freedom of press must be viewed in the broader context of national interest and social effect—and this imposes in certain circumstances and under certain conditions an obligation to remain silent.

It is against this backdrop that I propose to examine with you two rather unrelated areas of present concern where, I submit, freedom of expression should today be tempered by an obligation to remain silent.

The first aspect involves disclosure of information learned in the high councils of Government or in relationships at high levels where public interest is great. The issue has recently arisen in various forms. There have been books and articles about President Kennedy and his months in the White House. There have been magazine revelations of a conversation which Adlai Stevenson held with a television commentator just before his death in which matters of great national significance were discussed long after midnight. There has been the Fanfani affair in which, by publishing a report about a "peace feeler" from North Vietnam, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch may have affected the progress of preliminary peace negotiations and contributed to the later resignation of Mr. Fanfani as Italian Foreign Minister.

Admittedly, each of these situations poses its own particular problems and raises its own particular questions. But there is, I suggest, a common and fundamental concern: It is whether there is not in all these cases an obligation to remain silent if there is danger that publication may adversely affect the national interest.

In the case of the press—whether it be newspaper, magazine, television, or radio—I suggest that the limitation can only be self-discipline and self-imposed restraint; not because—as Warren and Brandeis made clear—the freedom of the press is or should be untouchable; but because a free press and "the people's right to know" should not be tinkered with easily. But the press must also accept its full responsibility: When the choice is between increased circulation and national interest, there must be no question where the press stands.

Thus, in the case of a newspaper alerted to a story about a "peace feeler" and knowing that deeply sensitive negotiations may be affected by disclosure, the national interest, I submit, would require that it refrain from publication until such time as the facts can be made known with accuracy and safety. When a commentator and a magazine report some of Adlai Stevenson's statements about Vietnam when his death has made it impossible to be certain of his precise words, their implications and context, national interest, I suggest, calls for decent hesitancy before rushing a commentator's recollections into print. The press would do well to write large on its walls the wisdom of Lord Acton, who said in his lecture on the study of history some 70 years ago:

"If in our uncertainty, we must often err, it may be sometimes better to risk excess in rigor than in indulgence, for then at least we do no injury by loss of principle."

A second phase of this problem involves the obligation to remain silent incumbent on those who have served in high governmental office and are able to publish memoirs based on access to private and confidential discussions. There has always been a widespread interest in "inside" stories about famous people; and the interest has been deep and intense in the case of President Kennedy. Those who served under him are in a position to bear personal witness to discussions and decisions, some of the highest national importance. The asserted justification for their publication is that these things occurred and the people are entitled to know the facts. But, I submit, that does not go to the heart of the matter. The real question is not merely whether something transpired, but if and when it should properly be made known. Whether or not to exercise freedom of disclosure under the broad blanket of "the people's right to know" must be weighed against the consequences of such disclosure; and when the revelations relate to matters affecting national concern, every word, every implication, every nuance becomes meaningful and the accuracy of the reporter's recollection crucial. Moreover, if there is a danger that such disclosures may stifle freedom of discussion among high Government officials for fear of subsequent "interpretive" revelation, then the national interest will indeed be ill served.

It is both true and ironic in this connection that in private enterprise the employer-employee relationship imposes a well-established and enforceable burden prohibiting the employee from divulging confidential information acquired during the course of his employment. This responsibility properly delineated extends beyond the term of a man's actual employment. Moreover, this obligation is imposed whether or not there is a specific provision in the employment contract requiring the employee to retain such trade secrets in confidence.

Is it not appropriate to suggest that a similar limitation should apply to those who serve in our high Government councils and who may thereby become privy to matters of confidence and highest consequence?

I would think that a Presidential directive might be issued specifically setting forth limitations with reference to disclosure of information acquired during the course of such Government service. This might, for example, provide that such memoirs not be published until a certain period of time has passed following termination of governmental service—or perhaps until those directly involved in the disclosures are no longer serving the Government. This would gain perspective for the writers and historians who are seeking to capture it. Certainly, no facts will be lost and perhaps a few more remembered.

However the problem is approached, it seems to me clear that the obligation to remain silent should not in this instance be left to whim, to interpretation or to individual judgment. What is at stake is of concern not only to our leaders but to all of us as a Nation and deserves our thought and attention.

I now want to turn to a second problem which is far more perplexing and disturbing—the problem of the Vietnam protest movement. It is here that "the obligation to remain silent" has, it seems to me, found its most disturbing and even agonizing challenge.

Let me begin by restating my full recognition and total support for the principle of freedom of dissent; and my awareness—as I indicated during the McCarthy era—that if the time should ever come in this country when our right to dissent were to be placed in jeopardy, then our American body politic and our fundamental institutions would be eaten from within by a malignancy far worse than anything we could encounter in Vietnam.

I also recognize that our history and tradition have long upheld the right of those who have wanted to speak out against what they regarded as an unjust war. We have done honor to men such as Thoreau who preferred jail to paying taxes in support of a war he thought iniquitous; and to James Russell Lowell, who put his opposition into the poetry spoken by his Hosea Biglow.

During the Philippine War of 1899—as Prof. Henry Steele Commager has reminded us—the United States threw her military might into defeating what was called an insurrection and there erupted in this country an excited outburst of protest and opposition among intellectuals and others. This was the war about which the poet William Vaughn Moody wrote in his poem "To A Soldier Fallen in the Philippines":

"Let him never dream that his bullets scream
  Went wide of its island mark
 Home to the heart of his darling land
  Where she stumbled and sinned in the
   dark."

This kind of opposition has also been familiar in other instances where some have felt our Nation "stumbled and sinned in the dark."

While I, therefore, recognize the importance of preserving the freedom of dissent even in time of war, I submit that we must not be led astray by semantics. As a matter of fact, the freedom of dissent presents a most difficult dilemma precisely because it is such an easy freedom to exercise in the name of liberty. But dissent merely for the sake of dissent is not and has never been the same as a solution; eloquence for the sake of eloquence—no matter how brilliant or soaring—may be not only irrelevant but harmful. The fact is that the freedom of dissent—like all other freedoms—encompasses limitations of responsibility; and responsible freedom is distinguishable from license by the reasonable restraints and self-discipline imposed upon it.

Thus those who, in the case of Vietnam, recognize the enormous obligation which accompanies responsible dissent—to be as informed as possible, to be as honest as possible, to be as realistic as possible, to be as positive and constructive as possible—are making immense contributions in fulfillment of the highest role of citizenship in a democracy. Their views are entitled to be heard with both respect and gratitude.

But what does concern me are the dissenters whose protests lack responsibile thought and direction. To the dead American killed on this very day 9,000 miles away—whose wristwatch still ticks off hours that no longer have meaning—such dissent can be nothing less than a lasting injustice.

I am not concerned about the relative few who consciously break Federal law by burning their draft cards or who fly Vietcong flags beneath the Washington Monument. If they disturb me at all, it is only bceause of the attention they receive in the press. Nor am I concerned about the handful who on this campus and elsewhere raise money to send to the Vietcong. They may be—as the recent editorial in the Cornell Law Forum pointed out—violating the Federal statute which forbids any citizen from dealing with any foreign government with intent to influence the conduct of that government in relation to a dispute or controversy with the United States. If so, they are subject to the penalty of law.

But none of them, in my judgment, is any more typical of the heart of the Vietnam protest movement than are those who carry red gasoline cans and offer free matches are typical of general American opinion. Both approaches are as alien to America as they are to each other. The draft card burner and his colleagues are neither cowardly nor courageous. Those who assault them are neither patriotic nor anti-American. Both groups are just sadly and profoundly wrong.

The real problem involving the Vietnamese protests has far broader implications. It arises when, on this campus and elsewhere, thoughtful people who are respected leaders in their fields, and recognized as men and women of integrity and conscience, confuse protest with involvement and concern with understanding in expressing their dissent.

All of us are, for example, moved and saddened by the deaths of innocent people in Vietnamese villages. But tragically there is no exit in war through which the innocent can escape dying with the guilty; there is no bullet which sees only the soldier and not the civilian—no bomb which distinguishes between an adult and an infant. Innocent people also died in England during the blitz, in the fire storms of Dresden, in the Congolese blood bath, in the bitterness of battles on the Indian-Pakistani borders.

Therefore, to protest against the death of innocent people in Vietnam is not truly a protest against the American position in Vietnam. It is rather a protest against war itself—against any war waged by any nation at any time in any place. It is a protest against the ultimate senselessness of mutual and voluntary human destruction.

It, therefore, denigrates reason to make the death of blameless people in Vietnam the sole responsibility of the United States without recognizing that the Vietcong and Hanoi are at this very moment also killing the innocent. Their machines of war do not—as far as I know—possess the enviable judgment either to kill only the deserving or to maim only the guilty. The final irony is that those in this country who protest on this score direct their protests against the one nation which has zealously tried to alter the direction away from war—our own. Can we really believe that injustice and inhumanity will stop if the United States simply withdraws from Vietnam? Should we remind ourselves of forgotten places like Mongolia and Tibet? Should we ask whether Cuban prisons are filled only with felons? Of if the guns carried by Vopos at the Berlin Wall are just props in some grand charade?

To speak up responsibility about Vietnam today calls for far more than slogans and marches and banners. It calls for weighing all aspects carefully and thoughtfully. It requires taking into account the fact that today in Vietnam—behind the battlelines and the headlines—we are trying to create the conditions of freedom for a people who have never known it; that even as men die in South Vietnam, schools are being erected, children are being given libraries, hospitals are going up, agricultural methods are being improved, new roads are being put in. It calls for recognizing that during the past 5 years the United States has built 4,682 classrooms, set up 12,000 village health clinics, established 700 factories; that in 1965 alone we provided 7 million textbooks.

Those who believe our withdrawal from South Vietnam today will advance the cause of peace and freedom must ask: Will we truly be furthering either peace or freedom by abandoning the people of Vietnam? Or will we be relegating them—and possibly the people of all Asia—to a darkness in which dissent is never heard and in which free choice is never granted? And it is especially right and fitting that these questions should be asked at our colleges and universities where the cries for withdrawal are so insistently heard.

At the outset of this lecture, I mentioned the fear which stalked the American campus 13 or 14 years ago and imposed a blanket of silence on faculty and students. Happily today freedom of expression and the freedom of dissent are widely asserted. But it is at a university—above all other places—that we have a right to expect the measured and the rational course rather than the emotional and impetuous one. For a major charge placed on a college and university is not only to stimulate concern, not only to encourage the expression of individual views, but also to convey true understanding of the importance of forming judgments with care and clarity on the basis of relevant facts, and to contribute positive alternatives based on those facts. And it is in the formation of such judgments that one must carefully weight the question of when there is an obligation to speak out and when to remain silent.

John Masefield in a few words set forth the role of a university in times such as these and in dealing with issues such as this one:

"It (a university) is a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see; where seekers and learners alike, banded together in the search for knowledge, will honor thought in all its finer ways, will welcome thinkers in distress or in exile, will uphold ever the dignity of thought and learning and will exact standards in these things * * *. In these days of broken frontiers and collapsing values, when the dams are down and the floods are making misery, when every future looks somewhat grim and every ancient foothold has become something of a quagmire, wherever a university stands, it stands and shines; wherever it exists, the free minds of men, urged on to full and fair enquiry, may still bring wisdom into human affairs."

Shortcomings of Public Law 89–10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked Mr. Robert Norman's permission to print his letter in the CONRESSIONAL RECORD because I feel it demonstrates a basic weakness in the fabric of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as it was passed last year. The problems he points up would be eliminated if we could change to a system of broad grants to States without strings attached.

The letter follows:

FARIBAULT PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Faribault, Minn., March 1, 1966.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: Because the present session of Congress will wish to evaluate title I of Public Law 89–10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I wish to make some personal observations to you on the effect of this law upon the public schools of Minnesota.

In this State, there are some school districts that have established excellent school systems. Taxpayers have been willing to support educational programs that attempt to meet the needs of all pupils. Other school districts, in order to save tax money, have neglected their schools, Public Law 89–10 favors the school districts that have not been willing to support good schools. With the help of Federal funds, they are able to establish educational programs that other schools districts have been supporting locally. Programs already in existence are not eligible for Federal school aid under Public Law 89–10.

Minnesota has a number of small weak high school districts that should be reorganized into larger units. The effects of Public Law 89–10 is that it encourages the weak school districts to resist reorganization more than ever. Even with additional Federal funds to help educationally deprived children in these districts, the students in small school districts will be cheated out of an adequate education.

Although Public Law 89–10 was not intended to provide general Federal school aid, it actually is a general aid bill because over 90 percent of the school districts in the United States are eligible to receive funds. The worst feature of the law is the Federal redtape and interference in local school affairs in its administration.

It is unfortunate that this legislation was passed and its administration established without the advice and assistance of experienced, professional public school administrators.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT H. NORMAN,
Superintendent of Schools.

Save the Children Federation: Helping the Poor To Fight Poverty—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Save the Children Federation is to be commended by all of us for its role in helping our less fortunate citizens to help themselves in dignity. Today I submit part III, the conclusion of the story of SCF, for publication in the RECORD.

Child-family-community sponsorships are the fastest growing overseas program administered by the Save the Children Federation. With several of these concentrated in one locale, trained Federation fieldworkers can guide a central cooperative program for mutual improvement. Thirty such sponsorships offered by an American corporation have helped the Greek village of Pentapolis turn into a thriving poultry center where increased family incomes offer greater support for the schools and better health facilities.

Near Seoul, Korea, 22 sponsorships helped to reclaim a wasted river basin for fertile farms for 33 refugees who were also supplied with farming tools, improved potato seed and fertilizer as they resettled their families. That even one self-help sponsorship can affect community improvement was demonstrated in the Lebanese village of A'na. Not only did it provide medical aid and clothing for a child, but it also sparked a youth club to organise the first town library which now serves 250 school children.

Programs for economic aid abroad are not new, but what makes the work of Save the Children Federation unique is the person-to-person power for social renewal—bringing not only material rewards but also that intangible sense of "community." Personal involvement of a sponsor with the child and family he is helping plays a vital role in kindling new concepts of self-worth and in strengthening the family's resolve to achieve full self-support. In giving a personal service to needy people where they live, trained workers of the federation help them to direct their own resources more effectively and sustain them during the difficult period of change. Cheered by the personal interest of these federation friends, deprived people find direction for moving ahead to the mainstream of progress. The federation's sponsorship program, widening respect and mutual understanding between peoples, is building a foundation for world fellowship and prosperity.

In the poverty pockets of our own country federation self-help activities show victims of poverty how to avail themselves of unexpended personal resources and how to use them effectively to wage their own campaign against poverty. In the Appalachian hamlet of Lower Mill Creek stood nine splintery shacks. The men and their families who lived there yearned for safe weatherproof homes, but stoically endured these conditions because they had no money and could see no way to change. The federation worker showed them that it could be done. First, the men worked out a budget for each house; next, they worked out a plan for the number of man-days each one could give to their housing project. With a small interest-free loan from the federation they went to work. They placed a foundation under one house, covered five houses with weatherboard, nailed down flooring, hammered sheetrock, installed windows and screens, and painted the whole. Then the wives got busy making curtains and spreads.

The families of Lower Mill Creek have begun to believe in themselves. When people can see their own efforts reflected in a project that brings them new security, they recognize their greater worth, and the knowledge that hitherto unemployed time and labor have an unsuspected value restores self-respect and inspires further initiative.

In like manner hundreds of Appalachian school committees have worked together to improve the schools for their children. Through self-help projects they are installing electricity, running water and toilets; clearing playgrounds; and equipping school kitchens.

Experience gained in the practice of self-help makes a positive impact on the ability and willingness of deprived people to involve themselves in the national antipoverty work. As federation workers help rural communities to organize, formulate, and submit their own plans for improvement, they are enlisting the poor in their own cause, equipping them with technical knowledge, and sending them forth to fight their own battles.

Through his tribute to the federation's clothing program, the President commends an organization which has always given first consideration to the human side of poverty as it recognizes the deprived person's dignity and desire for self-fulfillment and as it invites private individuals to make a personal response to the social challenge of reconstructing a better world for children and all humanity.

Restore Budget Cuts in Special Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the deletion of $82 million in the special milk program, as proposed in the President's budget, would effect a drastic curtailment of this program. Many areas of the Nation have expressed concern over this segment of the proposed 1966–67 budget. This cut would, in effcet, emasculate a program designed to promote sound nutritional benefit to school children throughout the Nation.

In my own State of New York for example, the far-reaching impact of such an unwise cut would affect 4,020 schools participating in the special milk program. New York State's allocation would be reduced by an estimated $8.6 million.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide for a permanent special milk program and to insure that school children receive top priority in distribution of dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

A Most Unusual Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Fred C. Atchley of Sevierville, Tenn., is an outstanding and beloved member of the Tennessee Legislature, representing Sevier, Jefferson, and Cocke Counties.

In a recent article by Willard Yarbrough, roving reporter and staff writer for the Knoxville News-Sentinel, State Representative Atchley was described as "a most unusual legislator," and well-deserved praise was heaped upon him.

I would like to insert this fine tribute to my good friend at this point in the RECORD, and I am honored to add my own appreciation and commendations to those expressed in this biography.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, Mar. 6, 1966]

A MOST UNUSUAL LEGISLATOR: REPRESENTATIVE FRED C. ATCHLEY ENJOYS DOING HIS BEST FOR EVERYONE

(By Willard Yarbrough)

SEVIERVILLE, TENN.—Tennessee's most unusual legislator must be Fred C. Atchley, of Sevierville.

Representative Atchley is a full-time member of the house, keeps office hours 6 days a week at his own headquarters in the Sevier County Courthouse.

The 5-foot, 5½-inch bundle of energy, his once flaming red hair turning not grey but dark, radiates contentment in his unpaid dukedom. When a Sevier Countian doesn't know what else to do about a problem, big or little, he goes to Fred Atchley.

"Fred never promises anything to anybody," said veteran lawyer George Allen, secretary to the county election commission. "His stock answer is: 'I'll do the best I can for you.' "

His "best" is done for at least a dozen troubled people weekdays and twice that many on Saturdays when farmfolk come to town. He's usually in his first floor office, name on door, at 8:30 a.m. until 6 p.m., doing business when the courthouse is otherwise empty and silent.

He'll be in Nashville starting March 14 for the special session called by Gov. Frank Clement.

GETS THINGS DONE

Atchley's political invincibility—he has more Republican seniority in the legislature than any other member and is outranked in tenure only by Democrat Representative James H. Cummings—is traceable to his devotion to all comers in Sevier, Jefferson, and Cocke Counties, his third district.

"He's a Republican at home," said Allen, "and a Democrat when he goes over the mountain to Nashville. He gets things done for his district and the people."

Some time ago a woman seeking parole for her imprisoned son met a lawyer in Atchley's office. She asked the lawyer what he would charge her, and he replied his fee would be $100. "How much will I owe you?" she asked Atchley, who is said to have replied: "You and your family paid me long ago. You've been good to me. I charge nothing."

OWNED A ROLLING STORE

Atchley can afford to give his time and his car only because he has a comfortable income from rental property and investments over the years. He started out in native Catlettsburg community, better known as Cobtown, near Kodak, with a general store and the once-familiar rolling stores on wheels.

His trips into town fired his ambitions and his visits to the courthouse quickened his political zest. He's invested in and sold such businesses as insurance, automobile agencies, and supermarkets.

His trusting nature, soon after his Sevierville arrival, taught him something about life in town. Allen tells the story:

"A 10-year-old lad came into his supermarket one day with a big duck under his arm, and asked Fred to buy it.

"As Fred weighed the duck, the boy said he had more he wanted to sell. Fred wanted to know why he didn't bring all of them at once and the lad explained he couldn't carry but one at a time.

"So Fred bought five of the boy's ducks, each time having him turn the duck into the chicken pen out back. A woman huckster, selling at the old Market House in Knoxville, came by and asked for ducks.

"Fred, licking his lips with prospect of a quick profit, went out back to get the ducks. He saw the boy reaching in for a duck. Then Fred learned his lesson. The boy had sold Fred one duck five times and was about to sell it to him again."

Atchley admitted he had been duped but said he and the crafty duckboy today were fast friends and still laugh about the incident.

ROOMED WITH GRACIE

Atchley's sense of humor bounces him along. Even Mrs. Atchley, a popular school music teacher here, has learned to appreciate his special brand.

He kept talking about his legislative roommate at Nashville, so Mrs. Atchley paid him a surprise visit one weekend. She found some Atchley cronies with him in the hotel room.

Fred looked up and said: "Why, Mom, what are you doing here?" Mrs. Atchley said, "I just blurted out: 'Where's this Gracie you say you've been rooming with?'

"And Representative George Gracey stood up and introduced himself."

"Mom" hasn't been remotely jealous since, and has become tolerant too toward her husband's perpetual politicking. Ask why, she replied: "Well, I now can see what he's doing to help so many people. So I've decided I should share him with those people he does so much to help."

IN RADIO, REAL ESTATE

Atchley won't admit to more than 39. His age isn't recorded at Nashville. Won't even say how long he's been married. But he can't deny that his daughters, Mrs. Carolyn Marshall of Sevierville and Mrs. Charlotte Crutchfield, Dalton, Ga., have long since gone from home. The Atchleys have five grandchildren.

Atchley is now WSEV radio board chairman, is former president of the 5,000-watt station. He's president of Citizens Real Estate & Loan Co., and the Sevier County Fair Association, has served on the chamber of commerce committee that sparked the expanding industrial park here. He's been Lions Club president, and has headed the Sevier County High School Boosters Club. He and Mrs. Atchley are to be found regularly in the Baptist Church pews.

He has three farms, two at Pigeon Forge and one at Kodak. He owns rental houses and business properties, and doesn't have to do a thing.

Recently the Sevier County Republican convention heaped praise on him with a resolution, telling about his 16-year service in the legislature and acknowledging that he could have any Republican office he might even choose in Sevier County. Lest anyone worry, however, he's happy just being a member of the Tennessee House.

HE'S A LITTLE EMBARRASSED

While sitting in the house one day reading his mail, Atchley heard his name mentioned. Rep. Burnett Bush, Chestnut Hill, representing the same territory, got unanimous approval of a resolution that named a new State bridge on Highway 66 here "The Fred C. Atchley Bridge." Senator Roy Crawford, Maryville, passed it in the Senate. The surprise actually embarrassed the naturally-red faced wonder from Cobtown.

Actually, the business speculator (that's a grade higher than East Tennessee muleskinner) was embarrassed about this story. When he learned the writer was gathering information from his friends, he capitulated in his office.

"I enjoy keeping this office open," he said. "I just get a kick out of helping people."

When election day dawns he long since has done his campaigning from day-to-day doings.

At 6 p.m., three youngsters stuck their heads into his office and asked for Coke change, laying a quarter on his table. Atchley made the change, then shoved the boys' last quarter back to them. A few years from now those boys will be voters, too.

Voter Registration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I feel that one of the most important developments toward perfecting the democratic process in the United States in recent years was the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and subsequent efforts in the direction of universal registration to vote.

My own State of California has always been a leader in attempts to bring as many persons to the polls to vote as possible. I am currently sponsoring a registration drive in my own district and I am sending the following message to each household in the district:

DEAR FRIEND: As your Congressman, it is my duty to urge you to take part in determining the future of America. Register to vote if you are not now registered. Congress has expressed its intent that every citizen should vote. Remember, you are responsible for the quality of your elected officials. Deadline to register to vote in the June 7 primary is April 14.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
Member of Congress.

YOU MUST REGISTER BY APRIL 14

If you: 1. Have not registered in California before; 2. Have moved, changed your name legally, or wish to change your political party affiliation; 3. Failed to vote in the November 1964 general election.

Registration headquarters: 4304 Brooklyn Avenue, East Los Angeles, phone: 263-9383; 4408 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, phone: 666-5442.

Drive chairman: Well-known East Los Angeles civic leader Richard M. Calderon.

You can register at all fire stations, city halls, many markets, registrar of voters office (808 North Spring Street, Los Angeles) or call headquarters for information.

The National Water Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Water Commission Act."

THE NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is established the National Water Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members, who shall be appointed by the President. Members shall serve at the pleasure of the President. No member of the Commission shall, during his period of service on the Commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or retired civilian employee of the United States.

(c) The President shall designate a Chairman of the Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman") from among its members.

(d) Members of the Commission may each be compensated at the rate of $100 for each day such member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission. Each member shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The Commission shall have an Executive Director, who shall be appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the President and shall be compensated at the rate provided by law for Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The Executive Director shall have such duties and responsibilities as the Chairman may assign.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall (1) review present and anticipated national water resource problems, making such projections of water requirements as may be necessary and identifying alternative ways of meeting these requirements—giving consideration, among other things, to conservation and more efficient use of existing supplies, increased usability by reduction of pollution, innovations to encourage the highest economic use of water, interbasin transfers, and technological advances such as desalting and waste water purification and reuse; (2) consider economic and social consequeunces of water resource development, including, for example, the impact of water resource development on regional economic growth, on institutional arrangements, and on aesthetic values affecting the quality of life of the American people; and (3) advise on such specific water resource matters as may be referred to it by the President and the Water Resources Council.

(b) The Commission shall consult with the Water Resources Council regarding its studies and shall furnish its proposed reports and recommendations to the Council for review and comment. The Commission shall submit to the President such interim and final reports as it deems appropriate, and the Council shall submit to the President its views on the Commission's reports. The President shall transmit the Commission's final report to the Congress together with such comments and recommendations for legislation as he deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission shall terminate not later than five years from the effective date of this Act.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949; as amended: *Provided,* That not to exceed five persons may be employed an their compensation fixed at salaries not in excess of GS-18, without regard to such laws; (5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (6) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; (7) enter into contracts or agreements for studies and surveys with public and private organizations and transfer funds to Federal agencies and river basin commissions created pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act to carry out such aspects of the Commission's functions as the Commission determines can best be carried out in that manner; and (8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with an reasonably required to perform its functions under this title.

(b) Any member of the Commission is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE CHAIRMAN

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to general policies adopted by the Commission, the Chairman shall be the chief executive of the Commission and shall exercise its executive and administrative powers as set forth in section 4(a)(2) through section 4(a)(8).

(b) The Chiarman may make such provision as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the preformance of any of his executive and administrative functions by the Executive Director or other personnel of the Commission.

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall, to the extent practicable, utilize the services of the Federal water resource agencies.

(b) Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal department or agency or river basin commission created pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act is authorized (1) to furnish to the Commission, to the extent permitted by law and within the limits of available funds, including funds transferred for that purpose pursuant to section 4(a)(7) of this Act, such information as may be necessary for carrying out it functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with this Commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(c) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services: *Provided,* That the regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46e) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: and *Provided further,* That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Modern-Day Changes in Small, Rural Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable study and discussion given these days to the future status of small towns and rural communities across America. I personally beleive that small rural communities will gain in importance in the years ahead. They will not die as some have predicted. Many already are taking on new life. In fact, we can expect to see more industrial and commercial-type rural development in these areas. Agriculture, too, will grow in importance and acreage controls will have to be relaxed to meet the food needs of a growing population.

Mr. Larry Marcellus, editor of the McPherson County, Kans., News and the Inman, Kans., News, has written a column which intelligently presents the problems facing the rural Kansas community and, at the same time, points out how they can be met.

The column follows:

MODERN-DAY CHANGES IN SMALL, RURAL COMMUNITIES

(By Larry Marcellus)

In this modern day and age we find our society constantly changing. Modernizing, if you please.

One of the more notable changes is that of the small town or rural community. So few of our small, rural communities are accepting these modern-day changes and remain on a static basis. Many don't want to go to the expense of dressing up their main streets. Many don't want to bother about curbing and guttering the residential area. It's even a struggle for many to go to the expense and bother of installing sanitary facilities on a townwide basis.

Traveling over the State a person can see which are the progressive rural communities. Hesston is a fine example in point.

With the Hesston Manufacturing Co. and the Excel Manufacturing Co. located there, Hesston, as a town, pretty well had to pull their bootstraps up and progress. If not, the town as such would go backward while these companies continued to go forward. In other words, Hesston's citizens were going to be left in the dust if they didn't want to keep up with a couple of progressive companies.

Apparently this is what is needed in many rural Kansas small town. Simply one person or organization who will go ahead with progressive plans regardless of the thoughts of the conservative element who are content with the way it was done back in grandpa's day.

Some of our progressive looking rural towns started looking up when a developer—local or otherwise—started building a new house or two. This in itself will start a progressive thinking running through rural towns. Soon there are new houses springing up all over, and the old houses with five rooms and a path are soon coming down. Close by we have Moundridge, Buhler, and Assaria as examples. Where these were at one time farm centers, they are now referred to as bedroom communities. Communities where people live who work in larger centers.

This is the trend all over Kansas, and we're happy to see it. Recently there was a paper to come out of Kansas University which in effect stated that the small farm town in Kansas was on its way out. The opinion at that time was that such a town was drying up and blowing away. Not so. Not so long as there is at least one individual in such a town who will put his best foot forward and start a progressive movement regardless of the guffaws and criticism he will receive.

In larger centers—centers of several thousand rather than several hundred, there are enough progressive thinking people to overcome the conservative element who fight progress and the changing times. The little towns have a fight when they buck up against their neighbor. They have to live a little closer than those of the larger centers. Fighting for a change in a small town is like fighting within the family.

We feel these progressive changes will eventually come to the rural Kansas community. The change is moving in, but on a pretty slow scale. Many a farm center of yesterday is still clinging to the belief that the farm population isn't dwindling at a very rapid rate. Others are slowly realizing this, and still others have fully accepted this fact and are on the forward move to save their town and their name.

These are the ones who will keep Kansas the great State she is.

Exit Little David

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the labor movement has lost a great champion in the retirement of David Dubinsky who headed the International Ladies Garment Workers Union for 34 years.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. Dubinsky for many years. His wise counsel and leadership will be sorely missed, but his retirement is well deserved and I wish him an abundance of health and happiness in the years to come.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the March 19 Washington Evening Star, entitled "Exit Little David":

EXIT LITTLE DAVID

With the retirement of David Dubinsky from the labor movement after 34 stormy, colorful years, American unionism will lose an articulate spokesman.

Little David, born Dobenievski in Poland 74 years ago, took over the racket-ridden International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union back in the twenties and made it honest. He helped bring stability to a chaotic industery. But more than this, he devised highly original welfare programs for members and farflung charities financed by union funds.

The ILGWU built an orphanage in China, a trade school in France, lent huge sums to Israel, supported a Boys' Town in Italy. Simultaneously it helped rescue its own members from the garment district's notorious sweat shops, negotiated decent hours and pay, all the while pursuing a militant anti-Communist policy under the Dubinski leadership.

It is probably true that Federal programs such as medicare and social security have made many of the garament workers' social experiments seem quaint and dated today. The union's proud showpiece in the Poconos, Unity House, no longer throbs with the political reformist fervor of old. Union recreation programs must compete with a score of outside diversions for members' attention. A consumer economy has shared its blessings with garment worker and blurred Old World class distinctions.

But Dave Dubinsky was part of the elemental force that brought such change. Given the appalling conditions of the garment indusetry when he first came to power, with workers an easy prey for syndicalists and Marxist radicals, his leadership showed remarkable restraint.

Dubinski, in fact, was a conservative—in the most meaningful and truest sense of all.

Distinguished Flying Cross Awarded to Chief Warrant Officer Richard D. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I am continually impressed by the courage and dedication of the men and women serving in our Armed Forces in Vietnam. Today I would like to bring to the attention of the House the achievement of CWO Richard D. Miller, a career Army officer now living in Frederick, Md.

Chief Miller has recently been awarded one of the Nation's highest military honors, the Distinguished Flying Cross, for his heroism in rescuing two wounded men under heavy enemy fire during a battle last year near Pleiku. To accomplish his mission, Chief Miller, a helicopter pilot, had to land his craft in a small area on the side of a hill despite heavy ground fire, remain there while a wounded American Special Forces sergeant and a wounded Vietnamese captain were lifted aboard, and then take off to safety through mortar fire.

For another exploit near Plei Me, Chief Miller has been awarded the Vietnamese Cross of Valor with Palm by the South Vietnamese Government.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot fully express the gratitude we owe to brave men like Chief Miller and countless other career officers and men of our Armed Forces. Besides serving with extraordinary bravery on the battlefields of Vietnam, they have borne a large share of the burden of instructing and training other Americans in the defense of our Nation. Almost a year in Vietnam, Chief Miller is about to move with his wife and daughter to Fort Rucker, Alabama, where he will continue his work as a flight instructor.

I wish to extend my congratulations and sincere best wishes to CWO Richard D. Miller, and to include in the RECORD the following article from the Frederick News of Saturday, March 5:

WINS DFC MEDAL: FREDERICK AVIATOR CITED FOR HEROISM

(By Marie Howell)

A Frederick Army officer's heroism during a Vietnam medical evacuation mission last year has earned him one of the Nation's highest military honors.

Although CWO (W–3) Richard D. Miller sees his heroism as "part of my job," President Johnson recently awarded Miller the Distinguished Flying Cross for his rescue of two wounded men during a battle near Pleiku.

Miller, a helicopter pilot, was on the evacuation mission at the Duc Co Special Forces Camp. "I was No. 4 of 5 ships," he said, "and the first three went to the airstrip which was under siege." Miller's helicopter along with the fifth aircraft was sent to rescue an Army Special Forces sergeant and a Vietnamese captain who had been wounded.

Although the fifth ship "had to break off" because of ground fire, Miller managed to bring his helicopter to the landing zone. When he could not land normally, Miller placed his front skids between two stumps on the side of a hill until the wounded men could be placed aboard. Then, amidst mortar fire, he lifted his aircraft to safety.

"The area was small and there was an intermingling of friendly and enemy gunfire," Miller explained. "We didn't know if we were receiving gunfire from the enemy or from our gun ships * * * we couldn't tell."

A career officer with 15 years of service, Miller pointed out that he had been under heavy fire before this engagement. "The only thing I was worried about this time was crashing," he said with a smile.

Quick to give credit to his air cover, Miller pointed out that "it was worse for the gun ships * * * they're the unsung heroes."

Neither he nor his attractive wife Ruth were aware that he had been nominated for the Distinguished Flying Cross.

"People heard about it on the radio and called," she smiled.

In addition to this award, Miller also received the Vietnamese Cross of Valor with Palm from the South Vietnamese Government. What he describes "as another military action," near Plei Me earned him this award.

The Army officer, who returned home Monday after almost a year in Vietnam, has logged "a little over 3,500 total helicopter flying hours * * * and a little over 80 hours of combat duty." He has received the Air Medal with 16 clusters for his service.

During his stay in Vietnam, Miller said the Vietnamese people's concern for their children "impressed me the most." Whenever there was any danger, he said, "the first thing the Vietnamese in Saigon did was look for their children."

Although the Millers have been married for 12 years, the past year was the first time they had been separated. While her husband was away, Mrs. Miller and the couple's 4½-year-old daughter, Dee, lived at their Taney Court home with the family dog, Ludwig.

Around the first part of April the family will move to Fort Rucker, Ala., where Miller will serve as a flight instructor. Prior to his departure for Vietnam, Miller was stationed at the Army Aviation School at Fort Rucker.

Since he's been home, Miller admits he's had some trouble getting acclimated to the time change. "There's a difference of about 11 hours between here and Vietnam," he explained with a grin.

The Millers have made no definite plans on what they will do before leaving for Alabama. "We just have day to day plans," he joked.

Miller, who says he likes the service, pointed out that his group worked a 7-day week while they were in Vietnam. "The taxpayers are getting their money's worth," he added.

How did he and his men feel about the anti-Vietnam demonstrations? "Some people didn't like it * * * but it's one of the rights and we're over there to protect individual rights," he explained.

Budget Bureau Limitations Threaten Cutback in SCS Watershed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House action taken by the Bureau of the Budget which, unless reversed, will be extremely harmful to future operations of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service watershed program.

The Budget Bureau, I have learned, has imposed upon SCS severe limitations for fiscal year 1967 sharply curtailing the number of approvals which can be made for both planning and construction of watershed projects.

In addition, and despite the lack of any authorization from the Congress, the Budget Bureau also has placed a limitation on the number of watershed planning approvals for fiscal year 1966.

If the Budget Bureau's limitations remain in effect, the results will be as follows:

For the remainder of fiscal year 1966, SCS will be able to approve planning for only eight additional watersheds.

For all of fiscal year 1967 SCS will be restricted to providing planning for 50 watersheds and approving the actual construction of only 35 projects.

In comparision with the past operation of the watershed program, these limitations are extremely severe. For example, from fiscal year 1963 through 1965, SCS has made an annual average of 114 planning approvals and 62 construction approvals.

Thus, if the Budget Bureau's limitations for fiscal year 1967 are not removed, the scope of the present watershed program will be virtually cut in half.

The most immediate problem, however, is the Budget Bureau's limitation on watershed planning for the current fiscal year. This limitation, covering the entire fiscal year 1966, restricts SCS to providing planning for 100 watersheds.

Thus far in fiscal year 1966, SCS has given approval to planning for 92 projects. If similar assistance can be provided for only another eight watersheds before June 30, SCS will be faced with a heavy backlog of planning requests.

At present, SCS has pending 47 such requests. Included is one from my home State of Iowa, asking planning assistance for the Carter Creek watershed in Davis and Appanoose Counties. Almost certainly, more planning requests will reach SCS before the current fiscal year ends.

In my view, these planning limitations for fiscal year 1966 are unfair, both to SCS and to the local people who are awaiting approval of watershed planning requests, and I feel very strongly that the Budget Bureau should remove them.

The limitations on SCS, both for the current and the coming fiscal year, were imposed only about 2 months ago. They appear in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967, sent to the Congress on January 24, as estimates.

These estimates, however, are in fact hard and fast limitations, and SCS is working with the knowledge that the estimates cannot be exceeded. But even though the Budget Bureau has imposed the limitations, it has, to the best of my knowledge, offered no explanation for them to SCS.

If the planning limitations for fiscal year 1966 remain in effect, it will be grossly unfair to the people on the local level who have spent a great deal of time and effort reaching agreement on the watershed planning requests now pending with SCS.

Preparation for a SCS watershed project requires an enormous amount of local cooperation, perhaps more than in any other Federal program. It requires coordination between farmers in the watershed, State and local conservation officials, and personnel in the State SCS headquarters.

Thus, by the time a watershed planning request reaches SCS in Washington, it represents perhaps a year or more, and sometimes several years, of preliminary planning and cooperation among State and local officials.

If SCS cannot approve more than eight additional planning requests during the remainder of this fiscal year, the probable result is that many of the proposed watershed projects will never reach the planning stage.

The danger of this is all the more acute, of course, if the even more restrictive Budget Bureau limitations for fiscal year 1967 are kept in force.

If this should happen, and if many of these watersheds never reach the planning stage, then much of the efforts toward cooperation and preliminary planning on the local level will have been spent in vain.

In fairness to those who have invested so much time and effort in these proposed watershed projects, the Budget Bureau should lift its planning limitations for the current fiscal year.

This will allow SCS to approve a reasonable number of planning requests before June 30, unhampered by an arbitrary and unrealistic limitation. If a local watershed merits planning approval, SCS should be allowed to provide that approval.

In addition, I think it is essential that the severe Budget Bureau limitations on planning and construction for fiscal year 1967 should be removed.

If the Budget Bureau itself does not do so, then I believe the Congress should spell out, in language accompanying the SCS appropriations for next fiscal year, that these limitations shall not remain in effect.

Unless they are removed, serious damage will be done to a time-proven program which has provided valuable benefits to rural America.

Since 1954, when Congress enacted the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, rural residents have been able to utilize SCS assistance for construction of watersheds in many areas across the Nation.

These watersheds have provided much-needed measures for soil and water conservation, as well as for flood control. Moreover, SCS now provides assistance for recreational development at watershed projects, and this can be a big help in promoting economic growth in some rural areas.

The Congress now has before it proposed legislation to establish new programs for both conservation and rural redevelopment. Continued efforts in these areas are, of course, much to be desired.

In my view, however, it makes no sense at all to propose new programs for conservation and rural redevelopment and, at the same time, sharply curtail the highly effective and widely supported SCS watershed program.

Personally, I do not believe that it is the intent of the Congress that the watershed program should suffer a severe cutback, and I am therefore hopeful that the Budget Bureau limitations on SCS will be lifted.

Questionnaire in Missouri's Ninth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we of the 89th Congress can be justifiably proud of our record achievements during the 1st session, but many weighty decisions must still be made on domestivc and foreign issues before this session ends.

In an effort to sound the sentiment and gain the advice of my constituents on a number of our more controversial measures and the more pressing issues facing us at this time, I issued a questionnaire at random throughout the Ninth District. I think the results will be of great interest to my colleagues and request permission to reprint the results following:

1. Do you approve of our Government's policy in Vietnam? Yes (1,507), no (900), undecided (135).

a. Would you favor withdrawal of troops from Vietnam, leaving the area to Vietcong? Yes (424), no (1,938), undecided (175).

b. Would you favor extending the war with widespread bombings and additional troop commitments? Yes (1,577), no (693), undecided (275).

2. Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations? Yes (671), no (1,712), undecided (153).

3. Is the poverty program effective in your area? Yes (395), no (1,195), undecided (948).

4. Do you favor expanding coverage of fair labor standards and minimum wage laws to farm workers, restaurant, motel, and filling station employees? Yes (1,759), no (657), undecided (126).

5. Would you favor an increase in congressional terms from 2 to 4 years? Yes (1,389), no (1,189), undecided (66).

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the executive director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has brought to my attention an outstanding speech by Mary Beth Anania on the subject "Democracy: What It Means to Me."

Miss Anania was one of five winners of a scholarship award in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies' auxiliary. Miss Anania currently lives in Japan and was brought to Washington for the final judging as guest of the VFW.

I have been so impressed by this brief and splendid statement of our national ideals and our democratic heritage that under the leave to extend my remarks I am including Miss Anania's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may come to the attention of my colleagues and all those who read the record of our proceedings. Her speech follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Mary Beth Anania)

In election years emphatic posters cover the cities, towns and countryside of America and urgent speeches are given over radio and television and in public gatherings. Each party vehemently supports its candidates and its platform. The courses they advocate may differ, but they all have a common goal: it is democracy.

"Democracy." The cry goes up, and is echoed in Maine, Louisiana, Iowa, Oregon, and in every united State.

A politician proclaims his belief in, and support of, democracy, and the voters support him. But what is this ideal, so desirable and so powerful it is written across a nation in boldface type?

Representative democracy is Americanism. It is more than being born within the borders of the United States and more than having American parents. It is having, and believing in, the democratic ideals of freedom, equality, justice and humanity. It is feeling the obligation of citizenship to uphold these ideals. It is realizing that the success or the failure of democracy depends on you, the American citizen, regardless of your race, sex, color, or creed. Americanism is living by those ideals, and defending them, whether with words or with bullets.

The defense of the United States has been met in the past by Americans. Not all our defenders were born American, but they believed so strongly in the democratic ideals that they were willing to sacrifice of themselves to insure democracy's safekeeping.

Will our generation be able to do the same? Will we, the future leaders of America, assume the qualities, physical, mental, and moral, which have protected her in the past? Do we believe in this democratic republic, the United States of America? America is our Nation, democracy our heritage. We are tomorrow's responsible Americans, tomorrow's defenders of democracy. Can we fulfill our obligation?

Yes, we can. If we believe our "one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all" is the ideal nation, and if we are willing to protect our democratic heritage, we are ready to take up the challenge of democracy.

Let us, then, shout to the world this meaning-filled portion, of our American creed: "I believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

To do less is to deny our right to the privilege of being American.

Oversea School Improvements Needed, House Group Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of a Special Education Subcommittee which visited a number of American oversea schools last winter, I have taken a special interest in the educational facilities which are offered to the children of U.S. servicemen and other Government employees who are stationed overseas. In the past few days, I have introduced two bills which are designed to correct some of the inequities and problems which this committee uncovered on our trip. A more comprehensive bill, to overhaul the entire overseas educational program, is now being prepared.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the overseas school situation should be brought to the attention of all my colleagues, and I recommend to them an article which appeared in the March 23 edition of the Army Times. This article spells out some of the major problem areas as outlined by our committee, which was headed by my good friend, Congressman JOHN DENT, of Pennsylvania. I will have this article reprinted as part of the RECORD.

OVERSEA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED, HOUSE GROUP REPORTS

(By a Times staff writer)

WASHINGTON.—Many of the schools for children of U.S. servicemen overseas are giving a "highly questionable" education in overcrowded classrooms that often lack textbooks. That is the conclusion of a special House education subcommittee that visited 18 areas all over the world on a 34-day trip. The subcommittee, headed by Representative JOHN H. DENT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, reported that dependent schools operated by the Defense Department range from "excellent to deplorable," and "much could be done to improve the system."

The 7,100 U.S. teachers in the school system have been engaged in a running battle with the Defense Department over the last few years, claiming that they are underpaid and are not given the necessary facilities, equipment, and textbooks. The dispute grew so bitter that in 1964 there was talk of a teachers' strike, and a pay raise was nearing final action in Congress last week.

In effect, the Dent subcommittee report agreed with the teachers, who are responsible for the education of 165,000 children in 327 schools around the world. Defense spends $79 million a year to operate the equivalent of the ninth largest school district in the United States.

The Dent report spelled out eight major problem areas.

They are:

Poor administration. The Army is responsible for all schools in Europe, the Navy in the Atlantic, and the Air Force in the Pacific. But each base operates its own school. Thus there are many cases where a military service is responsible for the academic work without having the operating authority.

For example, said the committee, Forrest Sherman High School in Naples, Italy, is for children of Navy people, is funded by the Navy, but the Army is in charge of academic administration because Naples is in the European zone of academic administration.

Said the committee: "It was felt that this arrangement was responsible for many of the ills found in the Department of Defense schools."

Poor facilities and a lack of equipment and supplies. The report said this was "the most disturbing" observation—supplies are inadequate, notably textbooks. Some science textbooks are 10 years old, and 1 sixth grade science class had 6 books for 35 children. This class was housed in the attic of a converted barracks with no convenient sanitary facilities.

The Dent group blamed administrators for the textbook shortage, saying such shortages "existed for at least one class in every school."

The group found that few buildings actually were constructed for school use, and "even the most common types of writing paper and pencils are not always easily obtainable."

Teacher pay is insufficient. Teachers start at $4,835 per year, a figure which the report said "is not unreasonable" considering other benefits. However, said the report, "it is unreasonable when it is realized that the pay scale does not recognize more than 2 years of prior experience * * * and does not recognize exceptional qualifications." Top pay is $6,615.

Teacher morale, said the report, "was found to be not generally good." It said teachers are frustrated because of poor supplies and equipment and because of some alleged poor administrators.

Overcrowded classrooms. Defense maintains a 25 to 1 pupil-teacher ratio on the average, but some classrooms have a few as 10 students and "instances were common" where 35 to 40 were in 1 inadequate room. In many instances the report said, there are "classes of such size as to constitute an urgent problem."

Because of a lack of funds, there are no speech therapists, specialists in teaching slow learners, or experts in art, music, and library.

Cultural exchange. "The schools seem to operate removed from all foreign influences," the report said. Most of the schools do not even offer the language of the host country as a regular academic course.

Lack of uniformity. The Army provides kindergartens in many schools through nonappropriated funds. The Air Force and Navy require parents to pay tuition. School quality ranges from "excellent" to "deplorable." The committee found "severe discrepancies in curriculum, textbooks, and teacher ability."

No participation in Federal education programs. The schools don't even take part in the Federal school lunch program.

Not enough money. "The committee learned that additional funds have been requested by school administrators in the Department of Defense schools," the report said, "but that these requests somehow become diffused at the higher levels." It predicted that Congress would readily respond to a request for more money.

The probers offered several suggestions, after visiting schools at Wake Island, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, Hong Kong, Bangkok, New Delhi, Athens, Wiesbaden, Heidelberg, Frankfurt, Berlin, Rome, Naples, Madrid, Paris, and Newfoundland.

They recommended that the schools be unified under the Secretary of Defense, to be organized as a single system, with the schools having a separate item in the Defense Department's budget each year. They suggested that the local military base retain control over the physical plant and logistical and other support functions.

The report urged that salaries be made equal to those paid in U.S. cities of 100,000 population, which is the effect of the bill nearing enactment last week. It recommended better recognition of long service and advanced degrees, as most school systems do in the United States.

It called for additional teachers to cut down the size of large classes, some running as much as 35 to 40 students per teacher. It also called for hiring such specialists as remedial reading experts, speech therapists, and guidance counselors.

It also called on the teachers and administrators to modernize the education program, to make more use of modern teaching aids and to present new ideas and test new methods. The report said most of the dependent high schools are geared to a college prep program, and they should offer more vocational and business training. And it called for more effort to take advantage of local culture. "Many schools," the report said, "seem to operate in a vacuum, culturally unaware of their surroundings."

It called for raising the $455-per-pupil limit, pointing out that while this figure might seem reasonable in a stateside school system, it does not allow for the many unusual expenses found in overseas schools.

The Dent report concluded that the committee "was not unfavorably impressed by the education offered—given the circumstances of the situation." But it added: "The education can very definitely be improved, however, and indeed, it must be improved."

Members of Dent's subcommittee were Democratic Representatives Augustus F. Hawkins, of California, William D. Ford, of Michigan, and Patsy Mink, of Hawaii, and Republicans William Ayres, of Ohio, and David Martin, of Nebraska.

Oversea Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, during the last session Congress authorized the Subcommittee on Special Education to travel out of the country on an inspection tour of the DOD oversea schools.

I am happy to note from the attached news item that Hon. William D. Ford, of Michigan, a member of our committee has been putting into action plans developed on the trip to better our DOD school system.

The committee has submitted a report which should be read by all Members of Congress.

In this session members of this subcommittee will be introducing more legislation designed to erase certain inequities in the operation of these schools.

Congressman Ford's effort is the first in this direction and hits a practice that is eminently unfair to the parents of children of high school age who must travel far from home to attend a boarding high school in France. While the attached article does not cover this particular bill it does give a thumbnail analysis of the most serious problems found by the subcommittee.

The article follows:

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, Mar. 6, 1966]

American Oversea Schools Target of Representative William Ford

(By Paul A. Miltich)

Washington.—A little fellow who swings a lot of weight for a freshman, Michigan's Representative William D. Ford, is indignant over what he calls "the second-class education" being given many American children overseas.

As member of a House Education Subcommittee, the Taylor Democrat late last year took a first-hand look at Defense Department and private schools for American youngsters throughout the world.

Now armed with information the group gathered, Ford is determined to force an upgrading of those overseas schools which do not pass muster.

He says his subcommittee soon will come up with a bill aimed at improving the overseas schools—legislation which will give Lynn M. Bartlett, former Michigan superintendent of public instruction, a lever for administrative changes. Bartlett is the Defense Department's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education.

The overseas schools are attended by about 180,000 children and range from "excellent to deplorable," in the view of Ford and other investigating Congressmen.

Ford, the other committeemen, and Bartlett agree that the solution—and one that may not be easy to come by—is more money.

The Udall-Hartke bill now pending in Congress would cost $3.2 million for a full year and would provide overseas teachers with a $430 salary boost this year. Ford happily says that a most conservative member of the House Education and Labor Committee, Representative Dave Martin, Republican, of Nebraska, favors a sizable pay boost for the overseas teachers.

A big obstacle in efforts to increase overseas teachers' salaries and recruit better and more stable personnel has been the Defense Department's method of financing the schools.

The formula has been a per pupil cost limitation—the same for elementary and high school students. The figure now is $455 per student, which is supposed to cover teacher transportation and housing allowances as well as other administrative expenses.

Said Ford: "I think the biggest weakness we've got in these schools is the civilian administrators. They're not qualified people for the most part. They're not the kind of superintendents who would readily be hired in Michigan, for instance.

"The jobs don't pay enough, but the lines of responsibility are so nebulous that these administrators can avoid responsibility.

"In case after case, we (visiting Congressmen) observed glaring deficiencies where the administrators told us they didn't exist.

"We walked into school after school and found old social studies books—for instance, a 1953 reprint of a book published in 1951. This is what they're using to teach these kids. Think of all the things that have happened since 1951.

"They might impress an appropriations committee by saying a high percentage of their kids go on to college, but the kids are high caliber to begin with and the truth is they're being short-changed on their education.

"This sort of thing causes career men to leave the service rather than subject their children to a second-class education."

Some of the overseas schools are private schools run by civilian parents of American children—usually State Department people.

"This is the country club set," Ford said. "If the child of a military man attends, we pay tuition of about $400 per pupil, in some cases $600 or even $900, as in Rome. Although this American school is expensive, it's considered by some of the military to be substandard educationally."

Bartlett and the Defense Department have nothing to do with running these private schools except to work out a kind of cooperative arrangement where military dependents are involved.

"What we've got now in our system of schools for military dependents and children of American civilians assigned overseas is an expedient answer that has continued for 20 years," Ford said. "We've got to bring order to this chaotic situation."

The contrast between the schools is best illustrated by the private school in Rome, where the tuition for a military dependent is $900 a year, and the Defense Department school in Naples.

Ford described the American school in Rome as "high quality" and the military-run school in Naples as "a mess" because there just isn't enough money to operate it properly.

"If we gave the commanding officer in Naples $900 per pupil to run his school, he'd have a good school, too," Ford said.

The Defense Department's overseas schools now are under three administrative setups—European theater, run by the Army; Atlantic, under the Navy, and Pacific, the Air Force.

Ford and Bartlett say there should be a "single manager" system for all the overseas schools.

Ford also urged separate and independent budgeting for the overseas schools, so Congress will know just how the money is being spent.

He strongly backs the Udall-Hartke bill, which would set overseas teacher salaries at the level of teachers in stateside school districts of 100,000 or more.

The investigating committee, in a report now being printed, calls for sufficient funds to bring all the overseas schools for American children up to date and to keep them "current in terms of present-day needs and in light of recent educational research and development."

Bureaucracy at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Congress today to an incredible situation which graphically illustrates the cross purposes, conflicts, and injustices resulting from big, centralized government.

According to reports published in recent days, American GI's wounded in Vietnam are being denied free cigarettes because of a ban imposed by the Surgeon General's office.

To correct this situation I intend to introduce a resolution to express the support of Congress for groups and individuals wishing to donate free cigarettes to our servicemen wounded in Vietnam.

In order that the Congress understand the situation I am providing for the Record recent stories from the Muncie (Ind.) Star, the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, and the Greenfield (Ind.) Daily Reporter.

The articles and editorials follow:

[From the Greenfield (Ind.) Daily Reporter, Mar. 17, 1966]

Bureaucracy at Work

It has recently been disclosed that there is a present rule in effect in Government servicemen's and veteran hospitals under which patients must buy their own cigarettes. It is not permitted that kindhearted people, visitors and the like can give the smokes to be distributed to those who want them.

It is presumed the rule is a development of the recent health campaign against the use of cigarettes because of a possible link between smoking them and the development of lung cancer and other physical ailments.

We're neither for or against cigarette smoking. We see the hospital rule as aside from the point. No doubt if a patient is going to smoke, he will smoke, irrespective of the rule of the hospitals. The critical point is an exhibition of attitude.

To us it is clearly a matter of "the lady doth protest too much, methinks." It's all out of proportion.

We take young men, without their consent if need be, away from their normal life, train them, ship them 7,000 miles and put them in a jungle or swamp, to be shot at or step on a landmine. Then, if they survive the ordeal, forbid them to be given cigarettes while they're in a hospital.

Which would you think was the most dangerous coming at you—a Vietcong rifle bullet or a Camel?

For that matter, many more people are killed each year from automotive accidents than die of all types of cancers attributable to smoking cigarettes, yet we have not heard it seriously proposed to restrict automobiles by law or put a sign on them from the manufacturer to the effect that they may be potentially dangerous to health.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star]

Cigarettes for Our Wounded

We hear from our Columnist Alice Widener that she is being swamped with letters from Indiana, and the rest of the country, about her column revealing that Vietnam amputees in Walter Reed Hospital have to buy their own cigarettes, because of a ruling by the Surgeon General's Office.

The ruling, based on the idea that cigarettes may be harmful to health, prohibits the Red Cross, or any like agency, from giving free cigarettes to wounded veterans in hospitals. So they have to buy them themselves.

Some of the letters, all of which were angry and indignant, generously enclosed checks and cash. Mrs. Widener cannot accept the checks or money to buy cigarettes for the wounded men. She was even unable to spend her own money for the purpose while at the hospital. So she will have to return the money and checks to the very generous senders.

The real outrage here is that there is no agency in the country that can provide free cigarettes for these men who fought in Vietnam. It is no use sending money to the Red Cross or American Legion or USO or any like organization as long as the ruling still holds—as long as Congress allows it to hold.

So if you want to make it possible for free cigarettes to go to the amputees, the wounded and suffering men from Vietnam, the only remedy seems to be through Congress. Write your Congressmen and Senators and tell them to insist that this asinine and unfeeling ruling be lifted. Once that is done, we are certain, one or many organizations will be ready to distribute free cigarettes to our wounded in hospitals all over the country.

Do it today.

[From the Muncie (Ind.) Star, Mar 17, 1966]

This Is Asinine

Although the order has been in effect for 2 years, it comes as a shock that there's an official ban against providing free cigarettes to American servicemen and to patients in military and veterans hospitals.

The delayed reaction doubtless stems from the fact that the ban went into effect at a time which was relatively quiet as far as military action was concerned. The Vietnam war had not yet involved enough Americans in direct action to attract attention. Under these conditions not many free cigarettes were being handed out to servicemen anyway, so the order did not make any spectcular difference.

Now it's different. Now Vietnam has grown into a vicious bloody war involving troops in hundreds of thousands, and the wounded are beginning to come back not by handfuls but by hundreds.

We recognize that there are differences of opinion, on both moral and medical grounds, about the use of cigarettes. But in wartime the cigarette becomes something very special. It's the soldier's friend on lonely outposts. It's a quieting touch when waiting draws nerves tight. It's a spark of comfort when pain tears at his body.

It was the role of cigarettes in two wards full of amputees from the Vietnam war which drew the attention of Alice Widener, a syndicated columnist. She noted the amputees were using cigarettes to soften their yearning for drugs which were available and would depress their pain, but would also slow their recovery.

She offered to help provide supplies of cigarettes. She was told, "No." Cigarettes may be given to an individual, but not just made available generally to the servicemen at a post—or the men in a hospital ward. They can buy cigarettes, but they can't have free supplies.

Cigarettes, you see, "may be injurious to health." The Surgeon General says so.

The Government puts young Americans into the stinking, infested jungles of Vietnam. It exposes them to the bombardment and gunfire of attack, to the murderous boobytraps of terrorists, to sniper's bullets and guerrilla's knives. It puts them where they get arms and legs blown off and suffer other gruesome wounds.

But the Government draws the line at exposing these young Americans to the perils of cigarettes.

This is asinine.

GI Amputees Must Buy Own Cigarettes

(By Alice Widener)

Washington.—Probably the war photo most familiar to civilians around the world is that of a soldier doing the one thing he can to try to comfort a badly wounded buddy—lighting a cigarette and putting it between the suffering man's lips.

This act of mercy has been photographed countless times: in World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam war, on the battlefields, in foxholes, and in hospital wards. During World War II and the Korean war, the U.S. Government officially classified the growing and processing of tobacco as "essential" and gave growers and manufacturers the necessary priorities.

During the Korean war, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, director of Selective Service, ordered deferment of tobacco farmers. Why was this? The best explanation lies in the following true story:

In 1942, the employees at an American aircraft factory collected $10,000 for a donation to the war effort and cabled Gen. Douglas MacArthur to find out what his soldiers needed most. MacArthur replied from the Pacific theater: "The entire amount should be used to purchase American cigarettes which, of all personal comforts, are the most difficult to obtain here."

Today in the Vietnam war our fighting men are forced to buy their own cigarettes. As the result of blue-nosed, prohibitionist pressure by statistics-addicted theorists in the Surgeon General's Office and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare asserting cigarette smoking may be hazardous to health, Dr. Shirley C. Fisk, Deputy Assistant Secretary (health and medical) to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, announced on January 30, 1964, a ban on free cigarettes to patients in military hospitals. Dr. Fisk did not ban individual purchase or use.

What this means to our GI's must be seen to be believed. I saw it in Walter Reed Army Hospital's wards 34 and 35, where every bed in block-long rows is occupied by a young amputee. Without a single exception, the Vietnam-war amputees smoke cigarettes. In ward 34, the amputees are convalescing. In ward 35, the 46 young amputees still are in the gravely ill stage. They use cigarettes to keep "the thing" going.

What is "the thing"?

"Pain pills are chicken." This is the way these young amputees express their almost superhuman self-control in not taking the painkilling drugs to which they are entitled under doctor's orders. They understand the fact that indulgence in the pain pills acts as a depressant and thus retards their recovery. A horribly wounded stoic sergeant is setting the present example of "the thing" to his fellow patients. He has not taken a single pain pill, though his suffering is beyond description.

The other wounded GI's are trying hard to live up to his example. Instead of taking a pain pill, the sergeant and the other amputees puff cigarettes. To witness "the thing" is to see the most heroic and most pitiful drama.

Fellow Americans, these young war amputees have to pay for their own cigarettes. Did you ever hear the like of it? Did you ever hear of anything more outrageous? No Red Cross volunteer worker is permitted to give these amputees—most of them only 18, 19, and 20 years old—a free pack of cigarettes. They must buy their own at 19 cents a pack from the post exchange.

On one bed in ward 35, there is a 19-year-old amputee who lost both arms at the elbow and a leg. Next to him is an amputee who lost both legs. The legless boy manages to get to the edge of his bed, lights a cigarette, and puts it between the lips of the armless amputee.

There is another legless amputee, a Negro, who, though suffering intensely, has managed to invent traction weights for his stumps so that he can sit in a wheelchair and propel himself from patient to patient in ward 35. He wheels himself around, stopping at beds to light cigarettes for patients, to put them out, to empty ash trays, to say a cheery word.

Believe it or not, neither the American Legion nor any other organization, and not even a private American citizen, can give money for free cigarettes for soldiers to the Red Cross or Salvation Army or military administrative offices—not for free cigarettes in hospitals, on the battlefields, or anywhere else.

This is an outrage. It can be halted only by an aroused, furiously angry public.

South and Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the excerpt from the Official Report of the House of Commons, dated Tuesday, February 8, 1966, should be extremely interesting to my colleagues here in the House of Representatives. Primarily, it consists of a speech by the Honorable Philip Noel-Baker, Member of Parliament, and is an excellent analysis of the Vietnam situation.

Mr. Noel-Baker, in addition to being a Member of Parliament, was the 1959 Nobel Peace Prize winner. In 1945 he became Minister of State and was a member of the first British delegation to the United Nations. Later he became Secretary of State for Air, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, and Minister of Fuel and Power. His book "The Arms Race," a comprehensive analysis of the case for disarmament, was published in 1958.

I recommend the following extract to my colleagues:

SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Speech by Mr. Philip Noel-Baker, Member of Palliament in the House of Commons, Tuesday, February 8, 1966, an extract from the official report.)

Mr. PHILIP NOEL-BAKER (Derby, South). I must apologize to the House for my voice and for my manners. I have been briefly afflicted by the current malady. I hope that before I have finished my speech my right Honorable friends will not think that it is an attack of Asian flu. I could not speak yesterday and today my doctor tells me that I must leave the Chamber as soon as I sit down.

I will follow the honorable Member for Stratford-on-Avon (Mr. Maude) on the domino theory a little later. I want to begin by saying that I disagree with the view, which is sometimes heard, that the policy of the present Government toward Vietnam has been the same as that of the Tory Party while it held power. I am glad to think that that is quite untrue. I remember often urging on the Tory government that further fighting could never bring a solution to the problem of Vietnam and that Britain's role should be to seek an end by conference. I always received a flat rebuff. I could not find a hint, when I looked up Hansard, from the Government or from the Tory benches that peace by negotiation might be a better plan.

The present Government's line has been quite different. As the Prime Minister has said, they have tried with all their power to get a conference and if there is now a great world debate about Vietnam, if there is a great questioning going on in the United States and if the forces for peace by conference are gaining strength, as I am sure they are, that is due in no small measure to the enlightened work and sustained endeavors of the present Government, and particularly of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary. They have based their policy on the proposition that armed force will not bring a settlement satisfactory to the people of Vietnam or acceptable to Asia. They have urged throughout that every day of war, with the tortures and atrocities committed by both isdes, makes it more difficult to get a just and honorable peace.

I will not enlarge on their record, on the Foreign Secretary's efforts to get Mr. Gromyko to join him in summoning the Geneva conference a year ago, his visit to Washington and his talks with the President of the United States in March, the Prime Minister's talks with the President a little later, the Commonwealth Peace Mission in June, the very striking and important statement in which the Commonwealth Prime Ministers unanimously agreed, the courageous visit of my honorable friend the Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Pensions to Hanoi—and how the opposition scoffed and sneered——

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. NOEL-BAKER. The Foreign Secretary's speech to the United Nations in October, with his detailed, precise, and impartial proposals on how settlement could be found, the Prime Minister's speech to the General Assembly and his talks with the President then.

I do not want to exaggerate the results which my right honorable friends have obtained—other forces have been at work—but it is a fact that the President's speech at Baltimore on April 7, when the first spoke of "unconditional discussions," followed closely on his talks with the Foreign Secretary at the end of March. The President's invitation to U Thant and the member governments of the United Nations, the great change in the U.S. line, his invitation to them to help in getting a conference, came 2 weeks after the Commonwealth Peace Mission was set up. His recent peace offensive, his bombing pause, his reference of the war to the U.N., followed his talks with the Prime Minister and the Assembly speeches of my right honorable friends.

Unfortunately, the Government of Hanoi says that they accept the Geneva settlement of 1954, which we have been urging, but that they are not yet convinced that the U.S. Government sincerely does the same. Perhaps some of them do not want to be convinced. One of their leaders, Le Duan, was commander of the resistance against the French in 1954 in South Vietnam. He had great success. He firmly held a large area of land. He said then that if Ho Chi Minh had taken a stiffer line in Geneva in 1954 he could have got the whole of Vietnam and not just the northern half.

It is said that this Le Duan is still powerful in Hanoi, that he is the man to blame for the hostile or ambiguous responses which come from there. If so, I think that he is wholly wrong. If I may say so in answer to the Prime Minister's observations, I have written to Hanoi several times, in common with some eminent people from other countries, and only last week I said on Moscow radio, hoping that it might reach Hanoi, that anyone who refused a conference now, anyone who allowed the bloody torment of the war to go on, would take a grave responsibility before his fellowmen throughout the world.

I must add in candor that if Le Duan and Ho Chi Minh view the President's peace offensive with caution or with deep suspicion, I am not surprised. I do not share the view of recent Vietnam history which has prevailed in Washington and in some quarters in this country until today—the view that the Geneva conference set up two sovereign states in north and south, and that the 17th parallel was the frontier between them; that 900,000 refugees fled in terror from the horrors of communism in the north and were generously settled by the non-Communist Prime Minister the late Diem in the south; that all went well, that the south prospered and was at peace until the government of Hanoi started their aggressive war, sending troops, supplies and general staff to destroy democratic government in the south and to impose their own tyrannical form of communism on the unwilling people there.

The history has not been at all like that. Before Geneva, while the French were still the government, the Viet Minh had held a large part of South Vietnam. It had acted as a government in areas which it held and the people had not found it a cruel tyrant. Honorable Members know the writings of the Alsop Brothers in the American Press. They are not exactly "Reds." Joseph Alsop toured rural South Vietnam when the Viet Minh were in occupation, before 1954. He wrote as follows:

"I would like to be able to report—I had hoped to be able to report—that in the long slow canal trip to Vinh Binh, in the Mekong Delta, I saw all the signs of misery and oppression that have made my visits to East Germany like nightmare journeys to 1984. But it was not so. At first it was difficult for me, as it is for any Westerner, to conceive of a Communist government genuinely 'serving the people.' I could hardly imagine a Communist government that was also a popular government and almost a democratic government. But this is just the sort of government the Palm-Hut state actually was while the struggle with the French continued."

And he went on:

"The Vietminh could not possibly have carried on the resistance for 1 year, let alone 9 years, without the people's strong, united support."

I am sure that Hanoi believes that this is still true of the Vietcong today. That fact is of immense importance in its thinking now. There are other parts of its thinking arising from history for which many of us do not allow.

The Geneva agreements of 1954 had five main political provisions.

The first was that not later than July, 1956, there should be general elections under international supervision to insure that democratically elected governments should be established in accordance with the people's will in both North and South Vietnam. Second, the agreement said that the 17th parellel should be the provisional boundary between north and south. But it set out in terms that the country was only "temporarily" divided, that the parellel was in no way an internationally recognized frontier. It said this because everyone foresaw that after the elections the two halves of the country might want to reunite.

The third provision was that anyone who desired to do so could move from north to south or south to north; but anyone who stayed, even if in the north he had fought for the French or if in the south he had fought for the Viet Minh, should be granted a full amnesty. His life, his property and his rights were guaranteed by article 14(c) of the Geneva agreement.

The fourth provision was that after the French had left the country, in stages, over a stipulated period of time, no new foreign troops might be brought in, no new bases might be maintained and a limit of 685 was set on the number of military advisers whom its new protectors, the United States might introduce into South Vietnam. Fifth, the agreement laid down that an International Commission of Control should be established, provided, by India, Canada, and Poland. Its task was to insure that all of these various political provisions were faithfully carried out.

I ask the House to consider the Geneva agreement from Hanoi's point of view. Hanoi had stopped fighting after 9 years of ferocious conflict, when victory seemed within its grasp. It gave up a lot of territory which it had firmly held in South Vietnam. It accepted the Commission of Control, in which the non-Communists were 2 to 1. It did this believing that the agreement was an international treaty which the parties would faithfully observe. True, the United States did not sign the declaration endorsing the treaty, but its delegate, Gen. Bedell Smith, gave a pledge that his Government would seek the unity of the country through free elections under international supervision.

What followed? The United States replacing France in Saigon, turned out the Emperor Bao Dai and made the late Mr. Diem President of a Republic instead. It chose Diem on the advice of the CIA. Almost at once Diem made trouble for the Commission of Control. He said that he would not allow it to investigate charges that his agents had violated article 14(c) of the agreement, that is the amnesty for Vietnamese who had favored or helped the Vietminh against the French. In other words, he tore up the solemn guarantees that had been agreed to and defied the Commission to carry out its tasks. The Commission formally reported to the Geneva Conference that, owing to Mr. Diem's obstruction, it was—"No longer able to supervise the implementation of this article by the Government of South Vietnam."

Mr. Maude. I am sure that the right honorable gentleman is aware, and would wish the House to be aware, that the Government of South Vietnam was not a party to those agreements?

Mr. Noel-Baker. There was not a Government of South Vietnam when the treaty was made. There were the French and the Vietminh. The United States had made a declaration that it took note of the agreements and promised to support the elections. After Diem had torn up the article 14(c) and the Commission reported that it could do nothing, he unleashed a reign of terror in the countryside. Thousands of Vietminh supporters were taken to "reeducation centers," 30,000 of them by 1960. Those accused of being active agents of the Vietminh were jailed or shot. It was a shameful betrayal of the treaty pledges and of human rights.

Mr. Maude indicated dissent.

Mr. Noel-Baker. The honorable member shakes his head. Why was the Government of South Vietnam there at all except by virtue of the agreement made in Geneva? Quite apart from the treaty is he defending Diem's violation of the human rights which the treaty had promised?

Mr. Maude. If the right honorable gentleman asks me that I am bound to say that there have been a fair number of violations of human rights in all countries over Asia, not excluding the Communist countries.

Mr. Noel-Baker. Of course, there were grave atrocities by the Vietcong in South Vietnam which, with the Foreign Secretary and all my honorable friends, I deplore, but I am afraid that Diem set them an example.

After that, still in the summer of 1955, Diem allowed or organized—I will not say which—demonstrations against the Geneva agreements, demonstrations in which the hotel which housed the International Commission of Control was burnt to the ground.

In its sixth interim report the Commission said: "The degree of cooperation given by the two parties has not been the same. While the Commission has experienced difficulties in North Vietnam, the major part of the difficulties has arisen in South Vietnam."

Still in 1955, Diem announced that he would not allow the elections—which were the very crux of the bargain on which the Vietminh had agreed to peace a year before—to be held either in July 1956, or ever. Only one explanation has ever been given of this extraordinary decision, supported by the United States, to violate a solemn international pledge. Writing long afterward, President Eisenhower said in his memoirs that 80 percent of the people in South Vietnam would have voted for Ho Chi Minh, who was a national hero. In other words, "Do not let the people's will prevail unless it is on your side. Democracy by all means, provided you win. If that is in doubt, scrub the elections, build up your secret police, and try all-out repression instead." That is precisely what Diem started in to do.

From 1955 to 1959, during the so-called period of peace and progress, Diem terrorized the members of the anti-French resistance; he suppressed the various sects who had opposed him; he drove the Buddhists, a large part of the nation, into very large scale demonstration against his rule. I pass over the gross corruption of his brothers, who shared his power, which is eloquently described by Mr. Dennis Warner, a veteran Australian reporter, and an ardent anti-Communist. I pass over the misuse of American economic aid—$1,000 million—which did less than nothing to help the common people or to aid the national economy.

In April 1960, 18 Vietnamese nobles—all conservatives, some of them ex-ministers, all well known for anticommunism and for their past ties with the French—petitioned Diem to liberalize his regime. According to the New York Times:

"The petition said continued arrests had filled the prisons to overflowing, and asserted that a swollen bureaucracy was corrupt and inefficient. The petitioners warned Diem that his policies would soon give rise to soaring waves of hatred and resentment of a terribly suffering people standing up to break the chains that restrain them."

On November 21 of the same year Diem's elite paratroopers rose in revolt against him. Thousands of civilians joined their march on Diem's palace. After bitter fighting, when 400 men lay dead, Diem remained in power, and he stayed in power until, abandoned by the CIA, his generals murdered him in 1963.

Was it surprising that by the end of 1960 the Vietminh had become the Vietcong, that they concluded that Diem had closed every avenue of political action to them except the use of force, that many non-Communists—intellectuals, professional men, officers, liberal-minded landlords—had joined them? In 1961, a Rand Corp. researcher, who worked with the U.S. Air Force, traveled through Vietcong country. He reported that they were fighting with French, American, or homemade, jungle-made weapons—none from Hanoi or other Communist sources of supply. This man, George Tanham, said: "It is easy, but wrong, to attribute their success solely to terrorist methods."

A French historian, a specialist on Vietnam, Phillippe Devillers, wrote in March 1962, that the Commnuists in the south entered the fight against Diem reluctantly, not on orders from Hanoi or Peiping, but in response to Diem's campaign of terror against the former Vietminh. He wrote:

"The insurrection existed before the Communists decided to take part, and they were simply forced to join in. And even among the Communists, the initiative did not originate in Hanoi but from the grassroots where the people were literally driven to take up arms in self-defense."

Mr. K. Zilliacus (Manchester, Gorton). Is not a very important factor that Diem took from the peasants the land distributed to them by the Vietminh and restored it to the landowners, which set the peasants going?

Mr. Uoel-Baker. Under Western pressure, Diem brought in what he was pleased to call a land reform. The Communist land reform had given all the land to the peasants. Diem's land reform, following Western models, gave a large area to former landlords and made the peasants pay a high price for the land they retained. It was exceptionally unpopular with the peasants who had been as well treated, as they thought, by the Communists.

Mr. Blaker. Is it not a fact that in the 5 years before the reign of terror initiated by the Vietcong about 1959 or 1960 the average rate of growth in food production in South Vietnam was 7 percent a year whereas in North Vietnam food production was falling?

Mr. Noel-Baker. That may well be. The honorable gentleman is always very well informed on matters with which he deals. I have friends who visited both North and South Vietnam who thought that the north was better managed than the south. When a country is in a state of war, or near war, or is recovering from 10 years of ghastly war against the French, as the north was doing, we cannot expect the economic picture to be very rosy.

I think that the facts that I have recited explain the fanatical obstinacy of the Vietcong against vastly superior numbers, as the leader of the opposition said, and against the infinitely superior armaments which they had to face. These facts explain the Hanoi hatred and suspicion and doubts when the Americans declare that they are defending democracy and human rights.

It will not be easy to establish trust after the ruthless cancellation of the elections promised in 1954. It is made still harder by the flat denials from Washington that Hanoi had ever agreed to suggestions for negotiation a year ago, in May, or more recently still. I have here the press conferences of U Thant. I think that the State Department was less than candid with its public and its allies. It is made still harder to establish trust by the State Department's strange white paper of February 8, 1965, which contrived to be both naive and disingenious. It sought to prove that there was no civil war in South Vietnam and that the 17th parallel was a recognized frontier between sovereign states across which North Vietnam was conducting charter-breaking aggression.

I have said all this not to justify the Vietcong or to exculpate Hanoi. I repeat that they are entirely wrong to reject the peace negotiations which the President has proposed. I only wish that he had, as the Times said, kept his pause going a few more weeks and given them a little longer to make up their minds.

I have said what I have today to show the difficulties that we must overcome to get these people to the conference table and the difficulties that we will face when we have got them there. I believe that those difficulties are still further increased by the resumed bombing in North Vietnam. It began a year ago yesterday, on February 7. We were told that it would discourage the Vietcong, check the movement of troops and supplies from north to south, and help to persuade Hanoi to end the war. In those three purposes it failed completely. Indeed, it strengthened the Vietcong, it increased Hanoi's commitment, and it stiffened their resistance, just as Hitler's bombing stiffened our resistance in 1940–41.

I see no reason in logic or experience to believe that the resumed bombing will be more successful now. U.S. generals have testified that the bombing of the trails in Laos has no military value, and anyone who understands bombing and jungle trails will see how likely it is that that is true. No doubt President Johnson sees no reason why bridges, railways, and power stations in North Vietnam should be immune. But I say that if he cares for Asian opinion, if he wants peace and an early conference, as I am sure he does, as a matter of hard political realism he would do much better to call off the bombing.

What else is needed to improve the hope of peace? The Prime Minister spoke about the status of the NLF. I believe that we must do more to clarify what that status is to be. On some days Mr. Rusk says that it is a matter of marginal importance and that, of course, agreement could easily be found once there was a willingness to come to a conference. On other days he says that he deals with governments only and that the NLF is not a government in any way. I sometimes wonder whether, in the realities of political power, the NLF is not quite as much a government in rural South Vietnam as is the militarist junta of Air Vice Marshal Ky, who boasts that Hitler is the man he most admires.

In any case, the NLF has been, is and will remain a major party in the war, and it must be an equal and accepted party in the conference and in the peace. Without it, we can be very certain that there will be no conference and no settlement.

I believe that we must clarify the West's commitment to the Geneva agreement of 1954. Washington repeats that it accepts the essentials of that agreement, but what does that mean? Does it mean what it meant in 1955? Of course, details can be varied, but the essentials of the Geneva documents, as I have described them, are crystal clear, and this time only honest interpretations will suffice.

Would the West take a terrible risk, if it agreed to carry out free elections which brought Ho Chi Minh to power? Honorable members have mentioned Tashkent, but what is the supreme fact about Tashkent? It is that the Soviet Government, instead of trying to create trouble between two neighbors, instead of trying to inflame a war from which they might hope that their Communist Parties in India and Pakistan would profit, took the initiative in securing a great agreement, to which Mr. Kosygin made a contribution second to none.

I call that the supreme fact about Tashkent, and surely it is the supreme proof that the domino theory is nonsense. Of course, much has happened to drive Ho Chi Minh into Chinese arms, but all who know him and his people say that he would follow an independent line and he would be an Asian Tito. In any case, so far as Vietnam is concerned, the domino theory, repeated today by President Johnson is simply nonsense.

I have shown that the war in Vietnam did not start in some deep-laid plan in Moscow or Peiping. I answer the honorable member who raised the point, that its ending, with neutralization of north and south and mutual armament reductions, would bring no threat to Vietnam's neighbors. It is the war itself which is the danger to Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and China. It is sheer illusion to believe that Communist ideas can be destroyed by guns and bombs. As the Prime Minister said today, war creates the misery and chaos in which communism breeds.

Let us end the war and then let us work with Russia and perhaps with China to free the Asian peoples from their ancient enemies of serfdom, usury, ignorance, hunger and disease.

The Wrong Place for Budget Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have made a number of protests recently regarding the administration's proposal to cut the school milk and lunch program to the bone, affecting literally every school district in the Nation.

The following editorial is an excellent example of the kind of thinking that is going on at the local level—the local level that is so often overlooked in Great Society programs—and I hope it draws attention to the fact that people will not tolerate the replacement of sound established programs with new and experimental ones which also give more control to Federal administrators.

The editorial follows:

[From the Albert Lea (Minn.) Evening Tribune, Mar. 17, 1966]

The Wrong Place for Budget Cut

The proposed Federal budget cut in school lunch funds ought to be raising more concern among local taxpayers.

A check with school district 241 officials reveals that during the 1964–65 school year the district received $22,609 in Federal aid for the special milk program. In addition, another $20,151 was allocated for the general school lunch funds. That's more than $42,700 of our money that was returned here.

Now the Johnson administration has ticketed a cutback in funds from $202 million this year to $183,590,000, or almost $19 million. Although it is impossible to know precisely how much this would affect the local situation we believe Superintendent Lorne S. Ward when he says, "It would hurt."

Why cut back what has been a successful program for many years?

The administration says a redirection of funds to needy families is needed and that conditions to other programs are in order.

The local school district is experimenting with titles I and II of the Federal Education Act. We cannot yet properly evaluate the results but we do know that the redtape involved in applying for these programs is unbelievable.

We believe that anyone who says these programs are entirely free of obligation is wrong. School officials have already been told that they are to try and distinguish between the poor and the rich student.

On the other hand it can be said almost without exception that school lunch programs have had very few strings attached over the years.

About 410,000 school lunches are served daily in Minnesota schools. Participation increased by 6.1 percent last year. Some schools supply milk free to the students, others charge a penny, another group charges 2 cents, and 107 other schools charge over 2 cents. The Albert Lea District assesses 2 cents per half pint.

Application of a needs test or poverty test would mean that almost all students would have to pay the full cost of the milk which in Albert Lea is about 5 cents.

Presently, only a very small number of students obtain free lunches because of low family income. About 4 percent of students get meals free but most of these receive them in return for assisting with kitchen or lunch line work.

The present program has proved itself. It is money well spent. Let's keep it that way.

Vietnam: Beware Our Own Rhetoric

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the road to peace, in any conflict between nations, is at best a difficult and tortuous route.

As Ray Price points out in the following column from the March 19, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune, we must be exceedingly careful in our use of language and in any negotiations in which we participate.

Mr. Price's column follows:

Vietnam: Beware Our Own Rhetoric

(By Raymond K. Price, Jr.)

It is time for the United States to consider seriously the dangers of being caught as a prisoner of its own rhetoric on two crucial issues in the Vietnamese confrontation: negotiations and free elections.

Both are useful only as means to an end, not as ends in themselves. Yet the rhetoric has tended to treat them as goals to be pursued in and of themselves.

Certainly, in the abstract, it is far more civilized to negotiate than to fight, to settle differences over a conference table rather than by the cruel means of war. But in practice, negotiations can take on some of the qualities of quicksand. And this is particularly true if one side (which would be ours) has been conditioned to feel that, having begun to negotiate, an agreement has to be reached at whatever price has to be paid.

It should be axiomatic that if a war is worth fighting, the peace is worth winning. There are, of course, those who argue that the Vietnamese war is not worth fighting, and who would readily accept any course—even precipitate withdrawal, and the certain takeover of the south by the north—that would extricate us from it. But these are few.

There are many more, however, who feel uneasily that though we have to fight because we are engaged, we should never have gotten engaged in the first place; who leap at each new suggestion, however tenuous, of a peace feeler; who insist (as Senator FULBRIGHT said to Secretary Rusk) that if we have failed to bring Hanoi to the bargaining table, we, not they, must be doing something wrong. These are the ones from whom the strongest, if not the loudest, pressure for negotiations qua negotiations comes. And these are the ones who, if Hanoi relented and did sit down to negotiate, would probably press for concession after concession by our own side to reach an agreement—any agreement.

So far, we have been saved from possible folly by the stupidity and stubbornness of the enemy, who has not concealed his own demand for total victory. When Hanoi proclaimed as a condition of any talks that the National Liberation Front (a creature of the North Vietnamese Communist apparatus) be recognized as the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam, it was bad public relations but an accurate reflection of Hanoi's war aims.

Suppose, however, Hanoi should decide that it could win more at the conference table than on the battlefield, or even that under cover of negotiations it could gain a military advantage. This is by no means inconceivable. The American build up, the effects of which are only now beginning to be felt, has radically altered the military balance. The Vietcong are hurting; they have not even been able to defend their own strongholds; increasingly, the peasants, no doubt sensing where their own security lies, are cooperating with the Government forces.

If Hanoi should suddenly decide to enter negotiations, the United States would then be faced with a test of will of another sort: whether to stick to its guns, figuratively and perhaps literally, with the prospect of peace dangling in front of its eyes—if only we would reach far enough. And the rhetoric of negotiations has created a climate in which it would be difficult not to overreach; difficult, that is, not to yield the very things we have been fighting for merely because we have been persuaded that there is something sacred about the fact of negotiating.

Free elections pose a comparable problem. The mechanics of election present a staggering enough challenge in a nation torn by guerrilla war, in which the Vietcong have for years practiced wholesale slaughter of selected civilians as a device of political terror, and in which there are no clear fronts behind which the people of one side and the other can be reasonably secure in their persons.

In Vietnam, the problem is complicated by the almost total lack of political sophistication among much of the farflung populace. To suppose that Western parliamentary democracy can be imposed, intact, on a war-torn country alien to its traditions and without its experience, is to suppose the highly unlikely.

Yet elections, like negotiations, has become a propaganda shibboleth, and the danger is that we will lose sight of the vast gulf between our own experience and Vietnamese experience.

Essentially, elections are a means of providing a responsive and responsible government, under which personal liberties can be secure. They can only be meaningful within a framework of legal order which, among other things, provides security against terrorism and the threat of reprisals. One goal of the war is to establish such a framework. Meanwhile, when talking of elections, we should be careful to bear in mind the essential distinction between the electoral process and what it is meant to achieve. Elections held under conditions which might invite their subversion by a skillful and cruelly disciplined Communist apparatus would be of no service to the cause of democracy, or to the Vietnamese people.

Like so many things in this world, the value of both negotiations and elections depends crucially on the conditions under which they are held. The danger is that we will become so firmly committed to holding them, that in order to do so, we will sacrifice the conditions necessary to their success. And if we sacrificed the conditions, we might find ourselves sacrificing South Vietnam.

Cure for the "Credibility Gap"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable Don Rumsfeld, of Illinois, has played a key role in attempting to obtain for all Members of Congress the proper flow of information from the executive branch. Mr. Rumsfeld's persistence is very properly and effectively described in an editorial in the Topeka, Kans., Capital-Journal on March 13 which I am pleased to place in the Record:

Cure for the "Credibility Gap"

For a long time the word "gap" was one associated with geography. There was, for example, the famed Cumberland Gap situated near the point where Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky meet. This structural fault provided a natural passage through the Cumberland mountains. Daniel Boone's road to Kentucky ran through it and encouraged settlers to move west.

Most of our mountain areas have locally-known "Horsethief Gaps" or other names reminiscent of earlier days. We know of one instance where a route through the mountains was called "Bootlegger's Gap" for good reason.

But the modern use of the word "gap" is mostly in a different sense. John F. Kennedy, when campaigning for the presidency, had a lot to say about the "missile gap," which turned out to be something less than a major gap, if it was a gap at all. And now we are concerned with still another gap. This one has become known as the "credibility gap."

The term is derived from the complaint of Washington newsmen, and Members of Congress, that the Johnson administration is not (1) putting out enough information about what it is doing, and (2) coloring the news or its activities to the point where its reports are less than reliable.

There is sometimes a fine line between what a government can safely permit to be known and what it cannot. But the tendency in Washington these days seems to be to manage the news.

This can be damaging to the Nation and its citizens. Editor J. Russell Wiggins of the Washington Post wrote in his book, "Freedom or Secrecy":

"If a government repeatedly resorts to lies in crises where lies seem to serve its best interests, it will one day be unable to employ the truth effectively when truth would serve its interests best. A government that too readily rationalizes its right to lie in a crisis will never lack for lies and crises."

Associated Press newsman Saul Pett, in a recent article on the "Credibility Gap," said there have been lies by the Government in recent years and cited the following:

"In 1960, the government of Dwight D. Eisenhower lied about the U-2 plane shot down over Russia.

"In 1961, through its Ambassador in the United Nations, the government of John F. Kennedy lied about the Bay of Pigs invasion.

"In each case, the deception was posed in a moment of profound national pain. But in neither did the President nor his administration continue to suffer from a lingering doubt about its word.

"The administration of Lyndon B. Johnson has had no single moment as traumatic as the U-2 incident or the Bay of Pigs. It has not been obliged to make public confessions of attempted deception.

"And yet there lingers over Washington today a cloud of doubt—large and gray in the minds of some, small and white in the minds of others."

One doesn't have to look far to find other instances where the present administration has more or less had to be "smoked out" on international developments. There was the peace feeler from Hanoi in 1964 which was concealed until after the death of Adlai Stevenson. There was the case of the prime minister of Singapore who claimed the CIA had offered him a $3.3 million bribe in 1960. The State Department denied it but was forced to admit it when the Singapore minister produced a letter from Secretary Dean Rusk apologizing for the incident.

The optimistic assessments of Secretary McNamara in the early years of the Vietnam war, which turned out to be wrong, didn't help the credibility of the Johnson administration.

And newsmen will not soon forget that Arthur Sylvester, from the McNamara Pentagon, proclaimed the Government's right to lie in emergencies.

President Johnson seems to go to extreme effort to bottle up some of his intended actions which could have no actual bearing on the peace and safety of the country. For instance, he appointed Abe Fortas to succeed Arthur Goldberg on the Supreme Court the day after he said he had not begun to consider Goldberg's successor.

What is the answer to all this jockeying to control the free flow of information?

It lies, we believe, in a measure now pending in Congress called the freedom of information bill. A leading advocate of the bill, which so far has only Senate approval, is Representative Donald Rumsfeld of Illinois. At 33, young Rumsfeld is a member of the House Government Operations Committee and of the Subcommittee on Government Information and Foreign Operations which has held hearings on the bill safeguarding the public's right to know.

Representative Rumsfeld notes that when the House hearings were completed in early 1965, every witness who testified supported the legislation, except for every single witness sent to testify by the President on behalf of the executive branch of the Government.

Rumsfeld realizes that governmental secrecy is nothing new, that it is as old as government.

But, he said in a recent speech:

"The Johnson administration has been particularly skillful and imaginative in its use of secrecy and news manipulation as a protective device. Within the last few years, increased Government secrecy has resulted in a marked loss of confidence by the people in their Government.

"Talk of a 'credibility gap' and 'truth in government' is heard increasingly."

Nobody wants to release information that would be in the class of aid and comfort to the enemy but neither does the public want to be spoon fed political medicine. It would be to the interest of the public if Congress would approve the "freedom of information" bill, which would require the Government to make all public records available to any citizen.

Watershed Projects in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor yesterday to introduce to the Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit a distinguished Idahoan, Mr. DeVon R. Jensen. Mr. Jensen is chairman and director of the Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts; chairman of the watershed committee of that organization; supervisor of the Butte Soil and Water Conservation District; and watermaster of Water District No. 27 of the State of Idaho which includes all drainage of the Big Lost River.

Mr. Jensen's testimony in behalf of watershed projects in Idaho was a most forceful one: Testimony that pointed up the need for such projects in the State, and the difficulty encountered in the past in securing them.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Jensen is to be commended on his testimony and the possible effect it had on members of the subcommittee. It is just possible that his testimony on problems involving similar projects in Idaho played no small part in the approval by the subcommittee yesterday, and by the full committee today, of a similar project in the State of Utah.

It is also my belief that approval of the Utah watershed projects could constitute a breakthrough which will lead to approval of the Idaho projects for which Mr. Jensen spoke so forcefully.

Under leave to include extraneous material, I include Mr. Jensen's statement, which follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am DeVon R. Jensen from Moore, Idaho, a director of the Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts, chairman of the watershed committee of that organization, and a supervisor of the Butte Soil and Water Conservation District. I run and operate an irrigated farm, and I am watermaster of Water District No. 27 of the State of Idaho which includes all drainage of the Big Lost River.

Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared statement for the record.

Gentlemen, I appreciate this opportunity of appearing before such a distinguished group of Congressmen to discuss some of Idaho's watershed problems.

As you gentlemen are aware, Idaho is a public lands State. There are over 34 million acres of Federal land in our 53 million-acre State with approximately 18½ million acres agricultural land and less than 6 million acres of cropland. So, gentlemen, you can see that nearly any watershed work planning would include a substantial area of Federal lands.

There are over 40 watershed applications in Idaho that have not yet been planned.

I had some figures put together for 15 Public Law 566 watershed applications now being investigated—or that probably will be investigated in the next 3 or 4 years. I'm sure these figures will make it very clear that Federal land policies and the position of this committee with respect to Federal land treatment in Public Law 566 projects will affect Idaho's watershed program significantly.

The 15 watershed applications include a total of just over 2,400,000 acres. Almost one-half million acres of national forest land and one-half million acres of public domain administered by the Bureau of Land Management are within these watersheds. Seven of the fifteen include national forests while all but one watershed include public domain. Over 55 percent of these watersheds are privately owned and 41 percent federally owned with the rest in State or Indian ownership.

Land statutes—15 typical watershed applications, State of Idaho

[In acres]

Watershed	Total	National forest	Public domain	Idaho State	Indian	Private
Trail Creek	88,000	42,900	4,058	----------	----------	41,042
Georgetown Creek	30,700	18,670	200	----------	----------	11,830
Sand Creek	185,600	----------	4,800	(1)	423	180,377
Roberts Kettle	187,800	----------	71,990	9,760	----------	106,050
Little Willow	111,900	----------	39,480	4,830	----------	67,590
Bancroft	130,000	----------	19,220	5,930	----------	104,850
South Palouse	97,300	----------	----------	800	----------	96,500
Rock Creek	206,558	26,235	30,064	14,552	1,120	134,687
Minidoka	220,000	----------	29,000	(1)	----------	191,000
Twin Buttes	186,000	----------	49,000	40,000	----------	97,000
Pocatello Valley	71,350	----------	14,630	1,100	----------	55,620
Big Lost River (4)	887,800	410,000	233,000	(1)	----------	244,800
Totals	2,403,008	497,705	495,442	76,972	1,543	1,331,346

[1] Not available.

Of immediate concern to us in Idaho—and particularly to the sponsors—is the Trail Creek Watershed project in Teton County. A first draft plan has been prepared for this project and adopted by over 95 percent of the stockholders of the sponsoring irrigation companies. The village of Victor and the Teton Soil Conservation District, cosponsors, also support this work plan 100 percent. In fact, I know of no opposition. The Bureau of Land Management has agreed to finance the needed land treatment on the 4,000 acres of public domain. The Forest Service reports that they need $162,012 of Public Law 566 funds to finance the required land treatment on about 40,000 acres of the Targhee National Forest. The Forest Service has stated that they are unable to finance this work from other funds available to them. The work proposed for the forest lands includes check dams and gully plugs, contour trenching, contour furrows, and grass seeding.

The Trail Creek work plan would help tremendously to improve the irrigation of 7,200 acres of private land, by converting from irrigation canals and ditches to a buried pipeline with gravity pressure to operate sprinklers for irrigation. Water losses and gravelly soils under their present system are so inefficient that there is not enough water for the crops in the summer and fall.

The project has a very favorable benefit-cost ratio and the 61 family farms involved are very anxious to get this project under construction.

It is our understanding that this project may be held up because of the Forest Service proposal to use Public Law 566 funds for the accelerated land treatment.

The project that interests me probably more than any other is the Big Lost River because I know more about it. It is my home, and part of the country I have lived in for 34 years. It is a part of Idaho's watershed that needs considerable improvement. It encompasses 887,800 acres of which 410,000 acres are Forest Service lands, 233,000 acres BLM land, and 244,800 privately owned lands.

We have submitted four applications under Public Law 566. A preliminary investigation of all four projects was started in 1960. The investigations brought out the fact that the use of surface runoff and of ground water by pumping for irrigation require more knowledge of the ground water.

We have been 5 years since 1961 trying to get the ground water study made.

Finally, beginning July 1 this year, we have agreement whereby the USGS will make a 3-year, $60,000 study. The State of Idaho and our local sponsors will bear half the cost of this study. By 1968, then, we should be ready to go to work and finsh watershed work plans under Public Law 566.

It is my judgment that the Federal lands in the Lost River watershed will need accelerated land treatment—just as the private lands will. My people will be awfully disappointed if we get the ground water study made and watershed work plans completed and then can't get these projects authorized for construction.

I don't know just how this problem can be solved—I do know that the outlook for the small watershed program in Idaho is pretty dim if deserving watershed projects are not planned and authorized for construction because they include Federal land.

At our State convention held at Salmon City, Idaho, November 17, 18, and 19, 1965, the following resolution was adopted:

"RESOLUTION, WATERSHEDS NO. 1

"Whereas Public Law 566 requires proper land use and proper treatment along with structural measures for flood prevention, agricultural water management, and other purposes; and

"Whereas the Watershed Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee refuses to approve watershed projects under Public Law 566 if those projects require the use of Public Law 566 funds for accelerated land treatment of Federal lands; and

"Whereas Idaho is a public land State with more than two-thirds of the total land area in national forest or public domain so that every Public Law 566 project will contain substantial areas of Federal lands in need of proper treatment; and

"Whereas the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management advises that sufficient funds are not available to accomplish the accelerated conservation treatment needed on Federal lands within several projects being planned within the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas these plans have been or are being developed at considerable cost from both Public Law 566 and State of Idaho funds: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the IASCD in convention assembled*, That the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management be requested to secure sufficient funds in their appropriations for specific use in Public Law 566 watersheds to accomplish the planned accelerated program or, that the House Committee on Agriculture permit approval of projects even though Public Law 566 funds would be used for accelerated land treatment on public lands; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Governor Smylie, Regional Forester Floyd Iverson, State Director Joe Fallini, Senate and House Agriculture Committees, Idaho Congressmen, Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, Director of the Budget Bureau, Chief of the Forest Service, Director of Bureau of Land Management, and Administrator of SCS."

Others here before your committee, I'm sure, can figure out a solution to the problem. My purpose is to explain how essential it is to Idaho now, and for the future, to be able to plan Public Law 566 watersheds containing federally owned lands with confidence that the time and effort and money that go into the planning will be fruitful and result in installation of worthwhile watershed development and protection work.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to appear before you. If you have time and there are any questions I'd be happy to try to answer them.

Letter From Gen. Harold K. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy is located within the congressional district I have the honor to represent, and the Academy has done an outstanding job over the years in preparing our youth for the maritime service of the Nation. It is therefore with deep satisfaction that I include in the RECORD the following letter from Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army to the able Superintendent of the Merchant Marine Academy, Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock.

U.S. ARMY,
THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
March 9, 1966.

Rear Adm. GORDON MCLINTOCK,
Superintendent, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N.Y.

DEAR ADMIRAL MCLINTOCK: On March 15 as the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy marks the 28th anniversary of its founding, it is a distinct pleasure to extend the U.S. Army's heartiest congratulations and our sincere best wishes for continued success in your service to country and ever-increasing achievements for the future.

We share your deep pride in the numerous accomplishments of your graduates and the magnificent job they are doing in supporting our efforts in Vietnam and elsewhere around the globe in defense of freedom, and are most appreciative of the pledge from all at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy to serve with special devotion in whatever areas merchant ships are needed. As in World War II, Korea, and other national emergencies, our merchant marine is today continuing to demonstrate the important role of American shipping as our "fourth arm of defense."

I know I am joined by all members of the U.S. Army in expressing our gratitude for many contributions to the cause of freedom and in voicing our confidence in the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy's ability to meet whatever challenges the future may present.

Most sincerely,
HAROLD K. JOHNSON,
General, U.S. Army,
Chief of Staff.

Deprive American Students To Help the Reds on Castro's Campus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the following editorial was presented over WTAE, channel 4, in Pittsburgh, by Franklin C. Snyder, vice president and general manager, Pittsburgh Broadcast Division—the Hearst Corp.:

Criticizing any money spent by or for the United Nations is a sure way to get yourself dismissed as a square, a moss-backed isolationist, or a far-out rightwinger.

We're none of these things, but we still think the proposed gift by the United Nations development program to Castro's University of Havana is pretty silly.

This U.N. agency has Castro's college of communism and kookery down for $3,100,000. since the United States furnishes 40 percent of this program's funds, more than $1 million in American taxpayers' money would go to the University of Havana, a fountainhead of international communism 90 miles from our shores.

And it is an ironic fact that while we send $1,200,000 to the University of Havana, the Federal Government is practicing some education economies at home—like proposing to cut funds available for American student loans and to reduce Federal aid to land-grant colleges, such as Penn State.

A similar editorial was broadcast over WRYT radio by F. Geer Parkinson, vice president and station manager.

Listeners are understandably provoked at this disclosure, which so far has had little public notice. The whole sordid story needs to be given public circulation, for it reflects an attitude on the part of the United Nations that will continue to prevail until its major underwriter, Uncle Sam, is no longer willing to permit his money to be appropriated to the cause of those who seek to destroy him.

As pointed out in the editorial of the air, it is ironic that more than a million dollars taken from the taxpayers of this Nation should be marked for shipment to Castro's university at the very time the administration proposes to cut funds for *American student loans* and *for* land grant colleges. The pending contribution for the education of Communist students in Cuba is also in step with the administration's request to reduce appropriations for the children's lunch program in our own schools.

Adding to the insult of serving Castro's bearded scholars to the neglect of our own students is the threat to increase taxes for the purpose of carrying on in Asia the battle against the very tactics and doctrine that Communist Cuba is attempting to impose upon the entire Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, American dollars have been donated to many strange and suspicious programs in recent years, yet in the light of current conditions it is doubtful if any has been more absurd than this plot to aid Cuba's detested dictator. I trust that the White House will make it clear that the United States will not stand for such nonsense under any circumstances.

Who Speaks for the Poor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of March 3, 1966:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Mar. 3, 1966]

WHO SPEAKS FOR THE POOR?

The very low turnout in Tuesday's antipoverty board election was disappointing but not disastrous to the program. Far from it.

Critics of the war on poverty will read the results as a vote of no confidence. It was not.

The decision to allow the poor to pick their own 7 delegates on the 23-man board by direct ballot was based more on idealism than realism—and with a strong nudge from the Federal Government.

That less than 1 percent of those eligible cast ballots proves only that a better means of selecting poverty area representatives on the Economic and Youth Opportunities Board must be found.

The war on poverty represents a basic new direction in dealing with the problems of the poor. Unlike most welfare programs, it seeks to help the underprivileged help themselves to break the poverty cycle.

To achieve that goal, there must be the greatest possible participation of the poor themselves in planning and carrying out antipoverty programs.

The Times strongly believes that delegates of the poverty areas should sit on the program's policymaking board. Their unique knowledge of the problem is indispensable, and their very presence on the board gives the rest of the poverty community a sense of involvement they have not before known.

Federal regulations properly—although somewhat ambiguously—provide for "maximum feasible participation" of the poor and for "democratic selection" of their representatives.

In the light of Tuesday's experimental election, however, those terms need redefinition. Local and Federal antipoverty officials must waste no time in developing a better system.

The theory that those with a family income of $4,000 or less would flock to the polls ignores the harsh realities of their background and environment.

These are people who, for the most part, have lost hope that their grinding proverty would ever be improved. Many perhaps had never participated in an election. The usual motivations of citizenship simply were not present.

The antiproverty program, in effect, has only begun. It is far too early, therefore, to expect that it already has changed attitudes, years, even generations, in the making.

Yet as the war on poverty progresses—and it must—much of that despair can change to hope. And with hope apathy can be dispelled.

Every effort must now be made to strengthen the program, to correct its defects, and to give tangible evidence that there is hope for all the victims of poverty's cruel effects.

What About Those Streams That Pollute the Mind?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, Americans still have a problem to be faced up to, an issue yet to be resolved. That is the question of the huge, multimillion-dollar mail order smut industry that continues to pollute the streams of our society. We cannot continue to bury our heads in the sand and hope that this problem will go away. Nor can we let die those good pieces of legislation that now lie buried in various committees of the House and of the Senate. It is time for action, Mr. Speaker. The citizens of this country are demanding it.

An article dealing with this problem was written last week by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, in the March 15, 1966 issue of the Los Angeles Times. I insert it in the RECORD for the information of Members of Congress:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Mar. 15, 1966]

WILLFUL PEDDLING OF SMUT SHOULD NOT BE TOLERATED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The House Education and Labor Committee is marking time these days on its pending obscenity bill, waiting upon the pleasure of the Supreme Court of the United States, but at some point this spring the committee will get back to its dirty and difficult task. What, constitutionally, can be done about obscene materials? Anything at all?

Last fall the committee grappled with the question during 3 days of wholly typical hearings. Witnesses turned up from the churches and the decent literature committees. They brought with them an armload of filthy magazines purchased the night before at Washington newsstands. There was *no question in their minds that the stuff* was obscene.

The ministers and rabbis were followed by some uncomfortable professionals from the Post Office Department. They were familiar with the horrid exhibits piled on the chairman's desk. But there was grave questions *in their minds that the things were obscene.* Maybe yes; maybe no.

The hearings wound up with testimony from Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union. He looked at the exhibits with the air of a man who has just found a dead mouse in his stew, but there was no question in his mind: The stuff was not obscene. Trashy, yes; obscene, no.

Speiser's testimony was cast in the mold of the down-the-line liberal. The committee had before it a bill, sponsored by DOMINICK DANIELS, of New Jersey, that would do no more than to create a study commission on "noxious and obscene materials." The underlying assumption of the bill, obviously, is that such materials are social evils; and if one function of a legislative body is to eliminate social evils, it would follow logically that the bill would result in legislation proposing to eliminate the materials.

Speiser questioned the assumption: Who can say if filthy books really cause antisocial behavior? He questioned the definitions: Who knows what is meant by "noxious" or "obscene"? He challenged the idea that any law ever could be drafted in this field that would not violate the first amendment's guarantees of free speech.

The September hearings clarified nothing, and changed no one's mind. A few weeks later, the Supreme Court heard argument in the famous Ginzburg case, which promises to be the next milestone in the field of obscenity law.

If it is true, as the High Court held in the Roth case just 9 years ago, that "obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press," it ought to be possible to come up eventually with some sort of workable legislation. A special study commission would seem a reasonable step in that direction.

The whole wordy dispute over cause-and-effect is irrelevant to this affair.

The law does not require that glue factories be tolerated in a residential neighborhood, simply in the name of property rights. The law does not permit men to carry concealed weapons, in some absolute construction of the right to bear arms.

In every such case, the law takes the reasonable view that a fair balance must be struck between liberty and order. The man who sets out to write a deliberately dirty book, having no other purpose than to profit upon purience, has no right of "free press" that society is bound to respect; and judges and juries are perfectly competent to determine guilt where that motivation is found.

To be sure, there is the crack in the door objection: If juries convict on "Seed of the Beast," by "Helene Morgan," they may convict on the works of some potential Joyce or Dreiser. But there are two answers to this.

The first is that the record of judges and juries in this field, taking the number of books banned against the number of books published, is amazingly good; and appellate courts exist to protect the rights of serious authors as they protect the rights of other men. The second is that the "damage to freedom" that would result from prohibiting this pollution is plainly minimal.

No newspaperman approaches the subject of "obscenity" lightly. There is a danger—*of course there is a danger*—in State censorship by criminal laws or otherwise. But there comes a time when society can flex its muscles and decree that such-and-such a business will not be permitted. Willful smut peddling is such a business.

Rumsfeld Demands Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a speech recently to the Inland Daily Press Association in Chicago, my colleague, Representative DONALD M. RUMSFELD, of Illinois, described the freedom-of-information bill pending before this body as, "one of the most critical measures to be considered by the Congress in the past 20 years." The Star-Courier of Kewanee, Ill., on March 15, published an editorial complimenting the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] and urging support for this legislation.

As a newspaper man myself I am especially conscious of the need. Fortunately the State of Illinois has a "right to know" law which gives reporters access to almost all information in State government files. Enactment of this law was a major step forward. The same wise provision must be enacted at the Federal level if the public interest is to be protected. Representative RUMSFELD deserves the gratitude and support of all Americans.

Following is the text of the editorial:

SECRECY BY GOVERNMENT

"The Government will serve us well only if the public is well informed."

This statement, made recently at a meeting of the Inland Daily Press Association in Chicago, puts the finger on the necessity for newspapers remaining free so that they may keep the public informed.

U.S. Representative DONALD RUMSFELD, Republican, of Illinois, termed the freedom-of-information bill pending in the U.S. House of Representatives "one of the most critical measures to be considered by the Congress in the past 20 years."

He urged the inland association's members to help develop public awareness and congressional support for such legislation.

At 33, RUMSFELD is the youngest Republican in the U.S. House and is a member of the House Government Operations Committee of the Subcommittee on Government Information and Foreign Operations, which has held hearings on freedom-of-information proposals. He is a leading advocate of the public's right to know.

During the last session of Congress, practically every measure proposed became law—except those proposals aimed at the question of the public's right to know. The only conceivable reason for this legislative failure is the well known and well publicized White House opposition.

The Congressman feels strongly that the public's business must be conducted in public if our system of government by the people is to continue.

Purpose of the proposed law is to require agencies of the Federal Government to make all records promptly available to any person and to provide for court action to guarantee this right of access with the exception of certain specified categories of sensitive government information which would be exempted from the disclosure requirements.

The unfortunate fact is that government secrecy tends to grow as government itself grows.

Hearings in the House were completed in *April 1965.* Every witness who testified supported the legislation except for every single witness sent to testify by the President on behalf of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Talk of the credibility gap and truth in government is heard increasingly. In a re*cent press interview, Secretary McNamara* is quoted as saying, "The trouble is our credibility was destroyed."

Little wonder, when one recognizes how government information is being withheld, manipulated and twisted to the point that even the conscientious citizen is being deprived of the basic information on which to base an informed opinion.

Congressman RUMSFELD needs support in his campaign.

Cotton Checkoff Bill: 1 Man, 1 Vote?—8 Men, 191,111 Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 of this year the House passed H.R. 12322 by a six-vote margin. I opposed that bill and supported the motion to recomit with an instruction offered by the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] which incorporated the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] to delete the volume vote provisions in the referendum section of the bill. The motion to recommit also failed by only six votes.

In this week's issue of the American Farm Bureau Newsletter there appears a very interesting table showing the distribution of cotton production by bales throughout the United States. As this table reveals, the producers on 8 large farms in California could cast 191,111 votes in the referendum—or more than the combined total of all the small farms (10 bales or less) in the States of Alabama, Georgia, and North and South Carolina.

And to top things off, let us not forget that under the terms of the bill, these 8 large farms in California could vote 191,111 votes "yes" in the referendum and then turn around and receive a refund of $191,111.

Under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD the table and comments appearing in the American Farm Bureau Newsletter of March 21, 1966:

Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

[Totals for 14 States]

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Total farms	Total production	Total farms	Total production
10,000 or more	8	191,111	0.002	1.38	0.002	1.38
5,000 to 9,999	18	113,567	.004	.82	.006	2.20
4,000 to 4,999	17	74,614	.003	.54	.009	2.74
3,000 to 3,999	42	140,892	.01	1.02	.02	3.76
2,000 to 2,999	101	234,223	.02	1.69	.04	5.45
1,500 to 1,999	138	230,211	.03	1.66	.07	7.11
1,000 to 1,499	419	501,782	.08	3.63	.15	10.74
500 to 999	1,819	1,200,086	.36	8.67	.51	19.41
200 to 499	8,626	2,503,025	1.72	18.08	2.23	37.49
100 to 199	15,417	2,097,698	3.07	15.16	5.30	52.65
50 to 99	26,431	1,798,561	5.26	12.99	10.56	65.64
40 to 49	12,392	538,179	2.47	3.89	13.03	69.53
30 to 39	19,976	670,741	3.98	4.85	17.01	74.38
20 to 29	39,996	940,658	7.97	6.80	24.98	81.18
10 to 19	105,202	1,420,091	20,96	10,26	45.94	91.44
Under 10	271,406	1,184,605	54.06	8.56	100.00	100.00
Total	502,008	13,840,044	100.00	100.00		

The House-passed bill (H.R. 12322) to establish a Government-directed cotton research and promotion program financed by a "largely compulsory checkoff of farmers' money contains a referendum procedure which would enable a minority of the producers to impose a sales tax on raw cotton on all cotton producers.

This is made possible by the authorization for the Secretary to determine the outcome on the basis of volume.

The bill would authorize the cotton checkoff if approved by two-thirds of the producers or by producers of two-thirds of the cotton produced by those voting in the referendum.

This table—based on the 1959 Census of Agriculture—shows that 13 percent of the cotton farmers produced over two-thirds of that year's cotton crop.

Here are other interesting facts: In 1959, 8 large farms in California produced 191,111 bales; 43,719 small farms (less than 10 bales) in Alabama produced 184,856 bales; 26,879 small farms in Georgia produced only 123,951 bales; 45,228 small farms in North Carolina produced 174,920 bales; and 33,270 small farms in South Carolina produced 139,409 bales.

The 18 largest farms in California produced 254,480 bales, or more than the 248,937 bales produced by 36,194, "19 bale or less" producers in Georgia.

Exhausting Land and Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, there is not a single Member of Congress who will not find invaluable information in the article regarding use of land and water written for United Press International by Leland H. Bull, Pennsylvania secretary of agriculture. His subject has occupied considerable time on the part of the Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works, and Agriculture over the past several years, and it is going to provide food for thought for a long time to come.

Secretary Bull discusses the problems created by the urban sprawl and massive highway programs in relation to the loss of productive farm land. He points up some of the basic questions which the Nation's planners must consider in the context of future needs for food, fiber, and water.

The continuing loss of farmland is a question with which we are going to meet head on unless there is marked improvement in our whole land management program. Secretary Bull's observations should be perused carefully by all Members of Congress as well as by responsible officials in the Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture, and in every other department whose activities in any way pertain to this subject.

The article follows:

AGRICULTURALIST SAYS IT'S POSSIBLE FOR UNITED STATES TO EXHAUST LAND, WATER

(By Leland H. Bull, Pennsylvania Secretary of Agriculture)

People in this oft-blessed Nation of ours frequently take many things for granted. They assume we'll never run out of water or of land from which we can harvest an adequate supply of food.

The truth of the matter is that we already may be facing a day of reckoning, a day when we will not have enough food and water, a day like many now face in underdeveloped nations, a day that could end with hunger stalking too many individuals.

Our exploding population, combined with a lack of planning for the wise use of our natural resources, could hasten that day.

We may not be able to do more than slow down the population expansion but we can do something about the conservation and proper use of our natural resources, particularly something about the use of land and water.

At this hour, many fine efforts to conserve soil and water have been stymied by people seeking personal or business gain. The urban sprawl already has taken its toll of productive farmland. Each mile of dual highway has covered 30 to 40 acres. Business and industry, in the interest of increasing payrolls and profits, has contracted for long-term land and water rights. Many individuals would rather live in the serenity of a country scene.

MUST RESERVE SUPPLIES

If we don't soon plan to reserve fertile land and adequate water supplies for future food production, it may even become too late to be sorry.

Competition for land and water naturally is greatest in rapidly urbanizing areas. There have been confirmed reports that medium-sized farms have been sold for as much as a million dollars. It is inconceivable that a farmer could compete for land of that value to increase his farming operations.

The wisdom of planning and constructing dual highways through fertile bottom land must be challenged. It may be more feasible to run roads on hilltops or mountainsides where crops cannot be grown successfully.

The point is that we have been losing an average of 15,000 acres of our best farmland each year to urbanization, new roads and other purposes. A current inventory shows we still have a bit more than 3 million acres of cropland and pasture in class 1 and class 2 land areas but this cannot be greatly diminished if more food is to be produced.

It is true that we have about 3.7 million acres of existing woodland in Pennsylvania that can be developed at some expense into cropland. But it may be more practical to save the land already fertilized and build factories in the wooded areas.

According to the latest report, there are 16,780 acres of irrigated cropland in the Susquehanna River Basin. Conservative estimates are that 15 times that much land in the basin is suitable for irrigated crops.

As we build our food production potentials, we must remember that potato yields can be increased by 50 percent by irrigation; strawberries by 75 percent and many other crops by at least 25 percent.

Studies in one county indicate that 300 million gallons of water per day will be required in one project. Even though we think at this writing that we have lots of water, how long it will be before we realize that good, clean, unpolluted water is limited.

Polluted water can cause serious illness to livestock as well as humans. We already are aware that swimming is banned in some of our lakes and streams because of pollution.

With our future food and water supply at stake, now is the time for people to become interested in the planning for use of natural resources; not after the well goes dry.

The Proposed Atlantic Expressway—Unanimous Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a proposed project which has been put forward by the New York State Department of Public Works for the construction of an expressway through the South Shore of Long Island over Sunrise Highway. The voice of the people is loud and clear in unanimous opposition to the proposed route. Because some have erroneously referred to the proposed Atlantic expressway as a Federal highway many of my constituents wrote to me voicing their opposition to the project. The project is in the early stages of planning and therefore the State of New York has not yet applied for Federal funds—and probably will not do so for a number of years. However, because of the unanimous opposion to the proposed project, the State of New York should study various alternative routes before large sums of money are expended for the further development of a plan which has no local support.

Residents on the South Shore, local businessmen, churches, local civic organizations, elected officials, daily newspapers and community newspapers on Long Island have spoken out with determined opposition to this proposal. Based upon letters from officials and meetings with constitutents, I wrote the following letter to Governor Rockefeller on February 24, 1966:

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1966.

Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller,
Governor,
Albany, N.Y.

Dear Governor: I acknowledge receipt and thank you for your reply of February 15, 1966 to my telegram concerning the proposed Atlantic expressway.

I am writing again because the voice of the people on the South Shore of Long Island is coming through to Washington loud and clear, and the sounds are unanimously opposed to the proposed route. The voices are those of owners of private dwellings; businessmen whose establishments are located along Sunrise Highway; mayors of the villages along the proposed route; civic associations; boards of trade, chambers of commerce and other organizations; and lastly, but by no means the least, the voice of the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead. Of the many communications which I have received from the residents and businessmen of the South Shore not a single one speaks in favor of the proposed Atlantic expressway route.

It is important that I inform you that there is considerable confusion in the minds of the public about the manner in which a highway is developed from the planning stage to completion. The reason for this is primarily because it is being referred to as a Federal highway and secondarily because there is a lack of coordination between local, State and Federal elected officials on matters of common concern. In my telegram to Mayor Robert Sweeney, of Freeport, dated February 7, 1966, the text of which was included in my telegram to you, I pointed out that New York State is engaged in planning the highway, and has not filed an application for Federal funds. I also pointed out that under ordinary circumstances the State would not do so until after public hearings on the proposal have been held. Therefore, I am not presently in a position to ask that Federal funds be withheld from the project as I am being requested to do by most of my correspondents, who firmly believe that the proposed route is not in the public interest.

In your letter you suggest that it is premature to hold a public hearing and state that you have suggested to Superintendent McMorran that when the plans for the proposed route have been firmed up to a reasonable degree he might plan to hold an informational meeting. Most respectfully sir, I do not believe that this is a satisfactory answer for the people on the South Shore of Long Island.

A public hearing on the proposed Nassau expressway was held January 21, 1966, after detailed plans were completed and after a public announcement that work was to commence. This was considered by those who attended the hearings as too late on a project planned over a period of more than 15 years. Forty-one witnesses testified at the hearings, including the Congressman, State legislators, the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead, and village mayors. All unanimously opposed that aspect of the Nassau expressway plans which called for an overhead rather than a depressed road in certain sections of Inwood and Lawrence.

As an illustration of the feelings in the community the following telegram was received by me on February 21, 1966:

"Congressman Herbert Tenzer,
"*Congressional Building,*
"*Lynbrook, N.Y.*:

"Proposed Atlantic expressway through South Shore will be irreparably disasterous to village of Lynbrook. Request your intervention to oppose this as presently proposed and urge a complete disclosure of plans before any other steps are taken to move the project further ahead.

"George H. Mangravite,
"*Mayor.*"

Your constituents and mine are not sufficiently aware that the Atlantic expressway is a State project, requiring State approval, and that before it receives such approval, public hearings will be held.

Because of the experience on the Nassau expressways and the widespread misunderstanding of the procedure, I respectfully suggest that you issue instructions for the calling of a preliminary public hearing, before large sums of money are expended on a project which has such unanimous opposition.

On the date of February 23, 1966, I received the following communication from the Federal Highway Administator, the details of which are self-explanatory.

"Dear Mr. Tenzer: This is in reply to your letter of February 11 requesting a report on the status of the Atlantic expressway.

"The State has had consulting firms prepare engineering, traffic and revenue, and feasibility reports on the proposed Long Island-New England Bridge and connecting highways, including the Atlantic expressway. Any action to be taken on this project would be the responsibility of State authorities. We have received no proposals from the State for Federal participation. Under the circumstances we suggest that you write the New York Department of Public Works for information on any development plans and status of the overall project.

"Sincerely yours,
"Rex M. Whitton,
"*Federal Highway Administrator.*"

Governor, at your meeting with the New York State congressional delegation held recently in Washington, you made a strong appeal that on matters of common interest we develop concerted action on a bipartisan basis. I agree with you most heartily in this approach. I am writing to the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead and the mayors of those villages along the proposed route which are located in the Fifth Congressional District, inviting them to join with me in developing a bipartisan approach to protect the interests of residents and businessmen whose property and investments will be affected by the proposed Atlantic expressway.

Finally, Governor, I would most respectfully urge that you ask for feasibility studies on alternative routes, including the possibility of using the route of the Southern State Parkway, and the possibility of building the expressway over the Long Island Railroad tracks. Both of these suggestions involve publicly owned property with enough width for a 10-lane expressway. Important however is the fact that neither one involves a disruption of residence and business property to the extent involved in the present proposed route.

Your early attention to this communication is most respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,
Herbert Tenzer,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the local press expresses the voice of the people from villages along the South Shore of Long Island which includes the full length of the Fifth Congressional District of New York.

Elected officials and civic organizations as well as groups representing all the major political parties have expressed their opposition to the proposed expressway to me and they must be persuaded to express their opposition to Albany.

In my letter to Governor Rockefeller and in my letters to every Mayor on the South Shore of Long Island, I have endeavored to set the record straight. The proposed Atlantic Expressway is a State project in its early planning stages. While Federal funds have not been requested, I have expressed myself in opposition to the granting of such funds to the appropriate agencies. The voices of the people should be directed to Albany before it is too late.

The daily and community newspapers on the South Shore have rendered a unique public service by helping me to bring to public attention that we are dealing with a State project at this point. Their attention to the subject matter has brought about an unparalleled unity among elected officials of every political persuasion and I would like to insert in the Record at this point some of the

editorial comment on this dismaying project:

[From Newsday, Mar. 1, 1966]

THE ROAD TO ROCKY POINT

The proposed Atlantic Expressway along Sunrise Highway, intended as a high-speed connection between New York City and the proposed Long Island-New England Bridge, has been running into opposition recently from the mayors of five South Shore communities through which it would pass. As projected, the road would be a 10-lane highway 84 miles long that, in Nassau, would require substantial changes inside the downtown business area it traverses.

Representative HERBERT TENZER, Democrat of Lawrence, has now suggested that double-decking the Southern State Parkway might be an alternate and less disruptive solution. Edward McGowan, chairman of the Long Island-New England Bridge Study Commission, which proposed the Atlantic expressway, has described the Tenzer alternate as illegal—saying that the bonds for the section of Southern State, on which motorists must pay tolls, forbid its conversion to any other use. TENZER, however, has made a highly sensible suggestion. He wants the commission to hold hearings on the conversion of Southern State. If it represents a more acceptable route, with less disruption, then he feels the possible answer may be to retire the existing parkway bonds and to make use of that route.

We would take TENZER's suggestion a step further. Why not check all possible routes—including, by the way, the overcongested Long Island Expressway? Something, very soon, has to be done to improve rush-hour travel between New York and Long Island. If a route can be found that achieves a smoother flow of traffic in and out of the city, requires minimum disruption and at the same time provides fast access to the Rocky Point Bridge, that's the route to choose for development. Until further feasibility studies have been undertaken by the Department of Public Works, with the concurrence of the bridge study commission, no conclusions can be reached.

Mr. Speaker, the Long Island Press, March 11, 1966, in an editorial relating to the Long Island Sound bridge project, had this comment relating to the Atlantic expressway:

What's more, the proposed $350 million Atlantic expressway, suggested as part of the commission's original package, has stirred up a storm of protest from one end of the island to the other. This 10-lane swath through some of Long Island's most prosperous shopping communities is an unwelcome prospect. And even more dismaying are some of the alternatives being blithely put forward—like elevating the Southern State Parkway or the Long Island Expressway.

The thought of such metal and concrete monsters is a nightmare to Long Islanders who know what elevated structures can do to communities. Many areas of Queens have been saddled with such structures—the "Els" in Richmond Hill, Jamaica, Long Island City, Ridgewood, Corona, Elmhurst, Jackson Heights, Woodside and Sunnyside, not to mention the Bronx and Brooklyn. The people of these communities wish they could be rid of these depressing, noisy monstrosities. It is hard to believe somebody would think of bringing them, in this day and age, to the heart of residential Long Island.

The Long Island Kernal (Freeport), on February 17, 1966, said this:

CONSIDER AN ALTERNATE PLAN

Instead of disrupting long-established business districts and municipal facilities and at the same time incurring fabulous condemnation expenditures—why not utilize already existing highway routes which will disrupt practically nothing? And which would incur practically no additional property condemnation.

How? Widen these existing routes where necessary and double-deck them. (This has been proposed for Sunrise Highway.)

The route for the proposed alternate superexpressway would start at the Verrazano Bridge, utilize the Belt Parkway south and east to Marine Parkway, then southeast to Beach Channel Drive. Thence east on Rockaway Freeway to Sheridan Boulevard to Burnside Avenue and Rockaway Turnpike. From Rockaway Turnpike to northeast on Peninsula Boulevard to Southern State Parkway thence east to Sagtikos Parkway. North on Sagtikos Parkway to Long Island Expressway—and from there you have it right through, past Riverhead and along the North Fork to the East Marion bridgehead.

Southern State Parkway to Sagtikos Parkway is no longer a pleasure driving route, but a vital traffic artery. Therefore double-decking it as part of the Long Island superhighway would not only facilitate traffic flow, but would solve the question of a route to the (proposed double-decked) Long Island expressway and eastern Long Island.

The route proposed here would add no more than 3.1 miles in distance from the Verrazano Bridge to the East Marion bridgehead as compared to the proposed property-destroying, tax-destroying Sunrise Highway route.

The Bellmore Life of January 26, 1966, had this to say:

EXPRESSWAY THROUGH BELLMORE

Engineers and planners have come up with a grandiose project for a bridge from eastern Suffolk to Connecticut and an even more grandiose sounding Atlantic Expressway through the length of Long Island. Further studies are being undertaken and perhaps they will lead to the decision to build the bridge. Perhaps from an overall point of view and in the name of progress the bridge should be built. It is too early to tell.

But, from a local standpoint, considering the interests of Bellmore, we doubt that the radical widening of Sunrise Highway would be a good thing. The net result would be more gas fumes and less business. It would destroy many small businesses in which men and women have sunk much of their lives and hopes.

The proposed expressway would cut our community in half, leaving crossings only at Newbridge Road and Bellmore Avenue, but closing off Bedford Avenue and Centre Avenue. During construction it would disrupt the lives of the citizens for many months.

However much a bridge to Connecticut may be needed, this seems a very expensive way to lead up to it. We hope some other solution can be found. The fact that a commission has recommended using Sunrise Highway does not necessarily mean that other solutions may not be preferable.

Mr. Speaker, at long last after many letters and speaking engagements on the subject, editorials are now directing readers to elected State officials as well as their Congressman. Now the voices may finally be heard in Albany. The editorials follow:

[From the Leader (Freeport, N.Y.)
Mar. 3, 1966]

CHINESE WALL IN FREEPORT

Of all the idiotic ideas that have come forth in recent years, the proposal to convert Sunrise Highway into a 10-lane superexpressway is the worst.

According to the plan offered by the Long Island-New England Bridge Study Committee, the elevated structure would be about the height of the LIRR elevation. It would extent from the Queens-Nassau line to Patchogue where it would turn north to connect at Rocky Point with a proposed bridge to New England. It would run through the heart of Valley Stream, Lynbrook, Rockville Centre, Baldwin, Freeport, Merrick, Bellmore, Wantagh, Seaford, Massapequa, Massapequa Park, Amityville and on through Suffolk. The South Shore would become part of a corridor stretching from Washington, D.C., to Boston.

Are they kidding? This could only mean that our wonderful residential communities would become suitable only for the high rise apartments and factories that would necessarily spring up along the route.

Who would lose on the deal? Everybody else; especially the businessmen along Sunrise Highway and bordering streets and the homeowners who moved here to escape the big city. Faced with providing services, schools, fire protection, etc., for the huge apartment houses, the taxpayer will even lose his proverbial barrel—he'll be over it instead of in it.

The proponents of the superhighway claim that it will create more jobs on Long Island. True—but it will also bring hundreds of thousands of new jobseekers to live in the multistoried apartment houses. It will provide easy access to additional jobhunters from New York City. The competition for jobs will be fierce. The benefit from the increased jobs will be wiped out and we will be worse off than before.

WHAT CAN YOU DO

Fast action is called for if we are to prevent this attempted rape of Long Island. There are State and Federal funds required for the proposal and an "authority" must be created to administer the project. You can stop it—write your assemblyman, State senator and congressman today if you value your investment in your home or business. (Send copies to this newspaper, too, so we can keep up with the thinking of our readers.)

None of us moved to Nassau County during the past 20 years just for the sake of moving. We were seeking something better for ourselves and our children—and our grandchildren. Must we lose it all to become part of a high-speed route from Washington to Boston?

This newspaper will devote all the energy and all the power of a free press toward putting down this onslaught against our suburban way of life. We can't do it alone, however. The forces behind the highway proposal are extremely influential. Your help is absolutely essential if the plan is to be defeated. Get those letters moving—and fast.

[From the Long Island Graphic (Freeport, N.Y.) Mar. 3, 1966]

PROPOSED HIGHWAY MENACES OUR WONDERFUL COMMUNITIES

There has been considerable controversy regarding the proposed superhighway slated for Sunrise Highway all the way from Valley Stream to Patchogue.

The 14-lane elevated structure is a plan offered by the Long Island-New England Bridge Study Committee extending from the Queens-Nassau line to Patchogue where it would turn north to connect at Rocky Point with a proposed bridge to New England.

Running through the heart of Baldwin, Freeport, Merrick, and other adjacent communities, the highway would bring about the erection of high rise apartments and factories and mean the end of our wonderful residential communities.

At the same time, the businessmen along Sunrise Highway and bordering avenues would be adversely affected, and homeowners would be faced with providing schools, and additional services for the huge apartment houses.

While the committee claims more jobs would be created on Long Island, they're forgetting it will also bring hundreds of thousands of new jobseekers to live in multistoried apartment houses.

Since State and Federal funds are required for the planned superhighway, an authority must be created to administer the program. Only you, the voter, can stop it. Write to your State senator, assemblyman, or Congressman today. The Freeport Chamber of Commerce should sponsor the protest and now.

If you live or do business in the Fifth Congressional District, your Congressman is Herbert Tenzer; your assemblyman is John Thorpe, Jr., and State senator Norman F. Lent.

Representatives of the chambers of commerce will meet on Tuesday night, March 29 at 8 p.m. at the Sea Crest Restaurant, Sunrise Highway, Massapequa, along with editors and publishers of weekly newspapers in affected areas.

The protest is on. While the local newspapers, such as the Massapequa Post and others, can't fight this attempted rape of Long Island alone, your help is needed. Get those letters moving to your legislators now.

[From the Maileader (Valley Stream, N.Y.) Mar. 3, 1966]

SKYWAY

With the growing tremor of the impending Atlantic expressway becoming more and more ominous, the sounds of an aroused populace are being heard in Washington and Albany. It is apparent that most Long Islanders affected by this arterial extravaganza are unaware of many aspects associated with it's placement and ultimate construction.

We discussed last week the alternatives that accompany the present plan and during the past 7 days, the officials of our communities have communicated with Congressman Tenzer and in turn with Governor Rockefeller. The answers have been most revealing and could be indicative of things to come. The project is first of all a State one—part of the tri-State transportation committee, and does not come under the Federal Highway department nor in turn, in its present scope, under Federal participation. The skyway is a project strictly State instituted and the accompanying engineering, traffic and revenue, and feasibility reports on both it and the proposed Long Island-New England Bridge have caused the resulting hue and cry. Every town or village in the path of the skyway is encouraging its citizens to make their views known to the town supervisor, county executive, and eventually to the Governor in Albany.

Much has been said about the resulting havoc which would affect property owners and business owners alike. A very important result which has been seemingly played down throughout this clamor is the burden placed on those who are not necessarily in the path of the proposed route. This means you, Mr. Citizen. Yes, you who live even miles away from Sunrise Highway but who nonetheless have to share this ever-increasing burden. Who will eventually have to shoulder the losses from the businesses forced to shut down or move away? Who will have to come up with the difference to keep your community and country treasuries in the "black"? You, the homeowner. The loss in taxes will have to be replaced in some way and where will they turn? To you, the homeowner. Rockeville Center, alone predicts that besides the losses to property which amounts into the $3 millions, the village would lose over $800,000 taxwise.

So let us think, while the time is right, of the proper course of action to set. The wheels are already in motion. What are you doing to make your voice heard?

[From the Baldwin (N.Y.) Citizen, Mar. 17, 1966]

WE ADD OUR VOICE

Proposals to put a 10-lane expressway above or alongside Sunrise Highway have been greeted with unanimous dismay by residents, business interests, and government officials all down the south shore.

Here in Baldwin, the effect would be disastrous. Not only would such a high-speed monstrosity destroy our business district; it would split our long, narrow community right in half.

The town board, chambers of commerce, and Congressman Tenzer are among those whose voices have been raised in protest. We add out own.

Mr. Speaker, a resolution was adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Hempstead, N.Y., on March 1, 1966, stating that the town board "stands firmly opposed to the proposed route."

I am making this record in opposition to the proposed Atlantic expressway so that all Federal agencies having jurisdiction will be informed of the opposition and in turn advise the State of New York that Washington will not support a project which does not have the support of the people.

In conclusion I want to inform my colleagues that I am urging that Federal funds be withheld from this project so long as there is widespread opposition at the local level which indicates that the project is not in the public interest.

Taxation Without Representation

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress wish New York's mayor well in the task he sought of governing one of the world's great cities. We realize how important efficient government is to the metropolis and to the areas adjacent to it.

But I cannot go along with Mr. Lindsay's proposal to include commuters in his city income tax, many of whom live in my district. I believe the mayor's proposal would set a dangerous precedent for the Nation.

Many suburban residents make their living in New York City but they also leave substantial amounts of that income in the city's shops, theaters, and restaurants. The businesses themselves, many of which are owned by commuters, are also taxed heavily. The commuter pays as does the city resident for city transportation.

What would the commuter from Manhasset, Westchester, or Montclair get in return after paying a percentage of his income to the city of New York on top of all the other tax burdens he carries?

Do his children receive educational benefits in the city?

Does his family receive welfare coverage through city agencies?

Is his home protected against fire by city fire departments, and does the city provide police protection for his family at home?

The obvious answer to these fundamental questions defeats the arguments of those who would levy a further tribute on the commuters who already provide a large measure of the financial and intellectual lifeblood of the city.

Our suburban residents sympathize with the mayor's efforts in New York City, even though we do not have an opportunity to vote in city elections.

But this Nation fought a war almost 200 years ago to prove that taxation without representation is intolerable.

St. Patrick's Day Offers Lesson for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very remarkable editorial appeared in the Aurora Beacon-News, Aurora, Ill., on St. Patrick's Day. As the editor's explanation indicates, rather than produce an editorial, this paper used a letter to the editor written by Mr. Tedis Zierins of Chicago. The editor notes that the editorial very effectively speaks for itself, and I therefore insert it into the Record trusting that it will receive the very proper attention of the Members:

A TIME FOR INSPIRATIONS; ST. PATRICK'S DAY OFFERS LESSON FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Editor's Note.—It has become the custom for newspaper editors, down through the years, to write appropriate editorials on March 17 in recognition of St. Patrick's Day. These invariably pay tribute to our citizens of Irish descent, announcing that everyone loves the sons and daughters of Erin and that we are all Irish at heart on this occasion.

(We were considering how we might best express these sentiments for today's editorial when there arrived at our desk a letter to the editor signed by Tedis Zierins of 2118 West Schiller Street, Chicago. Mr. Zierins, a naturalized citizen from Latvia, approached the subject of St. Patrick's Day from a new and fresh angle, drawing a dramatic comparison between St. Patrick's dedication to truth and the fundamental beliefs and convictions which have made this Nation great.

(We read Mr. Zierins' letter and then reread it. We were so impressed that we decided to abandon our efforts to expound on the St. Patrick's Day theme and to use his words as today's guest editorial.)

Even though I am not an Irishman, St. Patrick's Day has a very special meaning to me because 2 years ago on this day I became an American citizen just as centuries ago another foreigner, St. Patrick, went to Ireland and became a part of that nation.

We admire St. Patrick very much for his strong convictions and dedication to bring the truth of belief in one God to all people.

I understand that only because the founders of this Nation also had similar strong convictions about the truth, the United States has become a really great Nation and leader of the free world.

I say thanks to God for helping me to escape from Red nazism—communism and bringing me to this great country of freedom where I can freely worship the God that St. Patrick preached about. And I pray that soon the people of my native country, Latvia, and all other countries oppressed by communism be free to hear God's truth, which today is forbidden there.

On St. Patrick's Day I would like also to express my gratitude to all the people who by their actions have taught me the true American way of life and those ideals for which the founders of this great Nation fought and died. They are based on the same principles which were taught by St. Patrick.

But at the same time I am also sad to see that many people here don't understand that Communists are working day and night to destroy not only the faith preached by St. Patrick, not only the traditions all Irishmen hold dear, but to destroy everything that is dear to every American and every free man, to make all men just slaves.

Therefore I also pray to the Almighty to rouse us all out of our apathy and indifference and give us all strong convictions and belief in God and His truth like St. Patrick had, so that like St. Patrick, despite the dangers of losing his life, buried and overcame paganism in Ireland, we bury and overcome communism.

Only then will freedom and everything else which makes the life worth living also be assured to the next generations.

Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 16, 1966, the very distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] was the guest speaker at the Bowie-Queen Anne District Democratic Club at the Somerset Elementary School, Stonehaven Lane, Bowie.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor of speaking to the Bowie-Queen Anne District Democratic Club on many occasions and it is one of the most stimulating groups in the district which I have the honor to represent. There is no better friend of the Federal employee than the gentleman from New Jersey. He is very well known in Prince Georges County where I live. I hope that his visit to my congressional district will be repeated again and again. On behalf of the more than 70,000 Federal employees in the 5th Congressional District of Maryland, I would like to express my thanks to the gentleman from New Jersey for his untiring efforts in behalf of the Federal employee.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I insert Chairman DANIELS' speech given to the Bowie-Queen Anne District Democratic Club:

ADDRESS BY CHAIRMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT, INSURANCE, AND HEALTH BENEFITS, HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE BOWIE-QUEEN ANNE DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC CLUB, BOWIE, MD., MARCH 16, 1966

Mr. Chairman, friends, I am most grateful for your kind invitation to be here tonight and to have this opportunity to meet and talk with you. Your chairman thought you might be particularly interested in hearing about some of the proposals pending before this Congress which affect Federal employees.

Every piece of legislation before the Congress is, of course, going to affect the Federal employee. He is, after all, first a citizen and only then a Government worker. He may be a parent, a veteran, a young man beginning his career in Government service, or a woman near retirement age. The Federal worker is interested in—and will be affected by—everything this Congress does with regard to education, poverty, crime, air pollution, taxes, space exploration, transportation, aid programs, and, of course, our commitments in Vietnam.

I wish we could discuss all these issues. I would like to hear from you about the decisions that must be made. But I am afraid we would be here far into next week—or the week after that.

During his time in the House, a Congressman does, however, become something of a specialist in one or two fields. Guided by the particular interests of his constituents, a Representative soon finds he is spending a great deal of his time on one or two special problems.

One of my own interests is that legislation which most directly affects Government workers—their pay raises, health, retirement, and insurance plans—those matters which come under the jurisdiction of our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, particularly, under the jurisdiction of my own Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits.

I want to quickly add that I do not claim to have all the answers on the various health, retirement, insurance, and pay plans that are before this Congress. But I have been working on these programs for several years now, and believe I can be of some help to you in explaining just what proposals are before the Congress this year which will most directly affect Federal employees.

The key item is, of course, the President's new pay and fringe benefit package. In his message to the Congress on March 7, the President asked for enactment of legislation which will provide an average pay increase for Federal civilian employees amounting to 3.2 percent. About 2.85 percent of this would be in a direct salary increase, and the rest would be in certain fringe benefits.

These benefits include proposals to allow those who reach 55 with 30 years' service to retire without any reduction in annuity. It is proposed that retirement, disability, and survivor benefits payable to Federal employees be equal to the benefits payable to other citizens under the social security system. The administration suggests that the Government provide for the transfer to the social security system of service credit to employees who die, become disabled, or leave Federal employment before becoming eligible for Federal retirement systems benefits. A phased 2-year increase in the Government contribution to the health benefits program is suggested. There is also a proposal for a one-half percent increase in the contribution of both the Federal agencies and employees to the retirement fund. The administration proposes that these changes be effective January 1, 1967.

The President also recommended the enactment into law of a clear statement of retirement policy and adjustments between the civil service and the Foreign Service retirement systems. Other important recommended adjustments in our retirement system include the extension of medicare to Federal civilian employees, the continuation of benefits until age 22 for surviving children, still in school, of deceased employees. A guaranteed minimum to widows of employees who die after retirement for disability is recommended, as are continuing benefits for a surviving widow if she remarries after age 60. The administration recommends that these latter adjustments in our retirement program be deferred for at least another year—to January 1, 1968.

The package is an attractive one. As the President has said, America expects much of its public servants, and we make vigorous demands on their time and energy. We exact high standards of work and conduct and are fortunate indeed in having a civil service corps of honest, intelligent, efficient, and dedicated men and women. I could not agree more, and I am firm in my belief that the public interest is best served when these men and women are compensated equitably and competitively for equality performance.

I am sorry, however, that the proposals do not go further. My own proposal to extend life insurance benefits introduced in the Congress last session—is not mentioned. The pay raise is not as generous as I think it should be, for it will not close the gap between compensation for Government employees and those in private enterprise. The smallest increase—approximately 1 percent—will go to the lowest grades, and the very modest higher increases—up to 4½ percent—will go to a few upper grades. The recommended effective date for the pay raise is January 1, 1967.

Frankly, I had hoped we could do better, both with pay and with retirement, insurance, and health benefits. On January 25 of this year I introduced legislation to provide a 7-percent pay raise for Federal employees. I introduced a bill to liberalize the Federal employees group life insurance act on January 10, and hearings were held on the legislation this February. This bill would broaden life insurance coverage for Federal employees, raise the limitation on the amount of life insurance allowable, increase the Government's contribution to one-third of the cost of the premium charges, and would give additional protection to retirees.

Last year I suggested an amendment to the Health Benefits Act of 1959 which would increase the Government contribution for those enrolled in Government health benefits plans. This proposal is more generous than that of the administration.

I will spare you the technicalities of these various measures, but want to emphasize that their intent is to carry out a deep and binding commitment to our Federal employees, embodied in the Federal Pay Act of 1962, that their salaries and other benefits should be comparable to those salaries and benefits earned by employees in private industry for similar types and levels of work.

In signing that Reform Act the President emphasized the need for excellence throughout our society. In his words: "Challenges cannot be met in this modern world by mediocrity * * *. We must search for brilliance, welcome genius, strive for excellence." To hold men and women with such qualities in the Federal establishment we must offer them compensation equal to that offered elsewhere.

Last year the House retreated from the position it had taken in passing a reasonably decent pay raise bill for Federal employees and accepted the watered-down version handed to us by the Senate. As the late Sam Rayburn once remarked, "Legislation is the art of the practical." We were practical and accepted the possible.

The situation in Vietnam has put us in a similar position this year. If the administration proposal falls short of reaching the state of true equality for Government workers which we seek—as I believe they do—it is because our country has many other problems to solve and other worthy goals to strive for. Earlier I mentioned some of these—schools, clean air, clean water, roads and dams, space exploration, foreign aid. Our most immediate—and most grave—problem lies in our commitment in Vietnam.

To protect this country's interests, as we must do in Vietnam, to secure our children's futures as we hope to do through our poverty and crime and other programs, we are going to have to commit a large proportion of our available resources. And while we are a vigorous nation and these resources are indeed vast, our civil servants are being asked to wait for some of the benefits to which they are entitled.

Let me state at this time that I shall vigorously oppose any attempt to make Federal employees the only group to be denied needed pay increases while other groups in our society are not so restricted. The net result of such a policy would not just be a delay for the implementation of the comparability principle, it would be more in the nature of a complete rout.

I am not about to let the comparability gap grow any wider.

The major administration proposals—the suggested pay raise, the 55–30 retirement plan, liberalized disability and survivor benefits, a modest increase in the Government's contribution to the health benefits program—will most likely pass the Congress this year. I am hopeful that my bill to widen life insurance benefits will also pass, despite the opposition of the administration. I am afraid that other proposals must await future developments.

Whatever the successes—or the compromises—reached by this Congress in the areas of pay, retirement, health, and insurance benefits, we are committed to a rational and equitable system of compensation for the Federal worker. I will continue to work toward the full realization of that goal.

Bold New Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's new transport plan is a bold new approach to a besetting American problem, Long Island's Newsday states editorially.

It hails the proposed highway safety program that includes Federal safety standards for new cars and trucks.

The paper declares:

> This is a gigantic program, of which the best feature is the coordination of all types of transportation—on rubber, on rails, in the water, and in the air.

This timely review of a pressing problem will merit the attention of my colleagues, and I therefore include this article in the Record.

A New Transport Plan

President Johnson, moving boldly to buttress his program for the Great Society, has asked Congress to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation. As a corollary, he has recommended a 6-year $725 million highway safety program that includes the creation of Federal safety standards for new cars and trucks, and has endorsed a pending bill that authorizes minimum standards for tires.

This is a gigantic program, of which the best feature is the coordination of all types of transportation—on rubber, on rails, in the water, and in the air. It represents an effort to improve all these modes of transport while, at the same time, making them safer. The probable overall costs have only been sketched in. These will have to be weighed out as they are put down on paper. But it is hard to fault the purpose behind the President's proposals.

The program starts gently as it affects the auto manufacturers. The Government would set standards for safe performance of vehicles—not involving a totally "crash-proof" car, which might have to be built like a tank, but rather a car from which all obvious interior and exterior hazards had been removed. If in 2 years the manufacturers had failed to comply with the regulations, their vehicles would be barred from interstate commerce.

The President's far-ranging program covers many items, including (1) The creation with Federal help of a 2,000-mile-per-hour supersonic air transport; (2) a new highway safety and research center; (3) encouragement to the merchant marine; (4) studies and recommendations to eliminate jet aircraft noises; and (5) a wrap-up, in the new department, of nearly 100,000 employees and an annual expenditure of nearly $6 billion. The new Department would include the Federal Aviation Agency, the Coast Guard, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Maritime Administration, and the Office of the Undersecretary of Transportation. Safety activities of other existing transportation agencies would also be bound in.

All these proposals are worthy, if the execution equals the concept and if bureaucracy does not take over, as so often is the case with Government agencies. The supersonic transport is required to retain American aerial supremacy on world trade routes, though of course the utmost effort is required to keep the cost within bounds.

Safety in every field of transportation is essential. We lose, in highway accidents, more than 50,000 American lives yearly. Millions of others are injured. If the new Cabinet agency can reduce this wastage in lives and an equal wastage in efficiency, it will be well worthwhile. Now we all wait the details of this bold new approach to a besetting American problem.

The 1954 Geneva Accord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun Times recently printed an excellent analysis of the 1954 Geneva accord, which is the subject of considerable discussion these days among those who participate in the debate on Vietnam.

I have taken the privilege of including this in the Record today because I believe the Chicago Sun Times has done a truly remarkable job in summarizing the full significance of the 1954 Geneva accord.

The Sun Times article follows:

The 1954 Geneva Accord

Some of our readers have asked about the General accord of 1954, mentioned frequently in the efforts to find peace in Vietnam—what it is and how it came about.

The Geneva conference, which ran from April 26 to July 21, 1954, was called to settle the question of reunifying Korea and restoring peace to Indochina. The Korean question was not settled. The agreements reached on Indochina have become known as the Geneva accord. The accord is a complicated document of 47 articles plus a long annex to the agreement.

Broadly speaking, the Geneva accord of 1954 put an end to the fighting between France and the Vietminh forces under Ho Chi Minh in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. The accord deals primarily with Vietnam. Separate peace documents were drawn up for Laos and Cambodia.

Nine nations participated in the Geneva conference. They were the United Kingdom, the United States, France, Red China, the Soviet Union, Laos, Cambodia, North Vietnam and South Vietnam. Representatives of France and North Vietnam signed the accord. All of the rest of the participating nations, except the United States, took "note" of the Geneva accord and pledged to respect the sovereignty and independence of both Vietnams, Laos, and Cambodia.

The United States issued its own declaration. It stated that it would refrain from the threat or use of force to disturb the Geneva accord, cautioning that it would "view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security." The United States also pledged itself to seek to achieve the unity of both North and South Vietnam through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure fairness.

The major pronouncements of the Geneva accord are few but weighty. Vietnam was partitioned at the 17th parallel, pending elections which were to be held in 1956 for the purpose of reunifying the nation.

The introduction of armaments which would increase the military potential of either side was specifically prohibited. The accord also banned the introduction of any additional military forces by either side or the establishment of military bases. All hostilities were to be ended and an International Control Commission, made up of representatives from India, Canada, and Poland, was established to supervise and enforce the agreements.

It is a matter of historical dissent as to who broke the rules of the Geneva accord first and to what extent. However, it is part of the record that barely 3 months after the accord had been accepted the then Premier Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam asked President Eisenhower for assistance in the form of military advisers and supplies to meet the direct threat to his nation from Communist guerrillas. The assistance Diem sought was granted by the United States on October 24, 1954. President Eisenhower insisted that some reforms also be carried out and sent his personal representative to South Vietnam to supervise a broad program of agrarian and economic reforms.

It is also part of the record that Ho Chi Minh, North Vietnam's leader, had been an active Communist since the early 1920's. He had made public his plans to take over all of Indochina by guerrilla infiltration, subversion, and revolution. His plans have been in constant operation from the time his military forces administered the decisive defeat to the French at Dienbienphu in May 1954.

The purpose of the Geneva accord was to provide a means for Vietnam to stabilize itself and reunify through free elections. The elections were never held. The plan has not worked. If a return is made to the terms of the Geneva accord it is obvious that the agreements need strengthening, particularly in the area of enforcement of the terms, and it has been suggested that the United Nations is best fitted for that difficult job.

Vietnam Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1966, I addressed the House on the subject of our situation in Vietnam and urged that, following up on the suggestions made by Senator Robert F. Kennedy, an international study be launched, mobilizing the best possible experts, first, to explore the experience of various countries in which Communists have shared power with non-Communists, including cases such as Czechoslovakia, where the result was a Communist takeover, and other cases such as France, Italy, Finland, and Indonesia, where the result was the opposite; and second, to recommend possible arrangements for a system of shared power in South Vietnam, including provision for elections, which would provide safeguards, checks and balances, international supervision, and other guarantees, so as to make the system as foolproof as possible against Communist takeover.

Among the comments on this speech which I have received is one from Prof. Willis L. M. Reese of Columbia University, director of the Parker School of Foreign and Comparative Law. While Professor Reese differs with my conclusion that the study I recommended be carried on under private auspices, I believe his letter is a provocative one and accordingly I commend it to my colleagues and readers of the Congressional Record generally.

Professor Reese's letter follows:

Columbia University
in the City of New York,
New York, N.Y., March 16, 1966.

Hon. Jonathan B. Bingham,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Jack: Thank you for sending me a copy of your speech on the Vietnam situation. It strikes me as being the best speech on the subject that I have read, and I congratulate you with all my heart.

The one point about which I am dubious is your suggestion that the question of what terms might be offered the Vietcong should be studied by an independent group and be financed by foundation funds. My present inclination would be to say that this study should be done by people selected by the administration and should be financed with Government funds.

I suppose that the adminstration must already have given considerable thought to what sort of terms to offer the Vietcong, including the question of whether, and if so on what terms, they might be permitted to participate in the government of South Vietnam. Certainly, a willingness to negotiate would seem to suggest a willingness to give something to the other side, and the administration would certainly be delinquent if it has not given thought to what it might give.

A difficulty that I can see with having the job done privately is that so much time might elapse before foundation funds could be procured and before the job could be completed. It would be hard to get topnotch people to work full time or nearly full time on a job of this sort unless it were pretty obvious that the administration was behind the project and was in a hurry for the report.

Also, the administration would presumably be more inclined to accept the recommendations of a group selected by it than those of a group which had undertaken the study on its own initiative or perhaps on the initiative of a foundation. A report prepared by an independent group might furthermore be of some embarrassment to the administration. It would presumably be made public and this might make it difficult for the administration to reject its conclusions if it happened to disagree with them. On the other hand, there would be at least one advantage in having the existence of such a group made public. The Vietcong would hear of t, and this might make them more anxious to negotiate. If such publicity was felt desirable, the administration could appoint persons outside its ranks to make the study and make their names available to the press. To be sure, the Vietcong would be unlikely to believe that any group of men appointed by the administration could be unbiased. But, I suspect they would feel the same way about any group composed largely of U.S. citizens. What would count in the long run would be the merit of the proposals made by the group. Able persons appointed by the administration should be able to make as good proposals as anyone else.

These are all matters of detail and do not bear in any way upon the excellence of your general thesis.

Faithfully yours,

Willis L. M. Reese.

Saving Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in a recent editorial appearing in the Sunday Oregonian which comments on the fact that American farmers will be expected to grow more wheat because of the serious shortage of food in some parts of the world, especially India.

The paper states:

> The United States has been pouring millions of bushels into that famine-threatened country under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace programs. * * * President Johnson's food-for-freedom program follows closely the present arrangement, with greater emphasis on efforts of recipients to increase their own food production.

The Oregonian believes the knowledge that "they are producing wheat to alleviate hunger among the millions who would starve without it" will be a great satisfaction to American farmers.

Since the editorial deals with a subject of vital concern to us all at this time, I offer it for the Record, where my colleagues may peruse its contents:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Sunday Oregonian, Mar. 13, 1966]

Loosened Reins

It now appears almost certain that the total wheat allotment for next year will be increased by 10 percent—from 49.92 to 55 million acres.

A late Department of Agriculture report estimates that by July 1 the surplus stocks of wheat in this country will have shrunk to slightly below the 600 million bushels regarded as a necessary reserve against crop failure, new demands and other emergencies, including war. This is a supply 150 million bushels less than was foreseen only last October.

Last July 1, the carryover was placed at 818 million bushels. The 1965 crop was a bumper 1,327 million bushels. Ordinarily, this would have been more than enough to cover both domestic and export demands. But the Agriculture Department now estimates that 1,537 million bushels will have gone into domestic and foreign outlets by July 1, a demand more than 200 million bushels in excess of the crop.

Reason for the increased demand is the serious shortage of food in some parts of the world, especially India. The United States has been pouring millions of bushels into that famine-threatened country under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program. Payment has been in Indian currency, for which the United States has little use outside of India, and thus our grain shipments may be regarded largely as gifts.

Hunger will continue to create a great demand for American wheat in India and elsewhere. President Johnson's food-for-freedom program follows closely the present arrangement, with greater emphasis on efforts of recipients to increase their own food production. No substantial reduction in shipments from the United States can be expected.

Therefore, the Federal Government's objective now must be to increase production, rather than to reduce it, as it has tried to do in the past in the face of huge surpluses. Even this year, winter wheat growers are being paid to divert part of their allotments to other uses. Some 2.5 million acres of the 35 million allotted to winter wheat growers may have been diverted by the end of the signup period April 1. The average farmer receives about $13.50 an acre on diverted allotments.

Offer of diversion payments was withdrawn this year, however, on spring wheat when it became apparent that a larger crop was needed to meet foreign demands. It is expected that no payments will be offered for underplanting 1967 winter wheat and that the allotments will be boosted to a total of about 55 million acres.

It is good news to American wheat growers, of which the Pacific Northwest has many, that they most likely will be permitted to grow more wheat. The price should be good in view of the heavy demand.

There should be satisfaction for the growers, too, in the knowledge that they are producing wheat to alleviate hunger among the millions who would starve without it. Growing wheat for Government storage has not pleased farmers any more than city people.

All Americans, even though they must continue to pay heavily in taxes for the wheat sent out in foreign aid, should be happy that the reins are being loosened at least a little on this country's amazingly productive agriculture and that the food the money buys is being put to good use.

Release of Information on Federal Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased last week to learn of a Civil Service Commission letter spelling out in quite specific terms the policy regarding the release of Federal personnel information. This letter, addressed to heads of departments and independent establishments, should do much to protect the public's right to know about what is happening in their Government.

A few words of background are in order. Last summer and fall, the Post Office Department attracted considerable public attention because of its temporary refusal—later reversed—to reveal lists of summer employees. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out the inherent dangers of curtailing the right of the people to be fully informed of the operations of their Government. I was gratified when Mr. Macy, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, was quoted in newspaper reports as differing with the Post Office Department's secrecy regulation and suggesting guidelines to make release of basic personnel information mandatory upon all agencies.

The Commission's letter, dated March 17, goes a long way toward accomplishing those guidelines.

The Civil Service Commission—

It says—

holds that the names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations of Federal employees are public information.

And it goes on to say:

> The Commission believes, therefore, that standard Government policy generally should be to release names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations in response to requests.

While I commend the authors of this letter for the spirit in which it was conceived and the tone in which it was written, I would like to direct a word of caution to the agencies affected. Much of the letter's wording is, as it should be, subject to a fairly broad interpretation. Each agency must, if the implementation of the new rules is to fulfill their purpose, keep a close watch on their interpretation.

I am concerned specifically, Mr. Speaker, with two conditions attached to the policy of prompt issuance of information when it is requested. The letter urges rapid compliance with requests unless, among other things:

> There is a definite showing that the release would be contrary to the public interest and the costs of labor involved in the preparation of the list would require an unwarranted expenditure of agency funds or interruption of the work of the agency.

Who is to determine what, exactly, is "contrary to the public interest"? What constitutes "an unwarranted expenditure of agency funds"? Care must obviously be taken to uphold these liberalized procedures and to avoid making them more stringent than the authors intended, thus defeating their purpose.

Because of its potential usefulness in protecting the public's right to know, Mr. Speaker, I submit the full letter to the RECORD:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
FEDERAL PERSONNEL MANUAL SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1966.

Subject: Issuance of general policy on responding to requests for names of employees and identifying information.

Heads of Departments and Independent Establishments:

From time to time a Federal agency may be asked for the names alone, or for the names and certain identifying information, of some or all of its employees. The Civil Service Commission holds that the names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations of Federal employees are public information. As an example of the public nature of this information, the Official Register of the United States for many years contained the names of all Government employees, with title, salary, state of origin, and duty station.

The Commission believes, therefore, that standard Government policy generally should be to release names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations in response to requests.

For assistance in carrying out that broad policy when lists are requested, the Commission has issued the following guides, based on its own experience and after consultation with interested groups:

The agency should comply promptly with every request for the names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations of Federal employees unless (a) there is a definite showing that the release would be contrary to the public interest; (b) it is evident that the list is sought for purposes of commercial or other solicitation; (c) there is reason to believe that the names would be used for purposes which may be in violation of the Hatch Act; or, (d) the costs or labor involved in the preparation of the list would require an unwarranted expenditure of agency funds or interruption of the work of the agency. If unwarranted time or cost would be involved, the person requesting the list should be told that and what costs must be paid or work arrangements made by him before the list will be furnished.

The guides may be applied to specific requests along the following lines:

From Congressmen or congressional committees: The information should be furnished promptly; if furnishing lists precisely as requested would entail undue cost, this should be reported to the requesting party along with suggestions of any possible alternatives that would be helpful but more economical.

From the press and other information media on behalf of the public: The information should be furnished promptly if it is available without unreasonable public expense or interruption of regular work; otherwise, estimate the necessary time and costs, inform the requesting party what is involved, and determine if the needs can be met with information that can be furnished at reasonable cost or expenditure of time. When information media desire lists for solicitation purposes, they are treated like other commercial firms.

From commercial firms and individual solicitors: Such requests should ordinarily be refused; exceptions should be made only when it is clear that the public interest will be served (for example, requests from compilers of widely used directories) and there will be negligible public expense or interruption of work. In no event will names be furnished for solicitation purposes.

From charitable organizations: Few if any requests should be received from charitable organizations since the arrangements for charitable fundraising in the Federal service are prescribed by the Federal Fundraising Manual. Mail solicitation of employees at place of employment is not authorized, and this should be emphasized to any group requesting a list of names. If a charitable organization desires a list for other than solicitation purposes, it should be treated like other nonprofit organizations.

From nonprofit organizations such as professional societies, schools, unions, veterans' organizations, State societies, etc.: In general, it should be the policy to cooperate fully with these organizations when it is evident that little cost to the agency or interruption of work would result. Otherwise, estimate the necessary time and costs, inform the requesting party what is involved, and determine if the needs can be met with information that can be furnished at reasonable cost or expenditure of time.

By direction of the Commission.

NICHOLAS J. OGANOVIC,
Executive Director.

Suggestions on the Balance-of-Payments Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues some thoughts on the balance-of-payments problem sent to me by L. B. King, manager of the Davenport, Iowa, plant of Caterpillar Tractor. Mr. King makes some interesting suggestions as to the best long-range solution to the problem of gold deficits:

CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO.,
Davenport, Iowa, March 8, 1966.

Hon JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHMIDHAUSER: Because the balance of payments appears to be a very timely subject in Washington, we thought you would be interested in the attached editorial about our company's experience in this area.

In 1965, Caterpillar's net contribution to the flow of international payments into the United States was $461 million. In other words—since the total national balance-of-payments deficit was $1.3 billion—had there been just three additional companies with records similar to that of Caterpillar, there would have been no U.S. deficit at all.

Our 1965 sales to customers outside the United States were $607 million. Over three-fourths of these sales consisted of product built in the United States by U.S. workmen. The remaining portion, of course, represents product built in foreign facilities.

I believe you may be interested in knowing that, from the beginning, these foreign facilities have provided a significant means by which our exports from the United States have been expanded. This has been brought about in two ways: (1) by the shipment of U.S.-built parts and components and for incorporation in Caterpillar machines produced abroad (for sales which otherwise would not have been made at all), and (2) by the stronger representation for U.S. exports that comes from active representation and participation, through subsidiaries, in the industrial economies of host countries.

We therefore believe that present voluntary restraints (with which we are completely cooperating) on direct dollar investment abroad find justification only as a short-term expedient. For a long-term standpoint, we believe such restraints are self-defeating because: (1) they can limit national income from such investment (which has substantially exceeded outlays in the past), and (2) they can inhibit the beneficial effect such foreign investment has on U.S. exports.

It would, therefore, naturally be our hope that such voluntary curbs will be only temporary in nature.

Sincerely,

L. B. KING.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Feb. 8, 1966]

CATERPILLAR SHOWS THE WAY ON EXPORTS

A couple of years ago it was fashionable *among those whose prejudices automatically except perfidy and doubletalk from* "management" to suspect and expect the worst from Caterpillar overseas expansion.

Today, the actual performance and experience demonstrates that, in fact, Caterpillar management's explanations, projections, and pronouncements on their future operations were accurate and wise.

*The latest annual report to the stock*holders reveals that exports haev so increased as to jump already high figures by 20 percent in the income from overseas sales. This increase they have reported in the context of the "balance of payments" and of how (responding to the crying need the President *has sounded) they have contributed* $461 *million to a more favorable balance.* The previous year it had climbed to $373 million.

This is of key benefit to the enitre financial position of the United States with its delicate situation on gold in *foreign* trade, but the *direct nature of the benefit lies* in the fact that it is of goods manufactured in our plants and sold overseas.

The 25 percent of overseas sales that is actually manufactured overseas has "opened doors" whereby the 75 percent overseas sales being made of products made here exceeds *all previous sales put together.*

Net gain is spectacular, and *is precisely* what Caterpillar predicted, and the gainers are not just government with its eye on foreign trade balance but the tens of thousands of workers engaged in making the equipment here that is thus being sold abroad.

The increase once again emphasizes the *plain fact that Caterpillar's success, its* employment level, and its ability to meet cost levels depend on the ability of the company to make sales in other countries.

As a leader in this complex field, Caterpillar has also passed on some of its knowledge and techniques to others, and assisted *Governor Kerner in his efforts to stimulate* overseas sales for Illinois firms.

It is no accident that the Manufacturers News, in announcing the 1966 directory of Illinois manufacturers, calls attention proudly to the fact that "Illinois industry is developing new international muscle."

More than 5,000 Illinois firms now sell goods and services throughout the world. Almost 20 percent of the manufacturing and processing firms in this Midwestern State now do business overseas.

Meanwhile some 1,500 firms moved into Illinois locations during 1965 and only three moved out to locations elsewhere.

There is a connection.

The Governor deserves due credit for recognizing that the grassroots base for resolving economic problems, for having a base to support governmental efforts in solving social problems, and for maintaining key services lies in increased industry.

He deserves credit for working effectively in that direction, and for recognizing the key importance of export sales to it.

Caterpillar deserves credit for pioneering in this field and for giving every expert assistance to the Governor's program and to other firms interested in doing business in foreign lands.

Everyone is better off for it, just as we would all find ourselves worse off if this State had stood still in this field of activity.

Caterpillar has thus also demomstrated, with dramatic results, the honesty, integrity, and accuracy of its announcements on future plans of this kind, and its effective concern for the United States, this State, this community, and the security of its own work *force.*

Talk is talk, and facts are facts.

We have again been shown that the two go together at Caterpillar, and this, too, is a matter of great importance to this community.

Address of Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Economic Development Director Eugene P. Foley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by Eugene P. Foley, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Economic Development Director, delivered in honor of northwest Florida's *"Businessman of the Year" in De Funiak Springs, Fla., Friday, March 4, 1966.*

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR EUGENE P. FOLEY SCHEDULED FOR DELIVERY AT DINNER HONORING NORTHWEST *FLORIDA'S "BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR" IN THE NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY, DE FUNIAK* SPRINGS, FLA., AT 7 P.M., FRIDAY, MARCH 4

Mr. Koerber, congratulation. Your story is inspirational to businessmen all over the country. Turning a 25-cent-a-day chicken and egg delivery business into an $6-million-a-year poultry processing business represents the daring, talent, managerial ability, perseverence, and drive that has made our country the richest in the world. And it also represents the qualities needed to get depressed areas on a permanent road to economic growth.

There are two elements in Mr. Koerber's story that intrigued me—mainly because they are what I am in the business of trying to achieve. These two aspects are: (1) the impact one growing industry can have on an entire aera, and (2) the importance of community support—financial as well as moral.

First, let me speak for a moment on the impact that one growing industry can have on an entire area. Part of the job of the Economic Development Administration is to attract such industries to economically depressed areas and to encourage industries already in those areas to expand. In order to do an effective job, we must first understand those depressed areas.

Most developed countries have regions that have grown and thrived throughout their history—and others that have either thrived and then dwindled or never were able to grow.

Our expanding economy has experienced changes in demand for certain items, and that changing demand has meant a change in an area's advantages. An area that once had advantages may suddenly find itself without them. West Virginia thrived when coal was a major source of heat, but it became a high unemployment area when the demand for coal decreased.

Or an area once without advantages may find itself ideally suited to producing a product that is wanted and needed. Some areas have never grown. And others have grown since the very beginning of our history—and continue to do so. New York, with its good harbor and diversified economy continues to expand.

In the 19th century an area's advantages *were its natural ones. Most production was* tied to primary industries, to nature—farming, raising livestock, and mining. Plants that processed the natural goods had little choice about their location. They had to be close to the goods being processed, usually for two reasons: (1) the natural goods could spoil, and (2) transportation *costs were very high.*

Now, however, our industries are technologically advanced and transportation costs are lower. Thus, plants are more free to locate. They do not need to be near the "source."

This means areas are better able to determine their own advantages. *An area's growth relies on its ability to attract indus*tries seeking new locations, especially industries that export goods to other regions of the country. Competition among areas for industries seeking new locations is great.

The program for which I am responsible—the Economic Development Administration—*was created for the purpose of helping communities identify legitimate business oppor*tunities and develop them.

Almost two-thirds of EDA's funds authorized are for the construction of public facilities. The very title of the Act authorizing the EDA program—the Public Works and *Economic Development Act*—indicates an awareness between the need for adequate public facilities for the attraction of industry. EDA will not grant funds to just any town that wants to improve its facilities. The program is highly selective. Money can only be given if the area has genuine possibilities *for growing—and causing the areas around it to grow. Proposed projects must* be related to the expansion of business opportunities and the creation of long-term employment. In contrast to EDA's predecessor, the Area Redevelopment Administration, there is no emphasis on immediate employment. If two cities request funds *from EDA, and one has a project that will* result in immediate employment but the other has one that promises to be a stimulant to growth in an entire area, the latter city will get the funds.

EDA's program also provides more business capital to depressed areas, another way of *giving an "edge" to such a community.* Funds are authorized for industrial loans—long-term and low-interest—to businesses that will locate in depressed areas or, if already there, want to expand. In addition, EDA can guarantee up to 90 percent of private working capital loans made to projects eligible for direct aid.

EDA can also provide technical assistance, another device that gives depressed areas an advantage in attracting industries. These areas need to analyze and understand their problems before they can find solutions. They need to identify regional needs and approaches and, of course, the bottlenecks which have prevented progress.

All these tools exist to enable one area to attract new businesses or help old businesses expand which will, in turn, as you in De Funiak Springs well know, help an entire area to grow. These businesses need employees who will spend their paychecks on food, clothing, shelter, and luxuries. That means mor people are needed in the industries providing these goods and services—the entire area will pick up.

I should emphasize here that our program is not designed to help one area grow at the expense of other areas. We do not want to redistribute the wealth of the Nation and to relocate economic activity from the more prosperous regions to the depressed regions. There is enough growth to go around, as our rising gross national product indicates. There is an expanding, not a fixed, national pie of potential for economic growth. Our intention is to increase the contribution of each region of the country to that national pie.

Mr. Koerber, I'm sure, got help of some kind from the community when he was first beginning his business. And one of the most salient points of his story is the town raising $40,000 to enable him to keep his doors open when calamity struck. This is the kind of local initiative and support our programs demand, and what its success relies on.

In this respect EDA is very similar to other Great Society programs. A tenet of the Great Society is that enforced solutions will never work. People in local communities must want programs designed for their benefit. Programs cannot attain their goals unless a willingness to support the solution to a particular problem permeates the community.

In the case of EDA, possible recipients of loans and grants must be willing to put up part of the money for the project. And they must also fulfill other requirements, especially that of developing on overall economic development plan—which increases the chances of the project's contributing to the economic growth of the area.

EDA programs—and those of the entire Federal Government—not only rely on local initiative. They seek to expand opportunities for local initiative, both individual and collective. For instance, the Bureau of Public Roads builds roads. In so doing, it enables an individual businessman who wants to ship his goods to a particular city to do so. An EDA loan enables a community that wants to attract industry to fulfill its desire.

I know this refutes a widespread impression that the Government is out to control all it can. But a careful examination of individual Federal programs will verify what I have said. These programs seek to be the helping hand that so many communities cry out for.

Well, Mr. Koerber, if I could report to the Congress the presence of a growing industry such as yours and the presence of community support such as exists here in De Funiak Springs in every ear in the Nation which concerns us, I would be a very happy man indeed. As we work with our programs, we will keep both you and this community in our minds as we work in Washington toward our goals of curing the economic wounds of the Nation and increasing our national wealth.

The First Human Right—An Address by the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1966, at a banquet in his honor, Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg was the recipient of the America's Democratic Legacy Award from the Anti-Defamation League for his continuing championship of freedom, justice, and equality.

In accepting the award Ambassador Goldberg made the following address which I commend to the attention of our colleagues:

THE FIRST HUMAN RIGHT

(NOTE.—Ambassador Goldberg calls it "life itself"—and if it is to have value, all men must learn "to practice tolerance and live together as good neighbors.")

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

President Kennedy once said, "Here on earth God's work must be truly our own."

In practical terms, a dynamic world society that has found ways to smash the atom and to conquer space must now use its genius and its resources to find new ways in human relations so that all men will live together in peace and harmony. There is no other way to succeed in achieving a world community of nations safe from the scourge of war.

In America we have long recognized the inescapable fact that there is no dividing line between equality and liberty. Indeed, it was George Washington who wrote to America's first Jewish congregation that a truly free nation gives "to bigotry no sanction; to persecution, no assistance."

Our Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965 gave a new voice and force to these words. Every citizen in our Nation is now legally committed to their implementation. Every citizen has the obligation to do so not only because we have new laws, but because they are good and morally sound laws.

Despite our new laws, however, can we say that there is no sanction of bigotry in America? Can we say that equal opportunity is now an accomplished fact? Can we say it does not exist in the factory, in the office, in our labor unions, in the executive suite of our corporations, in some of our higher educational institutions? Can we say if beginnings are made to eliminate racial discrimination, this extends to the elimination of religious discrimination? Can we say we have strpped bigotry from our minds and hearts?

We are now only at the beginning of the end. Writing civil rights measures against discrimination into law gives us no moral rights to pause in any phase of what must be a never-ending fight. There is no such thing as a little bit of prejudice.

The aims that guide us domestically guide us internationally. Whether at home or abroad we must move ahead in the good company of those willing to stand up and to speak up against injustice.

Seventeen years ago, the United Nations made notable progress when it adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The declaration was a milestone in every sense, but we must look to new horizons now. We can no longer talk about how much we loathe discrimination: The test of our loathing must be the speed and effectiveness with which each and every nation turns up the lights in its own house to end the darkness in which discrimination breeds and dwells.

The lights did not shine brightly enough when the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination—adopted at the last session of the General Assembly—omitted a specific reference to anti-Semitism as one of the particular evils to be condemned.

With its evil history over the centuries and the monstrous crime of 6 million Jews murdered by the Nazis little more than a generation ago, anti-Semitism demands condemnation by name. The U.S. delegation at the U.N. will continue the fight to do so by raising the issue again in the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations.

We will do so because our attitude is consistent no matter what the violation of a man's right—anti-Semitism, apartheid in South Africa or the denial of rights to black Africans in Rhodesia.

More than 100 years ago Lincoln observed this Nation could not endure half free and half slave. Surely it is an appropriate question to ask whether any nation today can endure one-fifth free and four-fifths slave.

The twin evils posed by Rhodesia and South Africa point up the challenges that face us not only in the United Nations, but as a sovereign people deeply committed to the freedom and the equality of the individual.

We know from our own national experience that the response to injustice can be both emotional and extreme. Finding the peaceful and speedy solution is not easy. This is the problem that now confronts us and other Western nations in our relationships with the new African and the Asian states. It is quite understandable that they are suspicious of promises and impatient of results.

It is not easy to wipe out the evils of the past centuries overnight. Yet the call is universal both here and abroad—freedom and equality—here and now. We must honor this call and put an end to any form of racism, or indeed any instance of discrimination, be it based on race, sex, language or religion.

The great Court, on which I had the honor to sit, said a little more than 2 years ago that the concept of eliminating discrimination with all deliberate speed never contemplated indefinite delay. Indeed, it cannot. The mortal blow to discrimination will not be struck, however, when its most vicious elements will be ended but only when all people everywhere will be concerned when just one man somewhere has the least of his rights trampled upon. The elimination of all forms of discrimination and racism must be the companion goal of man's eternal search for peace.

In Vietnam, the problem now occupying so much of the attention and determination of Americans, what we seek is nothing less than one of the most basic human rights of our day: that each person should have the right and the opportunity to choose his own destiny free from fear and free from force.

Thomas Paine said at the time of the American Revolution that "those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it." Since that time, we in America have supported the principle of self-determination for ourselves and for all others. It is a central theme of our domestic policy; it is a cornerstone of our foreign policy. It is also a basic principle of the UN Charter to which we and all member states of the UN are committed. It would be wholly inconsistent if we should turn our back on that principle now.

We also believe that the power of our Nation must always be used for peace no less than for fighting.

We were told by individuals and nations of many ideologies that a pause in our bombing raids on North Vietnam for a reasonable period of time would be essential before Hanoi would respond. The President ordered a halt and it went into effect just before Christmas, but there was no indication that Hanoi was any the more interested in peace.

Our conviction remains that the Vietnamese people—once the aggression from the North ends—are entitled to work out their destinies so that each man—North and South—will enjoy the fruits of peace.

It would be a mistake to assume—despite the negative response from Hanoi—that our peace initiative has not been worthwhile. We have made our views and peaceful intent known to all nations. It is precisely because there can be no question of our peaceful intent, that Ho Chi Minh felt called upon to defend his intransigent policies to the Communist world.

Unlike his stale polemic, the American position is plain, simple and morally sound. In essence it is:

That the United States is prepared for discussions or negotiations without any prior conditions whatsoever or on the basis of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962;

That a reciprocal reduction of hostilities could be envisaged and that a ceasefire might be the first order of business in any discussions or negotiations;

That the United States remains prepared to withdraw its forces from South Vietnam as soon as South Vietnam is in a position to determine its own future without external interference;

That the United States desires no continuing military presence or bases in Vietnam;

That the future political structure in South Vietnam should be determined by the South Vietnamese people themselves through democratic processes;

That the questions of the reunification of the two Vietnams should be decided by the free decision of their two peoples.

But until an honorable settlement is reached in honorable negotiations, the United States will respect its commitments and the human rights of self-determination in South Vietnam. If aggression there is permitted to succeed, the consequence will be felt not only in Vietnam but in all the world. We fight an enemy that has planned its aggression. And history has taught us—especially the history of the Nazi years—the horrible lesson that retreat does not bring safety and weakness does not bring peace. We will continue to resist aggression, therefore, but we will continue to seek peace.

At this moment, the fighting goes on and no one should be misled as to what is happening in South Vietnam. This is no more a civil war between citizens of the South than the Communist takeover of China was a simple agrarian reform movement. The Communist Government of North Vietnam, aided by Peiping has led, supplied, equipped, and sustained the fighting in the South. Hanoi has sent its regular army forces into battle and at least nine of its combat regiments have been identified. The presence of others is also evident. These North Vietnamese army units have been identified by many sources including neutral ones.

Hanoi has sent large mortars with a range of up to 6 miles. These sophisticated weapons are obviously not locally manufactured guerrilla arms nor have they been captured in the south. They are of foreign communist manufacture.

We want an end to terror and to violence in Vietnam, but this end can only come when communist aggression ceases and when our adversaries are as ready as we are for an honorable settlement.

Life itself is the first human right. If it is to have value, all men must learn—in the words of the United Nations Charter—"to practice tolerance and live together as good neighbors." That is our wish for the people of America, for the people of North and South Vietnam, for the people of the world.

McNamara Reassures United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Constitution has commented editorially on Defense Secretary McNamara's assurance that the Armed Forces are not overextended or suffering shortages but are fully capable of meeting their commitments anywhere.

The newspaper believes the defense achievement to date "is a great tribute to the Nation's adaptability and determination."

In the belief that many will want to read this editorial, I am taking the liberty of making it available for publication in the RECORD:

MCNAMARA REASSURES UNITED STATES

Secretary of Defense McNamara assures the country the Armed Forces are not overextended or suffering shortages but are "fully capable" of meeting their commitments anywhere. This news is welcomed in view of the fact there have been charges that the demands of the Vietnam war were depleting the Nation's trained manpower to a dangerous degree.

The Secretary also disclosed that 20,000 additional men were on their way to join the war against the Vietcong, bringing our total forces in South Vietnam to 235,000. "Far from overextending ourselves," the Secretary declared, "we have actually extended our military position."

The country will hope that the Secretary is right but it remains uncertain how many troops finally will have to be sent to Vietnam to win a military victory, if it comes to that. There are speculations that as many as 400,000 will be needed by the end of this year—more than the number in action during the Korean war. At this stage, we may expect troop strength to continue to climb.

In a press conference Wednesday, the Secretary was candid enough to say that some concepts and methods forged by him and his experts have failed to meet the test of the Vietnam war. "We have to develop new methods to meet problems for which we had old answers," he said. "Old answers are not applying." Those who have followed the course of the war will agree and hope that the new answers have been found.

Concerning the buildup, the Secretary also had a significant statement. "Never before," he declared, "has this Nation or any other nation been able to place so large a force in combat in so short a time and some 10,000 miles from its shores without calling up Reserves, extending active duty tours on a widespread basis and invoking the kinds of strict economic controls normally associated with military emergencies."

The country still may have to resort to the measures in the above statement but the achievement to date is a great tribute to the Nation's adaptability and determination.

We Cannot Afford Apathy About the Hunger Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, there has been over the past months a good deal of very constructive discussion about the worldwide population explosion and the problems associated with it. Senator GRUENING has held a number of very interesting and informative hearings in the Senate. The House Agriculture Committee has considered the matter in connection with the proposed food-for-freedom legislation. Newspapers and other communications media have devoted space and time to discussing the problem.

I would like to take this opportunity to salute those who have had the courage to lead and join in a rational dialog concerning a subject which was once taboo and upon which continued silence would have been disastrous. The people as a whole are becoming aware that the options are very simple: Either we undertake to reduce the birth rate or we face mass famine and political unrest.

The Battle Creek Enquirer-News, which serves the city of Battle Creek, which I have the privilege of representing in Congress, has been one of the national leaders in bringing this problem to public attention. Space in the paper has been devoted to a discussion of the problem, and the paper has commented editorially on the matter, always with pertinence and good taste.

A particularly informative editorial on the matter appeared recently in the paper, and I take this occasion to bring it to the attention of the Members:

WE CANNOT AFFORD APATHY ABOUT THE HUNGER PROBLEM

An Associated Press feature on the world hunger problem, published in the Enquirer & News Sunday, implied that people with full stomachs do not become very concerned about those who go hungry.

"Since the scope of the problem has been poorly comprehended by the general public in rich countries," the writer said, "there has been a high degree of apathy toward the plight of hungry millions."

If that is so, the time has come to abolish that apathy and become concerned. The day is not far away when the food problem will reach the proportions of a disaster unless more is done to feed the underfed and to increase farm production.

Coupled with this problem is the matter of population control, and to that issue also more attention must be directed. Commenting on the problem earlier this year, four Nobel Prize winners warned of a "new dark age" of hunger, poverty, cannibalism, and possible nuclear warfare if world population growth were not checked.

The urgency of the problem is borne out by a few figures:

There are 180,000 new mouths to be fed every day—65 million a year.

If present trends continue, world population will rise from the present 3.4 billion to from 6 to 7.5 billion by the year 2000.

The growth, moreover, will occur mainly in the underdeveloped nations where the masses even now can be described as in a state of conditioned starvation.

The United States, of course, has done a great deal through its Food for Peace program to avert famine in many nations. An official of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization has been quoted as saying that had it not been for American food surpluses, "the disaster would be upon us right now."

This country must do still more, however, if disaster in the form of death and unrest fostered by nagging want is to be averted.

Governmental efforts in that direction are embodied in the administration's Food for Freedom bill, which would authorize a 5-year program for furnishing food abroad to replace the present program when it expires on December 31.

The purposes of the bill are to expand international trade, to develop and expand U.S. markets, combat hunger and malnutrition, and encourage economic development in the developing countries with emphasis on aid to countries determined to improve their own agricultural production. Wisely, it requires stepped-up efforts by recipient nations to improve their own production capabilities, as a condition of receiving the aid. So it is not merely a handout but an effort to encourage food-short nations to overcome their shortages.

This bill deserves the support of every citizen in the form of letters to Congressmen. For, in the words of a witness who testified recently for the bill:

"A livable world cannot long exist in which two-thirds of human beings never get enough to eat, and the remaining third are overfed."

School Milk and School Lunch Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, as Congress pursues a cautious and deliberate course through a stream of complex and serious national and international issues, it is imperative that those matters of a less crucial nature not be overlooked.

One of the seemingly less crucial problems that could be an unfortunate victim of our well-intentioned preoccupation with questions of paramount importance is the appropriation for the school milk and school lunch programs.

The Nation realizes that a certain degree of fiscal restraint will be necessary to insure our Government's capacity to meet our serious challenges, particularly our commitment in Vietnam.

The question is not whether increased economy measures are needed, but rather, where these economy measures can be safely directed.

I submit that the school milk and school lunch programs, proven and valuable Government services that they are, should not be summarily sacrificed.

We should instead direct our paring knives to appropriations for less proven and less valuable services that can better absorb cuts without serious impairment of such widespread impact.

If the Vietnam conflict is to require sacrifice on the part of certain Government programs, there are alternatives open to us. We may choose to begin by temporarily restoring the excise taxes on luxury items untouched by the recent tax adjustment measure.

Another alternative would be a move to effect reasonable reductions in certain antipoverty programs. Commonsense dictates that when economy measures are required, they should begin with those programs that have not as yet won broad acceptance nor demonstrated positive effectiveness.

In order to place into perspective the terrible impact of the proposed reductions, I would like to introduce some facts on the situation in my State.

In Wyoming, with a population of approximately 340,000, some 32,000 children in 273 participating schools were served lunches during fiscal 1965. During that year, 5.2 million lunches were served. Only 3 percent of the lunches were served free to needy children. For the remaining children, the cost of the lunch was 27 cents a meal, with the Government absorbing 10 to 11 cents a lunch. Wyoming received $222,000 in Federal assistance for the lunch program.

Under terms of the proposed cut, the Government would now pay 1 cent less per lunch, which would mean Wyoming would receive $40,000 to $50,000 less, based on 1966 participation. This would result in Government assistance of $170,000 to $180,000—instead of the $222,000 last year.

During fiscal 1965, milk was served in 314 schools with 3.6 million half pints of milk served to Wyoming schoolchildren. This was over and above the 5 million included in the lunch program.

In the proposed budget, funds for this program are cut from $103 million to $21 million, and milk is to be served only in schools with no lunch program. This reduction of four-fifths means that Wyoming could expect her share to be $25,800—instead of the $129,000 received in fiscal 1965.

These children have paid 3 to 4 cents a half pint with the Government providing the other 3 cents. The immediate consequence would be a doubling of the cost of milk to the student.

This summary indicates to what a great extent this reduction would work a hardship on Wyoming students. I know it cannot be any less severe in our sister States, and with the total effect calculated, this proposed reduction can only be viewed as a serious threat to one of the most beneficial of Government programs.

The cost of these programs is actually modest when we view them as an investment in the health of our Nation's youth. The merits of establishing good dietary habits for our youth is obvious. Health is an essential factor in learning.

To restrict the chief impact to needy students is to place them in a separate and distinct category—an outlook so contrary to our American equality concept of a public school.

The school milk and lunch programs have done more than any other Federal program to improve the diet and health of American students. Now we are asked to assume the impossible task of limiting it to the needy, when we know that any ruling established will still hurt deserving children. This program must continue to be open to all students.

Because the merit is so apparent, perhaps it is best to emphasize the harmful consequence of a reduction. The increased cost would certainly cause some students to withdraw from the programs entirely, often to a totally unsatisfactory situation.

The dairy industry, already troubled by farmers leaving because of low income, would be further damaged, since these programs create and develop markets for dairy products.

The milk program supplements the dairy price support program because markets are provided for Government-purchased milk. Otherwise, the Commodity Credit Corporation would have to buy and store dairy surpluses—at a direct cost of about $100 million—or almost the cost of the milk program in 1965.

Surely the scant savings ultimately realized by this ill-advised budget cut do not justify such a move. To continue the present program, as the public most surely will demand, will merely shift the burden to State governments already beset by increasing pressures upon their resources.

There is only one practical course open to us—total restoration of the necessary appropriations, for to handicap these programs in the false name of economy would be a grave disservice to the Nation.

Vietnam: Political Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, political freedom and the individual security which democracy can provide are relatively new concepts in Asia. We must not forget, however, that these things are what the war is all about in Vietnam. It comes down quite simply to whether the South Vietnamese shall have a government imposed by force from the north or the right to choose their own government.

The following editorial from the March 20, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune illustrates this dilemma:

VIETNAM: POLITICAL DILEMMA

When Buddhist monks in saffron robes start fulminating, and crowds pour into Vietnamese city streets, the United States is always reminded of its most painful dilemma in South Vietnam. One horn is the stark fact that this unhappy country has no government—only an administration. The other is that there can be no government in any real sense until there is enough peace and order to permit the people to establish one. Yet government is the essence of the war in Vietnam; the reason why North Vietnam and the United States are sending in troops.

In cold logic, this need not present any crisis of conscience in the United States. The American purpose is to permit the South Vietnamese to choose their own government; the purpose of North Vietnam is to impose one upon them—the same kind of Government which Ho Chi Minh created in the north at the cost of perhaps 100,000 lives and nearly a million refugees. The American aim is not ignoble.

But an administration formed by military men to fight a war is not likely to be the kind that wins devotion from either the peasantry or the intelligentsia. Nor, in a nation as new as South Vietnam, has there been time to erect the largely self-functioning bureaucracy that enables older states to carry on even during wars and revolutions. Wars, especially like that now being waged in South Vietnam, seldom lend themselves to the redress of grievances. The Communists appeal to those suffering economic hardships by shooting landlords. Then, of course, they shoot the peasants if the latter do not join the local collective. But that hardly comes under the head of reform.

The objective of any administration in a country situated as South Vietnam now is must be to give the people as efficient services as can be rendered under the circumstances and to assure them that they will eventually be permitted to set up a government. It must enlist as broad support as possible. But at the same time it cannot bring into the leadership groups which, whether from good or evil intent, will sabotage the war effort.

This is an ideal which no South Vietnamese administration has yet achieved. There has been conflict of ambition, there has been unnecessary harshness, there has been corruption. The best that can be said of the men who have managed affairs in South Vietnam is that they have been no worse than those who have floated to the top in most of the new nations, and better than a good many. Also that their efforts are, in the long run, infinitely more promising for the freedom and economic well-being of the South Vietnamese people than the straitjacket imposed upon the North.

The role of the United States in all of this is infinitely delicate. It is blamed for all the shortcomings of the Saigon leadership and yet it cannot exert full control over that leadership without stultifying its own position. It is accused of both action and inaction—and can have no assurance, in any case, that its own selection of leaders would be any better than those already in charge. Nor is there any certainty that movements stirring in the land—political Buddhism, for example—are more than crude power plays or less than attempted subversion.

With the unpleasant burden of so much responsibility and such limited authority in civil affairs, the United States must struggle. There are no easy answers for the political dilemma, any more than for the war itself—although the outcome of the war may well hang upon the resolution of the dilemma. But what the American people must not do is to be so sensitive to the constant and often contradictory criticism leveled at the administration in Saigon that they overlook the wood for the trees, that they join the critics in equating a temporary authoritarianism there with the permanent slavery that Vietcong are trying by force and fraud to put in its place.

Civilian Command and Robert McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the defense of our Nation is an awesome and sobering job. Everyone of us who serves in the Congress is daily made aware of the complexities of this task. The man who today, at one of the most dangerous periods in history, bears the brunt of this enormous burden, is Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

As a former member of the Armed Services Committee, as well as in my current committee assignment, I have had occasion to observe the Secretary at close range and to be aware of the dedication and ability he brings to his task.

Because the problems he tackles are not easy of solution, because the decisions he makes affect so many facets of our public and private lives today, there is an understandable tendency to be critical of the conduct of the Secretary of Defense. But all of us owe a debt to Bob McNamara for the magnificent job he has done. While we may disagree with individual decisions he has made, none of us should doubt his high motivation and sincere dedication to the welfare of our country.

Mr. Joseph Kraft's column in yesterday's Washington Post, which follows, is a reminder of the many criticisms leveled at the Secretary as he endeavors to reconcile conflicting interests in the Department of Defense for the common good of all Americans:

McNamara's Enemies: Vested Interests Display Hand

(By Joseph Kraft)

Under cover of the Vietnamese war there is being waged a dirty political fight against Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

The attackers are the same old professional military men who have at all times challenged McNamara's rational approach to defense management. They are allied with the same old vested interests in the defense industries. And they speak through the same old military tribunes of the Congress.

Only now they are using the confusion and emotion of the war to reopen arguments lost long ago on the merits. A broad sampling of this ugly technique comes newly to hand with the publication of the Senate and House Armed Services Committee hearing on the supplemental defense appropriation bill for this fiscal year.

For a starter, consider that old chestnut, the role of the heavy bomber, Secretary McNamara and his civilian aids found, and convincingly demonstrated, that in a nuclear war, missiles would be immeasurably superior to manned bombers. They also found that in nonnuclear war, medium bombers were the most useful. Accordingly, they have been phasing out production of the heavy bombers.

But Air Force bomber pilots die hard. And they are now having their spokesman intimate that if only heavy bombing in North Vietnam were permitted, the other side would be on its knees. Here, for example, is Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, a former Secretary of the Air Force.

"They have taken the Air Force, put it in the ring, said make a good fight, then criticized it. You turn loose the naval air and Air Force air of this country against North Vietnamese military targets and you are going to have a changing situation in South Vietnam."

Another outworn issue centers on the famous TFX or F-111, a combined fighter-bomber which Secretary McNamara had designed for combined use by both the Navy and Air Force. Inevitably, the common design compromised out certain special features that the Navy wanted, and others desired by the Air Force. Still the plane has proved very effective.

But here is a sweet question on the matter put to two Navy officials by Chairman L. Mendel Rivers, the Democratic Representative from Charleston, S.C., with its big naval base: "When you get by yourself at home at night * * * do you wish you had some other plane rather than working on the 111, to work aboard the carriers? If you had your way, wouldn't you rather have something else?"

And here is Representative William H. Bates, Republican, of Massachusetts, and former naval officer, on the same subject:

"We have to remember that these planes here might fight the latest that somebody else might have, and we cannot fight a compromise airplane against a noncompromised airplane. If the situation should change overnight in Vietnam, so that we would have other planes against us, this is what we have to be ready for. * * *"

Another issue long since settled considers the Navy attack plane. Instead of the heavy and expensive A-6 Secretary McNamara had designed a lighter and cheaper attack aircraft, the A-7. A part of the savings in money and weight came in radar equipment, and as a result, the A-7 is less able to fly in bad weather than the A-6. Still, there has been no important letup of naval air attacks because of weather in Vietnam.

But the A-6 was built by the Grumman Aircraft Co. of Long Island, while the new A-7 contract went to another company. And here is a typical question from Representative Otis Pike, from a Long Island district with not a few constituents who work for Grumman:

"Does it make any sense to you to continue to buy aircraft in large numbers which are incapable of performing their mission at night, or in bad weather?"

On the surface, to be sure, these look like reasonable questions and comments. But the real purpose is to put into question the whole system of analysis and choice that has for the first time made it possible for the civilian leadership to get a grip on the defense program. And if anyone has any doubts on that matter, here is a revealing assertion by Repreentative Bates:

"The question that bothers me in all of these hearings is the kind of planning."

In the face of these attacks, it is easy to see why Secretary McNamara sometimes seems highhanded with the congressional committees. The fact is that the only way he could have amicable relations with the committees would be to let them and their allies in the defense industries and the military services run the defense programs. To me anyhow, it is a supreme source of satisfaction that he continues to meet his responsibilities.

Chicago's Scholarly Cop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has recently been written about the great things that are happening in Chicago. It is a source of pride to all of us from Chicago that finally, after many years of abuse and denegation, Chicago is now being recognized as the most exciting metropolis in America.

The complete transformation of the Chicago Police Department is one of the reasons, among many, for this revival of respect for Chicago.

Chicago today has undoubtedly the finest police force in the country. Two men are responsible for this development. One is Chicago Police Superintendent Orlando W. Wilson, and the other is Mayor Richard J. Daley, who had the good judgment to hire Mr. Wilson.

The current issue of the highly respected magazine, the Reporter, carries an excellent article about Superintendent Wilson.

I call this article to the attention of my colleagues by placing it today in the Congressional Record.

The article follows:

Chicago's Scholarly Cop

(By Hal Bruno)

Chicago.—While much of the rest of the country is experiencing an increase in the crime rate, Chicago's honestly compiled statistics show a 12-percent decline in major crime in 1965; where civil rights leaders in other cities demand civilian review boards, they praise the manner in which Chicago police have handled demonstrations and nipped riots before they reached the point of Harlem, Watts, or North Philadelphia; where it once was an accepted fact of life that the police were corrupted by hoodlums and controlled by politicians, even the most cynical Chicagoan today admits that the system is honest and it is only individual officers who go wrong.

None of this was true when Orlando W. Wilson took command of Chicago's scandal-ridden police department 6 years ago. At that time, he was expected to be mere window dressing to save the Democratic machine from election defeat after the revelations of "the babbling burglar" uncovered shocking criminal activity on the part of Chicago's police. "The professor is no match for these thieves," said those who knew Chicago. But they didn't know "O.W."—as he is called—and didn't know that Mayor Richard J. Daley really meant it when he repeated his favorite slogan "good government is good politics" and pledged full support to Wilson's cleanup job.

The conditions Wilson found had their roots in the prohibition era, when many of the police captains had first walked a beat and learned Chicago's laissez-faire law-enforcement philosophy. The citizenry was not much better than the crooked cops it condemned, for there was a sort of warped civic pride in the legend of Al Capone. A smart motorist had a $5 bill attached to his driver's license, just as a smart burglar carried a roll of bills to "make bond" in an alley if necessary.

It seldom was necessary, for there was widespread inefficiency as well as corruption. A person calling the police on a busy Saturday night was liable to wait an hour or more for a squad car to show up. On a major investigation, detective units worked as rivals rather than as members of the same department. A citizen who complained about police wrongdoing was treated like a criminal and his complaint would be lost in the shuffle if the officer involved had political "clout." The newspapers campaigned and exposed, but made little impression on a jaded public opinion.

Police-district boundaries roughly corresponded to ward boundaries, and certain aldermen had veto power over who was assigned to command their neighborhood station. The quality of police protection varied from district to district, depending on the captain and his political sponsor. Many ran their districts as baronies for their own profit. There were honest, hard-working policemen who hated the system but were unable to do anything about it and wouldn't break the code of silence inside the department. Those who did were transferred from station to station, given unpleasant assignments, and blocked from promotion by low efficiency marks. Some managed to rise in spite of everything, but they were the exception. The police commissioner himself, Timothy J. O'Connor, was personally honest, but the system prevented him from getting rid of the dishonest men he despised.

After Chicago's apathy was shattered by the scandalous exposures of January 1960 newspapers were flooded with letters relating further horror stories of police villainy. Some were written on the flimsy yellow paper used for official police reports, indicating that policemen themselves were fed up and were finally blowing the whistle for outside help.

THE RIGHT MAN

Orlando Wilson has started his police career in 1921 as a beat patrolman on the Berkeley force while earning his bachelor's degree at the University of California. His professional reputation was built in the 11 years he was chief of the Wichita, Kans., police and his service during the Second World War as a colonel in the military government in Italy and Germany. He was dean at California's School of Criminology and had directed reorganization surveys for a dozen police departments when Mayor Daley asked him to head an advisory panel assigned to choose a new commissioner for Chicago. After 3 weeks of deliberation, the other members of the panel turned to Wilson as the best man for the job. He hesitated at first to accept the challenge. Later, he agreed to a 3-year contract with the understanding that he would have a free hand, a large budget, and Mayor Daley's full support.

Wilson, a thin, austere man who speaks in precise academic phrases and measures every word, seemed out of place in the flamboyant Chicago setting. He started small, taking the title of superintendent instead of commissioner, making such seemingly minor changes as painting over the black squad cars with a conspicuous blue-and-white design, replacing red dome lights with spectacular blue flashers, and equipping the cars with weird wailing sirens that became known as "Wilson's warblers."

While the ward heelers scoffed at such innocuous beginnings, Wilson quietly completed his survey of the department. His first big step was to reduce the number of police districts from 38 to 21. The old districts had been drawn up in horse-and-buggy days and were an administrative burden in an era of motorized patrol; Wilson wanted bigger districts with more cars assigned to smaller beats. The reorganization served also to break the back of the old system by eliminating entire districts and wiping out police stations that had been private clubs for the ward politicians. Their protests echoed in the city hall corridors as Wilson changed boundaries, closed stations, and transferred officers without consulting anyone outside the department. The word came back from the mayor's office that Wilson had Daley's support in everything.

AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION

His position established, Wilson proceeded to turn the department upside down. Operations were decentralized. The detective bureau, for example, was distributed to six areas, giving each section of the city its own homicide, robbery, burglary, and stolen-car specialists. Civilian experts were installed in such departmental areas as personnel management, cost accounting, record keeping, and public relations. Civilians took over secretarial jobs; women guards replaced policemen at school crossings. As a result, more than a thousand men were released, most going into patrol vehicles, which Wilson increased from 1,209 to 1,798. Chicago has fewer policemen today—10,270 compared with 10,630 in 1960—but a civilian staff of 2,797 that has been more than doubled. Wilson has also saved police manpower by sending one-man squad cars into outlying districts with low crime rates.

Wilson doesn't think much of the theory that a patrolman walking a beat is the best deterrent to crime. Modern criminals use cars, he points out. "The best means available for the prevention of crime is aggressive patrol of streets, alleys, and public ways by uniformed officers in conspicuously marked cars. * * * For a crime to occur, two factors must be present—opportunity and desire. It is the function of the police to minimize the opportunities by open, conspicuous, and aggressive patrol."

A Wilson axiom is that "It is better to prevent a crime than it is to deal with it after it occurs." This is the work of the task force, a mobile reserve of 500 men deployed day and night throughout the city.

Task force men work in uniform or plainclothes, depending upon their assignment, which is determined by the daily crime pattern as revealed by statistics fed into a computer at headquarters. On a typical night in one section of the city, a two-man tack force team in an unmarked car will cruise a four-block area where car thieves have been active. Another team is staked out for a burglar who breaks into apartments from rear porches. A tactical undercover force—known as the "Tuf Squad"—works skid row by posing as drunken convenioneers to attract jackrollers. Other task force units are patrolling side streets where the pattern shows a rapist strikes between midnight and 4. An entire group meets shortly before 2 in the morning to cover a neighborhood where a robbery gang has been hitting taverns at closing time. But most of the task force on a typical night is working random stop-and-quiz missions in high-crime districts. A car with a tail light out gives the police an excuse to stop and question the driver; they find a .32-caliber revolver in the glove compartment. A motorist looks as if he just doesn't fit the expensive car he's driving; they've recovered another stolen auto.

By conducting more than a quarter million such field interrogations in the course of a year, the task force will find more than a thousand illegal guns, recover 700 stolen autos, and make almost 8,000 arrests. Those concerned with civil liberties argue that despite these results, the task force stop-and-quiz operation skirts the thin edge of police harassment. Wilson replies by saying, "Law enforcement necessarily restricts the liberty and freedom of movement of those persons who, by engaging in criminal activity, interfere with the rights of others." Translated, this means that only criminals have to worry about harassment.

Aggressive police patrols are the foundation of Wilson's system. It's impossible to go more than a few blocks in a high-crime district without encountering some type of police vehicle. Every car in the vicinity responds to a radio call for a potentially serious crime. Out-of-town officers are dazzled to see 10 or 12 squad cars arrive on the scene within 2 minutes for a routine "burglary in progress" call. Communications are a key factor in making the system work, and it has cost $2 million to install the world's most modern police radio network. A publicity campaign called Operation Crime Stop encourages citizens to dial PO 5–1313 at the first suspicion of trouble.

Within seconds, a caller is speaking directly to the radio dispatcher in charge of the area the phone call is coming from. If lines are busy and a call is not answered in 15 seconds, it is automatically switched to the officer in command of the communications center. Radio dispatchers work in front of brightly lit consoles with huge street maps showing the assignment of every beat car in their zones. The system operates at a speed that puts every citizen in almost direct communication with policemen in the nearest available squad car.

Wilson is the first to agree that his system is only as good as the men who make it work. The entire training and promotion structure of the department has been overhauled, with examinations held at least every 2 years. Patrolmen who waited as long as a dozen years for a first chance to take the sergeant's exam were a major source of low morale and bad morals in the old days. Bright, eager young men who once would have been buried, now rise rapidly to command positions. Lieutenants and sergeants are on the street with their men. A patrolman complains that "You can't make an arrest without a sergeant looking over your shoulder," and oldtimers criticize the table of organization as being topheavy. But it produces "accountability" to superior officers—a missing factor in the corrupt pre-Wilson era.

It is difficult today for a policeman to get away with much even if he wants to. The internal investigations division seeks out dishonesty inside the department and handles all complaints against officers. The division is thoroughly feared and hated by the rank and file, who complain bitterly that a policeman is considered guilty until proved innocent. However, a tough intrenal investigations unit is a policeman's best protection against unfair charges of brutality or corruption.

Wilson believes that the very nature of police work produces complaints and mistakes, and that there must be room for human error: "Police work * * * is tough work, it is dangerous work, it requires guts, and it often results in hurting people's feelings and gives rise to compalints. The man who receives no complaints about his actions is either exceptionally tactful or he simply is not doing an active, aggressive police job."

Although urged to be aggressive, the Chicago policeman is also cautioned to be "professional"—another favorite word with Wilson—and show restraint in dealing with citizens. He is convinced that a police department cannot be totally effective unless it has popular support. "Anger or hatred expressed toward the policeman is not always intended against him as an individual or against the department," he points out. "It may be an expression of revolt against authority or society in general."

This is particularly true in Negro slum districts that have the city's highest crime rate. But supervision, discipline, and professionalism have paid off for the Chicago police in the sensitive area of civil rights. Whatever a policeman's personal feelings may be about integration—and many don't like it—he has been made to understand that his job includes protecting the demonstrators' right to peaceful protest. When arrests are necessary, the standard operating procedure is to have four men carry a picket to the wagon, thereby eliminating the use of hammerlocks or nightsticks. Policemen with movie cameras and tape recorders get the whole thing down on film and tape to defend the department against any subsequent charge of brutality.

DARN THAT SMILE

Such charges are seldom made, and Chicago has produced no serious demand for a civilian review board. Wilson would firmly oppose any such demand on the basis that "It is the function of a police department to take care of its own disciplinary problems."

Wilson meets periodically with Chicago civil rights leaders and has encouraged transfers of white and Negro officers for the sole purpose of promoting integration within the department. The police have their own human relations section headed by an expert in the field who works closely with other city and private agencies in the ghetto areas. When rioting broke out on the West Side early last summer, the police moved in with speed and force to gain control of the streets and prevent what happened in Watts on the same weekend. Chicago, unlike Los Angeles, had hundreds of Negro policemen—some in high command positions—who played a leading role in stopping the riot on the second night. When racial disturbances have hit a mixed neighborhood, the police have displayed impressive impartiality in making arrests.

The professional temper of the Chicago police can be measured, in part, by the white commander who remarked, "It wouldn't hurt any of us to be Negro for 6 months so we can understand what they're up against." A task force sergeant—who admits that he has no love for any type of demonstrator—told of a secret weapon he discovered while on picket line duty last summer. "They used to bug me with those taunting looks," he said, "until I smiled at one of them and could see that it bugged him. Now I just smile and it drives them nuts."

HARD HATS AND GUINEA PIGS

He will have plenty of chances to smile this summer when Martin Luther King launches in Chicago his first attack on de facto school segregation, slum housing, and job discrimination in the North. One of King's early moves was to accept an invitation from Wilson to attend a staff meeting at police headquarters. Here King outlined his objectives and warned that civil disobedience might be necessary. In such a case, he said, the police would be notified ahead of time. Wilson replied that his men would protect and assist the demonstrators—until a law was broken. King said he was willing to go to jail in Chicago and added, with thanks, that it was the first city in which he had been invited to meet with top police officials.

It hasn't been altogether smooth sailing for O. W. Wilson. Some Chicagoans even now refuse to believe that much has changed and motorists still tell stories about curbside "traffic courts." A certain element simply can't get accustomed to things being on the square and fondly recalls the bad old days when things could be "taken care of." Every so often, the newspapers come up with unpleasant articles about alleged shakedowns, vice rackets, and wide-open districts. But most people are convinced that Wilson has done an outstanding job, and the Press Club voted him Chicagoan of the Year for 1965. Several thousand letters of praise have been written to the superintendent's office from citizens who have had favorable personal dealings with the police since the scandals of 1960.

Inside the department, there are mixed feelings about "O.W." "We've got some 'hard hats' who miss the old days," a patrolman said, "but the younger men are pretty eager to do police work and feel they can get ahead if they keep their noses clean." Not all of Wilson's critics have larceny in their hearts; some sincerely believe there is too much emphasis on new theories and not enough on "alley-wise" experience. We're the guinea pigs to put flesh on a skeleton he devised and the system has to work whether it can or not," is one sour comment. However, morale has improved, and most policemen think the department has an integrity and public support it never had before.

Wilson was deeply disappointed when the Illinois Legislature rejected a Chicago tax bill that would have raised police salaries and provided funds to hire more men. A Chicago patrolman starts at $6,228 and reaches a ceiling of $7,548 after 42 months. Higher pay is necessary to attract qualified men, and it costs $3.2 million to add 500 recruits. Wilson gloomily predicts a 20 percent increase in the crime rate if 1,500 men are not added to the department by 1970.

A Wilson-styled police department is expensive; the budget climbed from $72 million in 1960 to $103 million this year. Some critics insist that anyone could accomplish as much with the same money, authority, and backing of the mayor. But Wilson is the man who did it, and his system, expensive as it is, is a great deal less clostly than crime.

Proposed Agricultural Budget Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, just as foolish as the proposed cuts in the school milk and lunch programs are the proposed cuts in the funds available to finance agricultural research. In the past, these research funds have been responsible for monumental breakthroughs in the progress and abundance of American agriculture. Our seemingly endless food supply owes its very existence to research, sometimes slow and costly, but surely rewarding. At a time when the world looks to the United States for an increasing role in the world food supply, it is foolish to assume that the progress we have enjoyed will continue without financing.

The following material was prepared by the Crop Quality Council of Minneapolis, Minn., "serving business and agriculture." The statistics presented here demonstrate the far-reaching nature of the proposed cuts, and are worthy of consideration by all who would protect the best interests of the consumer, the economy, the farmer, and the continued agricultural abundance of this Nation.

The material follows:

Proposed Agricultural Budget Cuts—A Serious Threat to the Nation's Economy

The budget submitted to Congress by the President for the U.S. Department of Agriculture proposes drastic cuts in support for agricultural research and pest control programs, together with a substantial redirection of support for the agricultural extension service.

These proposed cuts affect every State of the Union. They affect crop producers; business firms who process agricultural commodities, or supply agriculture with goods or services; industrial firms with a financial stake in the purchasing power generated by agriculture, and consumers.

U.S. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY THREATENED

Crippling cuts in agricultural research and pest control programs affecting food, feed, and oil crops are proposed, when—

U.S. wheat supplies will be reduced to the level of a sound national reserve within a few months.

International tensions again point out the importance of our agricultural productive capacity to the Nation's strength and security.

Impending famine in India and an exploding world population make it obvious that greater agricultural production will be needed soon.

WHAT IS PROPOSED?

The total U.S. budget, now being considered by Congress, proposes expenditures of $112.8 billion.

Expenditures for all programs and activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture are proposed at $6.6 billion—down $1.8 billion from last year.

Specifically: Support for the Agricultural Resarch Service will be reduced $22 million, payments to States for agricultural research at land-grant colleges and universities will be reduced $8.5 million. In payments to States for agricultural extension, the budget proposes to transfer $10 million to rural resource development and expansion of work with low-income families. This will mean a substantial loss in funds which benefit crop and livestock production and marketing.

CUTS IN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Farm research, aimed at developing improved varieties of wheat, corn, sorghum, and flax, will be drastically reduced or eliminated at key locations throughout the United States. Cuts total $3,431,200.

Some examples: Wheat breeding, quality, rust, smut, and insect control will be reduced by $410,700; corn breeding and disease control by $201,000; sorghum improvement reduced by $134,900; flax breeding, quality, and disease control reduced by $81,800; and soil and water conservation research reduced by $505,600.

Pest control programs, aimed at protecting wheat, oats, barley, rye, soybeans, corn, potatoes, pastures, shade and forest trees from destructive insects and diseases, are to be reduced by $5,616,700. These are cooperative programs with the State departments of agriculture.

Some proposed cuts in pest control programs: Cut back barberry eradication, a cooperative State-Federal rust-control effort by $371,700. This is a vital part of efforts to protect wheat, oats, barley, and rye throughout the United States from rust attack.

Eliminate present efforts to protect the principal U.S. soybean producing areas from the destructive soybean cyst nematode, $523,000.

Virtually eliminate efforts to protect the Nation's potato crop from the dangerous golden nematode, $320,000.

ALL AMERICA IS AFFECTED

U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists concentrate on programs with regional and national applications. They are generally stationed at land-grant colleges and experiment stations, where work of a basic nature, or with broad geographical effects, can best be carried out. They work on programs too broad in scope to be undertaken by individual States or by the seed, fertilizer, chemical, or other industries.

Payments to States for agricultural research and extension help solve crop and livestock production and marketing problems. They have provided much of the technology, and aided in the training of research scientists and extension specialists, on which our successful agriculture is based.

Statistics show more than 40 percent of the U.S. economy depends on agriculture and related business activity. In some individual States this figure exceeds 80 percent.

Crop and livestock production and marketing generate demands for a wide range of goods and services.

IS IT SOUND?

Upper Midwest wheat suffered devastating losses from stem rust in the early 1950's. Spring wheat production was drastically reduced and Durum wheat production was practically eliminated. Producers lost millions of bushels of grain, and the income from it, to rust.

In contrast, from 1962 to 1965 the results of expanded rust research saved nearly 550 million bushels of bread wheat and Durum from destruction, and increased purchasing power and business activity by more than $1 billion.

Is it sound to eliminate wheat breeding, rust control efforts, seed increases in Mexico, and rust testing in Puerto Rico, of proven benefit?

More than 500 million rust-spreading barberry bushes have been eradicated from over a million-square-mile area in 19 States. The States and Federal Government have invested more than $30 million to eliminate this source of new rust races from all but 30,000 square miles.

Is it sound to jeopardize the substantial investment already made, by not eradicating the relatively few bushes remaining?

The State of New York and the Federal Government have each invested more than $10 million to protect the $3 billion U.S. potato industry from the destructive golden nematode. Only 2,000 acres on Long Island remain to be treated before this pest is eradicated.

Is it sound to risk spread of the golden nematode to other U.S. potato-producing areas by eliminating this control program?

Corn and sorghum are feed grains of vital importance to crop producers, the grain trade, and the Nation's livestock industry.

Is it sound to eliminate efforts to learn more about a destructive corn disease, which has caused heavy losses to corn in Africa, and has been found in 15 States of the United States in recent years?

Is it sound to terminate efforts, only one-third completed, to utilize valuable sorghum germ plasm from throughout the world in U.S. sorghum improvement programs?

AN IMPORTANT DECISION FOR CONGRESS

The burden of final decision on budget matters rests with the U.S. Congress.

The suggested total budget for the U.S. Department of Agriculture is $6.6 billion. Reductions of about $40 million, affecting key programs vital to America's agriculture and the Nation's economy, are proposed. Clearly, the importance of research, pest control, and extension to agriculture have not been recognized in the present budget proposal.

America's agricultural productivity was built with continuing support for agricultural research, extension, and pest control programs. Protecting the productive capacity of the Nation cannot be deferred—it is either maintained by continuing effort, or it is lost.

The Nation cannot afford this crippling blow to agriculture.

Farmers' Hides Are Taken Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the livestock industry in Nebraska, and the Nation, will suffer heavy losses if the recently imposed export quotas on hides are not immediately removed by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The export quotas on hides, declares the Department of Commerce, are to "maintain existing domestic supplies." This means that the tanners can now buy their hides at a lower price—at the expense of the farmer. Our livestock industry would prefer to sell domestically, provided the domestic markets would pay competitive world prices.

The domestic market has already dropped 5 cents per pound for hides. This amounts to about $4 per hide. The live cattle prices dropped immediately as the result of the lower domestic hide prices. These losses are always passed back to the original producer.

In Nebraska, the export quota order will mean a loss of more than $17 million to our producers this year.

The American livestock industry and the U.S. Department of Agriculture have been overseas promoting the sales of beef and beef byproducts—and getting results.

Last year, exports of cattle hides rose to 13.3 million—and brought us almost one-quarter billion dollars. The livestock industry not only helped itself, but helped the Nation with the foreign exchange problem of gold outflow and balance of payments.

Will we be paying less for shoes, Mr. Speaker, because hides are being bought for less money by tanners? About 25 pairs of shoes are made from a hide. This means there is about 70 cents of green hide in each pair of shoes. If the price of hides drops one-fourth, this means the price of leather in a pair of shoes will go down only 20 cents. It is difficult to believe that this savings will be passed on to the purchaser of a pair of shoes.

Mr. Speaker, if it takes legislative action to negate this export quota order on hides, let us act immediately.

The Endorsement of a Candidate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the South has reached a point where it can view old-fashioned one-party "courthouse politics" with some degree of humor, if not derision. There are, of course, those that labor night and day to keep these politics going.

Nevertheless, the more enlightened portion of our population, the vast majority who are going to vote in Alabama for the Republican Party this fall, are not only tired of voting the deceased several times but of one-party politics in all its sordid aspects.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to introduce in the Record an article from the editorial page of a recent issue of the Montgomery Advertiser:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, Mar. 17, 1966]

THE ENDORSEMENT OF A CANDIDATE

(Note.—The Advertiser does not entirely comprehend the following extract from the want-ad page of the Selma Times-Journal. It may be the new fashion in political pamphleteering and our aim is to recognize, if not encourage, any departures from the tedium of conventional pamphleteering. It ran under the "For sale miscellaneous" category. See here:)

MR. AND MRS. EZRA WHIFFLEBOTTOM IS A VOTE FER AN HONEST COUPLE

My wife, Mrs. Whifflebottom, doesn't have anything to say today, so I'm gonna take over fer her. We want y'all to know how honest we are: your friend Ezra ain't never got caught stealing, and once we Whifflebottoms get elected Governor, we ain't gonna get caught then either. We gonna look out fer the folks who vote fer us. After we find jobs and make jobs for our kinfolks, we goin' give the rest of the jobs to the people who voted fer the Whifflebottoms.

If we have to spend every nickel of the State's money with our kinfolks in the road business, we're gonna have good roads, by cracky. When we're elected, all them law enforcement men who voted fer us will keep their jobs. All them that didn't vote fer us will be fired first off. I mean to say we're honest all the way through.

We got an uncle that's in the car business, and he promised to give the Highway Patrol the best and lowest-down prices in the State. We got another uncle wot's in the gasoline business in Hog Crossing, just outside of Hog Hollow. He's done promised to give the State the lowest-down prices on gas and oil, and that's where we gonna get gas and oil. Our uncle's name is Crooked Whifflebottom and he runs the Crooked Gas & Oil Corp.

Folks, if you don't want to waste your vote, vote for Mr. and Mrs. Ezra Whifflebottom. You could do worse * * * but why?

The Whifflebottoms are supported by Cohen's Department Store—the workingman's store, 1208 Alabama Avenue, Selma, Ala.

(Paid unpolitical advertisement.)

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181, Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b, Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

George A. Grier, Dedicated Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, George A. Grier, planning director and executive assistant for 7 years to the commissioner of Carroll County, Md., has achieved an enviable record in his dedicated service to the public. In a recent editorial, the distinguished editor of the Carroll County Times, Charles Mooshian, has ably summarized the accomplishments of this outstanding civil servant. I bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

GEORGE A. GRIER, DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

When the program of cooperative student on-the-job training between the county planning commission and Western Maryland College was inaugurated several years ago we published a series of articles explaining the project.

The program was the brainchild of the county's planning director and executive assistant to the commissioners, George A. Grier.

This one program alone has saved the county thousands of dollars in salaries and has been a boon to the college students, who have amassed a vast amount of knowledge in the planning field. In other words it has been good for the county and the college.

In this seventh anniversary of Mr. Grier's association with Carroll County there are many other projects initiated by him that bear acknowledgment.

He drafted and participated in the development and adoption of the county's comprehensive zoning ordinance in 1965. Before that he had drafted and aided in the adoption and administration of the interim zoning ordinance in effect until 1965.

Mr. Grier initially developed programs leading to maximum use of Federal allotments for roads and bridges and for the development of snow removal routes on a countywide basis. Through his alertness, the county has received thousands of additional dollars in Federal tax funds.

During the years, Mr. Grier has directed programs leading to complete existing land use studies of the county; and studies on agriculture, population, parks, highways, water and sewerage, the county's economy, and the planning programs.

He directed studies leading to the adoption of the county's master plan for future development and the major road plan.

Mr. Grier initiated and made the preliminary survey of 212 county bridges and developed an inventory system for bridges, in addition to drafting detailed street specifications for the county. A survey of all county roads and development of an inventory system of roads was also made.

He drafted and administered, after adoption, subdivision regulations for the county which has resulted in the processing of 109 new residential subdivisions for the county.

The planning director aided in the formation of and the development of initial programs pertaining to the economic development commission and the county sanitary commission. He participated in industrial promotional and development programs for the county including Random House and other industries.

Grier participated in the drafting of legislation and ordinances allowing the construction of private streets under assessment method in which 11 different private street projects have been constructed to date.

He participated in the development of specifications and the initiation of systems for installation of the two-way radio, equipment purchases, and snow fencing.

Mr. Grier has been an important voice and consultant in such special surveys as the airport feasibility, housing, community, college, farm museum, county industries, vacant industrial buildings, watershed development, personnel, regional planning, road name standardization, school facilities, and the use of the computer system for tax billing.

From planning commission records, we note that Mr. Grier has attended 707 official meetings in and out of the county through February 1966. He has made a total of 174 speeches to various county and out-of-county organizations on the county's planning programs and projects and related governmental matters.

Space prevents us from going on but the foregoing is an outstanding record of an outstanding, dedicated, public servant. We are proud to be among those who recognize and appreciate the talents of Mr. Grier and his many contributions to the betterment of Carroll County.

As a news source, Mr. Grier and his department are "tops." He never hedges and is readily available to the press at all times.

If we want facts for a special article he will got out of his way to get them and will spend as much time with us as is necessary to do the job.

Because of the many contributions made by Mr. Grier in the past 7 years, Carroll County has become a progressive, prosperous and growing area.

We give our roses to Mr. Grier now while he can smell 'em.

Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, Retired, Praises Fort Riley as Home of the New 9th Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, recently Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, retired, visited in Junction City, Kans., and in an interview with John D. Montgomery, civilian aid to the Secretary of the Army, had warm praise for Fort Riley, its personnel and its facilities, as the home for the new 9th Division.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I feel that it is pertinent to call attention to excerpts from this interview as it appeared in the Junction City, Kans., Union on March 10. General Clarke also had interesting comments about our effort in Vietnam. Excerpts from the interview follow. The questions were asked by Mr. Montgomery; the answers were given by General Clarke:

Question. General, it is good to see you back in the Fort Riley-Junction City area. What brings you to Kansas at this time?

Answer. I have been asked to speak to the class at the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth on Friday, and so I came a day early to visit my old friends in Junction City, Manhattan, and Fort Riley. I consider this an ideal Army-civilian community where members of both cooperate so well for their mutual advantage. I really never miss an opportunity to visit Fort Riley if I am in the area. I am always happy at the chance to see soldiers again after having been one for 42 years.

Question. How have you found things at Fort Riley?

Answer. Fort Riley is in excellent shape, and in good hands. I could list many of the outstanding experienced officers and senior NCO's you have here, but I will only mention General Eckhardt, Colonel Roseborough, Col. C. P. Miller, Colonel Murphy, Sergeant Major Meyer, and Sergeant Major Wendling—the top people in the new 9th Infantry Division and Fort Riley. And I know from long association with them that they are experienced, dedicated, and are outstanding leaders and trainers.

Their plans, as explained to me, for building the new 9th Division, are thoroughly complete, realistic, and practical.

Question. Is Fort Riley adequate for the job?

Answer. Oh, yes—with the new increase in area at Fort Riley, it has become a very fine division training post. It has good terrain, good facilities, good climate, good soil trafficability. It is now one of the Army's finest division training stations.

Fort Riley is a very definite permanent asset to Kansas and this area, as well as to the Army.

Question. What do you see as the future of Fort Riley?

Answer. I see a very bright future. Here you see combined the spirit, prestige, romance, and history of the Army's past with the modern facilities and concepts of the future. I look to Fort Riley being the home of a combat division constantly. That does not mean you may not have divisions moved out and new ones moved in or organized here, and men going and coming as the demands of the Army for combat troops are supported, but that is the reason for having and creating combat-ready troops at Fort Riley.

Question. You have been interested in the Association of the U.S. Army. What importance do you place on the Central Kansas Chapter?

Answer. This is the one organiaztion in which the military and civilian join to better understand each other's points of view and to further cooperation. Its public relations value in the vicinity of a large Army post such as Fort Riley is very great and valuable. I encourage wide membership in your chapter.

Question. As you know, the 1st Division left from here for Vietnam. We are proud of them and what they are doing there. How do you see the war in Vietnam?

Answer. I have only available to me the reports in the papers, magazines, on radio and TV, and the privilege of talking to my friends who have been there and have come back. But, I am convinced we are doing well there. I see a turning of the tide in our favor. I have great confidence in our first team which we have now in Vietnam from General Westmoreland on down. I too am very proud of the Big Red One.

I am sure your realize that the logistics and construction requirements employ a great part of the troops available to General Westmoreland.

Question. When were you last there?

Answer. I was there briefly in 1962; but prior to that when I was Commanding General of the U.S. Army in the Pacific, I visited and travelled in Vietnam on a couple of occasions.

Question. Why do you think it is that there appears to be less political support for our troops in Vietnam as compared with other wars?

Answer. I am not sure of the various degree of support in past wars for our troops. I am aware however that we have not fought recently a war without a callup of the Reserve components. In previous cases the troops involved and their relations and friends were more concentrated from one area and more associated with a particular area or State and hence have had a greater political consideration and support. The regular establishment of our Armed Forces is pretty uniformly spread over the entire country.

Question. General, you speak with great feeling. You must have many close ties with our men in Vietnam?

Answer. Yes, I do. I have been privileged during my career to command and train several million American soldiers and marines in peace and war. I have at times placed great demands upon them. They have never failed me or our country. They have been loyal in all the directions I have pointed out. Many of them are now fighting in Vietnam. Two of them happen to be my sons. They are in Vietnam under the legal orders of a legally elected President of the United States, carrying out his legal directives. They deserve no less than the full support without reservation of all Americans here at home.

Authorizing an Official Residence for the Vice President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2394) to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I will vote against H.R. 12944, for I do not believe that this valid but low-priority project should be allowed to absorb funds sorely needed this year for programs now threatened, such as the school milk and school lunch programs; the national defense education loan fund; and others.

While three-quarters of a million dollars out of a total Federal budget for the year of over $100 billion will seem a relatively small amount, nevertheless nonessential items such as this should be cut to justify our commitment of more substantial funds to continue the more vital programs.

Introduction to FOI Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a leading proponent of freedom of information over the years has been the national journalistic society, Sigma Delta Chi. The society's advancement of freedom of information committee has been chaired for the past 2 years by Julius Frandsen, chief of the United Press International bureau in Washington, D.C.

Late in 1965, the Advancement of Freedom of Information Committee of Sigma Delta Chi issued its annual report. The report discusses the information situation in Washington, D.C., the attitudes of the Johnson administration on this subject, and comments on the pending Federal public records law.

These portions of the Sigma Delta Chi report follow:

ANNUAL REPORT, 1965, ADVANCEMENT OF FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMITTEE, SIGMA DELTA CHI, JULIUS FRANDSEN, CHAIRMAN

INTRODUCTION TO FOI REPORT

The most certain fact about freedom of information is that the fight to maintain it is never ending.

In 1965 two more States—South Dakota and Georgia—enacted open meetings laws as a result of continued campaigning by Sigma Delta Chi and its allies.

Hopes for early passage of a Federal open records law, which seemed quite bright at the opening of Congress, came to nothing this year in the face of administration opposition. The issue may be brought to a showdown in 1966. Taking advantage of present lack of such a law, the Post Office Department refused to release names of youths given summer jobs when it developed that many of them were patronage appointments.

Bureaucrats remained bureaucrats whether in Washington or in local school boards, in State capitols or in Vietnam.

The U.S. Supreme Court, reversing the conviction of Billie Sol Estes in a Texas court, slammed the door on photographing or televising trials for the foreseeable future.

A Federal district court in Nashville, however, staked out new ground for freedom of the press when it set aside a Tennessee Senate resolution which had barred reporters of the Tennessean from their accustomed seats in the press section on the senate floor. The senate had passed the resolution after a reporter had refused to leave a closed committee meeting. The significance of Federal Judge William E. Miller's decision in favor of the Tennessean was summarized by William P. Rogers, counsel for the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

"It represents a unique instance of a Federal court invalidating a resolution which purports to deal with the internal affairs of a State legislative body when, in fact, it was an attempt to punish a newspaper for its conduct. Of even more fundamental importance is the fact that once again there has been demonstrated the concern with which the Federal courts will examine and in proper instances reject attempted impediments to free access to the news. This case becomes a controlling case and a landmark in the long history of a successful struggle for a free press."

Another notable court decision came in the celebrated murder case of Dr. Samuel H. Sheppard who was convicted in 1954. Last year a Federal district judge at Dayton, Ohio, set Sheppard free on grounds (among others) that publicity attending his trial had made it "a mockery of justice." However, on May 5, 1965, the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the district judge and held that the publicity had not prevented Sheppard from having a fair trial. Sheppard has appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The same U.S. circuit court a few weeks later directed a district judge to hear an unusual Federal suit brought by the Dayton Daily News charging the city of Dayton with unlawful conspiracy to deny it access to news. The district judge had thrown out the suit, which resulted from police interference with a reporter at a fire.

The impending U.S. Supreme Court action in the Dr. Sheppard case could have important implications for the problems of free press and fair trial that have been so widely discussed in the last year. Meanwhile it is gratifying to note that these discussions seem to have become less heated and more directed toward seeking areas of agreement.

The chairman of this committee is passing the task on to other hands after 2 years. He salutes the vice chairmen and committee members, the regional and chapter representatives, who have devoted much time and effort to this cause. But the biggest salute goes to Sigma Delta Chi members everywhere who never give up in the endless struggle to perserve and protect freedom of information.

The Johnson administration can be given some limited commendation in connection with its advance announcement of at least some regular presidential press conferences. However, a number of areas cause concern about Federal information policies. These include the following:

1. The secrecy of the names of Post Office Department employees hired in the summer program in 1965, and the regulation 744.44 used to justify this secrecy.

2. The Johnson administration's efforts to warp the proposed Federal Public Records legislation into an almost unlimited authority for the President to establish broader secrecy practices.

3. The Defense Department continues the October 1962, Sylvester directive which requires military and civilian personnel to report all contacts with the press to Sylvester's office.

4. The increased centralization of information releases at the White House, and the increasing sensitivity over leaks of information that have no connection with natonal security problems.

5. The basic problem of balancing national security interests and freedom for the press in connection with Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

WHITE HOUSE

The situation with regard to presidential press conferences improved in 1965. The decision to hold at least one regular, full-dress, televised, announced-in-advance conference every month was primarily responsible for the improvement. If the White House continues these regular presidential press conferences with advance notice, it will overcome a major problem that was created when unannounced press conferences limited the questioning to White House beat men.

There are complaints about the "staging" of the sessions, but the White House has only a limited responsibility. The major responsibility is with the press. If it is bad to ask "planted" questions, a remedy is available: do not ask them. The press can deal with this problem whether or not the White House seeks to "plant" questions.

There is the same remedy for the overly friendly or "soft" questioning. If the publications do not like the kind of questions asked at the White House, they can change staffers. There is no requirement that a reporter assigned to the White House be "friendly" unless it comes from the reporter's superiors. While reporters who ask "unfriendly" questions or write "unfriendly" stories may be excluded from the President's inner circle of social intimates, there is some indication that those who display independence are actually better off in their professional relations with the White House.

UNJUSTIFIED POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT SECRECY

The Post Office Department was responsible for one of the most unjustfied cases of Government secrecy in years. The Department refused to make public the names of summer employees hired in a program which the Department mishandled in violation of a Presidential order.

There was no manner in which it could be claimed that "national security" or any specific law authorized the Post Office Department officials to withhold this information from the Congress or the press. It was an arbitrary action based on a regulation drawn for the convenience of the postal officials.

Carrying its secrecy practice to a point which Representative John Moss, of California, termed "absurd and ridiculous," the Department sent out postal inspectors to investigate how two Iowa newspapers obtained the names of several youths hired in the program.

Moss, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Government Information, pointed out that the Government secrecy could not even be remotely justified on grounds of Government security, and that the Department's secrecy regulation had no valid basis in law.

This secrecy issue arose after the Washington bureau of the Des Moines Register and Minneapolis Tribune revealed that the Post Office Department was distributing as congressional patronage thousands of jobs in the President's youth opportunity campaign. The President and Civil Service Commission had ordered in May that the jobs be given to economically and educationally disadvantaged youth selected through the employment service.

However, ranking officials of the Post Office Department and a White House aid immediately started distributing the jobs on a quota basis to Democratic Congressmen. After the initial newspaper story in early June reported how the Department was handling the jobs, postal officials announced that all Congressmen—Republicans as well as Democrats—were being asked to recommend youths for the jobs.

After the youths had been hired, various newspapers began learning and reporting names of youths with prominent political connections who had obtained the jobs on congressional recommendations. Many of those hired included relatives of Senators and Representatives and in Huron, S. Dak., the two youths hired were the nephew of the Vice President and the nephew of the State Democratic chairman.

At this point, more newspapers asked the Post Office Department for the names of the youths recommended by political figures and hired. The Department refused on grounds of its regulation 744.44 which states that the names, salaries, and other information about postal employees should not be given to any individual, commercial firm, or other non-Federal agency. The regulation states that other Federal agencies may obtain the information when the need justifies it.

Four different Congressmen asked for the names of summer employees in their States and were refused by Postmaster General John Gronouski. Gronouski told them the postal regulation prohibited giving such information to Congressmen whom he categorized as individuals rather than Federal agencies.

The Moss subcommittee challenged the secrecy regulation and also was rebuffed by Gronouski. Gronouski consented to make the names available to the committees of Congress having jurisdiction over his Department, but even here contended that the releasing of the list of names of Government employees "would set a dangerous precedent." He justified the secrecy on grounds that it is designed to protect postal employees from commercial and political solicitations and harassment. He said the two postal unions violently oppose release of such information.

In September the Post Office Department did authorize local postmasters to release the names of youths hired in their cities, but still refused to change the basic regulations.

Another issue arising out of regulation 744.44 is under investigation by the Moss subcommittee. It is looking into the Department's efforts to seal leaks in its secrecy system. The Department has acknowledged that inspectors from its St. Louis regional office attempted to investigate how the Des Moines Register and the Burlington Hawkeye obtained names of several youths. The three youths who received the patronage jobs in the Burlington post office were the president and vice president of the county Young Democrats organization and the daughter of a Democratic county officeholder. The postal inspectors were unsuccessful in their effort to learn whether postal employees had supplied the names to the newspapers.

The Department acknowledged that 3,380 of 8,600 youths hired throughout the country had been recommended by Congressmen. Independent inquiries by newspapers indicate that the 3,380 figure was low and did not show the full extent of patronage distribution of the jobs. Summer patronage was the reason for the coverup, but the secrecy problem didn't end with the summer job program.

FEDERAL PUBLIC RECORDS LAW

The Johnson administration blocked passage of a Federal public records bill in 1965, and seems to be opposed to any legislation in this field that will limit executive branch secrecy. If the Congress passes the type of legislation the Johnson administration has requested, it would give the President and the members of the Cabinet almost unlimited authority to withhold information from the public, the press, and the Congress. Fortunately, the administration has not been able to sell its version of a public records law to Congress for such legislation would make matters worse than they are at present with no Federal records law.

Sigma Delta Chi has favored the passage of a Federal public records law that would sharply limit the authority of the executive branch to withhold information. It would set out those categories of information that could be withheld for national defense, foreign policy, or law enforcement reasons. It would permit an individual to go to court to enforce his right of access to information under circumstances where a Federal agency would be required to prove the necessity for secrecy.

In seeking the objective of more Government information, Sigma Delta Chi has supported Federal public records law legislation introduced in the Senate by Senator Edward V. Long, of Missouri, and in the House by Representative John E. Moss, of California.

While conceding that the Long and Moss bills were not perfect, the intention was to eliminate vague standards that were often misused and misinterpreted and to limit withholding to eight specific categories. We spelled this out in the discussion of the Long bill in the 1964 Sigma Delta Chi report. With this objective in mind, representatives of Sigma Delta Chi again appeared before the Moss subcommittee and testified in favor of the Long and Moss bills.

Later in the year, administration representatives demanded that the language of the House bill be changed to give the President and the Cabinet officers legal authority to "executive privilege" when no such legal authority has existed. It would have given Cabinet officers the widest discretion, and would have put the burden on the press or the public to prove information should be made available rather than forcing the officials to prove why it could be withheld. In brief, the changes suggested by the Johnson administration would have warped the whole impact of the legislation from "open government legislation" to "closed government legislation."

Administration representatives informed members of the Moss subcommittee that no public records bill could be passed and signed unless it included the changes President Johnson demanded.

A copy of the legislation as proposed by President Johnson's representatives was printed by the Moss subcommittee and was discussed in the subcommittee. Members of the Sigma Delta Chi information committee examined it, and informed subcommittee members that it was better to pass no Federal public records law this session than to pass the legislation the administration was pushing.

It appears that a majority of the members of the Moss subcommittee—Democrats and Republicans—are in agreement with the idea that it is better to delay efforts to push a Federal public records law until such a time as it can be passed without the broad secrecy power the administration demands.

Pakistan Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 19th anniversary of independence for the people of Pakistan. This is a memorable occasion, and we wish to take this occasion to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Ayub Khan, President of the Republic of Pakistan; and to His Excellency Ghulam Ahmed, the Pakistani Ambassador to the United States.

The idea of independence grew in the 1930's, was fostered by the Muslim League in the 1940's, and from it has evolved the present state of Pakistan, one of the leaders of the new Afro-Asian states. At the conclusion of World War II Britain undertook steps to grant independence to India. However, the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League were unable to agree on either the terms for drafting a constitution or for setting up an interim government.

Then on June 3, 1947, the British Government announced it would give independence to two separate states—India and Pakistan. Pakistan was to consist of the contiguous Moslem majority areas of British India. On August 14, 1947, Pakistan became an independent nation within the Commonwealth.

Independence did not bring immediate peace and prosperity to the people of Pakistan. On the contrary, they were shocked into the reality of how much hard work and sacrifice lay before them. Difficulties emanating from religious differences, political unrest, and economic handicaps all proved too much for the Government to handle, and in 1958 under the leadership of Gen. Ayub Khan, the military carried out a peaceful revolution. Under General Ayub's leadership stability emerged, and by 1962 the new National Assembly convened and promulgated the new constitution. That was on March 23 and has been designated as Pakistan's Independence Day.

Pakistan has been concentrating on diversifying its economy from a dependence on agriculture to a more even basis in which industry might play a larger role. Natural resources have not been exploited to their capacity yet, though there is hope that the natural gas and petroleum supplies may be increasingly developed.

While there have been some differences of opinion between Pakistan and the United States, relations between the two countries are still warm. There is every reason to expect they will continue to remain so. Pakistan's relations with India are still distant, though there is the constant hope that the Tashkent Agreement of January 1966 will go a long way in eroding some of the hostility between those two neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the Members of the House will agree with me that 19 years in the life of a nation is but a small fraction of time. And yet, in the case of Pakistan we have been able to observe that national leadership has exhibited much wisdom, diplomacy, and reason in its relations with other countries of the international community. I hope that this trend will continue. As I express my congratulations to President Ayub and the people of Pakistan, I am confident they will continue to carry on the magnificent work to which they have pledged their economic development program and dedicated themselves to the betterment of their country.

Wyoming: High, Wide, Windy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the April 1966, issue of National Geographic magazine contains a brilliant article by David S. Boyer entitled "Wyoming: High, Wide, and Windy," which I should like to commend to my colleagues' attention. The exquisite photography and the coverage of all important points of interest in Wyoming which appear in this 40-page article are well worth reading. My compliments to Mr. Boyer for a job well done.

Mr. Boyer was able to touch upon every timely aspect of Wyoming's scenery, industry, recreational facilities, educational development and heritage held very dear to the heart's of every Wyomingite in a tasteful and informative manner. My only thought while reading this article was you must read and enjoy it.

Don't Throw Me in the Briar Patch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President has intimated that for the moment at least, he will not be requesting a tax increase. There are many people who have reason to doubt the situation. The Chicago Tribune, in a most fascinating editorial March 21, raises many points which must be considered. Therefore, in the public interest, I place this editorial in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

DON'T THROW ME IN THE BRIAR PATCH

President Johnson and Secretary of the Treasury Fowler have an act going in which they throw up their hands in holy horror and protest that they don't want a tax increase or direct controls on wages, prices, and other economic factors and decisions—"at least, at this time."

But the dear fellows may yet have to succumb to popular clamor, for economists and soothsayers of every description are saying that action of both kinds must be taken to head off inflation. Walter Lippmann, the canned oracle, says somberly that it is time to temper the boom. Dr. Heller and Professor Samuelson, prophets of the "new economics," respectively urge "restrictive action" and that the President "bring in a tax program before midyear."

We don't see Mr. Johnson or Mr. Fowler discouraging this kind of talk. We imagine that, behind the door, they are grinning at each other. It's the old gimmick of Brer Rabbit after he has been caught by Brer Fox in the "Uncle Remus" story. Brer Rabbit said Brer Fox could do anything he pleased with him—eat him up or flay him—"but please, please, Brer Fox, don't throw me in the briar patch."

The briar patch was just where Brer Rabbit wanted to be thrown, for there he would be safe from Brer Fox, and he got away with his dodge. The briar patch of tax increases and controls is just where Brer Lyndon wants to be thrown, and the louder he protests that this is his most remote desire, the more you can count that he is overcome with eagerness to land right there.

Higher taxes and controls are always the refuge of political spendthrifts and improvident fiscal managers, for these devices serve to distract attention from themselves as authors of the trouble. As the taxpayer smarts while digging into his pocket for the latest bite, he might have the impression that this would not be necessary but for something wrong he had done.

Mr. Johnson encouraged this sense of guilt in the other fellow when he said that "we can be prudent and restrained and continue to enjoy this great era of prosperity, or we can be foolish and flee to mischief we know not of"—in which event "we can expect * * * additional fiscal, price, wage, tax, and expenditure restraints."

Controls, of course, are always the resort of the political scoundrel. What they do is to distort the economy and promote scarcities and black markets. Tax raises could be justified if they were used by an administration to bring the budget into balance and reduce debt. But everyone familiar with Parkinson's law knows that is the last thing that will happen: Expenditure always rises to meet income. New revenue will only send the administration off on another spending jag.

It is not accidental that the Democratic majority of the congressional Joint Economic Committee has now joined in the chorus demanding enactment of a standby tax boost on the contention that action is needed quickly to halt inflation. This is represented as going beyond anything the President has in mind, but everybody knows that these Democrats are the President's creatures.

The Republican minority made the pertinent response that inflation will be fought most successfully by reducing spending, but it, too, was resigned to a tax boost, knowing that the administration will not cut back nonessential and low-priority projects.

So, when Mr. Johnson finds himself hurled into the briar patch, he will say that he is responding to popular request when he installs controls and calls for higher taxes. The mien he will present will be that of agonized reluctance, but you can figure that he will have an inward glow.

SBA and the Department of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the frequency of reports around Washington that the Small Business Administration is to be stripped of its independence and placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce has been a source of increasing concern to a number of our small businessmen around the country.

Hopefully those protests and those of our distinguished colleagues on the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate will convince the administration that such a move is not in the best interests of this important sector of our national economy. One of the hard-hitting editorials that has appeared on this subject was that of the Small Business Association of New England in its March 1966 issue. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SBA AND THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

There has been a recurring rumor in Washington that the Small Business Administration will be made a part of the Department of Commerce. This rumor has caused considerable concern in various areas because it is believed that the SBA would lose much of its power and ability to serve small business were it to become a part of the Department of Commerce.

As presently organized, the SBA reports directly to the President. It is our belief that this relationship gives the Small Business Administration a stronger voice in the halls of Washington.

The integration of the SBA into the Department of Commerce would place the small business thinking under the direction of a Cabinet officer who by definition and historically favors big business. We recognize that many things which are good for big business are good for small business. However, the SBA was initially set up in recognition of the peculiar problems and needs of small business.

We are unable to untangle the various political motivations and nuances that cloud this issue. No doubt ther are some serious political considerations. Nevertheless, SBANE has gone on record as opposing the move. Congressman Joe Evins, Chairman of the House Small Business Committee, has read SBANE's letter on the floor of the House and has included it in the Congressional Record. Senator Claiborne Pell has also read a similar letter on the floor of the Senate.

Part of the difficulty rests in the fact that the SBA has gone without an Administrator since last August. SBANE has requested the President and has enlisted the support of the New England congressional delegation to get a new Administrator appointed without any further delay.

At press time it appeared that the action to move the SBA into the Department of Commerce has been stopped. We can only hope that this information is true.

Independence of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has enjoyed almost two centuries of independence, having severed its ties with Great Britain July 4, 1776. Most of the countries of North America and South America consist of nations which long ago threw off the yokes of various European powers.

In our own day we have witnessed the coming of independence to scores of new countries on the continents of Africa and Asia. Americans of all shades of political opinion have welcomed these infant lands to the family of nations.

While we have, through the years, rejoiced whenever men have thrown off the chains of colonialism, we have at the same time been saddened when the lights of freedom have been extinguished in nations which once enjoyed freedom and independence. One of the many peoples who have lost their freedom in modern times are the Byelorussians, who are now behind the Iron Curtain.

After the collapse of czarist Russia during World War I, the Byelorussians proclaimed their independence by establishing the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. Unfortunately, their freedom was shortlived. The Communists who had seized power in Russia soon conquered Byelorussia and made it part of the Soviet empire.

Friday, March 25, will be the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. Let us hope and pray that the people of Byelorussia may soon celebrate the return of freedom rather than commemorate an independence that has been destroyed by a ruthless tyrant.

May God grant that the Byelorussians, as well as other peoples who now live under the Communist terror, will, at an early date, regain their freedom.

China, by Those Who Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important to our country that we have as much expert knowledge of Communist China as can be obtained; but we must be certain that those we listen to are indeed experts.

With this in mind I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the March 21, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

CHINA, BY THOSE WHO KNOW

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—One of the more comic features of the sudden quickening of interest in China is the character of so many of the people who are asked about China, and the concurrent refusal to ask many of those who know about China.

Consider a recent contrast, exhibit No. 1 is Prof. Hans Morgenthau. He has been billed as a serious authority by such publications as the New York Review and the New Republic, which normally maintain high intellectual standards, whatever you may think of their political views. More recently he has been solemnly presented to a huge readership as an authority on the special subject of Chinese aggression.

On this same subject of Chinese aggression, Professor Morgenthau stated in writing some months ago that "in 2,000 years of history" China had always peacefully refrained from conquering "her neighbors to the south and southwest."

Actually, China conquered the Vietnamese just a bit more than 2,000 years ago. Three periods of Vietnamese colonial subjection followed, with two intervening reinvasions to reestablish Chinese colonial rule. Thereafter, the Vietnamese never suffered another Chinese colonial occupation; but they did suffer four subsequent invasions by Chinese armies, which they managed to hurl back with great courage. It may be added that failing to notice three occupations and seven invasions was only an average Morgenthau error on the subject of China.

In the face of these fairly startling facts, how can any sane person treat Morgenthau as an authority on Chinese aggression, or indeed, as an authority on anything at all? In contrast, as exhibit No. 2, consider Prof. Lucian Pye.

Pye really is an authority, and one of great weight. He holds the chair of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He also heads a China studies project at MIT, which is doing most important work on contemporary China. But no one requests him to address an audience of many hundreds of thousands.

His most recent audience, instead, was the small though select circulation of Foreign Affairs, in which he has just published a remarkable and illuminating article under the title, "Dilemmas for China's Leaders."

The theme of his article is the extreme likelihood of "radical change" in China in the rather near future. Specifically, he predicts that this radical change will occur not long after the death of Mao Tse-tung, which can hardly be long delayed.

Very sensibly, he does not predict that China will cease to be Communist, any more than China ceased to be an empire when the Ch'in dynasty fell and the Han dynasty arose from its ruins. What he is talking about, in fact, is the disappearance of Maoist communism, paranoid, rigid, and inhuman, and its replacement by a wholly new kind of communism.

The new kind of Chinese communism that he foresees will be far more pragmatic, far better suited to Chinese conditions, far better adapted to the vast energies and unparalleled talents of the Chinese people. It will also make China, incidentally, a perfectly possible participant in a dialog with other nations, including the United States.

Space forbids recitation of the knowledgeable arguments with which Professor Pye buttresses his prediction. But two further point, elicited by private inquiry, are perhaps worth noting.

First, Pye believes that Mao's death, when it comes, will probably be followed by a short period of even more paranoid rigidity, after which the change will occur. What he really envisions, therefore, is some sort of radical changes of leadership, producing an equally radically change of direction and outlook. Second, Pye also believes that an American failure in Vietnam will much diminish the likelihood of this immensely hopeful change.

There was at least a hint of the same line of thought in the admirable testimony of Prof. John Fairbanks before the most recent hearings held by Senator William Fulbright. Fairbank and Doak Barnett are the sole serious authorities who have yet been given a large audience.

The results were laughable.

* * * * *

All this raises a rather serious question, if only because the Morgenthaus now command a larger intellectual following than the Barnetts, Fairbanks, and Pyes. The question is whether the American intellectual community is heading for another ghastly period of wallowing in guff, like the unlamented thirties.

I trust that Mr. Alsop will not object to my having deleted one sentence from his article, but it was necessary that I do so in order to comply with the rules of the House.

The Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, in this day when the two-party system is being challenged as perhaps it has never been challenged before, it is refreshing to me to know that students of our high schools throughout the Nation are aware of the situation and participate in various activities designed to call attention to the necessity of survival for our Nation's well-being.

In Maryland, the Prince Georges County Republican Club recently sponsored an essay contest on this subject. I believe the winning essay, written by Miss Carla Newman, of Benjamin Stoddard Junior High School, to be worthy of insertion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of all Americans.

THE IMPORTANCE OF A STRONG TWO-PARTY SYSTEM IN A DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

American political parties are vital to American democracy. They do the jobs that have to be done in any healthy system of representative government. They build a bridge between people and their government. They shore up national unity by bringing conflicting interests into harmony. They soften the impact of the extremists on both sides. They stimulate and channel public discussion. They find candidates for the voters and they find voters for the candidates. They help run elections. Parties shoulder much of the hard, day-to-day work of democracy.

Political parties existed early in American history. During the Revolutionary period, the people divided naturally between the Whigs, who opposed the British King and Parliament, and the Tories, who supported them. When the Constitution was being debated, the division was between the Federalists, who favored a strong Central Government, and the anti-Federalists, who opposed it. Ever since, there have always been only two major political parties, and our Government is based on what is called the two-party system.

Under the two-party system one party or the other must win the support of a majority of the voters to be elected to office. Thus the winning party can claim to have a mandate from the majority of the voters to carry through its program. The two-party system is a part of the tradition of western democracy; it tends to produce a more stable government than the multiple-party system, where no one party has a clear majority, or the one-party government, which often turns into a dictatorship. If we had a one-party system like the fascist or Communist type, our democracy would be far different from what it is—indeed it would be nonexistent.

Two important results stem from our two-party system. First, both parties must be broad alliances of many different interests. Parties are the means whereby groups pool their efforts to reach at least some of their goals. Parties want to win elections. In order to win, each of them emphasizes the common beliefs that unite men, and plays down the issues that divide them.

A second result of the two-party system is that both parties tend to be moderate in their platforms. Under a multiparty system the parties range all the way from extreme conservatism to extreme radicalism. With two big parties, these extremes are normally avoided. Each party must embrace a variety of groups, and above all, each must try to attract the crucial middle-of-the-road vote that easily switches from one side to the other. Not only do the parties seek wide support, but the different interest groups try not to alienate either party. This moderating tendency helps unite the country.

How can our two political parties, whose membership is so loose and hard to determine, be so useful to democratic society?

No better agency for mobilizing the electoral power of large numbers of people and channeling it to drive the wheels of government has been found in almost 200 years of experimentation. No other agency assumes for its chief task the formation of a majority so that officials can assume office with the knowledge that they speak and act for their fellow citizens. No other agency so persistently or so successfully stimulates citizen interest and participation in the processes of self-government. No other agency is quite so responsive to the feelings of its people. No other agency is in a position effectively to harness the multiple seats of power provided by our Federal and tripartite constitutional system and drive them toward an agreed goal.

Finally, no other agency has, at the same time that it has promoted political division, also promoted national unity. Only the political party reaches across sectional boundaries, economic distinctions, interest-group competition, religious differences, and racial antagonisms and softens the conflicts, bridges the gulfs, and helps to cement together a divergent, mobile, and aggressive people.

Let us think for a moment of the real value of our two political parties and their functions and contribution to our American way of life. The two-party system is necessary in our democratic form of government for several reasons:

1. They select the important issues and present them to the voters in the form of a "platform" to be debated. Thus public opinion becomes crystallized on important questions.

2. They act as an immense personnel agency. They present slates of candidates to the voters for election to office. Each party, by means of party caucuses or conventions, selects candidates who represent the party, and the voters then choose among them. How would we ever get through the process of electing a Congress if the parties did not take over the primaries and elections? How would the President ever find candidates for several thousand offices a year if his party's machinery were not quick with suggestions?

3. They help to educate the public on political matters and to arouse public interest in important issues through speeches, literature, and debate. History is full of instances in which a party took the lead in educating the public to recognize and understand the facts of a new trend in American life. The Republican Party, speaking through men like Lincoln, did much to educate the Nation in the true nature of slavery. The Democratic Party, speaking through Franklin Roosevelt, did even more to educate us in the proper relations of private enterprise and public authority.

4. They help to carry through legislative programs by majority action of their members. The parties have left their mark on the Constitution itself by taking an active part in the poky process through which we have added 12 amendments to the Constitution since the adoption of the bill of rights. The process of amendment demands a series of extraordinary majorities and thus cuts across party lines in search of both bipartisan and nonpartisan support.

5. They act as checks on each other. The party out of power is always on the alert to criticize the party in power for any shortcomings and to call them to the attention of the voters. The American two-party system appears as one of the truly conservative arrangements in the world of politics, a system designed by accident or providence to delay, and check the plans of man while permitting them to govern in a responsible and popular manner. The two-party system works to lengthen the delays built into the constitutional process. It is not the stubborn presence of the minority party but the opportunistic give and take of both parties that is the great auxiliary check and balance in the American pattern of free government.

Why do we have a two-party system? Nobody knows for sure, but we do know that there is no better formula for a good democratic government. Perhaps the sentry in Iolanthe was giving us the answer when he sang:

> Then let's rejoice * * *
> That nature always does contrive
> That every boy and every gal
> That's born into the world alive
> Is either a little liberal
> Or else a little conservative.

If You're Over 60 and Want a Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to bring to the attention of the House an excellent article, written by Louise Hickman Lione for the Sunday Sun, on Baltimore's Over-60 Employment Counseling Service.

It is encouraging to find that the Over-60 Employment Counseling Service is taking such an active role in assisting older people to find jobs and thus enjoy a more meaningful later life. I commend this article for its interesting treatment of a worthwhile and much needed community service:

IF YOU'RE OVER 60 AND WANT A JOB

(By Louise Hickman Lione)

People aren't honest. They won't tell you you're too old. They give one excuse and another. You know in your heart it is your age.

"I'm allowed to make $1,500 a year under social security, but the best I could do last year was make $300. Maybe I just haven't found the right job."

These observations, one from a former salesman and the other from an ex-railroad man, tell what it can be like to need a job when you're over 60. Bewildering, often heartbreaking.

Problems like theirs are met, and often solved, every day by men and women working at the Over-60 Employment Counseling Service at 309 Cathedral Street.

The service, founded 3 years ago by a group of civic leaders, is one of a number of its kind scattered across the country, all seeking to meet the needs, both economic and spiritual, of today's older citizens.

SERVICES ARE FREE

The Baltimore organization was established following a recommendation, based on a study of the economic aspects of aging, by the Maryland State Conference on Social Welfare. Its services are free. It is a nonprofit organization, depending largely upon voluntary contributions for its operating expenses, and upon volunteers for its personnel.

Applicants come from every circumstance that life can offer. Some are destitute. Most need to supplement inadequate retirement incomes or social security benefits. Others, comfortably fixed, are just bored—or getting under foot at home.

Sixty percent of the applicants are men. "Women are more resourceful," observes Arthur Wyatt, executive director of the service and a former bank vice president. "Many men don't have hobbies. Women have more things they can do and keep on doing." Knitting and sewing and keeping house can keep a life well filled at any age.

There is no dearth of jobs open to people over 60, though it may take work to find an applicant and an opening to match. There are more than 150 active openings on the over-60 service's books, just waiting for the right person to fill them.

There are always offers for those with office experience: bookkeepers, clerks, secretaries, and switchboard operators. There are many calls for desk clerks, elevator operators, and watchmen. Cashiers and salesmen are in demand. And so are babysitters, housekeepers, gardeners, and handymen.

The service has placed architects, engineers, chemists, writers—one male model and a chess player (to give companionship to an invalid).

DIFFICULT PLACEMENTS

Attractive-sounding jobs sometimes represent difficult placements. A cashier's job offering $75 to $85 for a 40-hour week goes begging because the hours are from midnight to 8 a.m. Caretaker and sexton jobs, paying $3,000 to $4,000 a year plus living quarters, may take time to fill since the most suitable candidates often have their own homes, and will not leave them.

The offer of full-time employment is not always a blessing. The great majority of applicants are receiving social security benefits, which limit annual earned income to $1,500 if none of the payments are to be forfeited. In such cases part-time employment is needed.

There have been potential employers quite willing to take advantage of the older person's need. Some wages offered, once worked out on an hourly basis, were pitifully poor. City regulations regarding minimum wage are doing much to correct such practices.

Especially for people with skills, the services of the Over-60 agency can be a quick, easy sequence of application, counseling, job interview, and placement. "The thing that appeals to me is the unusual kinds of placements we've been able to make," Mr. Wyatt says.

"A retired man with no social security and not much saved came in to find something to do. We found him a job as a janitor working 4 hours a day, 5 days a week. After 2 years he was eligible for social security. He came back every payday to make a contribution. "You helped me," he said. "I want you to help others."

COUNSELING ASPECT IMPORTANT

The counseling aspect of the service is just as important as the placement. Jobs available for older people may, in their eyes, represent a step down the status scale. Counselors, all over 60 themselves, must help them get over this hump. After that, applicants may state firm requirements as to hours and location. "Heck of it is—a lot of these people aren't as old as we are," says Robert Kolb, former professor of engineering and one of the service's busiest volunteers.

In one case, the Over-60 service found a job just three blocks from the applicant's home. Though easy walking distance would seem ideal for an older man, he did not want the job. Retirement regulations of his union did not allow him to take word at less than scale. But since the job offered required him to wear a uniform and be rather conspicuous, he was sure that his neighbors would presume he hadn't been thrifty and had to take any work he could find. The service found him another job with no uniform and farther from his home, far from possible neighborhood speculation as to why he wanted to work.

Applicants often end up working as volunteers for the Over-60 service. Everyone in the office is required to be registered, and this has led to some interesting employment for them.

One of the Over-60 typists, an ex-civil service secretary, perked up when a temporary position as a maid on an estate in Florida was put on the books. She went on the interview, was hired, and had a marvelous time in the sun, in between her tasks of table setting and serving.

A retired bank president who manned the telephones 1 day a week answered a call for a man with executive experience and became the business manager of a Baltimore foundation. The service considers this one of their top-echelon placements, along with a recent engineering job at $8,000 a year, filled by a 65-year-old applicant who had just been affected by the forced retirement program of a large corporation.

The regular services of the Over-60 organization are open Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. A Harundale Mall branch is open on Thursdays at the same hours. No appointments are made, but applicants are requested to arrive before 3 o'clock, so that they will have adequate time for counseling. "People at our age," says Mr. Wyatt, "are ready to go home by 4."

LONG RANGE PURPOSE

On Mondays and Fridays, some of the staff may be working in Baltimore's antipoverty program. The service shares in a Federal grant supervised by the city's health and welfare council. The long-range purpose of this work is to help elderly people now forced to accept welfare, or to try to live on meager pensions or benefits, to end their impoverishment and isolation. In this program interviews are often made in the individual's home or in neighborhood centers, since many of the potential applicants are too timid to make the trip in town.

Another grant to the Over-60 service, administered from Federal funds by the Maryland Commission on the Aging, and effective April 1, will help to expand the agency's regular service.

Still other funds are required for basic operations, and these must come from the donations of individuals and organizations. Last year these contributions amounted to $6,300. Mr. WYATT points out that since the service is nonprofit and tax free, donations are deductible.

While many are protesting forced retirement at 65 or less, able or not, others are predicting a retirement age of 55 within 10 years.

Either way, with life expectancy ever lengthening, society and the individual are presented with a brandnew set of problems. Organizations such as the Over-60 Employment Counseling Service feel they may play an even greater role in the society of the future.

Facts and Unfacts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, many officials of the Federal Government have, over the years, attempted to manipulate the flow of Government information to the American people.

But, as Columnist Joseph Alsop so aptly pointed out in a column in January 1966, no President before in history has claimed the right to keep from the people the basic facts of the national situation, unless he saw fit to divulge them, until President Lyndon B. Johnson came to the White House.

Today it is no secret in Washington, D.C., that there is a one-man "news bureau" and "editor" operating from 16th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Alsop's column on this subject follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1966]

FACTS AND UNFACTS

(By Joseph Alsop)

In the excitement over the state of the Union message, something of great significance has passed all but unnoticed. Rather glaring new light has been shed, in fact, on President Johnson's strange notion of the right way to deal with the public.

To begin with, a part of the curious espionage system to which members of the White House staff are subjected has been rudely brought into the open. All staff members' telephone calls are noted. All places they visit outside the White House are reported by the Government chauffeurs. And these lists of contacts are nightly studied, for symptoms of dangerous associations, by the President's new alter ego, Marvin Watson.

The unfortunate White House Press Secretary Bill D. Moyers, who more and more resembles a modern Saint Sebastian, was required to explain that Watson's nightly list perusals were solely motivated by a desire to achieve operating economies. This was said with a straight face, and the nearest that could be managed in the way of a show of indignation.

Yet it is of course an open secret that the telephone and limousine checks are only parts of a much wider system of surveillance that now covers most of the city of Washington. It is informal, but it works very efficiently.

In brief, a great many sleazy persons are now aware that the quickest way to make Brownie points at the White House is to pass the word that X has been seen talking to Y. Thus it is now an odds-on bet that any X–Y meeting, in a restaurant or other public place, will soon be added to the White House's dangerous associations list.

In addition, a fairly complete news control system has long been in force at the Pentagon. It was installed even before President Johnson's time by Secretary McNamara, who cannot quite get it through his head that he has thereby deprived the country of almost all protection against a Louis A. Johnson of the future.

Last week, finally, the State Department briefly tried to install a total news control system, and only retreated to installation of a partial system when sharp protest developed. And almost simultaneously the long-suffering Moyers, a good man trapped in a harsh predicament, gave the explanation of these puzzling phenomena in a television interview.

"It's very important for a President to maintain his options up until the moment of decision," said Moyers. "And for someone to speculate, days or weeks in advance, that he is going to do thus and thus, is to deny to the President that latitude he needs in order to make, in the light of the existing circumstances, the best possible decision."

Taken literally, this extraordinary statement appears to mean that the President cannot do whatever his duty requires him to do, if someone or other has already suggested in print that this is indeed what his duty will require. At any rate, this statement tells us why the President's attempts at news control are so much more aggressive, comprehensive, and one must add, repugnant to American tradition, than any such attempts by other Presidents.

The key to the statement is that curious word, "options." In order to understand the strange meaning the President gives to this word, it is useful to recall the period, almost exactly a year ago, before President Johnson faced up to the realities of the Vietnamese situation.

At that time, in the highest circles of the Government, there was desperate and justified fear of an early Vietcong victory in South Vietnam. The same concern was felt by the U.S. Embassy and U.S. military staff in Saigon. From Saigon, the President was being repeatedly warned that nothing could save the situation except determined U.S. action, such as he later took after the attack on the Pleiku barracks.

In November and December, the fear in the Government and in Saigon, and all the compelling reasons for this fear, were reported with some emphasis by a few persons, including this correspondent. The reports were strictly factual, if anything understating the true situation. But the President was deeply infuriated by this public ventilation of a crisis of the utmost public importance.

And it was later authoritatively explained that he was only angry because his "options" were being restricted.

What he means by his "options," therefore, is the freedom to decide whether facts are indeed facts, or whether it will be more convenient to classify them as unfacts. The facts themselves cannot of course be wished away, nor can their impact be diminished on the American national situation. But if they are just not mentioned, then they remain unfacts, as people who are unmentionable in the Soviet Union thereby become unpersons.

Most Presidents have of course tried, in one way or another, to manipulate the front and editorial pages of the press. But no previous President has claimed the right to keep from the country the basic facts of the national situation, unless he sees fit to divulge them. This is the novelty, and a most alarming novelty it is.

Record Number of Watershed Projects Approved in 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, during the year just ended the Congress gave its approval to 80 watershed projects under Public Law 566. Combined with the 20 smaller projects authorized by the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, this was the largest number ever approved in 1 year. It is a fitting indication of this body's interest in improved water and related land resources.

A good example of the worth of watershed project activity exists in my own State. Structural and land treatment measures in the Chippewa River tributaries and Hawk Creek pilot watershed project were completed just in time this past spring to take a real test.

The spring of 1965 saw one of the worst spring floods in Minnesota history. Heavy March snows resulted in accumulations of up to 55 inches. This was accompanied by a fast snowmelt and torrential rains that set the stage for the floods. This was in addition to thick ice on the streams and lakes. When the ice started moving and jamming, it created a real flood hazard.

Mr. Ronald Anfinson, editor and publisher of the Swift County News at Benson, spoke of the project's effect in an editorial:

> Though this city will always be spared major flooding from the Chippewa River, had it not been for the Mud Creek (watershed project) we would have found water lapping at our doorstep, causing difficulty and damage. Farms along the Mud Creek watershed project area would have been inundated—not for a week or so, but for weeks. The same is true for the Shakopee Creek watershed. Had the Chippewa River been the shallow, narrow, tree-choked, meandering stream it was before completion of the Mud Creek watershed project, this community would be experiencing considerable hardship * * * bad enough to result in thousands of dollars in property damage and lost land.

The large detention reservoirs on Shakopee Creek stored thousands of acre-feet of water. These reservoirs reduced and in many cases eliminated flooding of the cropland below. Cropland that was flooded remained that way only for 2 to 4 days, where previously it would have lasted several weeks. Due to the quick recession of floodwaters in the flood plains it was possible to get crops planted with very little delay.

Upland flooding and erosion were greatly reduced by the installation of soil and water conservation measures throughout the watershed, including terraces, field windbreaks, contour stripcropping, and many farm ponds.

Mr. Anfinson continued in a later article:

> This area, aided by the cooperation of the Government, has taken sensible measures to meet the menace of high water. Our watershed projects, covering millions of acres, demonstrated their great worth in recent days. These projects are costing the individuals and organizations affected considerable money, but the savings from 1 year such as this will more than offset the entire cost in many instances. We didn't have to sell a part of our independence to the Federal Government, but we did take advantage of Government aiding us in what was impossible on a strictly local basis. Perhaps by the next flood year, more communities, now fighting desperately to recover from the effects of high water, will have taken similar measures.

Mr. Anfinson has summed it up well. The efforts of the local people who are willing to spend their own moneys in worthwhile resource development activities deserve the continued strong support of the Federal and State Governments.

Statement of the World Order Committee, Catholic Association for International Peace on Southern Rhodesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I read with pleasure the support of the administration's policy regarding Rhodesia. I was happy to read the resolution of the Catholic Association for International Peace on Southern Rhodesia and I hereby insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATEMENT OF THE WORLD ORDER COMMITTEE, CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE ON SOUTHERN RHODESIA

The World Order Committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace in conjunction with its subcommittee on Africa, chaired by Dr. Thomas Melady has prepared the following statement on the deplorable situation in Southern Rhodesia:

The Smith regime in Southern Rhodesia has usurped the powers of government in violation of its own constitution and of its Commonwealth obligations to Great Britain. It has done so in the face of world opinion and the accepted traditions of western civilized society that orderly and systematic transfers of power take place with full recognition of the rights of all of its people.

The unilateral declaration of independence of the Smith regime is a clear effort to preserve the special privileges of the white minority and to refuse to protect the rights of its majority African people. This display of racism, disguised as a freedom movement, does a disservice to democratic government everywhere. The unjust deprivation by a white minority of the rights of an African majority in Southern Rhodesia is a scandal to good government and a potential threat to the peace.

We share with the Protestant church leaders and the Catholic bishops of Southern Rhodesia their concern for this "uneasy situation having the most appalling repercussions, not only here and in the other parts of Africa, but throughout the entire world."

We join our American Christian confreres in the National Council of Churches in publicly stating that we "stand in horror at Rhodesia's regression into colonization."

We support President Johnson in the effort he has already launched. We urge the American Government to continue to use its good offices with the Government of Great Britain to bring this dangerous experiment in contemporary racism to an end.

We offer our prayers that the defenders of freedom and human dignity in Southern Rhodesia will retain the courage to struggle, by peaceful means, against the injustice and the immorality of these actions. We affirm our continuing concern until the present dangerous situation in Southern Rhodesia is corrected.

Cracks Beginning To Appear in Rumanian Economic Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the administration emphasizing its pension for accommodation with the Communist dictatorships of Eastern Europe and the determination to build dubious bridges of understanding with these dictatorships, it is practical for us to get accurate reports of what is truly taking place behind the Iron Curtain. Therefore, I was intrigued by and am placing in the RECORD an article by Columnist Dumitru Danielopol of the Copley Press which appeared in the March 3 edition of the Joliet, Ill., Herald-News discussing economic facts of life in Rumania:

CRACKS BEGINNING TO APPEAR IN RUMANIAN ECONOMIC BOOM

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Some new cracks are showing in Communist Rumania's much ballyhooed economic boom.

Thomas Wyman, former Undersecretary of Commerce and a member of President Johnson's recent economic mission to Rumania, said on his return last November that "a high official of Rumania's National Bank indicated a free foreign exchange allocation of $200 million is available for purchases from the United States in the next 5 years."

It could be considerably higher, they intimated.

"Baloney," was the comment of Eastern European economists in New York.

The Rumanians are in debt to their ears. They have so much difficulty finding hard currencies that they can't make urgent payments.

"Rumania's economy is running into serious trouble due to a shortage of hard currency," writes the Free Central European News Agency from London.

Figures published last December by the Assembly of Captive European Nations reveal a Rumanian foreign trade deficit of $420 million accumulated during excessive 1961–64 imports.

It should be recalled that most of Rumania's exports go to Communist and underdeveloped countries which do not pay for their purchases in hard currencies.

"Work on Rumania's major industrial projects," wrote the London agency, "has been slowing down largely due to lack of the necessary currency with which it has to pay for the equipment ordered abroad."

One of these is the Galatzi steel combine.

That, however, is not all Rumania's trouble.

In their anxiety to industrialize rapidly, in accordance with pure Stalinist doctrine, the Rumanians have overdone it.

They have industrialized too much, too soon, according to experts in Europe.

For instance, the new aluminum factory built at Slatina with French machinery has run into serious trouble. The French engineers adivsed Rumania that they were building a plant that had too high a productive capacity for their needs. This proved to be correct. Now, despite excellent equipment and long hard work days, production quotas have not been attained.

Furthermore, the quality of the product is reportedly inferior and cannot compete in the international market.

The problem rests on factors that were predictable: lack of skilled workers, badly processed bauxite, poor transportation facilities and the eternal nonsense of mixing Marxist politics with industry.

"The trouble with the Rumanian economy," said one expert in Rome, "is that the Rumanians have failed to build an internal market for their industrial products. In fact, they have lowered the standard of living of the population to such a degree that between 60 and 80 percent of their income is used for food."

A food exporter before World War II, Rumania now has trouble meeting the agricultural needs of its own people.

Under the circumstances, Rumania's industry must produce for the export market—the very place her goods cannot compete.

Her economic "planners" are often forced to accept prices for their products that are below the cost of production.

Who bears the cost? The Rumanian people. And each time they are forced to pay for commissars' mistakes, their standard of living slips a little more and the dream of a Rumanian domestic market becomes a little more distant.

What is the answer?

Long term credits from the West, if the Reds can peddle the idea.

How will they repay these?

"When they reach maturity," said one Eastern European economist, "They will offer their Western creditors shoddy goods instead of cash."

And the West will have to make the best of it.

Fear of President Obstructs Information to the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Carl T. Rowan's professional background includes creditable service to journalism and to the Federal Government. Therefore, when Mr. Rowan speaks of the Government's information policies, he speaks from experience on both sides of the communications process. He has been both a reporter and a Government official.

In his nationally syndicated column of February 5, 1966, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News, Mr. Rowan discussed the President's role in influencing Government information policies. He aptly pointed out that the President keeps "the yoke of fear" on top Government officials and thus prohibits their "really informing the American people."

I submit for publication in the RECORD Mr. Rowan's timely column, "Fear of President Obstructs Information to the Public":

FEAR OF PRESIDENT OBSTRUCTS INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC

(By Carl T. Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—The telephone wires between the White House and the State Department were sizzling on January 27.

Someone in the White House was irked at press reports that the President had left a party for Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and Chief Justice Earl Warren without even saying goodby to his guests of honor.

But, despite the fact that he got relatively tame treatment in the press, the White House was looking for someone to scalp at State for the uncomplimentary articles.

A few days earlier the "security" beagles were scrurrying around the State Department trying to find out who had talked to Max Frankel of the New York Times in the days just past.

Frankel had written that Secretary of State Dean Rusk differed somewhat with the President on the wisdom of the much-publicized peace offensive.

The White House wanted to "pin the rose" on whatever "culprit" had induced Frankel to write his article.

All this might be "gossip" unworthy of a serious column except for the fact that it illustrates why the President today faces a most unfortunate public and congressional debate over his handling of the Vietnam crisis.

The fact is that the President's key advisers, from Cabinet members to Deputy Assistant Secretaries, are pitifully gunshy because of his notoriously thin skin regarding what appears in the press.

Ambassador William Porter, No. 2 man in Saigon, and Barry Zorthian, czar of the information program in Vietnam, were in Washington recently. They went through the inevitable routine of interagency discussions on how to deal with the press.

It became obvious that some Defense Department brass wants to junk the policy of "maximum disclosure consistent with national security." Why? Because the President occasionally is just as irritated by stories out of Vietnam as he was by those reports of his early adjournment to bed at the party for the Vice President and the Chief Justice.

And even generals find it a lot easier to worry about how to stop the irritating stories than to stand up to L.B.J.'s anger.

The tragedy, however, is that the Communists long have banked on a withering away of American support for our policy in Vietnam. They have been told repeatedly that in Congress and on the streets more and more Americans eventually would ask: "Is this trip necessary?"

I think that the President coupled his decision to resume bombing of North Vietnam with a reluctant decision to take the matter to the United Nations partly as a sop to his critics.

But most of those critics would not exist today if the administration would take the yoke of fear off its top officials and let them go about really informing the American people as to what we face in southeast Asia. This means a change from telling too little too late.

The future is grim, dangerous, and far more costly than anyone has been told—whether in terms of potential casualties, a wider draft, or a tax increase.

Perhaps the American people are not willing to pay the price. But I think that, knowing all the facts, they will.

We shall never know as long as gunshy Cabinet members and Presidential aids talk in riddles and diplomatic evasions hoping that the press won't understand enough to write anything that irritates the boss.

The Springfield Daily News Hopes More Nations Will Respond to American Appeal for Troops in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Daily News, a very well edited and respected daily newspaper in my home city of Springfield, Mass., noted in a recent editorial that the Republic of South Korea's offer to send more troops to help the war effort against communism in South Vietnam "is a generous response to the American suggestion that other nations help our effort there." Because I know that the Daily News editorial of March 14, 1966, will be of interest to my colleagues in the House, I place it with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Mar. 14, 1966]

HELP IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The Republic of South Korea's offer to send another division to South Vietnam to join its division already serving there is a generous response to the American suggestion that other nations help our effort there.

Australia, which now has a battalion and air units there, is preparing to increase its force to a 4,500-man, self-contained task force.

Just as in Korea, Americans were acutely aware of the paucity of help from our allies and only dimly aware of the magnificent help given by some smaller nations, so Americans now are likely to overlook the help given by other nations, or belittle it as insignificant.

Just as we should remember the help given to us in Korea by Turkey, Ethiopia, and several other nations, so we should be grateful for the help being given by Korea and Australia in South Vietnam. May their number and their numbers increase.

L.B.J. and the Governors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, recently there was a demonstration of genuine unity on the part of this Nation's Governors in their statement of support for President Johnson's policy in Vietnam.

The story of how that statement came about appears in the following column from the March 20, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

INSIDE REPORT: L.B.J. AND THE GOVERNORS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

WASHINGTON.—Far from being stage managed by the White House, the unanimous endorsement of President Johnson's Vietnam policy by 41 State Governors here March 9 was a spontaneous reaction to the L.B.J. treatment.

Actually, it did not originate at the White House briefing that afternoon to which all Governors were invited but at a meeting of the Appalachian Regional Commission in the Cabinet room that morning. With nine Governors attending, the President quickly veered from Appalachian problems to his preoccupation these days: Vietnam.

After explaining why heavy commitment of U.S. troops was necessary, Mr. Johnson turned to his troubles with the generals. To follow the military's advice and bomb strategic targets in the Hanoi-Haiphong industrial complex, the President said, would result in the murder of innocent civilians.

What's more, Mr. Johnson continued, some generals want him to bomb Red China's new nuclear installations. He said he will not do this, adding: "I don't want China to spit in my eye, and I won't spit in China's eye."

The reaction of the nine Governors present at the closed-door session was uniformly favorable. Republican Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York pounded the table with calls of "Hear! Hear!" Another Republican, Gov. James Rhodes, of Ohio, asked whether the President would like a resolution of all the Governors backing up his Vietnam policy. Mr. Johnson replied that indeed he would.

Rhodes next asked the President to draft a resolution for him. The job was entrusted to White House Aid Joe Califano and the new Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, former Gov. Farris Bryant, of Florida. Their resolution was passed at the afternoon session.

A footnote: High administration officials had been uneasy over the morning session because a nationally prominent Republican—Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania—currently is chairman of the Appalachian Commission. They feared he would play politics by attacking this year's cutback in Federal funds for the Appalachian development program.

Instead, Scranton told the President the Governors fully understand the need to limit domestic spending because of Vietnam. Mr. Johnson was so delighted that he asked reporters into the meeting and then had Scranton repeat his statement for them.

Getting Money Out of Congress: The Johnson Method

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative MELVIN LAIRD, has been cited by Columnist Bill Henry in the March 20, 1966, issue of the Los Angeles Times as having figured out the Johnson method of getting money out of Congress. This House needs more men like Congressman LAIRD, who will question the actions of the executive branch—actions which have become capricious at times.

I submit the article for the information of Members of Congress:

REPRESENTATIVE LAIRD EXPLAINS

The Johnson method of getting money out of Congress was explained the other day. The man who explained it, Representative MEL LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, appreciated it as a clever way of accomplishing a purpose. But he opposed it as a deceptive operation which allows Congress little room for the exercise of sound judgment, and which cleverly covers up huge debt-building commitments for the future.

LAIRD's analysis of the Johnson method is both interesting and important. Every American ought to be interested in whether or not his country's affairs are being well managed. On the political side, LAIRD is right at the top level of Republican thinking and policymaking and his analyses of political, and particularly military, matters, will form the basis of GOP campaign tactics this fall.

A $15 BILLION ERROR?

What he has to say is particularly timely because just this week one of his major arguments was proved when Congress was asked to pass a $13 billion supplemental money bill to cover costs of the Vietnam war. At the time, a year ago when the 1966 budget was presented the Republican minority on the Armed Services Committee issued a report charging that the President and the Defense Department had grossly underestimated the costs for Vietnam. The supplemental request proves that they were correct and LAIRD says the error for the year will be more than $15 billion.

LAIRD says an error of this size can only mean one of two things: (1) gross miscalculation or (2) political skullduggery. An error or a few percentage points might be, he says, excusable but this is fantastic—it amounts to about one-third of the total defense budget. LAIRD points out that it took place at a time when the President was going around turning off the lights in the White House and claiming great credit for keeping the total budget under $100 billion.

It wasn't just a miscalculation, LAIRD suspects. He charges that it had a political purpose. The first move was to present a reasonably conservative budget, indicating that the United States could afford a war and the Great Society, too. Next move was to quickly push Great Society projects through Congress, asking comparatively small appropriations but committing Congress to projects for which it would have to make much larger appropriations in future years.

MUST SUPPORT WAR

Having done this, the Johnson method—according to LAIRD—is to come in with the supplemental request, knowing no Congress is going to refuse whatever funds are needed to carry on the war. LAIRD's argument is that if Congress had been warned in the first place, through an honest budget, how much the war was going to cost, it would have been more careful about committing itself to Great Society projects. Now it's too late.

What do the Republicans propose to do about it? Obviously they are going to vote whatever funds are needed for the war. The big clamor soon will be to increase taxes to help carry to war load. LAIRD thinks the first thing to do is to whittle down the nonwar spending first and, meanwhile, give Congress and the voters a more honest reading regarding the real cost of the war.

Cotton Checkoff Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall that on March 3 during the deliberation on H.R. 12322, more particularly known as the cotton checkoff bill, I offered certain amendments. The purpose of one particular amendment was to strike from the bill a provision which would enable a few large cotton producers to literally overwhelm thousands of small producers in the referendum to determine whether or not a checkoff program would be put into effect.

Since that time I have had numerous inquiries as to the number of farms by States and the volume of cotton produced by size of farm. After considerable research this information is now available. I am taking this opportunity to provide this detailed information for the particular benefit of my colleagues and the cotton farmers of the 14 cotton-producing States. It is set forth in the following tables:

Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture, totals for 14 States

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Total farms	Total production	Total farms	Total production
10,000 or more	8	191,111	0.002	1.38	0.002	1.38
5,000 to 9,999	18	113,567	.004	.82	.006	2.20
4,000 to 4,999	17	74,614	.003	.54	.009	2.74
3,000 to 3,999	42	140,892	.01	1.02	.02	3.76
2,000 to 2,999	101	234,223	.02	1.69	.04	5.45
1,500 to 1,999	138	230,211	.03	1.66	.07	7.11
1,000 to 1,499	419	501,782	.08	3.63	.15	10.74
500 to 999	1,819	1,200,086	.36	8.67	.51	19.41
200 to 499	8,626	2,503,025	1.72	18.08	2.23	37.49
100 to 199	15,417	2,097,698	3.07	15.16	5.30	52.65
50 to 99	26,431	1,798,561	5.26	12.99	10.56	65.64
40 to 49	12,392	538,179	2.47	3.89	13.03	69.53
30 to 39	19,976	670,741	3.98	4.85	17.01	74.38
20 to 29	39,996	940,658	7.97	6.80	24.98	81.18
10 to 19	105,202	1,420,001	20.96	10.26	45.94	91.44
Under 10	271,406	1,184,605	54.06	8.56	100.00	100.00
Total	502,008	13,840,044	100.00	100.00		

In 1959: 8 large farms in California produced 191,111 bales; 43,719 small farms (less than 10 bales) in Alabama produced 184,856 bales; 26,879 small farms in Georgia produced only 123,951 bales; 45,228 small farms in North Carolina produced 174,920 bales; and 33,270 small farms in South Carolina produced 139,409 bales.

The 18 largest farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or more than the 248,937 bales produced by 36,194 19-bale-or-less producers in Georgia.

Thirteen percent of the total number of cotton-producing farms accounted for over 69 percent of total cotton production.

Alabama—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
1,000 or more	1	1,118	0.002	0.17	0.002	0.17
500 to 999	10	5,978	.02	.88	.02	1.05
200 to 499	125	34,718	.20	5.13	.22	6.18
100 to 199	313	40,642	.49	6.01	.71	12.19
50 to 99	995	64,610	1.56	9.55	2.27	21.74
40 to 49	730	31,838	1.14	4.71	3.41	26.45
30 to 39	1,583	53,123	2.47	7.86	5.88	34.31
20 to 29	3,956	92,692	6.18	13.71	12.06	48.02
10 to 19	12,557	166,696	19.62	24.65	31.68	72.67
Unter 10	43,719	184,856	68.32	27.33	100.00	100.00
Total	63,989	676,271	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 32 percent of the farms accounted for 73 percent of Alabama's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 69,633 bales more than the 43,719 smallest cotton farms in Alabama.

Arizona—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
5,000 or more	3	20,443	0.12	3.09	0.12	3.09
4,000 to 4,999	6	25,478	.25	3.85	.37	6.94
3,000 to 3,999	7	22,936	.29	3.47	.66	10.41
2,000 to 2,999	19	44,129	.78	6.67	1.44	17.08
1,500 to 1,999	27	45,783	1.12	6.92	2.56	24.00
1,000 to 1,490	72	85,768	2.97	12.97	5.53	36.97
500 to 999	231	154,939	9.54	23.43	15.07	60.40
200 to 499	504	154,681	20.81	23.39	35.88	83.79
100 to 199	499	67,399	20.60	10.19	56.48	93.98
50 to 99	340	23,355	14.04	3.53	70.52	97.51
40 to 49	151	6,428	6.23	.97	76.75	98.48
30 to 39	92	3,135	3.80	.48	80.55	98.96
20 to 29	153	3,719	6.32	.56	86.87	99.52
10 to 19	174	2,376	7.18	.36	94.05	99.88
Under 10	144	757	5.95	.12	100.00	100.00
Total	2,422	661,326	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 15 percent of the farms accounted for 60 percent of Arizona's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 147,320 bales more than the 1,553 smallest cotton farms in Arizona.

Arkansas—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
4,000 or more	1	4,356	0.003	0.29	0.003	0.29
3,000 to 3,999	3	9,468	.01	.62	.01	.91
2,000 to 2,999	6	14,850	.02	.98	.03	1.89
1,500 to 1,999	7	11,447	.02	.76	.05	2.65
1,000 to 1,499	37	44,297	.11	2.92	.16	5.57
500 to 999	238	155,386	.68	10.25	.84	15.82
200 to 499	1,173	349,436	3.36	23.06	4.20	38.88
100 to 199	1,874	254,960	5.38	16.83	9.58	55.71
50 to 99	3,435	231,172	9.86	15.26	19.44	70.97
40 to 49	1,600	70,014	4.59	4.62	24.03	75.59
30 to 39	2,674	90,521	7.67	5.97	31.70	81.56
20 to 29	4,262	101,579	12.23	6.70	43.93	88.26
10 to 19	9,095	126,425	26.09	8.34	70.02	96.60
Under 10	10,450	51,454	29.98	3.40	100.00	100.00
Total	34,855	1,515,365	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 19 percent of the farms accounted for 71 percent of Arkansas' cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 76,610 bales more than the 19,545 smallest cotton farms in Arkansas.

California—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
10,000 or more	8	191,111	.09	10.39	.09	10.39
5,000 to 9,999	10	63,378	.11	3.45	.20	13.84
4,000 to 4,999	7	32,182	.08	1.75	.28	15.59
3,000 to 3,999	27	91,258	.31	4.96	.59	20.55
2,000 to 2,999	42	99,086	.48	5.39	1.07	25.94
1,500 to 1,999	53	89,890	.60	4.89	1.67	30.83
1,000 to 1,499	140	167,334	1.60	9.10	3.27	39.93
500 to 999	476	321,743	5.43	17.50	8.70	57.43
200 to 499	1,295	392,011	14.77	21.32	23.47	78.75
100 to 199	1,357	188,545	15.48	10.25	38.95	89.00
50 to 99	1,530	109,299	17.45	5.95	56.40	94.95
40 to 49	595	25,515	6.79	1.39	63.19	96.34
30 to 39	793	26,892	9.04	1.46	72.23	97.80
20 to 29	972	23,469	11.09	1.28	83.32	99.08
10 to 19	952	13,789	10.86	.75	94.18	99.83
Under 10	510	3,169	5.82	.17	100.00	100.00
Total	8,767	1,838,671	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 23 percent of the farms accounted for 79 percent of California's cotton production.

The 52 largest cotton farms in California produced more cotton (66,630 bales) than the entire State of North Carolina.

Georgia—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
500 or more	8	5,345	0.02	1.04	0.02	1.04
200 to 499	69	17,831	.16	3.47	.18	4.51
100 to 199	303	39,462	.72	7.68	.90	12.19
50 to 99	876	57,450	2.06	11.18	2.96	23.37
40 to 49	756	32,919	1.78	6.41	4.74	29.78
30 to 39	1,271	41,972	3.00	8.17	7.74	37.95
20 to 29	2,973	69,826	7.00	13.59	14.74	51.54
10 to 19	9,315	124,986	21.94	24.33	36.68	75.87
Under 10	26,879	123,951	63.32	24.13	100.00	100.00
Total	42,450	513,742	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 37 percent of the farms accounted for 76 percent of Georgia's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 130,538 bales more than the 26,879 smallest cotton farms in Georgia.

Louisiana—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
1,500 or more	2	3, 002	0. 01	0. 78	0. 01	0. 78
1,000 to 1,499	13	15, 002	. 05	3. 24	. 06	4. 02
500 to 999	59	38, 741	. 24	8. 37	. 30	12. 39
200 to 499	273	78, 257	1. 12	16. 91	1. 42	29. 30
100 to 199	385	52, 672	1. 58	11. 38	3. 00	40. 68
50 to 99	690	47, 345	2. 83	10. 23	5. 83	50. 91
40 to 49	389	16, 922	1. 60	3. 65	7. 43	54. 56
30 to 39	755	25, 376	3. 10	5. 48	10. 53	60. 04
20 to 29	1, 804	42, 360	7. 40	9. 15	17. 93	69. 19
10 to 19	5, 589	75, 041	22. 92	16. 21	40. 85	85. 40
Under 10	14, 420	67, 566	59. 15	14. 60	100. 00	100. 00
Total	24, 379	462, 886	100. 00	100. 00		

In round numbers, 18 percent of the farms accounted for 69 percent of Louisiana's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 27,222 bales more than the 22,957 cotton farms that produced less than 50 bales in Louisiana.

Mississippi—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
5,000 or more	1	5, 781	0. 001	0. 37	0. 001	0. 37
4,000 to 4,999	1	4, 397	. 001	. 28	. 002	. 65
3,000 to 3,999	1	3, 800	. 001	. 24	. 003	. 89
2,000 to 2,999	7	15, 121	. 01	. 97	. 01	1. 86
1,500 to 1,999	15	24, 589	. 02	1. 58	. 03	3. 44
1,000 to 1,499	67	80, 634	. 09	5. 18	. 12	8. 62
500 to 999	296	197, 208	. 38	12. 67	. 50	21. 29
200 to 499	937	286, 862	1. 21	18. 43	1. 71	39. 72
100 to 199	953	132, 389	1. 23	8. 50	2. 94	48. 22
50 to 99	1. 502	102, 323	1. 95	6. 57	4. 89	54. 79
40 to 49	961	41, 498	1. 25	2. 67	6. 14	57. 46
30 to 39	1, 851	61, 346	2. 40	3. 94	8. 54	61. 40
20 to 29	5, 873	136, 539	7. 60	8. 77	16. 14	70. 17
10 to 19	19, 375	264, 602	25. 08	17. 00	41. 22	87. 17
Under 10	45, 404	199, 673	58. 78	12. 83	100. 00	100. 00
Total	77, 244	1, 556, 762	100. 00	100. 00		

In round numbers, 16 percent of the farms accounted for 70 percent of Mississippi's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 54,816 bales more than the 45,404 smallest cotton farms in Mississippi.

Missouri—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
5,000 or more	1	6, 600	0. 01	1. 44	0. 01	1. 44
4,000 to 4,999						
3,000 to 3,999						
2,000 to 2,999	3	6, 800	. 03	1. 48	. 04	2. 92
1,500 to 1,999						
1,000 to 1,499	5	5, 600	. 05	1. 22	. 09	4. 14
500 to 999	30	18, 594	. 30	4. 06	. 39	8. 20
200 to 499	218	59, 220	2. 19	12. 92	2. 58	21. 12
100 to 199	710	97, 719	7. 11	21. 31	9. 69	42. 43
50 to 99	1, 726	116, 742	17. 29	25. 46	26. 98	67. 89
40 to 49	719	31, 346	7. 21	6. 84	34. 19	74. 73
30 to 39	1, 197	40, 293	11. 99	8. 79	46. 18	83. 52
20 to 29	1, 516	35, 790	15. 19	7. 81	61. 37	91. 33
10 to 19	2, 133	30, 624	21. 37	6. 68	82. 74	98. 01
Under 10	1, 723	9, 118	17. 26	1. 99	100. 00	100. 00
Total	9, 981	458, 455	100. 00	100. 00		

In round numbers, 27 percent of the farms accounted for 68 percent of Missouri's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 107,318 bales more than the 7,288 cotton farms that produced less than 50 bales in Missouri.

New Mexico—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
2,000 or more	2	4, 300	0. 07	1. 47	0. 07	1. 47
1,500 to 1,999	1	1, 500	. 03	. 51	. 10	1. 98
1,000 to 1,499	7	8, 104	. 24	2. 78	. 34	4. 76
500 to 999	51	33, 297	1. 71	11. 41	2. 05	16. 17
200 to 499	329	93, 397	11. 03	31. 99	13. 08	48. 16
100 to 199	544	75, 364	18. 24	25. 82	31. 32	73. 98
50 to 99	645	46, 432	21. 62	15. 90	52. 94	89. 88
40 to 49	208	8, 847	6. 97	3. 03	59. 91	92. 91
30 to 39	231	7, 821	7. 74	2. 68	67. 65	95. 59
20 to 29	270	6, 213	9. 05	2. 13	76. 70	97. 72
10 to 19	352	4, 788	11. 80	1. 64	88. 50	99. 36
Under 10	343	1, 871	11. 50	. 64	100. 00	100. 00
Total	2, 983	291, 934	100. 00	100. 00		

In round numbers, 31 percent of the farms accounted for 74 percent of New Mexico's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales or 9,756 bales more than the 2,922 cotton farms that produced less than 500 bales in New Mexico.

North Carolina—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
200 or more	4	857	0. 01	0. 28	0. 01	0. 28
100 to 199	32	4, 219	. 06	1. 35	. 07	1. 63
50 to 99	152	9, 948	. 29	3. 20	. 36	4. 83
40 to 49	186	8, 014	. 35	2. 57	. 71	7. 40
30 to 39	358	11, 961	. 67	3. 84	1. 38	11. 24
20 to 29	1, 157	26, 464	2. 19	8. 50	3. 57	19. 74
10 to 19	5, 745	74, 916	10. 87	24. 07	14. 44	43. 81
Under 10	45, 228	174, 920	85. 56	56. 19	100. 00	100. 00
Total	52, 862	311, 299	100. 00	100. 00		

In round numbers, 14 percent of the farms accounted for 44 percent of North Carolina's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 4,653 bales more than the 50,973 smallest cotton farms in North Carolina.

Oklahoma—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
1,000 or more	1	1, 087	0. 01	0. 28	0. 01	0. 28
500 to 999	2	1, 300	. 01	. 36	. 02	. 64
200 to 499	111	30, 591	. 65	8. 36	. 67	9. 00
100 to 199	390	49, 127	2. 30	13. 43	2. 97	22. 43
50 to 99	1, 234	81, 225	7. 26	22. 20	10. 23	44. 63
40 to 49	769	33, 112	4. 53	9. 05	14. 76	53. 68
30 to 39	1, 114	37, 124	6. 55	10. 15	21. 31	63. 83
20 to 29	2, 023	47, 440	11. 90	12. 97	33. 21	76. 80
10 to 19	3, 732	50, 929	21. 96	13. 93	55. 17	90. 73
Under 10	7, 620	33, 946	44. 83	9. 28	100. 00	100. 00
Total	16, 996	365, 531	100. 00	100. 00		

In round numbers, 33 percent of the farms accounted for 77 percent of Oklahoma's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 51,938 bales more than the 15,258 cotton farms that produced less than 50 bales in Oklahoma.

South Carolina—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
500 or more	3	2,433	0.01	0.59	0.01	0.59
200 to 499	49	12,104	.11	2.94	.12	3.53
100 to 199	190	24,542	.42	5.97	.54	9.50
50 to 99	661	44,097	1.46	10.72	2.00	20.22
40 to 49	380	16,497	.84	4.01	2.84	24.23
30 to 39	703	23,866	1.56	5.81	4.40	30.04
20 to 29	1,791	41,454	3.97	10.08	8.37	40.12
10 to 19	8,076	106,832	17.90	25.98	26.27	66.10
Under 10	33,270	139,409	73.73	33.90	100.00	100.00
Total	45,123	411,234	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 26 percent of the farms accounted for 66 percent of South Carolina's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 8,248 bales more than the 41,346 smallest cotton farms in South Carolina.

Tennessee—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
1,000 or more	1	1,100	0.003	0.18	0.003	0.18
500 to 999	17	9,705	.04	1.59	.04	1.77
200 to 499	113	31,190	.30	5.10	.34	6.87
100 to 199	324	43,007	.85	7.03	1.19	13.90
50 to 99	1,089	69,282	2.86	11.33	4.05	25.23
40 to 49	788	33,983	2.07	5.56	6.12	30.79
30 to 39	1,824	60,683	4.78	9.92	10.90	40.71
20 to 29	4,787	112,063	12.55	18.32	23.45	59.03
10 to 19	11,913	163,556	31.24	26.74	54.69	85.77
Under 10	17,278	87,043	45.31	14.23	100.00	100.00
Total	38,134	611,613	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 23 percent of the farms accounted for 59 percent of Tennessee's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 3,890 bales more than the 29,191 smallest cotton farms in Tennessee.

Texas—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
5,000 or more	3	17,365	0.004	0.42	0.004	0.42
4,000 to 4,999	2	8,201	.002	.20	.006	.62
3,000 to 3,999	4	13,430	.01	.32	.01	.94
2,000 to 2,999	22	49,937	.03	1.20	.04	2.14
1,500 to 1,999	33	53,400	.04	1.28	.08	3.42
1,000 to 1,499	75	91,788	.09	2.20	.17	5.62
500 to 999	398	255,417	.49	6.13	.66	11.75
200 to 499	3,426	961,861	4.19	23.10	4.85	34.85
100 to 199	7,543	1,027,651	9.22	24.67	14.07	59.52
50 to 99	11,556	795,280	14.12	19.10	28.19	78.62
40 to 49	4,160	181,246	5.08	4.35	33.27	82.97
30 to 39	5,530	186,628	6.76	4.48	40.03	87.45
20 to 29	8,459	201,060	10.34	4.83	50.37	92.28
10 to 19	16,194	214,531	19.79	5.15	70.16	97.43
Under 10	24,418	106,870	29.84	2.57	100.00	100.00
Total	81,823	4,164,655	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 28 percent of the farms accounted for 79 percent of Texas' cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 147,619 bales more than the 24,418 smallest cotton farms in Texas.

Achievement Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times is one of many newspapers across the land which hails the achievement in space being made under this administration. The Times says:

> The imagination is awed at the thought of the joining together of two space vehicles in the sky, each almost 200 miles above the earth and each traveling at almost 20,000 miles an hour.

The Times adds that this was the "magnificent feat" accomplished when *Gemini 8* successfully linked itself with the Agena target vehicle.

Since the editorial seems so typical, I include it in the RECORD:

ACHIEVEMENT IN SPACE

The imagination is awed at the thought of the joining together of two rockets in the sky, each almost 200 miles above the earth and each traveling at almost 20,000 miles an hour. This of course, is the magnificent feat accomplished last night when *Gemini 8* successfully linked itself with the Agena target vehicle. The subsequent difficulties which forced the decision to return *Gemini 8* to earth prematurely do not detract from the brilliance of the achievement.

The docking maneuver thus successfully pioneered is of the utmost importance. It is through combining the loads brought into space by individual rockets that the great structures can be built that will be necessary for man's activities in the cosmos in the years ahead. Tomorrow's stations in space will serve as laboratories for astronomers and other scientists, as terminals for transshipment of passengers and freight between short-range and long-range rockets, and, unfortunately—if the future resembles the past—also as military bases reflecting in the sky the tensions and hostilities of earth. But whatever purpose they serve, these islands in space will have been made possible by repeated use of the same maneuver that Astronauts Armstrong and Scott performed for the first time last night.

So swift is man's capability for adjustment to new conditions that in the not-too-distant future the joining together of two spaceships in the sky will no doubt seem as routine as the takeoff or landing of an airplane does today. But for the moment, a sense of wonder, and of admiration prevails.

The wonder is evoked by this latest demonstration of the way human science and engineering are extending man's domain ever further into the heavens. And the admiration is inspired by the courage and the skill of the two astronauts who set the course that many others will follow in the future.

Backward Ho—At State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by newspaper accounts of the State Department reorganization that would abolish the Bureau of Security Affairs—an action which has led to the resignation of its Administrator, Abba P. Schwartz. I am happy to join a number of my colleagues in urging that this matter be investigated thoroughly by the appropriate congressional committee.

I do not know Mr. Schwartz, but I do know that in the last several years, during his tenure as Administrator, there has been a tremendous improvement in our official attitude toward travel both into and out of the United States. It would be disastrous if this trend should be reversed.

I know of dozens of instances in which foreign officials, educators, and publicists who needed to have their misconceptions of America corrected and whose understanding and good will could have been of inestimable benefit to us were denied visas because officials in Washington drafted regulations on admissibility going even beyond the letter of the McCarran-Walter Act and consular officers interpreted those regulations with inflexible rigidity.

All this has changed in recent years. It would be disastrous if the spirits of Joe McCarthy and Scott McLeod should again dominate our passport and visa policies. Are we once more to assume—or act as if we assumed—that every foreign liberal or radical is an enemy agent, that our democracy is so wobbly that a few hundred or even thousand of such visitors would topple it, and that American citizens are so untrustworthy that they must not be permitted to examine other societies at first hand?

This may not be the intent of the reorganization, but the manner in which it was engineered—in deep secrecy, without consulting the person most directly concerned—is certainly suspicious.

Surely consular affairs are important enough to be assigned to a separate bureau, not relegated to an already overworked and exceptionally competent man, Deputy Under Secretary William J. Crockett.

An inquiry is in order. I hope it is begun without delay.

Mid-America Council of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, the Mid-America Council No. 326, of the Boy Scouts of America, headquartered at Omaha, Nebr., adopted an ambitious 8-year growth program known as Breakthrough for Youth. It is designed to make possible a tremendous growth in Boy Scout membership each year until 1972, when it is hoped that the mid-America area can serve some 54,000 boys. This would be 50 percent of all available boys at that time. The plan not only envisions reaching all boys who desire to be Scouts, but provides for a continual upgrading of the program offered.

It was gratifying for me learn last week, Mr. Speaker, that the plan now having been in effect for 1 year is on target and there is every anticipation it will continue to be so at the end of 1966.

I wish to congratulate the leaders in the Mid-America Council. They are men of vision and high purpose. They seek to make the opportunities of Scouting possible for thousands of new boys each year, and they are ever alert to see that the quality of the program offered shall be increasingly good. The leaders have seen that the master plan of operation was carefully drawn and is both practical and workable. The one element yet to be proven is their faith that the people of the Mid-America Council will back their council with the necessary support, in both time and money.

Service hours totaling hundreds of thousands are given each year by dedicated volunteers in order to make effective the splendid character-citizenship training program of the Boy Scouts of America. If these hours were to be translated into dollars and cents, the price of the Boy Scout program would be staggering. Since this is not the case, however, Scout budget needs are very, very modest indeed. Particularly is this seen by comparing the Scout budget with request from correctional institutions in the State of Nebraska, for rehabilitation purposes. How much better to put only a fraction of this cost into the "ounce of prevention" the Scouting movement represents.

The Boy Scout program all over America is doing a truly magnificent job in fostering the ideals of true Americanism in our growing boys. In fact, I am inclined to agree with the statement once made by the beloved Will Rogers, "The only trouble with the Boy Scouts is—there just ain't enough of them."

The Mid-America Council is to be commended on making a sincere effort to remedy this situation.

Coordinating the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned about the lack of administrative coordination of a number of our programs affecting urban areas, water pollution, and transportation. Last year when the new Department of Housing and Urban Development was created, Republicans pointed out that the new agency could not possibly provide the needed one-stop service for local officials in dealing with the more than 40 Federal programs affecting urban areas. This problem is true in a number of other fields as well.

Writing in the latest issue of the Reporter magazine, Stephen K. Bailey pointed out that the report of the Advisory Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations stated they could find no evidence "of a unified urban development policy." Professor Bailey discusses a number of other areas where there is a similar lack of coordinated planning .

All of these difficulties indicate that a sweeping review of the organization of the executive branch is very much in order. A number of Members have introduced legislation calling for a new "Hoover Commission." The examples highlighted in Professor Bailey's article indicate that these bills should receive prompt consideration.

I include the article, entitled "Coordinating the Great Society" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COORDINATING THE GREAT SOCIETY

(By Stephen K. Bailey)

Probably no series of legislative enactments in U.S. history has created more complex administrative problems than those recently passed under Lyndon Johnson's leadership. They have three things in common: their implementation cuts across existing departmental and agency lines within the Federal Government; they demand almost heroic responses from State and local governments in order to succeed; they require a combination of technical and administrative skills that are critically scarce in the society at large. Despite the demands of the war in Vietnam, the critical shortage is not money but people to carry out the programs and effective administrative machinery. Neither medicare nor aid to education nor the poverty program has either of these at the moment.

The poverty program alone, based on the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, is being handled by a multiplicity of agencies. Some of its projects are directly administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, headed by Sargent Shriver and based in the Executive Office of the President; others are not. While the Job Corps is run by OEO, the Neighborhood Youth Corps is administered by the Department of Labor; the work experience program by the Welfare Administration of Health, Education, and Welfare; the rural family loan program by the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture; the Economic Opportunity loans by the Small Business Administration. And this catalog does not begin to touch efforts related to the poverty program but not formally a part of it: for example, the Rural Community Development Service in the Department of Agriculture; the Economic Development program in Commerce; and the Appalachian Regional Commission, an autonomous organizational entity composed of State Governors and a single Federal representative.

Such various sources of attack provide an undeniable impetus to the campaign against poverty, but they do not make for administrative tidiness. The difficulties in Sargent Shriver's position are patent: vested with overall responsibility for the poverty program, he must negotiate, coordinate, even command and veto activities of departments whose Secretaries outrank him in status-oriented Washington. It is perhaps symptomatic of his situation that the Economic Opportunity Council, headed by Shriver and composed of the Cabinet Secretaries and agency directors with responsibilities in the drive against poverty, met only four times in the first year of the program.

There have been some attempts to unsnarl the administrative lines. Agriculture and OEO, for example, have established a task force to coordinate Federal efforts to eliminate rural poverty. But the search is still on for a way of providing general direction for the total war on poverty. The miracle is that in spite of the administrative confusion, Shriver can point to the award of 1,800 community action grants, half a million Headstart youngsters, 87 Job Corps centers in operaiton, and 1,800 trained VISTA volunteers—all accomplished in 18 months of frenetic activity. But the administrative problems remain, and they will get worse before they get better.

THE PROLIFERATION BARRIER

The problem of administering programs whose boundaries are amorphous is a grand characteristic of the Great Society. A recent New York Times report on education found that, despite the formal responsibilities of HEW's Office of Education, important new education programs are found in most of the 11 Office of Economic Opportunity programs, as well as in 5 programs in Cabinet departments. Civil rights responsibilities are similarly assigned, and have recently been reassigned, to each individual governmental agency. In spite of heroic work by Vice President HUMPHREY, no central bureau effectively coordinates the various efforts and policies in the field of human rights.

At present more than 40 different Federal programs provide aid for urban development, yet the most careful of studies—that of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—fails to reveal "any evidence of a unified urban development policy." In the field as in Washington, interagency contacts are predominantly informal. Where formal arrangements have been made, they are usually bilateral rather than multilateral. The new Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will make inroads in this confusion, but it will not end it. Bureaus of at least four other Cabinet departments, as well as a half dozen or so independent agencies, administer grant programs to urban areas. As a result, separate federally assisted programs tackling different aspects of community development—physical, economic, and social—are often quite separate. In the area of assistance for local waste disposal facilities alone, four different Federal agencies handle similar grant or loan programs in dissimilar ways.

If barriers to effective administration seem nearly insurmountable in Washington, they grow even more so away from Washington. Between the Nation's Capital and the 90 percent of Federal employees who work in other parts of the country, among Federal field agencies, within State governments, within and between local jurisdictions, and among Federal, State, local, and private agencies working at similar purposes, a lack of cooperation and the absence of effective coordination threaten the very base of the President's programs.

ROOM AT THE TOP AND ELSEWHERE

There is often imperfect understanding between Federal field agencies and their headquarters in Washington. Federal regional and district offices representing scores of departments, agencies, and bureaus are sprawled haphazardly across the landscape. State and local officials find real difficulty in getting answers to their questions at local Federal offices. Problems must be referred upward through the hierarchy, laterally across agency jurisdictions, and screened at many stages along the way. The urgently needed decentralization of decisionmaking can be achieved only after a thorough reorganization of the Federal field structure.

But implementation of the President's program is equally dependent for its success upon State and local governments. Here too the hazards are severe: metropolitan areas, each composed of dozens and even hundreds of anarchic local government units that are largely unconcerned with the needs of the whole interdependent area; State legislatures whose malapportionment has made them unconcerned with the plight of their urban areas for generations; and State bureaucracies inadequately staffed to fulfill the needed functions of program coordination and information gathering for rational community and regional development.

Affecting all levels of Government from the operating level to high policymaking positions is the dire shortage of trained and talented people to plan and manage the thousands of projects and programs of the Great Society. I can perhaps best illustrate this dearth of manpower with an example from the field of education. The searching examination of our school system that was stimulated by the launching of the first Sputnik in 1957 revealed serious deficiencies in the training and competence of a dismaying proportion of our classroom teachers. And the problem reaches upward into the top levels of State educational systems. "Few States can command competent personnel," Roald Campbell, one of the most talented educational administrators, now dean of the graduate school of education at the University of Chicago, commented recently. "Possibly only the New York State department is prepared to be an equal partner with the U.S. Office of Education."

And what of the situation in the Office of Education itself? With an operating budget that has multiplied fourfold in the last 2 years, it is undergoing a determined effort to reorganize itself to meet its responsibilities. One step below its excellent chief administrators, in the crucial top 50 or so civil service posts, nearly 45 percent of the positions were "vacant" as of last summer. Many others are still filled by holdovers from the more relaxed atmosphere of the Office's years of fiscal and programmatic neglect.

Another characteristic of the Great Society programs is the degree to which they become of necessity involved in the competition and conflict of local political machines and social institutions across the country. The OEO, for example, has authorized a third of a billion dollars in Community Action grants, each of them based on projects designed by community leaders, local officials, and neighborhood councils in more than a thousand different localities. Thus, along with the benefits of broad citizen participation, these Great Society programs inherit the headaches of local political struggles.

A case in point is the battle joined by Mayor William F. Walsh in Syracuse, N.Y., and an independent Community Development Association. To the Republican mayor, this federally subsidized campaign to organize, as a part of its program, a "democratic" voter-registration drive in the city's poor wards looked suspiciously like an effort to build "Democratic" organizations. The conflict over the $425,000 program has been fought almost daily in the news media of Syracuse since last spring, and at various stages has taken either the mayor or program participants to Albany, Washington, and the LBJ Ranch. In a similar vein, the conference of mayors has complained that city-sponsored community action agencies are sometimes bypassed; and Governors have testified before congressional committees on the erosion of State sovereignty implicit in direct OEO links to local communities.

In many cities the poverty program has indeed brought about a revolutionary assault on the established social structure. The now famous requirement set forth in title II of the Economic Opportunity Act for "maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served" calls upon the administrator to bring into his organizing effort the very people he is trying to help, the traditionally alienated and effectively disfranchised. How widely the representatives of the poor will be effective partners in the design and implementation of the poverty program remains to be seen. In San Francisco a persistent and well-organized campaign brought them a series of victories that now leave them in numerical control of both the San Francisco Economic Opportunity Council and the council's executive board. More commonly, as in Syracuse, neighborhood representatives find themselves outnumbered and outmaneuvered. But expectations have been aroused and will doubtless continue to complicate administrative operations of the community action programs.

At the same time, the Great Society is increasingly dependent upon the cooperation and initiative of commerce and industry. Appalachia's $840 million in new roads will not rehabilitate the region unless new trucks are rolling on them. Regional development plans, no matter how well formulated, will not bring progress to other economically backward areas unless businesses and factories take imaginative advantage of the $3.25-billion Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Streams and rivers and air will not be effectively cleansed without the active cooperation of the managers of the private economy (or for that matter the public communities).

This kind of Federal partnership with private enterprise in achieving the Great Society is already at work in the Job Corps, where a number of contracts to run residential training centers have been let to corporations whose usual activities are far afield from education. While Shriver has praised the record of corporation-run camps for their efficiency and their job-oriented programs, a highly publicized report on one of them, Camp Kilmer, by a panel of Rutgers professors criticized the camp's authoritarian atmosphere and its administrators' lack of understanding of young people raised in poverty. Yet training centers run by educational or community organizations have had their problems, too—brawling, prostitution, marijuana, sloppy bookkeeping. As Job Corps Director Dr. Otis A. Singletary has pointed out, "We don't recruit angels into the Job Corps." A certain degree of mayhem is built in.

ASSIGNING THE CHALLENGE

It is easy—and politically popular—to overstate the administrative difficulties created by the Great Society programs. But administrative tidiness is not the be-all and end-all of Government, and competition is often as desirable among Government agencies as it is elsewhere. Nonetheless, the dangers are real and the need for new administrative machinery and methods correspondingly urgent. Federal programs must be more effectively related to each other and must complement State and local programs without the sacrifice of initiative, experimentation, and momentum.

What should the President's role be in such a broad and ambitious enterprise? Certainly not that of personally supervising the operation of the National Government, but rather of setting the necessary forces to work. For one thing, he can strengthen the capacity of his own Executive Office to recommend and enforce organizational change. In the west wing of the White House and in the office building across the driveway are the President's supporting staff—those most capable of breaking the inertia and self-interest that protect existing jurisdictional patterns in the Federal Establishment. The Bureau of the Budget, especially, needs additional staff to perform management surveys and to recommend administrative reforms. The entire field structure of the Federal Government, as I said earlier, requires drastic overhauling and a decentralization of decisionmaking. And with increasing authority assigned to Federal field offices, new interagency information sharing, planning, and program coordination must be made possible at the regional as well as at the Washington level. The President should also insist that "overhead" money be given to State and local governments to assist their administrators in setting to rights their present haphazard participation in the scores of Federal aid programs.

The President has already led the way by raising the standard for top Federal administrators. He must now set higher standards for recruitment at all levels. By establishing suitable incentives or sanctions he will also encourage greater effectiveness at the State and local levels.

Indeed, the President in his 1966 budget message and in subsequent special rural and urban development messages has already indicated his awareness of what is required. Ultimately, however, the real burden of administering the Great Society is not on the President. The Great Society should be seen rather as a Presidential challenge to the American people. Looked at in this way, it represents a return to local responsibility.

Its success depends not upon the administrative genius of the President but rather upon the cooperative energies of officials and citizens throughout the Nation.

Petition of the National Citizens Committee for the Shasta Daisy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received from Mrs. Esther Macdonald, in behalf of the National Citizens Committee for the Shasta Daisy for the National Flower, a petition and some very strong arguments in behalf of this lovely outstanding American flower.

Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include this impressive communication in the RECORD.

I was happy to note that reference was made to the great genius, Luther Burbank, born in Lancaster, Mass., who not only created the Shasta Daisy but whose genius brought many marvels and incredible horicultural creations greatly changing plant life and revolutionizing and improving many growing things and creating new varieties of plants, flowers, fruits, berries and other plants, trees, shrubs, and productive horticulture.

Mrs. Macdonald mentioned the enthusiastic efforts of the school children at Lancaster, who are so vigorously supporting the Shasta Daisy and the cooperation of adults, children, individuals, and groups on the west coast and other States, who have joined in pressing for the Shasta Daisy to be the national flower.

Mrs. Macdonald is a powerful leader in this cause, and I want to commend her and the group that she has enlisted in the Shasta campaign for their fine work.

The Shasta Daisy stands out in every respect as a thing of beauty, configuration, vigor, heartiness, and stability to be the national emblem. Instead of allowing a further delay, it would be well for the Congress to settle the matter now by selecting the Shasta Daisy.

This would please millions of school children and earnest, patriotic adults who have worked tirelessly for this flower.

Best of all, it would give this Nation a floral emblem that no other nation presently has and that would exhibit all the fine attributes the natural floral resources that this Nation possesses.

I hope that the beautiful Shasta Daisy may soon be selected as the national flower of the United States.

To the House of Representatives, Committee on Library and Memorials:

We the undersigned members of the Current Topics Club, Lancaster, Mass., hereby renew our petition to make the Shasta Daisy our National Flower. The idea to promote the Shasta Daisy was first conceived in the minds of schoolchildren in California where Luther Burbank, who created this lovely flower, lived and worked so many wonders with plants and fruits and flowers.

The schoolchildren in Lancaster, Mass., where Mr. Burbank was born, have lifted their voices in support of the Shasta Daisy. East and West have worked together to secure the support of the adults, individuals, and groups, people in all walks of life. You have received many communications and endorsements over the past 5 years.

It is our earnest hope that the decision will be made in this session of Congress and that your committee in its wisdom and fairness, unbiased by commercial or political considerations, will choose the flower which seems to express best the beauty and the distinction which symbolizes the spirit of our great Nation.

Vera E. Phillips, Ruth Williams, Ruth M. Merrill, Mrs. Homer F. Kirk, Evelyn H. Fentiman, May L. Smith, Jessica K. Imen, Mrs. Edward Stevenson, Obie Chiapetta, Mrs. Albert S. Bowman, Marjorie A. Powell, Mrs. Ralph C. Breed, Mabel R. Conklin.

Mrs. R. M. Sheperd, Blanche E. Willard, Marion L. Doty, Marion E. Fitts, Mrs. Arthur Longton, Agnes Richter, Mrs. John B. DiPietro, Estelle Briggs, Mrs. Paul Fannerty, Iva S. Furnival, Mrs. Alfred L. Perry, Jr., Letha B. Wendell, Mrs. Charles M. Mitchell.

Norma Senft, Mabel Safford, Sarah G. Harley, Mrs. H. L. Hayden, Cornelia C. Parker, Esther B. Macdonald, Mrs. Richard Schaumburg.

Elizabeth B. Scally, Irene Brady, Muriel A. McLaughlin, Jennie E. Newcomb, Marian Larson, Margaret F. Walsh, Doris Beckner, Dorothy S. Mudgett, Mrs. Matthew Gilmour, Mrs. Frank Heald, Mrs. Audrey S. Garber, Mrs. Zana Farnsworth, Ethel C. Bartol, Sarah T. Chickering, Bessie Farnsworth MacAskill.

Baseball at Bat in Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the prestigious Wall Street Journal yesterday carried on its editorial page an article which explains why and how Milwaukee and Wisconsin are fighting organized baseball in the courts.

Written by Steven M. Lovelady, the article, "Baseball at Bat," provides an excellent summary of the events of recent weeks as Milwaukee fights in the courts to keep a major league baseball team.

Of particular note is Mr. Lovelady's conclusions about what may happen if the Milwaukee judge orders the Braves to play the 1966 season in Milwaukee.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have addressed the House on this subject a number of times in the past. It is my belief that what our people in Milwaukee County and Wisconsin are doing goes beyond our local situation.

We are fighting to restore sanity and public responsibility to the national pastime. This is a cause in which all baseball enthusiasts can take an interest, no matter where they live.

The national interest in this question was reemphasized recently when the March issue of the American Legion magazine featured the question "Should Professional Baseball Be Put Under Antitrust Laws?" in its "Washington Pro and Con" feature.

It was my privilege to be on the affirmative side of that question. The negative was represented by an esteemed friend and colleague, the gentleman from Atlanta, Ga. [Mr. WELTNER]. In the thought that this debate would be of interest to our colleagues, I am also inserting it in the RECORD.

I might note that this article has brought dozens of letters to my office from all over the country, supporting my contention that baseball should be stripped of its antitrust exemption. Not one letter has been received opposing my position.

This indicates to me that the people of our Nation understand what we in Wisconsin are attempting to do, that they approve and support efforts to clean up professional baseball.

The items follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 22, 1966]

BASEBALL AT BAT: MILWAUKEE ANTITRUST SUITS MAY PROFOUNDLY CHANGE THE GAME

(By Steven M. Lovelady)

MILWAUKEE.—Professional baseball has finally been forced to come to bat for itself, and against the pitcher it's tried mightily to avoid for 44 years—the law.

Feelings in the critical series run so high there's even a rhubarb among the umpires, and a playoff seems certain. But at the moment, with Judge Elmer W. Roller calling them in Wisconsin Circuit Court here, baseball is behind in the count, about two strikes and no balls.

Judge Roller presides over the antitrust suit by the State of Wisconsin and Milwaukee County to ban the National League's Braves from moving to Atlanta, or anywhere else, unless they provide a substitute major league franchise for Milwaukee. The judge has already ordered the league to "be prepared" for an order to play in Milwaukee, but a Georgia court has ordered the Braves to play in Atlanta.

At least two National League club managements regard it entirely possible, if not in fact likely, that conflicting orders will prevent the Braves from playing at all this season anywhere, incredible as that may seem. Financially and otherwise, this would be a disaster for the league and a catastrophe for the Braves. An order to play in Milwaukee this year could, National League Attorney Bowie K. Kuhn affirms, "lead to the utter destruction and ruination of baseball."

The weighty immediate prospects, moreover, pale by comparison with the possibility lurking in the wings: An all-out attack on the monopolistic position baseball was given or has assumed under a 1922 Supreme Court decision, that it is not interstate commerce. Such an attack might not stop merely at curbing major league wanderlust. It could upset some of organized baseball's most cherished foundations, notably the reserve clause indenturing players to one team and the exclusive territorial rights the leagues give their teams.

So far, however, Milwaukee has only perfunctorily attacked baseball's monopoly as illegal. True, it has contended for the record that league decisions and limits on franchise locations are a conspiracy in restraint of trade. And since the suit is under Wisconsin State antitrust law, the 1922 decision about interstate commerce has scant effect. But the State has not stressed these points, possibly because to do so would put it in the awkward position of telling a judge, in effect, "Baseball is an invidious monopoly, and we are suing to make sure we keep a piece of the action."

THE PLAINTIFF'S STRATEGY

Rather, the plaintiffs' strategy so far has been to agree, even to plead, that baseball is a legal monopoly because it is generally recognized as such. With this understood, they are trying to hoist baseball with its own petard. For the law holds that to retain any sanction, a monopoly must behave reasonably, not capriciously.

Specifically, one interested lawyer explains, precedents indicate that "when a legal monopoly is supplying a market that is economically productive, it can't remove itself from the market without providing another supplier." It is illegal for the Braves to pull out of Milwaukee, County Corporation Counsel Robert P. Russell contends, in the same way it would be illegal for the manufacturer of a patented product to withdraw a local franchise and then enter agreements with other patent licensees to prevent the distributor from getting a franchise from anyone else.

Thus, county lawyers demand, allow baseball to keep its monopoly powers, but order it, as a recognized monopoly, to refrain from abandoning an economically productive area without producing an alternative supplier—namely, a replacement major league franchise.

So far, the main battleground has been the phrase "that is economically productive." The Braves management testifies that it lost $3.5 million in the last 3 years in Milwaukee, a circumstance which would justify its withdrawal even as a monopoly. The State and county contend this is merely a paper loss, and that under more "accepted" methods of accounting, the Braves have about broken even or turned a slight profit.

State witnesses, including some businessmen willing to undertake a new Milwaukee franchise, have offered detailed and generally convincing testimony that baseball can be profitable here. They contend a team can earn money on attendance of 800,000 a year, though the Braves say 1,400,000 is necessary. The Braves attendance peak here was 2,050,000 in 1956, but it slumped to 555,584 last year, when fans boycotted the team because of its announced intention to move.

Another important issue is what impact the move would have on the Milwaukee economy. The Braves are offering witnesses contending it would do no significant damage. The State put Washington Economist Robert R. Nathan on the stand to testify that his consulting firm found the move would cost the city $18 million in income, 2,600 jobs, and more than $600,000 in tax revenue. Judge Roller has struck down other Brave contentions, such as the one that his State court has no jurisdiction over baseball because it is a "national sport."

Meanwhile, Atlanta Judge Sam McKenzie has ordered the Braves to honor their contract with the Fulton County Stadium Authority, which calls for the Braves to play there 25 years starting this season. Both Judge Roller and Judge McKenzie were elected by constituencies apparently anxious to have major league baseball in their cities, a fact which may or may not have bearing on their decisions.

In Houston, a Federal judge, James Noel, granted the Fulton County Stadium Authority's request for a temporary injunction enforcing the Atlanta contract. He said Milwaukee's antitrust accusations were inconsistent with the purpose of keeping the Braves there. Judge Roller observes, however, that the Federal court decision does not answer the question of whether the move violates Wisconsin law.

EXPOSURE TO PENALTIES

Thus, if Judge Roller issues a permanent injunction calling for the Braves to play in Milwaukee, an attempt to play in Atlanta would open the team to the massive financial penalties of the Wisconsin law. Milwaukee's lawyers, moreover, could ask enforcement of the injunction by courts in each of the seven other States that have National League teams. Conflicting rulings from two such courts could make the league schedule impossibly complicated.

An Ohio court, for example, might order the Cincinnati Reds to play the Braves' home games in Milwaukee. At the same time, a court in Illinois could favor the Georgia ruling to order the Chicago Cubs to play the Braves in Atlanta. In the words of one club owner, the schedule would be "wrecked beyond repair." Such a conflict could eventually be worked out in a Federal court, but that would be time consuming, and the baseball season's opening day is April 12.

Even if the Braves simply did not play, the other teams would face large expenses in revamping their travel arrangements. Some observers conceive of a compromise, with the league offering Milwaukee a team later, say in 1967, in return for letting the Braves go now. So far, however, the owners have adamantly refused this idea.

To make the situation even more threatening for baseball, Milwaukee has also filed a Federal antitrust suit, which is dormant pending the end of the State trial. Milwaukee could change tactics in this suit to press the contention that the league is guilty of illegal restraint of trade, and demand that baseball be stripped of its monopolistic privileges. Then, presumably, the Braves would be free to move and the Milwaukee businessmen—or anyone else—would be free to form their own franchise and bid for established players on the open market.

Baseball has long feared the 1922 precedent would no longer protect it from such a challenge. Since then, the U.S. Supreme Court has obviously evolved a far broader definition of interstate commerce, and with the advent of television, baseball has in fact become more involved in interstate operations. In recent years, the Supreme Court has ruled that professional football and boxing are indeed interstate commerce. In 1963, however, it refused to reconsider the 1922 baseball decision, suggesting the matter would be appropriate for legislation. So far, Congress has not taken the hint.

If antitrust laws were applied strictly to baseball, the leagues could no longer limit the number and location of franchises. Nor could they maintain their reserve clause. Traditionally, this clause has meant that once a player signs a contract with one team, he cannot offer his services to any other. Last year, moreover, baseball started a "free agent" draft which all but eliminates even the chance for a player to bargain one team against another before signing his first contract.

SETTLEMENT OUT OF COURT

In a 1949 test of the reserve clause, a State court ruled that baseball was interstate commerce, the 1922 decision notwithstanding. To avoid a Supreme Court test, baseball paid $60,000 in an out-of-court settlement with Danny Gardella, who had been barred from U.S. baseball for 5 years after jumping his contract to play in Mexico. Team owners maintain the clause is needed to prevent a few wealthy teams from buying up all the best players. Critics reply that no serious imbalance of wealth would occur were it not for another league rule distributing TV and radio income among teams on the basis of won-lost records.

Some critics question the owners' assertion that loss of current antitrust protection would hamper the game seriously. Professional football has not, to say the least, suffered discernibly since being ruled interstate commerce. In that case, the court allowed some exemption from antitrust enforcement because of the unusual nature of the enterprise; football even operates a player draft, but with reserve clauses much less greedy than baseball's.

Ralph L. Andreano, a University of Wisconsin economist, studied the effect of entirely removing baseball's antitrust exemption in "No Joy in Mudville," published before the Braves' hassle arose. He concluded, "Major league baseball would not materially differ in its structure or performance in the long run if the courts were to strike at the institutional heart of its monopoly position."

Whatever its ultimate legal and economic effects, the Milwaukee episode is doing baseball no good on most of the nation's sports pages. Hearst columnist Jimmy Cannon proclaims that what the Braves have done to Milwuakee "would make a man with a zinc-lined stomach vomit." Dick Young of the New York Daily News agrees; baseball, he says, "moved in like a gay young blade, ravished the land, and is about to move on to other parts where money is fresher and the suckers riper."

At least in a publicity sense, baseball is unlikely to forget anytime soon its time at bat in Judge Roller's courtroom. And when the legal skeins are finally untangled, who knows what the result may be? Contemplating the day-to-day complications of the case, one Chicago lawyer sighs, "The national pastime ain't what it used to be." If the good burghers of Milwaukee have anything like their way, it certainly never will be again.

[From the American Legion magazine, March 1966]

SHOULD PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL BE PUT UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS?

YES

(By Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, Fourth District)

Of all professional team sports, organized baseball alone is exempt from the restrictions of the Nation's antitrust laws. This highly privileged position results from a 1922 U.S. Supreme Court decision that professional baseball was a "personal effort," a sport rather than a commercial venture. Although baseball and the times have changed drastically, the decision has remained, mainly because it has never been seriously challenged either in the courts or by Congress.

Baseball was principally a sport in 1922; today it is first and foremost a big business. Major league franchises cost millions of dollars and generally are owned by syndicates of wealthy businessmen. These businessmen tend to view their teams as they would any other investment, in terms of the profits to be made. Baseball, indeed, has become very profitable, particularly because of lucrative, television and radio contracts.

In 1965, for example, organized professional baseball reaped a total of $25,310,000 from the sale of game broadcasting rights. Broadcasters, in turn, charged sponsors $85 million for advertising rights. The result has been that team owners are more concerned about the fan in the armchair at home than the fan in the stands. Baseball today is being operated not so much to quicken the clicks of the turnstiles at the ball park as to affect the click of TV channel selectors.

Further evidence of the ties between baseball and broadcasting are the many persons with extensive holdings in radio and television stations and networks who are officials and major stockholders of American and National League teams. In 1964, for example, the Columbia Broadcasting System bought the New York Yankees, marking the first time a network had gained actual control of a baseball team.

The power of TV over baseball also is apparent in the decision to move the Milwaukee Braves to Atlanta, Ga. Milwaukee, which once set the National League attendance record, is recognized as a good baseball town, but it has a limited TV market because of geographical location. Atlanta, on the other hand, is the focal point of a large area of the South and rich with potential broadcasting money. That apparently is the reason the Braves' owners want to move there. They are shamefully disregarding the hundreds of thousands of Braves' fans in Wisconsin who loyally have supported the team for years.

There is, of course, nothing wrong in televising games or making a profit. But something is wrong with claiming an exemption from antitrust laws as a sport and then using that privilege for strictly business purposes which flaunt the public interest. That is the reason I have introduced a bill into Congress which would strip the baseball industry of its antitrust exemption.

Stringent measures are necessary in order to restore public confidence to what once was our national pastime. Congress cannot do more damage to the sport than its owners have done already.

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI.

NO

(By Representative CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia, Fifth District)

On January 4, 1965, a bill, H.R. 6, was introduced in Congress which would place professional baseball under the complete jurisdiction of Federal antitrust laws. In my opinion such legislation, if enacted into law, would prove detrimental to the future of professional baseball. In the first place, it would place such important business practices as player drafts, reserve clauses, and territorial franchises under the cloak of legal uncertainty. Also, such legislation would negate two Supreme Court decisions of 1922 and 1953 which held that professional baseball was "not a subject of commerce," and thus was not subject to the antitrust laws.

Professional baseball today is a highly competitive enterprise, both on and off the field. Competition, not monopoly, is the best assurance of success to baseball owners and players alike.

In order to maintain equalization of competitive strength between teams, it is necessary for clubs to engage in substantial cooperation—for example, in the distribution of player talent and in the granting of territorial rights to team franchises. Under the Commissioner of Baseball, baseball has managed its own house, and done so quite well.

In opposing H.R. 6, I realize that during the 1950's the U.S. Supreme Court rendered two important opinions which place professional basketball, football, and ice hockey squarely under the jurisdiction of the Federal antitrust laws. Aware that these opinions collided with those on professional baseball, the Court stated, "the orderly way to eliminate error or discrimination, if any there be, is by legislation, and not by court decision."

During the current session of Congress, bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate which, with certain important exceptions, would place all professional team sports under the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws. Antitrust laws will not apply to agreements and rules pertaining to:

Equalization of competitive player strengths;

Employment, selection or eligibility of players, or the reservation, selection or assignment of player contracts;

The right to operate within specific geographic areas.

This proposal, strongly supported by ex-Commissioner Ford Frick and the Senate Judiciary Committee, would clear up uncertainty pertaining to business practices outlined above, would prohibit improper restraint and would allow all professional team sports to continue to operate effectively by self-regulation.

H.R. 6, however, poses a serious threat to self-regulation because all business practices of professional baseball would be subject to antitrust laws.

Professional baseball has benefited immensely from self-regulation. If professional baseball is to continue to serve the national interest, we must assure the continuance of those natural, competitive instincts which have made it the national sport.

CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER.

Successful Dairy Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is from the March 10 issue of Hoard's Dairyman, a leading dairy publication. I feel that the tone of the article is rightfully enthusiastic about the overwhelming acceptance of the class I plan which was included in last summer's Food and Agriculture Act. The painstaking care with which the Puget Sound dairy farmers worked out their own plan is a good example of the use of local initiative to carry out a Federal program.

If all Federal programs could be implemented with the same degree of local participation, we would have many fewer problems in obtaining local cooperation. I hope that the wagers of the present war on poverty will take note of the success that occurred in this case when the people involved work out their own program as it is needed in their own community. This is the key to Federal-local success.

NINETY-ONE PERCENT OF DAIRYMEN VOTE FOR CLASS I IN SEATTLE

If anyone ever doubted what dairy farmers think about using class I bases in Federal milk order areas, farmers in the Seattle (Puget Sound) milkshed have provided a resounding answer. By a 91-percent majority, they have indicated they want to move ahead with a base plan that has been developed by a committee of dairymen.

As reported in our article appearing on page 269 of this issue, there were 18 country meetings held after the plan was put together. Of the 986 dairymen who cast secret ballots, 845 voted yes, 85 voted no, and 56 were undecided. Of those who had an opinion, therefore, 91 percent voted in favor.

Naturally, this first major test of the popularity of class I bases is gratifying to us at Hoard's Dairyman because we have fought so long and hard to get Congress to give dairymen the right to use such bases if they want to use them.

All during this struggle, opponents have poor-mouthed class I bases, saying dairy farmers really aren't interested in them. As recent as last December, an agricultural economist at the University of Illinois wrote that dairymen would not vote for class I bases and he used a hypothetical Seattle market situation to illustrate why dairymen would vote them down. How wrong he was.

After the verbal and written beating we have taken from class I base opponents over the past few years, it is a temptation to report each erroneous criticism and fallacious projection. But little good is served by such rehashing of past mistakes. We're more interested in building a better future for dairy farmers than looking back on past history.

Let's see what we can learn from the pioneering effort in Seattle. We believe there are some lessons which can be of great value to other markets.

First, Seattle area milk producers decided very early that no one organization was going to go it alone in developing a plan. A committee from the entire milkshed worked it out. On the drafting committee were members of the predominant cooperative in the area, independent producers, and members of general farm organizations. But they spoke as individuals, not for their groups. Thus, the plan that was drafted was the result of their combined applied intelligence.

Consider the consequences of this first principle. Dairymen wisely decided they would slam the door on any possible bickering among organizations. Politics were out. Problems which develop from pride of sponsorship were avoided. And we think this independence of the drafting committee had a lot to do with the overwhelmingly favorable response which has been gained thus far.

Second, we would emphasize that this is a farmer plan. Though the committee drew on the talents of professional and technical dairy marketing specialists for information and counsel, the final decisions were those of dairy farmers only. They and they alone drafted the plan and only farmers were permitted to vote in the country meeting after hours were spent at each session exploring every point in the plan.

There was another factor which contributed a great deal to the acceptance of the Seattle class I base proposal. Dairymen in Northwest Washington have as their neighbors the dairymen of British Columbia and Oregon. Both markets use class I bases. Thus, Washington dairymen are familiar with how they work. There is no fear of the so-called unknown, such as seems to prevail in other areas.

In our judgment, Seattle area dairymen have provided a great service to dairy farmers throughout the country. Their pioneering work is available as timesaver to other markets. No one base plan will probably suit any two markets but the spadework should be helpful.

U.S. Merchant Marine Is Sick, and Getting Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the continuing crisis in our merchant marine fleet is worsening each day. The stress created by the pressures of shipping supplies to Vietnam dramatically points out that a vital part of this Nation's economy, the merchant marine, so necessary to international trade, is being neglected. The failure of this administration to announce a clear-cut policy and course of action, at this time of crisis, is difficult to understand.

Concern for this problem is growing across the land. Los Angeles Times Staff Writer Thomas J. Foley, in the March 20, 1966, issue reports on the merchant marine situation. I insert his article at this point in the RECORD for wider dissemination of this information to Members of the House:

U.S. MERCHANT MARINE IS SICK, GETTING WORSE—AGING FLEET IS PLAGUED BY HIGH WAGES, OBSOLETE EQUIPMENT, OUT-OF-DATE LAWS

(By Thomas J. Foley)

WASHINGTON.—A war on the other side of the globe and rapidly increasing world trade show the U.S. merchant marine today to be a sick industry, and growing sicker as other industries grow stronger.

Unable to compete on equal terms with its ever-growing foreign rivals, the maritime industry has been kept alive only by huge doses of Federal dollars—nearly $400 million a year.

But supplying the needs of nearly a quarter of a million soldiers in Vietnam has brought the illness near a crisis.

There has been no lack of diagnoses. The industry has been almost studied to death. Indeed, one of its main troubles is that its condition grows steadily worse while a dispute rages over two proposed cures.

PLAN FAVORED

One, favored by most in the administration, requires an operation that the patient and its powerful friends in Congress won't agree to. The operation involves cutting some of the industry's subsidies.

The other proposed cure calls for continued and greater doses of Federal funds—more of the same expensive medicine.

As with so many other crises, the key to the solution rests in the hands of President Johnson. And he is unwilling now to get deeply involved in this most complicated and bitter area while he is so heavily engaged in Vietnam.

The picture is not all black. Nuclear propulsion, automated cargo handling, and use of giant, easily removed containers are near at hand and offer hope for getting rid of some of the causes of the gap between U.S.- and foreign-flag operating costs.

But until the shipping companies, the unions, the shipbuilding firms and the Government can agree on a long-range policy for correcting the industry's ills, these opportunities will remain beyond its grasp.

The industry now operates under the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, passage of which followed more than two decades of policymaking stumbling and fumbling that had put the fleet in even worse straits than it is today.

The 1936 act declared that the Government should promote the fleet, and it established the subsidy system for both building and operating the ships. A 1954 act broadened the subsidies by requiring the Government to ship at least half of its cargoes on U.S.-owned ships.

The construction subsidies cost the Government $100 million a year, and the operating aid $200 million. The cargo preference costs another $80 million or more each year.

Here are some of the reasons for and anomalies of the situation:

1. It costs 220 percent more to build a ship in the United States than it does abroad.

WAGE COST HIGH

2. The annual wage cost of a 45-man U.S. tanker is $612,000. For an Italian-manned crew, the cost is $236,000.

3. For every passenger enjoying a leisurely trip to Europe on the liner *United States*, American taxptyers are spending the equivalent of $250.

4. It costs $30 a ton to carry U.S. wheat to India from a gulf port on an antiquated American ship and less than half of that amount on a modern foreign carrier.

5. Union rules require 45 men on a U.S. tanker. A similar foreign ship can be operated with as few as 16 men.

6. Every dollar of wage increase won by the maritime unions is paid out of the U.S. Treasury. The subsidy cost per merchant seaman is $8,000 a year.

FLEET AGING

There are now more than 300 U.S. ships, including 13 aging passenger liners, built and operating with subsidies along designated and regularly scheduled trade routes. The passenger liners use $50 million of the $200 mililon operating subsidies.

Other U.S. ships, called tramp steamers, go wherever they can get business and do not operate under schedule.

The tramps receive no formal operating subsidy but benefit from the cargo preference laws. Almost all are aging, inefficient, and slow.

To find enough ships to supply U.S. forces in Vietnam, the Government has had to reactivate more than 100 of the World War II Liberty ships from the mothball fleet.

Another 175 are available for reconditioning, and the official line from Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara is that there is "adequate" shipping.

NAVY UNHAPPY

The Navy, privately, is much less satisfied and believes that a larger buildup in Vietnam will leave shipping woefully inadequate.

U.S.-flag ships must be built in U.S. shipyards. Not only are American labor costs higher than such costs abroad, but the shipyards themselves are older and more inefficient.

More and more American shipowners are buying foreign-made vessels and chartering them in other countries under what are called flags of convenience. This permits the owners to use foreign crews at a saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Another problem is that life at sea is not easy, and U.S.-flag shipowners are finding it more and more difficult to find Americans willing to man their ships, particularly in this period of growing labor shortages.

What should be done?

There have been dozens of proposals over the years, but the one that shook the maritime world to the bottom of its keel came last October from the President's interagency maritime task force, headed by Under Secretary of Commerce Alan Boyd.

AMONG OTHER THINGS

This all-Government body urged, among other things, ending passenger service by not building any more liners (none has been built since 1958), abandoning the cargo preference laws, permitting subsidized lines to buy and repair ships in foreign shipyards, reducing crew sizes, and authorizing operating subsidies for dry-bulk carriers for the first time.

Except for the last, each of these proposals rocked one section of the maritime industry or another.

Within 6 weeks, the President's Maritime Advisory Commission—made up of shipping, union, public, and Government representatives—came up with its own proposals. The effect of these would be to build up the existing subsidy programs until they cost possibly as much as $1 billion a year.

More important, it was made clear that the industry would fight the task force proposals if the President chose to recommend them to Congress. The proposals would have to go through the House Merchant Marine Committee which is firmly in the hands of Congressmen interested in the existing way of doing things.

The result of this conflict is a stalemate, with the fleet suffering as a result. The Persident will not propose the task force recommendations until he can win industry agreement to them.

In fact, the President is putting indirect pressure on the industry to come around by proposing a sharp reduction in the new ship construction subsidy program for the coming fiscal year.

But he is not going to announce a Government policy now, and no one expects him to do so this year.

One break may come with the establishment of the proposed Department of Transportation, which will include the Maritime Administration.

With considerable resistance already existing in Congress to a new department, every possible controversy was left out of the proposal.

But once it is law, officials have indicated, the administration will be more willing to come out with its merchant marine policy.

Meanwhile, there is the possibility Congress itself may try to break the stalemate. The House Merchant Marine Committee has been holding hearings on the merchant marine status, particularly its adequacy to supply troops in Vietnam. These could conceivably develop into legislation, if not this year, then next.

Boyd, who is expected to head the new transportation department when it is formed, is pessimistic about the merchant marine's future unless his task force recommendations are followed.

In a recent address to a maritime union convention, he said: "The alternative, as I see it, is a slow voyage to the scrap heap. Maybe that is too strong. But it does seem to me that it takes a pretty strong pair of rose colored glasses to see any great future in the existing situation."

Why Guam Should Have an Elected Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as I can testify from personal experience, there are no more patriotic Americans than those who live on Guam. Many of them gave their lives for their country in both World Wars and many are now serving in our Armed Forces in Vietnam and elsewhere.

Guam has an elected legislature and many other aspects of self-government, but the people of Guam, although American citizens, are still not authorized to elect their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor. To my mind the time is long overdue when they should be given that right. Both political parties on Guam and all members of the legislature favor this step.

For an eloquent statement of the case, I include herewith an editorial from the Guam Times Weekly of March 5, 1966:

WHY GUAM SHOULD HAVE AN ELECTED GOVERNOR

We believe Guam ought to have an elected Governor. The sooner the better.

The reason, of course, is obvious.

Guam is an American territory. Americans have their own local governments, chosen by the people of the area they serve.

That's what it says in the history books, anyway. It says the same thing in the civics books. And in all the thousands of other publications which tell of the American way of doing things.

Americans choose their own leaders through free elections, it says. Everyone has the right to cast his own vote—express his own opinion in his own way.

That's what it says in the books, and that's what American children believe.

Except for the American children on Guam, that is. They know better.

They know that some Americans don't have the political rights that the books talk about.

They know that some Americans don't have the rights that the Constitution of United States indicates.

They know that some Americans don't have the rights that more than 200 years of American usage and custom have guaranteed to all Americans.

All but the Americans on Guam, that is.

For Americans on Guam don't have the traditional rights. Oh, they get to pick their own legislature, and that's quite a bit.

But they don't get to choose the head of their local government. They don't get to vote for their own President. They don't get to vote for their representatives in Congress.

They aren't really Americans in the political sense. They don't have the same rights other Americans do.

The reasons cited for the failure of full citizenship to reach the shores of Guam are many and unconvincing.

Guamanians were at first not sufficiently politically mature, it was said. They had not had much experience in governing themselves.

Which was true in a sense. They never got the chance.

But it's not so fashionable to say that any more. After all, Guam has been under American rule for over 65 years, and it might be a bit embarrassing to say that Guamanians don't yet know how to govern themselves.

Besides, talking about Guamanians not knowing this and that in these days has an unpleasant flavor of discrimination about it.

And everybody knows that one of the things that America stands for is the right of everyone to be what he wants to be, regardless of race, creed or religion. It says so in the books.

What's more, it's a little hard to tell just who Guamanians are nowadays. If Guamanians are only those people who are descended from the original inhabitants of Guam, what is to be done with all those other Americans who live on Guam?

So political maturity is no longer the measure of why the people of Guam can't vote for their own government officials.

In this latter day it's because Guam is such a key defense bastion. The great and good Federal Government couldn't be expected to take a chance on all the money it has invested in Guam, could it?

We don't see why not.

The Federal Government takes a chance on the huge military establishment it has in Pearl Harbor. Also in San Diego, Annapolis, Memphis, and all the other cities where major military bases are located.

The Federal Government takes a chance on most of the States of the Union. There are important bulwarks of national defense located in them.

Apparently the Americans who live in those places are trustworthy enough to have their own elected officials despite the presence of Federal investment.

So why is it that the Federal investment in Guam is suddenly going to be endangered by an elective Governor?

The obvious conclusion would have to be that the Americans who live on Guam are somewhat less trustworthy than the Americans who live in other parts of the American domain.

Which, of course, is absurd. We can prove it.

Just consider how trustworthy the Americans who live on Guam are when someone questions the use of Guam as a major military base. Americans through and through, aren't they?

And consider how completely American the Americans on Guam are when someone suggests that Guam is a colonial possession of the United States.

Why, you never saw a better American than those who live on Guam when something like that happens.

The truth of the matter is that the only time the Americans who live on Guam are less American than other Americans is when the Americans on Guam start trying to have some political rights and privileges of being American.

Such as electing their own Governor.

It is not too soon for Guam to have its own Governor. There is not a problem of political maturity. There is no danger of the Federal investment here.

There are simply 50,000 Americans here who would like to choose the man who governs them, rather than having him chosen by the President.

That's the way Americans are supposed to feel, according to the school books.—BYRON W. BAKER.

Crisis in Cattle Hides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the completely arbitrary action of the Department of Commerce in placing export controls on cattle hides and skins, was the subject of a hearing by the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture this week. It was a good hearing, and established without a doubt that the Department's sudden action was ill-considered.

The Wall Street Journal of today, Mr. Speaker, contains a particularly knowledgable description of what this is all about, and for the benefit of any who may doubt the seriousness of the Commerce Department move, I place the article at this point in the RECORD:

CRISIS IN CATTLE HIDES

Though a spokesman for the Nation's shoe manufacturers says the current furor over cattle hides "just astonishes us," the uproar should have been fairly predictable. The whole affair could in fact be an unhappy portent of what's in store for the economy generally.

The crisis in cattle hides began building up a few weeks ago when shoe manufacturers blamed rising hide costs for shoe price increases. Since the administration is opposed to rising prices—that appears to be the only official definition of inflation—Federal officials decided that something had to be done.

It seems not to have occurred to anyone, however, that the hide and shoe price increases were two more arguments for curbing the Government's easy-money, high-spending expansion that is now pressing upward on prices almost everywhere. Instead, the administration reasoned that rising hide exports were reducing the supply in the United States and helping push up domestic prices; the obvious remedy, in Washington's view, was to restrict exports.

As too often happens when the Government moves to manipulate the economy, the restrictions were imposed with a minimum of dexterity. First the Commerce Department announced that hide exports would require Federal licenses. Then, less than a week later and before the industry or anyone else had a chance to see how limited controls would work, the Government clamped tight export quotas on top of the licensing system.

In the economic controllers' eagerness to go to work, they found it easy to ignore a few old policies and principles, such as America's alleged devotion to free world trade and the Government's longstanding effort to lift exports and hus aid the Nation's ailing balance of payments.

Nor are Washington officials apparently much disturbed by the confusion they have created in the industry,. Licenses won't be issued under the quota setup until mid-April, nearly a month away. While the Government says some emergency licenses will be issued in the meantime, no one is too sure of how to go about getting them, and hide dealers contend they are virtually under an embargo.

As usual, too, controls are raising sharp questions of equity.

At the moment, for instance, the export curbs are bringing domestic hide prices down. "Now with lower hide prices," says President John K. Minnoch of the National Hide Association, "Why shouldn't shoe prices be reduced?" Whether they should be or not, it's understandable that hide merchants are piqued enough to contend the shoemakers may be "profiteering."

The long-range results of the hide hassle could go well beyond the current acrimony among businessmen and the destruction of some export markets. Controls also can cause disorders in the domestic economy.

The shoe industry, for its part, is a relatively smaller user of cattle hides than it was a few years ago. In this situation the export curb and artificially low domestic prices may lead eventually to a reduction in domestic supplies instead of a rise, as packers slow the rate of cattle slaughter. The upshot might be not only higher prices for hides but higher prices for meat as well.

Such self-defeating interventions would be discouraging enough if they were limited to a single segment of the economy; actually, they're growing progressively more pervasive. That's true even though it should be evident that the wage and price guideposts and all the other gimmicks aren't producing the economic stability the administration so earnestly professes to seek.

What they are producing, and will continue to produce as long as the Government shuns sensible restraints on its own monetary and fiscal policies, are unhealthy distortions in the economy. It's the administration's inability or unwillingness to see those results, rather than the cattle-hide contretemps, that's really astonishing.

Government-Business Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. J. PICKLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, relations between business and Government are more important than ever before and will become even more important with the rapid growth of our Nation. Frank N. Ikard, member of the board of regents of the University of Texas and president of the American Petroleum Institute, recognizing this fact, has stressed in a recent forthright speech that businessmen and Government officials need to discard some of their outmoded attitudes toward each other in order to solve the complex problems facing this Nation. He further pointed out the roles that business and Government are playing in the revolution in knowledge and learning. This speech was delivered on March 16, 1966, during "Infocade 1966," a 3-day series of informational conferences sponsored by the West Texas Chamber of Commerce.

Frank Ikard is exceptionally well qualified to speak on this subject. He has had a distinguished career in Government, business, and education, having been a former Member of this House and now one of the outstanding spokesmen in the Nation for business and a member of the governing board of one of the largest State university systems in the United States.

I believe that his message will be extremely interesting to my colleagues, and I therefore offer it for inclusion in the Record:

Business-Government Relations

It is a particular privilege to be here this morning. The subject of business-government relations touches just about everyone—even those who may think they have little to do with either business or government. The nature of those relations—how well they are established, maintained, and kept in the right balance—is a matter that affects us all.

A hundred years ago the question of business-government relations wouldn't have been raised. Fifty years ago, it might have been worth talking about, but relatively few people would have been interested.

A few facts will suggest why the subject is more important than ever. Government at all levels—State, local, and Federal—now collects in taxes and other charges about one-third the entire gross national product. That includes about one-half of all corporate profits. Government—again at all levels—will spend over $135 billion this year on goods and services. Today, government and government enterprises produce about one-seventh of the total national income, mainly in the form of services of military and civilian personnel. Local, State, and Federal governments will spend over $25 billion this year on education—and so will influence the quality of the labor force. Annual investment in research and development is now at the level of $17 billion, of which about two-thirds is financed by government. And the four major industries subject to the most government control—agriculture, finance, transportation, and communications, and public utilities—account for about a fifth of all our privately produced national income.

This may strike you as a lot of money and a lot of government. But many businessmen agreed with the late Charles Kettering when he observed that we're lucky we don't get as much government as we pay for.

Whether we have too much or too little, relations between government and industry today have a decided bearing on the outcome of almost every human activity. When these relationships are in a state of severe tension, or when they fall out of balance, activities on every level reverberate and undergo some change.

The major loss is usually one of efficiency. It takes many forms. It ranges from setting prices that are lower than a free market might dictate, or starting a project that will benefit a few at the expense of many.

It has been my good fortune to serve and to observe both sides of this relationship for some 20 years. During most of this period, relations between business and government have been generally harmonious. In those rare spells when the relationship has been strained, it has been due mainly to a breakdown in understanding. Some strain also results from a tendency of both to misread the others' intentions. Businessmen are properly alarmed when they see signs of unnecessary government intrusion, but their anxiety sometimes leads a few of them to overreact. The overreaction occasionally takes the form of foolish statements which reflect no credit on the business community at all. On the other side, some government people frequently underestimate the capacity of the free market system to meet the needs of people. Their overreaction sometimes takes the form of excessive regulation, a glorification of paperwork, and foolish statements about business in general.

According to an old saying, facts have a way of outrunning thoughts. That is happening today. The old attitudes of many businessmen toward government, and the old attitudes of many government people toward business, are no longer relevant. They are badly out of date because they are based on yesterday's facts.

Vast changes are taking place in our Nation. The changes—amounting even to a revolution of sorts—are shaking the foundations of nearly every aspect of American life: Our politics, our economy, our society, our culture. The revolution has been going on for some time. But only now are we beginning to see some of its implications for both business and government.

A part of the revolution consists in sheer numbers of people. We are gaining in population at the rate of more than 3 million each year. It seems only yesterday that we were accustomed to thinking of ourselves as a nation of around 160 million. But now we are close to 200 million. In less than 35 years we will number 310 million. That's the equivalent of moving the entire present populations of Britain and West Germany into this country in one generation.

More important than the total number of people is the growth of metropolitan areas. Urbanization is accelerating so rapidly, that 35 years from now four out of five Americans will be living in a relatively few large metropolitan areas.

We're just beginning to realize what urbanization means. For cities themselves it has already meant skyrocketing taxes, spreading slums, high crime rates, and transportation facilities strained to the breaking point. And remember, our metropolitan areas will double in population in just a few decades.

What happens in the large cities already reaches out to affect every corner of the Nation. During the recent subway strike in New York City, for example, about three-fourths of the city's garment workers couldn't get to their jobs. As a result, department stores and dress shops all over the Nation were caught short and lost business. As another result of the strike, banks and brokerage firms across the Nation ran into serious delays in completing financial transactions. The Federal Reserve System reported that checks in process of collection fell off by $347 million on an average day during the strike.

As a still further result, public service workers and their unions in other cities were following the results—and so were other city governments. Voices were raised in Congress on the passage of new legislation to curb labor's powers. And so a strike by a handful of workers in a single city became an issue of national importance.

The political implications of urbanization are enormous. Centers of power will swing sharply to the great metropolitan areas—and are already doing so. Recognizing this, a number of promising political figures have already decided to build their careers in the cities, rather than in Congress.

Urbanization may also bring about a remarkable revival of local government, with greater dependency on private enterprise to carry out tasks of public interest. This will occur because the problems generated by urbanization may finally become too large and too burdensome for even the Federal Government to handle. The role of private enterprise will increase because it will have much of the available managerial talent. Steps in this direction right at hand are the Job Corps centers managed by corporations.

Good managers will be in short supply because of the population mix. Even as few as 15 years from now, 9 percent of those who are heads of households will be under 25 years old—almost double the number in that category today. In the meantime, the number of people between the ages of 35 and 55—the age group which generally provides managers—will actually drop. There will, in fact, be 1 million fewer people in this so-called managerial age group in 1975 than there are today. With this severe shortage of people to make decisions, business managers and their companies will have to take a leading part in public matters.

Advancing technology is another face of the revolution. Until fairly recently, our country's economic progress has been closely tied to a steady expansion of people and industry. An expanding population created markets, and industry expansion helped maintain a relatively high level of employment.

All that has changed. Government and industry have been making huge outlays for research and development for the past 10 to 15 years. More scientists and engineers are at work in the world today than the cumulative total over the previous 6,000 years of recorded history—and a large share of them are in America. This suggests to me that our technological progress is only at its very beginning. It also suggests that along with the welcome benefits will come serious dislocations and displacements. The retraining programs undertaken not only by government, but by various industries as well, are only a short, tentative step toward what we may be doing in 10 or 15 years.

Retraining, in fact, may become a way of life for many of us in the next few decades, and particularly for technical people. Advances are coming along so quickly that much technical knowledge acquired in pursuit of a degree is out of date by graduation day.

Hand in hand with technological progress has come a revolution in knowledge and learning in nearly every field. Quietly, and while most of us weren't looking, knowledge has become a major industry all by itself. As a nation, we're spending just about $50 billion each year on public and private education. Business, too, has become deeply involved in education. Aside from grants, scholarships, and other forms of air, corporations are now spending at the level of $17 billion each year to educate and train workers.

The revolution in knowledge means that we are fast turning toward a type of society that will place unusual emphasis on human resources. The trend has already had a strong impact on communities, government, and businesses. Three States—California, New York, and Massachusetts—have been able to claim over half of all military research contracts—largely because they are centers of learning. If a businessman is considering moving into the Greater Boston area, for example, the industrial development experts can tell him how many Ph. D.'s live and work within 50 miles of the area.

None of us, I am sure, would want to reverse this new emphasis on knowledge. But a society which places a high premium on the acquisition of knowledge runs certain risks. We run the danger of creating a whole class of people who may appear to have no real contribution to make and therefore don't seem very important. There are more than 22 million adults in this country who failed to finish elementary school, and we are describing them as dropouts. The disappearance of many manual labor operations, particularly in the cities, intensifies the frustrations of being left out or left behind. This is the great breeding ground for crime and violence.

In the face of such momentous domestic problems, relationships between business and government must fall in a new perspective. If we add the problems involved in maintaining peace in the world, in carrying on trade with other nations, in carrying on a war in Vietnam, and a host of other concerns, the subject of business-government relations takes on an almost incredible complexity. It means that almost any action business takes today has an immediate effect on some area of public interest, which automatically makes it of legitimate interest and concern to government.

Old relationships, then, are moving in a period of transition—and perhaps a long one. Old procedures for dealing with government no longer work. The businessman who travels to Washington in pursuit of some narrow, special interest is wasting everyone's time. Even if he succeeds, he will be hurting himself in the long run. History will overtake his action, if it is shortsighted.

Today's upheaval and faster tempo mean, of course, that there are no easy routes to better business-government relations. Both business and government will have to find new approaches with the aim of working together, not just living with each other. But for the business side of the partnership, I believe there are a few guidelines we can follow.

First, we ought to recognize that under our system, the needs of people will be met in one way or another. If they are not met by private, voluntary effort, government will enter the picture. If they are not met at the local level, or at the State level, they will be met by action at the Federal level. It is simply the way our system works, and it gives us a wide choice of ways to get things done.

One way may be better than another; it may be more efficient, more economical, or more equitable. But, one way or another, needs will be met.

Recognizing this, businessmen can do a much better job of anticipating and identifying small problems before they become big issues.

The petroleum industry is trying to do just that. As an example, let's consider the problem of restoring the quality of the air and water. It is the kind of problem that every businessman can easily identify, and can easily see that sooner or later it will somehow affect him.

The petroleum industry had several courses open to it. It could deny the problem even existed. Or it could admit the problem existed, but point out the impossibility of doing anything about it. Or it could aline itself with those who are determined to conserve our air and water—using its influence and experience to help steer a practical, sensible approach to solutions.

The petroleum industry has been able to point to its substantial contributions toward knowledge in this field. It has sponsored basic research projects in some 20 different university laboratories and research institutions. Individual oil companies will spend more than $41 million this year on air conservation alone—for research and control facilities.

These activities, carried on for a period of over 30 years, give the industry a claim to substantial scientific background and expertise in air and water conservation. And efforts to acquire even more knowledge are being intensified. When rash and emotional statements about air and water pollution are made, we want to be able to point to concrete, scientific evidence in support of a moderate, sensible course.

The industry, I ought to add, has taken similar approaches to such problems as highway signs and beautification, the protection of wildlife and other natural resources, and the study and exploration of the Continental Shelf.

Second, there is the simple question of involvement. More and more businessmen must take an active interest and participation in government affairs.

Participation means much more voting. It means judging issues, expressing opinions, being willing to take a public stand. It means writing letters to legislators and reaching your Congressman with your opinion, so that he will have the benefit of your knowledgeable viewpoint in determining what his own stand is going to be.

The businessman who takes no active part in the affairs of government abdicates his right to criticize.

Third, businessmen can be much more effective in government relations if they weigh their interests against the larger needs of society. This means considering a step or a stand in the light of what it may mean to the public as a whole. The necessity for this kind of examination will surely become more pressing as the Nation's problems become more complex and interrelated.

An examination of this sort is worthwhile. If there is no real public benefit, and the proposal will serve only a narrow interest, the businessman is probably wasting time in pursuing it further. But if he can honestly judge that a step or proposal really is in the public interest, he will have no trouble demonstrating it.

Finally—and as an extension of this thought—businessmen must shake off some of their old thinking about government.

For too long many have tended to think of business and government interests as necessarily opposed. Even such a subject as "business-government relations" somehow suggests two antagonists ready to square off, with the word "relations" thrown in to hold down the explosion.

The tests of the future will demand that all segments of society—business, labor, consumer, government worker—stop thinking of themselves as segments, and instead think of themselves simply as citizens. Once we begin thinking as citizens, government becomes less remote. It becomes not just government, but our government. It appears what it really is: an instrument of our own making, one that only we can change to meet peoples' needs.

Businessmen can and ought to provide leadership toward such a goal.

Texas Independence—The Continuing Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly fortunate appointments recently made by President Johnson has been that of Mr. Jack H. Vaughn as Peace Corps Director. Mr. Vaughn has had considerable experience in the foreign field and has approached his new job with enthusiasm and determination.

Recently, Mr. Vaughn spoke in Austin, Tex., at the University of Texas on the occasion of Texas Independence. Under unanimous consent I insert at this point a copy of his speech so that all Members may have the opportunity to read this important and significant message.

The speech follows:

Texas Independence—The Continuing Struggle

(Speech delivered by Peace Corps Director Jack H. Vaughn, at the University of Texas)

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, happy birthday.

I accept your award of recognition as much in awe as I do with pride.

In pride, of course, because I am aware that the recognition of this University and of this student body is neither lightly given nor hastily withdrawn. For such an honor, I am eternally grateful—and since I am young enough to expect that eternity is still a long way off, I intend to be grateful for a long time.

I am in awe, however, of a university which holds its people's independence to be a process, rather than a fact. To do so is to do more than merely honor and observe a proud tradition. It is to enrich and keep it young, as well. In so doing you challenge yourselves, which is inspiring—but you challenge your guest speaker to an imposing standard, so if I rise sufficiently to the occasion, count it as my own heartfelt award of recognition to a very special spirit here, of which it is an honor to be a part.

Birthdays seem to cluster about this time. My daughter, Kathryn, is 18 years old today.

I told a friend—an easterner—about Texas Independence Day and of the occasion for my visit here. He said, "Thank Heavens Sam Houston didn't wait 15 days more. St. Patrick's and Texas simultaneously? The Nation would never survive."

Never a colony or a territory, Texas seems to have come to the Union with something a little extra: Texas came to the Union, an American legend in its own right. It gave our Nation more than its massive land and vigorous people. It brought the legend along, too—enriching the heritage of every American, then, and in succeeding generations.

I come to claim a share of that heritage for 18,000 Americans from every State in the Union: the Peace Corps. I shall trust to Texas' generosity for the occasion. For this week was our birthday, too. Yesterday the Peace Corps was 5 years old. It was more than a birthday. It was an independence day, as well.

The Peace Corps had to fight for its own independence, too. Formidable opinion in our early days have had the Peace Corps tucked away within another agency. We were determined to make our own way—and we put up a good scrap.

We almost lost.

But we won and retained our independence because we had a strong champion in a Texan who was chairman of our National Advisory Council as well as Vice President of the United States. It was Lyndon Johnson who spearheaded the fight for Peace Corps independence in the conferences and confrontations which were the healthy battles of our beginning.

Another Texan, Bill Moyers, carried the fight for a strong Peace Corps still further, guiding and aiding Sargent Shriver in gathering the best ideas available from Members of Congress even before the original Peace Corps legislation went up to the Hill.

Thus did Texans fight for the independent beginning the Peace Corps needed if it were to succeed at all.

In that moment, we chose our course. No people, through their Government, had ever placed such faith in themselves. But John F. Kennedy's challenge was as new and as fresh as the spirited men and women who came to volunteer. We could not meet that challenge with old, known courses. Rather, we said with Robert Frost:

> "Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
> I took the one less traveled by
> And that has made all the difference."

New problems require new solutions. Thus, we took new directions. The Peace Corps would not be a body of technical advisors and experts, but workers to share the burden, and to lead.

Nor would we turn our hand to projects we decided others might need—but rather to aid in doing things that our host nations wanted done.

Moreover, we steered clear of commissaries and special housing, hardship allowances and private transportation.

A new service required a new tradition. To this we turned.

What a towering task we faced. To appreciate the terms of human existence wherein the Peace Corps works, let us return briefly to your own history.

Texans came to this land for room to flourish and grow. They declared their independence to fight for the very principles which today are cherished by countless peoples throughout the world. They committed themselves to freedom—and to a long struggle for independence. They won—and they built on that base.

In nations everywhere today, like struggles for independence are underway.

But there are tragic differences. In the early days, Texans had strong leadership. Moreover, the people had mobility. They could rise from one social class to another. They insisted on having a voice in their own destiny, and they did.

Not so, the new nations on the move. Traditions there are not the stuff from which new worlds are conquered. People have been isolated as much by physical distances as by social isolation.

Texans fought as Americans, enriched by our Nation's exciting new heritage of optimism. That they knew what they wanted should be no surprise to us.

For Texans, freedom had value. In freedom, they beheld the power to change human condition.

But, as President Johnson asked at Freedom House last week: "What does freedom mean—when famine chokes the land, when new millions crowd upon already strained resources, when privilege is entrenched behind law and custom—when all conspire to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their lives?"

The President was speaking of the lands in which we serve.

And in every one of those lands—no matter the nation—no matter the skill we bring—in every one of those lands the Peace Corps serves a single cause.

That cause is peace.

Yet in each year of our life we are finding reason to grow more skeptical of that virtuous word: peace.

I believe that peace in modern times presents a treacherous illusion. For peace should signify that men are free to act in their own best interest, within the limits of justice—that they are free to cope, to choose a course, to match wits.

But bitter irony, then, when peace offers no options for a better life—when peace offers, indeed, no better way of life than war.

Nevertheless, such is the lot of people in almost every land wherein we serve.

Make no mistake—they are independent. Yet they guard their nation's freedom with deeper conviction than, they guard their own. They have been taught all about sovereignty—but they have learned nearly nothing of personal liberty—and hence, of freedom.

Peace has concerned them as nations. It has given them nothing, as human beings.

We serve human beings. Peace Corps volunteers grapple with the hard, mean issues of survival, down where people live. At such levels are the battles of peace won or lost.

In such battles, the tactical objectives are measured in terms of knowledge imparted, faith created, and confidence restored.

Therefore, when we in the Peace Corps ask to share in Texas' heritage, we do not come just to learn of your struggle for independence. That battle was won.

For us in the Peace Corps, Texas independence is not nearly as important as what Texans have uniquely made of their independence. In that there are lessons for us to absorb and turn to service overseas in what surely has become our mission: imparting utility and human dignity, to peace.

Moreover, I believe the Peace Corps can learn some things from Texas which you may not even recognize in yourselves—but which it is our business to recognize—and use, if what we are about is to be done well—or even done at all.

To wit: Texas is a remarkable social revolution, and has been for decades. There is a newness and vigor in this society. Like it or not, Texas writes its own rules. It is a society of youth—a society of achievement.

Texans may appall some easterners the way easterners may appall some Englishmen. Never mind. The spirit which appalls may at times be a tool of our trade. (Even the very unalarming trend to urbanity I have noted recently in young Texans bound for—or better, bound to—eastern schools, doesn't mitigate that spirit one bit. Put spurs to some of those young men behind their button-down boots and grey flannel jeans and you find them talking dreamily of land and cotton and cattle, and even of Houston.)

Next, Texas is the frontier State. People move here as if they were forever moving on. Indeed, Texas has been an eternally new frontier almost from its inception—and this indeed may have been one of its most significant assets in the struggle to impart meaning to its independence. Now it is at the very forefront of the newest frontier, in space.

Moreover, Texas has been possessed of a sense of pragmatism—a belief that it is important to move at something, piece by piece, if it is ever to be done at all. In the Marine Corps, we used to call that "Pickin' 'em up and layin' 'em down," one foot at a time, mile after endless mile.

Next, you might as well accept and live with a sense of gregariousness—which makes Texans happily mindful of people more than of things.

In addition, I suggest one crowning success in their struggle for meaningful independence with which Texans ought to be genuinely satisfied:

In the last 20 years, Texas appears to have accepted and become justly pleased with its Spanish ancestry.

One out of every five Texans is of Spanish descent. As Congressman HENRY GONZALEZ has told the world, in Texas the name Gonzalez is as common as Smith.

All through this State, particularly in the south, things Spanish glisten colorfully as never before.

The architecture around us, the names on mailboxes, yes, and the school enrollments and club memberships, all bear witness to the oneness with which Texans of all ancestries have applied themselves to impart human dignity to Texas independence.

Moreover, Texas has moved into working, harmonious relationship with its neighbor to the south, on terms and to an extent undreamed of less than a generation past.

Texans have done all this because they willed that it be so—for Texans have become too busy—and perhaps, too prosperous—to just waste valuable money, time, and energy in prejudice and false pride.

Texans, have another quality—an outgrowth surely of the continuing struggle for independence, and yet perhaps it is the very essence of that struggle. It mystifies outsiders.

I have in mind your intricate relationship with freedom. It is an unfathomable love. It is so powerful that it is often defended from view, and protected lest it be misunderstood and attacked. Yet that jealous protection of deep personal faith is precisely the way of the ghetto. And in that noble tradition, I suggest that Texas is truly freedom's ghetto.

I could stop right there with a list of reasons why Peace Corps volunteers ought to make good use of your traditions. But there is something else for them to learn from Texas—not from the people, but from the legend itself.

We have discovered that legends and myths are as serviceable to freedom as are jobs and dollars.

In many of the lands in which we serve not only is there precious little time to cope with their history; there is also precious little history to cope with their times. In such instances, our problem is actually one of nation building.

Thus, when a nation is so fragmented that its people speak over 250 dialects, volunteers teaching English throughout the land are doing more than establishing a means of communication between people. They are building a nation.

Legends and myths are what make a political entity out of a geographic location. They also can make states out of valley districts, and nations out of regions. When a people begin to think that their nation is, they begin to think of what it can become.

As did the men at Washington-on-the-Brazos 130 years ago today.

We in the Peace Corps claim a share of their heritage for reasons as unabashed as they are shameless:

Peace Corps volunteers throughout the world are building a legend of their own—and they know it.

The Peace Corps began on odds as high as Travis' 1 to 33 at the Alamo. They have never risen to Houston's 4 to 1 at San Jacinto. Indeed, a Peace Corps volunteer in India stands at an even 1 to 1 million.

The Peace Corps will not refuse to consider any assignment for which we have authority under law—and it is my fondest hope that that will come to mean any nation anywhere in the world, whether it wishes us well or wishes us ill—so long as its government wants help for its people, of the brand we can supply.

Moreover, President Johnson yesterday expressed interest in Peace Corps aid to the beleaguered and gallant people of Vietnam. We look forward, of course, to the day when volunteers can be of service to human beings in all lands which have borne the brunt of violence and terror, not only in southeast Asia, but throughout the world.

Peace Corps volunteers will build traditions where they find the need to build them—but they will build them to fit the needs at hand. There are no rules, neither of high policy nor of politics, for the men and women who serve our cause.

Are they too few? Eighteen thousand have served or are serving now. Not enough to make a dent in human misery.

It took just 20,000 Texans to begin the tradition which convenes us here today.

Moreover, the number of volunteers will grow—not in the dim future, but now. Thus, a quarter of a million men and women can have served during the next 10 years.

We shall hold them to high standards, for we must have utmost confidence in their judgment and the ability to endure confusion and despair in others as well as in themselves.

But in such numbers, and under those terms which we have established—such will be a force ready to export the unique vigor which Texas has found its independence.

And as Texas sows, she shall reap.

When Peace Corps volunteers return from overseas, they constitute a body of rare young people accustomed to tough responsibilities for their years.

Overseas they may be the people called to build new traditions of the human spirit, but at home, they are the very people upon whom existing traditions can safely repose.

Texas, for example, is the most bilingual State in the Union.

And the Peace Corps is the most bilingual of all Federal services. If better Spanish is your need, why not call upon Americans who truly have lived the language, to teach it and to work closely among those who need to communicate in Spanish.

Texas is a melting pot whose people ask what a man has done and can do, not who his family is and where he came from. Ask our veterans what they have done, but be perpared to sit and listen a while.

Texas is a State where a bright young man can be elected to the State legislature at the age of 23. The Peace Corps is an outfit whose bright young men can revive the spirit of a village or a town, at the age of 21.

Texas is the place where Mexicans died serving on both sides at the Alamo. It was Peace Corps volunteers and they alone who risked fire to serve the wounded and were trusted by both sides at Santo Domingo.

Texas is a legend of ever new frontiers for all Americans. The Peace Corps is a legend of service to freedom for all mankind.

I like to think that these two legends will be a part of each other, for fruitful generations yet to come.

On this my first full day of service as Director of the Peace Corps, I am honored to receive your Award of Recognition.

On this my first day as a Texan—I'm mighty glad we gave it to one of our own.

Thank you.

Pittsburgh Courier Praises Brimmer Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding appointments made this year by President Johnson was the naming of Andrew W. Brimmer of Pennsylvania to the Federal Reserve Board. Mr. Brimmer has already established himself in academic circles and in the Federal service as an economist of preception and understanding.

One of the best editorial assessments of the Brimmer appointment was made by the Pittsburgh Courier, March 19. Under leave to extend my remarks I include it in the Record at this point.

Brimmer's Appointment Borders on the Epitome

President Johnson, during the short period in which he has occupied the White House, has appointed more Negroes to major positions than probably all of the other Presidents combined. The President has done this with such regularity that any further praise of him editorially might seem redundant. The fact remains however, that his continuing to reward Negro ability is increasingly praiseworthy. But when he steps out of the normal routine and makes unprecedented appointments of Negroes, it is certainly worthy of the highest accolade that we can give him.

President Johnson's naming of Andrew W. Brimmer to the Federal Reserve Board is a significant milestone in the struggle for broader recognition of Negro ability.

The seven-man Federal Reserve Board is a regulatory commission which strongly influences interest rates and the availability of credit to the American economy. Last December, this Board had a head-on clash with the President by asserting its independence and voting narrowly four to three for high interest rates. The President openly criticized the Board at that time. This means that he not only is vitally concerned but he is particularly careful of whom he names to its membership. Mr. Brimmer's appointment is not to be regarded however, as one designed to improve the President's position. Although the appointee is generally viewed as a moderate, somewhere between a liberal and conservative position, such portends that in all probability, he like the others, will support tighter money and higher interest rates under some conditions.

On the other hand scholarly Mr. Brimmer has spent most of his career in both academic life and public service. He has also served for 3 years on the research staff of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

The chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William H. McChesney Martin, Jr., in praising Brimmer's appointment said:

"Mr. Brimmer achieved a very commendable record as a member of the Economic Research staff of the Federal Reserve Bank during the fifties, and I believe that he can be counted upon to build further upon that record, in his service as a member of the Board, especially in view of the experience he has gained as Assistant Secretary of Commerce and working in the difficult problem the Nation's balance payments."

It can be clearly seen then, that not only has the President made a very excellent but a most significant appointment in Andrew Brimmer. Viewed in the context of his other historical appointments such as: the recent naming of Dr. Robert C. Weaver as Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; Dr. James Nabrit to the United Nations; Mrs. Constance B. Motley as U.S. District Judge plus others too numerous to enumerate here—all of these show that the President not only recognizes superior ability but he continuously does so at the exclusion of race and color.

While all of his prior appointments of Negroes were history making and precedent-setting, the recent elevation of Andrew Brimmer to the Federal Reserve Board has the broadest possible meaning.

This newspaper, as a member of the National Newspaper Publishers Association which within the past 10 months has twice had occasion to confer with President Johnson and recommend on each visit, the naming of more Negroes to Federal regulatory commissions, now expresses to him our gratitude not only for fulfilling our request but for breaking the color barrier on one of the most important Federal bodies in our Nation.

The Merchant Marine—America's Other Navy Fading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the testimony being received by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries concerning the status of this Nation's merchant marine fleet is most interesting and requires the attention of all those concerned about such things as balance of payments, support of our defense efforts in Vietnam, commercial competition with the Soviet Union, the shortage of trained manpower to man the fleet and the problem of ship construction and labor-management relations. Besides the statistical questions involved, there is the especially annoying question of just who in the executive branch is responsible for forming this Nation's over-all maritime policy. There seems to be some differences of opinion within the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, a fine summary of the merchant marine situation appears in the March 11, 1966, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, written by Mr. John Dillin. I insert this report in the Record for the information of Members of Congress:

U.S. Merchant Marine: "Other Navy" Fades

(By John Dillin)

WASHINGTON.—Squally weather flags are flying these days for the shrunken merchant navy of the United States.

A storm has been kicked up by the rapidly rising demands put on the merchantmen by the war in Vietnam.

But even before the war, dissatisfaction was growing.

At present, the storm center is located in the big, paneled hearing room of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Some committee members, after listening to testimony, charge that administration policies threaten to sink the entire fleet with economic ruin. They say it may be necessary for Congress to impose new policies on the White House.

In addition, the Soviet Union has added urgency to the discussions. The Russians, witnesses told the committee, are making a determined effort to become a leading force in the world's shipping business.

Boiled down, the problem confronting the President and Congress is this: Does the United States, at great cost to itself, want to maintain a viable, home-based merchant marine?

It is an immense and complicated puzzle. Two administration study groups looked at the problem in the last year and came up with conflicting answers.

The stakes are high. The industry, currently in a rapid downslide, employs 98,000 people. In addition, the industry is considered vital to national security.

The decision must be made principally by the Government for an obvious reason: The Nation's merchant navy cannot operate without heavy Federal subsidies. These currently total over $400 million a year.

Despite this heavy infusion of cash, however, the industry continues its decline. Since the days in World War II when the

Nation floated a record number of ships, the United States has slumped to the position of a second-class merchant-ship builder. Countries like Japan have raced to the lead.

One reason is that it costs about half as much to build a ship in Japan as in the United States. Japanese shipyard workers make about 73 cents an hour. American workers average $3 an hour.

Fifteen years ago, there were 1,955 active U.S.-flag ships, many quite new. Today there are about 870, and most of these are over 20 years old and near the end of their economic life.

The reserve fleet tells a similar story. When the Korean war broke out, the Nation activated 444 ships from its massive reserve fleet of over 2,500 World War II vessels.

But today these same reserve ships are over 20 years old and of questionable value.

What this means is that Vietnam is putting the U.S. fleet under tremendous pressures. Some 125 ships are making the southeast Asia run, including about 60 of the country's slim supply of modern cargo liners.

Tonnage volume to Vietnam has leaped from 300,000 tons per month a year ago to 800,000 tons a month currently.

POINT HAMMERED

Statistics like these prompted the House Merchant Marine Committee, under Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat, of Maryland, chairman, to call witnesses this week from three big U.S. steamship lines.

Seated at the long witness table were Capt. John W. Clark, president of Delta Steamship Line; William B. Rand, president, United States Lines; and Edward Webster, vice president, Pacific Far East Lines.

The witnesses hammered at what they see as the need for change.

Captain Clark was concerned especially with what the war effort is doing to disrupt ordinary business for the lines.

Due to the shortage of ships and crewmen, he said, "we are losing business to foreign ships which we have worked hard to obtain.

"This," he asserted, "constitutes a big expense to the operators, who have gone to great lengths to build up their commercial trade routes.

"The Maritime Administration estimates that 10,000 tons of commercial cargoes are lost to foreign-flag ships for every month that a single (U.S.), ship is away from its regular commercial trade routes.

"There also results a substantial loss to this country's balance of payments."

Turning to Soviet challenge, Captain Clark noted:

"Russia is building up a large merchant marine and, by her own admission, intends to utilize her shipping as an instrument of foreign policy without regard to cost."

Presently the Soviets boast a merchant fleet of almost 1,500 vessels. Most are new and efficient ships built since 1950.

In addition, Soviet orders for new ships rose from 225 in 1962 to 673 in 1964, while in the United States, orders and ships under construction at private yards declined from 84 in 1958 to 47 in 1965.

Captain Clark estimates that it would take subsidies of $500 million a year to turn the tide for the industry.

The witnesses also rapped the multimillion-dollar research and development program of the Maritime Administration.

"I regret to say," Captain Clark said, "that the research and development program has been of little or no benefit. Most of the funds budgeted have gone into the *Savannah* [nuclear ship] program. * * * The balance has gone into hydrofoil and surface-effects studies, which are very limited in scope and basically military in nature. * * * I know of no single project * * * which is of benefit to commercial trade."

Research work is needed, witnesses said, to boost sea speed without cutting loads. Efforts are also needed to improve cargo handling.

The Maritime Administration acts under the Nation's basic maritime law, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The law states that it will be the policy of the Government to aid national defense and commerce by supporting the merchant marine.

The Government, it says, shall see that the merchant marine is "sufficient to carry a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce." (The national fleet now carries 8.5 percent of the $30 billion annual trade.)

BRIGHT SPOTS SIGHTED

A close look at the U.S. fleet shows that the picture is not entirely dark.

For its $273 million annual operating subsidy, for example, the Government now sees a relatively thriving fleet of about 300 cargo liners.

Another 300 ships ply domestic waters—and thus have no foreign competition and fewer problems.

But then there are the 270 tramp ships—the bulk carriers that operate on irregular schedules. Every ship in this fleet now is over 20 years old. None receives a subsidy.

Should these tramps be replaced? This is a key issue.

Finally, there is the massive reserve fleet. The ships are old. They are slow. They are inefficient. Each one costs $400,000 to reactivate—and, it is said, another $400,000 in repairs within a few months. On these ships, facilities are uncomfortable. Four men share a single, hot cabin. On modern ships, each man has his own air-conditioned cabin. So crews would be hard to find.

At present, 86 ships from the mothball fleet have been reactivated, and this will soon rise to 111. But some feel that the entire fleet should be scrapped and replaced with a fewer number of modern vessels.

No clear answers to these problems have come from the White House. Indeed, word from the executive branch has been, if anything, conflicting.

CONFLICT TRACED

The conflict stems from two studies completed in 1965. They were initiated by two succeeding Secretaries of Commerce, John T. Connor and Luther H. Hodges.

Mr. Connor's study group was known as the Interagency Task Force. Among its controversial proposals:

Close all shipyards except those considered vital to emergency needs; cut subsidies by 10 percent over the next 5 years; allow ship operators to buy foreign-made ships and register them under the U.S. flag (not now allowed); drop all passenger trade; limit the U.S.-flag fleet, active and reserve, to 1,000 ships; merge the 9 seagoing unions into 3.

This was countered soon after it came out by a study initiated by Mr. Hodges. This group backed the subsidy system—even supported expansion of the current system.

Both reports have been dumped in the lap of President Johnson.

The only word so far this year from Mr. Johnson was that the Maritime Administration was to be placed in the new Department of Transportation.

The Philippines Stake in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, President Marcos of the Philippines recently made a nationwide television speech to his people on the issues of the war in Vietnam and his country's stake in that struggle. It was a moving address which reaffirmed the determination of the Philippines to stand solidly on the side of freedom in Asia. It was in this speech that President Marcos announced his decision to send engineer troops to aid the allied war effort in Vietnam. He said:

> If we sat by, complacently awaiting the uncertain arrival of peace, we might wake up to find that we had nothing to negotiate about.

I hope that all Americans will read his inspiring words. Some people ask how our friends and allies in southeast Asia feel about Vietnam. I think President Marcos' eloquent speech supplies an answer:

> My countrymen, Vietnam today is a name that agitates the world. But if this name is urgent for mankind, it should be ominous for those who are so close, geographically and physically, as we are, to Vietnam. Those used to air travel know that Saigon is almost as close to Manila as, say, Hong Kong. If any time the bell tolls for freedom in South Vietnam, none will hear it in greater pain, or with deeper foreboding, than the Filipino people.
>
> A long time ago we decided for our national interest that we are free and cannot accept communism.
>
> While we have been willing to live in peace with any political ideology—communism has not been so complacent.
>
> In accordance with the Communist plan of action and subversion and the use of indigenous forces for the forcible overthrow of the duly established government, the Hukbalahaps instituted a reign of terror which required all our human, spiritual, and material resources to overcome.
>
> When we were threatened with this internal danger, we entered into the Mutual Defense Pact with the United States. Under the military agreement, we armed our soldiers with the weapons from the United States.
>
> We joined the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—the latter being an aggruptation of countries agreed to contest, by force of arms, if necessary, the armed aggression of communism. These are international agreements and commitments we cannot now discard.
>
> Rather than discard them, our legislature embodied these agreements and commitments into our domestic laws by outlawing communism under Republic Act 1700.
>
> The policy thus embodied in international agreements and laws of our country was reaffirmed by our government in the Manila communique of April 12, 1964, and the Ministerial Conference in London in 1964 wherein we promised to extend moral and material aid to South Vietnam.
>
> In accordance with this policy when on August 10, 1964, the Republic of Vietnam requested from the Philippines, aid in her fight against communistic aggression, the request being limited to projects therein indicated, we extended the requested aid in the form of medical and psychowar teams. In accordance with Republic Act 4162, approved July 21, 1964, we have 68 uniformed officers and enlisted men in the Republic of Vietnam consisting of physicians, surgeons, nurses, psychological, rural development and civic action workers. In the London communique the member governments of SEATO agreed not only to be prepared to take further concrete steps necessary to assist South Vietnam but agreed "to continue and, consistent with their commitments elsewhere, to increase their assistance to South Vietnam."

This was in consonance with the Macapagal-Johnson joint communique of October 6, 1963, which stated that—

"The two Presidents exchanged views on the situation in southeast Asia and pledged themselves to maintain the unity of commitment and purpose between their countries in defense of the right of the free nations of southeast Asia to determine their own future. * * * The two Presidents reaffirmed their intention to stand by the people of South Vietnam and reiterated their commitment to the defense of southeast Asia under the SEATO agreement."

The problem of involvement of our Government in the conflict in South Vietnam has been resolved. The only question presented to us is whether this commitment and this involvement shall be manifested by an increase in the aid thus extended to South Vietnam. This was occasioned by the request for further aid by the Government of the Republic of South Vietnam on April 14, 1965, wherein it formally asked for engineer troops. In accordance with this request, last year House bill 17828 was presented in the House of Representatives and approved by that body but was not acted upon by the Senate.

The formal request of April 14, 1965, was reiterated to me on February 2 of this year by the Government of South Vietnam through its Ambassador. The Government of South Vietnam declared that the South Vietnam chief of state is reiterating its original request for engineer troops. A memorandum of this reiteration is now in the records of the Department of Foreign Affairs.

In accordance with this request an intense public debate now occupies our people.

It is said that it is impossible to please everyone. After 49 days in office, I realize it is impossible even to please one's own self often enough. These are the two facts that make my decision to speak to you tonight a painful one. For while it is my personal desire to make decisions pleasant for everyone, the clear duty of my office does not always make this possible. The performance of duty is a stern and demanding measure of any man, let alone of a President.

I have, through a series of consultations and conferences with the keenest and best informed minds available, studied all the possible aspects of the Vietnam question. This almost interminable series of discussions and briefings was necessary because the question concerning Vietnam involves the highest welfare of our country, not only today or the months to follow, but for many more generations to come.

You will recall that the discussions on this question were reported freely to the press and through various other media. This too was necessary, because it is my wish that all shades of opinion, that all voices that cared or dared to express themselves should be heard, with the freedom and the leisure that was possible.

If I have been accused of weakness or inconsistency, as indeed I have been in some quarters, that, I must grant, is the privilege of every citizen.

Nevertheless, it is also my painful duty to point out, as I do now, that leadership is not synonymous with rashness, nor does it preclude the exercise of caution and prudence.

On the contrary, it is the leadership that acts with cautioned prudence, that informs itself before it acts, that is to my mind the leadership which can claim to have fulfilled its duty. It is the leadership that can truly be firm. I now propose to exercise that leadership.

It is my sincere, my honest, my firm judgment that my decision to send engineers to South Vietnam is in the highest interest of the country.

I cannot tell you in this public manner all the intimate reasons why this is so, but I must assure you that all of them together concern the security of our people.

Fortunately, as I had already shown we are committed. Fortunately, we have chosen a side in the deepening conflict between democracy and communism. It is my intention as the leader of this nation not only to reaffirm that commitment but to make it more meaningful.

This commitment involves continued partnership with the United States. It involves continued allegiance to agreements with that country and other countries of similar ideologies and purposes. The Philippines cannot turn against that commitment. I do not propose to be the President who would bring this country and this people to the eternal shame of perfidy.

In respect to the war in Vietnam, there are four important principles which should underlie our course of action. The first is that we desire the establishment of peace in Vietnam at the earliest practicable time. We desire this peace for the sake of the people of Vietnam, for our own sake and for the sake of the world. For we realize that the longer this gruesome and brutal war lasts, the greater are the dangers that it would escalate beyond the point of no return.

We are, therefore, prepared to initiate or support any moves designed to bring the parties to the negotiating table. We shall support any moves designed to halt an interminable war that has laid waste an entire countryside and visited death upon the thousands of innocent civilians, including women and children. We shall support any move designed to lead to a peace which shall not sacrifice our principles or endanger our national security.

The second principle is this. While supporting initiatives toward peace, we regard it as essential that the relentless pressure of Communist aggression in Vietnam be stopped. The necessity for stopping this aggression is obvious. If we sat by, complacently awaiting the uncertain arrival of peace, we might wake up to find that we had nothing to negotiate about.

In the widening public dialog about Vietnam, one thing clearly emerges—there is nationwide agreement about the necessity of extending assistance to the beleaguered people of Vietnam. It is established beyond dispute that the war in Vietnam is not a civil war, in the historical sense of that term. It is a war on an international scale, involving massive aggression from Communist North Vietnam, with the active encouragement of Communist China. That is no longer confined within the borders of South Vietnam, for it involves directly or indirectly the two countries formerly associated with Vietnam; namely Laos and Cambodia. And in neighboring Thailand, Communist terrorists have begun a campaign of destruction, apparently with the intention of securing the flank of the Laotion area through which the Ho Chi Minh trail, a major Communist supply line passes.

Inside Vietnam itself, the gravity of the situation is manifest. Of its nearly 16 million people, almost one-fourth is under Communist control. And more than half of its total area is in enemy hands, marking a high point in the extent of Communist conquest.

The question, then, of extending assistance to Vietnam is no longer debatable. Indeed, since the Congress voted to allow the sending of medical and psy-war teams to the embattled country, the question as such has become academic.

There is a third principle and it is of great relevance to the question before us. This is our unquestioned obligation as free and independent people to succor peoples of kindred faith fighting in defense of their freedom. If we did not, we would be disloyal to our own history and ignorant of the meaning of past events. We ourselves broke the back of a massive rebellion led by Communists just over a dozen years ago. We share with the people of Vietnam an intimate knowledge of Communist terror. We cannot therefore view their plight with anything less than sympathy, or indeed with anything less than the praiseworthy desire to help them.

Finally, and most important of all, we feel that in aiding Vietnam we are insuring our own future safety. The vast sea that separates us from the Asian mainland may provide protection from external Communist aggression but it can hardly provide defense against homegrown Communists. For one thing it is certain. And if the Reds win in Vietnam, that victory will signal the reactivation of Communist insurgency all over southeast Asia, including the Philippines. Almost certainly, it will mean renewed Communist activity in the Philippines.

While we remain confident of overcoming this eventuality if it should arise, we would be forced in the future to divert our energies and resources to a degree a hundred times more than that required now which would otherwise be devoted to the urgent tasks of social and economic development. We feel therefore that assisting Vietnam today constitutes one form of guarantee that Communist activity does not arise in our country again and that our own efforts at material progress shall continue free from the hindrance of Communist subversion.

There should be no misunderstanding on this point. Philippine assistance to Vietnam is based on a hardheaded assessment of our own national interests. But there is clearly a limit to the kind of assistance that we can give Vietnam, for we ourselves need all our resources, and more, for the internal requirements of national growth. We shall therefore base the scale of our assistance on two considerations—first, what can we safely afford, secondly, and within this limitation what is the kind of assistance requested by the Vietnamese Government? In the past, we extended assistance in the form of medical and civic action units. We now propose to send an engineer battalion with minimum security protection.

What can we afford? I have stated in the state of the nation address and in my inaugural address that we are in crisis and in serious need of funds for our own government operations.

Because of the campaign against smuggling and the intensification of tax collection the original estimate of President Macapagal for a government income of ₱1,888 million can be attained or approximated. At the beginning of this year, we programed expenditures amounting to only ₱1,670 million. We have increased this today to ₱1,750 million in view of the increased collections, especially in April when income tax collections will begin. If we can maintain the present rate of collection we will attain the target of ₱1,888 million. If we spend only ₱1,750 million, this will leave an amount of ₱138 million for expenditures for public works as well as for the engineer construction battalion that we are sending.

But I want to make it clear that if necessary to attain the security of the Philippines, I would be willing to incur deficit in government expenditures. It is a pleasant task, however, to inform you that there will be no necessity to incur such a deficit for this particular project.

At this instance it is necessary for me to deny vehemently that I made this decision for and in consideration of any additional aid whether in dollars or any other form from the United States or from any other source. Neither coercion, threats, blackmail, nor dollars has dictated my judgment. Now and in the future only the national interest of the Philippines shall determine my decision.

Objections to the proposal to send engineering teams to Vietnam center around two points—first, that the engineering teams are in fact combat units and secondly, that Philippine assistance is of dubious value to the total Vietnamese effort.

Let me deal briefly with these two objections. As to the first, it can be stated that it rests on a misconception. The engineering teams are what the Vietnamese Government asked for and that is what we are going to send them—an engineering team, not combat units. These teams will be there to continue their specialized skills, not to hurt or kill Communists. We do not discount the possibility that they might get shot at, and that is the reason for the security cover.

We have never considered the medical team and the pay-war team composed of our men in uniforms as combat units. What distinguishes the man in uniform of a combat unit from those that are not? The principal purpose of the combat unit is to hunt and kill the enemy. It is not the purpose of the engineers to hunt and kill the enemy but rather to reconstruct and rehabilitate destruction in the areas recovered by combat units. And the purpose is to include, in the engineer team to be sent to South Vietnam, only volunteers from the armed forces of the Philippines.

As to the second objection, it seems to miss the point entirely. In sending the engineering units to Vietnam, it is not part of our plan, as it were, in the heroic fashion prescribed in war moves. We would if we could, but our aim is more modest. In addition to the undoubted concrete and material contribution that our engineering units can make to the Vietnamese, the function of this assistance is symbolic. By our action, we signify our solidarity with those who are determined to see that Communist aggression will always be resisted whatever the cost. Moreover, it is in conformity with our pledge as a signatory of the London declaration to assist the people of Vietnam morally and materially. It is not of wide public knowledge that 41 countries are actively aiding the Vietnamese effort, and among these the Philippine contribution is among the more modest.

We are, finally, confident that our assistance, no matter on how small a scale, will contribute to the necesary job of increasing the morale of the Vietnamese people, now badly battered by a decade of unrelieved conflict. If we succeeded in this, if by so much we increased the will of the heroic Vietnamese people to continue fighting, if we keep alive their hope of eventual peace and freedom, then surely no one can say that our effort has been a total waste. That is what we seek and that is what we hope for in Vietnam.

My countrymen, I have revealed to you all matters that I feel can now be publicly ventilated. There are others within the peculiar knowledge of the President which bear heavily on this decision, but I assure each and everyone of you that the national interest is the guide in this position.

I can add that the Philippine Communist movement is a part of Asian communism. Communism does not die in a country once infiltrated by it. It merely subsides and in this country it has subsided into a parliamentary struggle. It has resurrected in the intellectual arena and the Communist cadres that are being reorganized. I point to this danger. For if indeed it is a war that we fight because we send an engineer construction battalian to South Vietnam, this supposed war we fight today will stop the wars our sons may need to fight tomorrow. There are those who say that the Philippines should not be involved in Vietnam at all, considering that the war in Vietnam is a senseless American war which, moreover, could not be won at all. This conclusion is challenged by the fact of our own national experience. In our country the Huk movement persisted for 20 years, and it was defeated by a combination of superior military force and broad social reforms. The same thing happened to communism in Malaysia, Turkey, Iran, and Greece. And those who still nurse hopes of the infallibility of communism need only to be reminded of how very recently the Communist Party of Indonesia tricked itself into virtual extinction through an excess of zeal and overconfidence that is so characteristic of this type of political activist everywhere.

All these facts indicate that communism can be beaten and that the fanaticism of Communists is most often their own undoing.

Let us turn to the American presence in Vietnam. The fact that the United States shoulders the major burden of the Vietnam war does not change the fact that this is an Asian challenge. The United States is in South Vietnam because there are enough South Vietnamese who are willing to die for the opportunity to live in freedom. It is not true that the United States is in Vietnam out of selfish national interest. As a matter of fact, the main body of the protest movement in the United States and the criticism of U.S. Senators opposed to the war is that engagement does not serve America's interest.

But there is no question that our own national security is involved. Red China's support of the "war of liberation" in South Vietnam has, indeed, uncomfortable implications for us in the Philippines. China is already lending increasing support to the "national liberation" movement in Thailand, and this is partly because Thailand serves as a base for some of the air raids against North Vietnam and for occasional air strikes against the routes by which Vietcong men and supplies pass through Laos. The success of the "war of liberation" in South Vietnam—once brought about by American withdrawal, if critics will have their way—will encourage subversive elements within the Chinese minorities of Indonesia, the Philippines, and Malaysia to subvert the existing governments. Once again, let us not forget too easily Peking's recent attempt to overthrow the existing governments in Indonesia which was supposedly neutralists.

Finally, if subversive elements, foreign as well as Filipino, were sure that henceforth Americans, for fear of being called imperialist or for the lack of an Asian will to fight for freedom, will turn a deaf ear to the request for help of established governments, then they will have done with the one obstacle to request—America's readiness to defend freedom in Asia with American arms, American ships—and American lives.

The U.S. plight in Vietnam must be seen separately from the irritants in Philippine-American relations. The issue is larger than our grievances with the United States. We are tackling these grievances. We are determined that Philippine-American relations must continue to evolve toward widening equality and true reciprocity as between two mature and friendly states.

It has been charged that I reversed myself on the Vietnam question; that during the campaign, I opposed the sending of combat troops to Vietnam. What has been mistaken for a reversal of position was actually a change in emphasis. In the campaign, I declared myself opposed to the utilization of the Vietnamese crisis by the party then in power as the pretext to circumvent the rule of law and abridge the liberties of citizens at home. I criticized the attempt to create a hysterical atmosphere in which it was proposed to dispatch Filipino combat troops to Vietnam. At the same time, I declared support for the enlargement of our humanitarian and technical aid to the Republic of Vietnam—that form of aid which I called "a Filipino area of excellence in southeast Asia." I believe that the dispatch of engineers to South Vietnam continues the constructive character of our earlier aid; and that this still falls within the "area of Filipino excellence" that I spoke of in the past. But even if this were considered a reversal of a previous opinion, I would do so for the national interest. The personal prestige of a leader I am willing to sacrifice for the security of the Philippines, especially since that prestige is mine.

At the same time, I should like to assure our people that while we recognize the gravity of the crisis in Vietnam, we shall not allow any effort to abridge the liberties of our own citizens under any pretext. On the other hand, I am convinced that this administration has shown from the start a profound sensitivity to the rights and liberties of the people.

I repeat that if we send engineers to Vietnam, this will be because we choose to act on the long-held convictions of the Filipino people; that the option for liberty must be kept for every nation, that our own security requires that democracy be given the chance to develop freely and successfully in our own part of the world. It would be an insult to our people to insinuate that the convictions were imposed on us by any foreign power. Our position in Vietnam grew out of these convictions that are rooted in our own historical development.

In sending further aid to the Republic of Vietnam, we shall be acting on these convictions. I call on our people to stand united behind these timeless beliefs and commitments of our people.

Thank you and good night.

Statement of Mr. Clarence M. Tarr, President of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BUCHANAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to include in the Record a statement given this morning before the Retirement Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives by Mr. Clarence M. Tarr, president of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees.

Mr. Tarr in his excellent presentation made a strong statement on behalf of a group of people, our retired civil employees and their dependents and survivors, who are almost overlooked in the legislation now before this committee. I commend its reading to the Members of the House:

Statement of Clarence M. Tarr, President, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Before the Pay and Retirement Subcommittees, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, March 23, 1966

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittees, we thank you for this opportunity to appear and present the problems of retired civil employees and their dependents and survivors. We are most grateful to you for your courageous action last year in approving a bill which gave a much-needed annuity increase to retirees and survivors on civil service retirement rolls and revised the plan of automatic cost-of-living increases to make it more responsive in meeting the costs of inflation. We came to you then as the forgotten people in the age of the Great Society and in some respects we feel that except in the Halls of Congress we are still very much the forgotten people.

For many years we have advocated the principle that benefits for active employees and their dependents and survivors and benefits for retired employees and their dependents and survivors should be considered at the same time, on a package basis. We have argued, as it is argued today, that the benefits provided to former employees and their dependents and survivors are part of the fringe benefits for the whole working force. There must be a correlation between benefits provided to those who have formerly retired and benefits promised employees who are to retire in the future. Otherwise, how could present employees be assured that they will not be forgotten as soon as they leave the working force?

Today we are seeking a correlation of survivor benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act. Prior to April 1, 1948, there was no simple procedure for a retiring employee to provide survivor benefits for his spouse. There was an option for a "joint-survivor annuity" to be computed on an actuarial basis but it was so complicated that few retiring employees used it. Also, there was no provision for an annuity for the widow of an employee who died in the service.

On April 1, 1948, Public Law 426 (80th Cong.) became effective, and permitted a retiring employee to elect a survivor annuity for his spouse by taking a reduction of 10 percent in his annuity, plus a reduction of three-fourths of 1 percent for each year that such spouse was under the age of 60, the total reduction not to exceed 25 percent. The survivor annuity was fixed at 50 percent of the unreduced annuity of the retiree. This law also granted a survivor annuity to the widow of each male employee who died in the service after service of at least 5 years, computed on the basis of half of the amount the employee would have received if retired on full annuity at the time of his death. Also, this law granted either a free survivor annuity, or an annuity increase of 25 percent (not to exceed $300), to each married person previously retired. The survivor annuity was set at half of the annuity of the retiree, limited to $600 per annum. Two years later, Public Law 601 (81st Cong.) granted survivor annuities to those who had chosen annuity increases and vice versa, thus assuring survivor annuities to all married retirees prior to April 1, 1948, who were living on that date. By a later law in 1958, the widows of pre-1948 retirees who had died before April 1, 1948, and the widows of employees who had died with 5 years or more of service before April 1, 1948, were granted annuities.

Under Public Law 310 (81st Cong.), after September 30, 1949, the cost of a survivor annuity was modified by requiring a reduction of only 5 percent on the first $1,500 of original annuity, plus 10 percent on the remainder, retaining the three-fourths of 1 percent reduction for each year the spouse was under 60 years of age, and with the maximum reduction limited to 25 percent. This law was not made retroactive to apply to persons previously retired.

Public Law 854 (84th Cong.) made a drastic change in survivor annuities, effective October 1, 1956. Thereafter a retiree could elect a survivor annuity based only on a portion of his annuity, and suffered a reduction of only 2½ percent on the first $2,400 of such portion, plus 10 percent of the remainder, if any. The survivor annuity was fixed at half of the amount of annuity designated by the retiree. Extra deductions based on the age of the spouse were discontinued. This enabled a retiree to provide a survivor annuity of $1,200, for a reduction of only $60 per year in original annuity. The provisions of this law were not made retroactive to apply to persons previously retired.

The latest change in laws governing survivor annuities was made in Public Law 87-793, effective October 11, 1962, when the amount subject to reduction at 2½ percent was increased from $2,400 to $3,600, and the amount of the survivor annuity was increased from 50 to 55 percent of the base. This enabled a retiree after that date to elect a survivor annuity of $1,980 per year at a cost of only $90 per year. The provisions of this law were not made retroactive to apply to persons previously retired.

During these years since 1948, both salaries and annuities have increased many times but the increases in salaries have been much greater than the increases in annuities. As a result, the average annuities of persons retiring today are much higher than the average of present annuities of persons retired some years ago.

Because changes in survivor provisions of the law were not made retroactive to persons previously retired, we now find that persons retired prior to October 1, 1956, are suffering the loss of up to 25 percent of their annuities in order to provide survivor annuities of only 50 percent of their unreduced annuities, while persons retired since October 11, 1962, can provide survivor annuities up to $1,980 per annum for a reduction of only 2½ percent of $3,600, or an annual cost not to exceed $90. Even where the age factor did not apply, the man who retired in 1948 who has annuity enough to provide his wife with a survivor annuity of $1,800 is now suffering a reduction of $360, 10 percent of $3,600. The 1948 retiree pays four times as much as the 1963 retiree but the 1963 retiree can provide 10 percent more in survivor annuity. The retiree in 1950 who has a large enough annuity to provide a survivor annuity of $1,800 is suffering an annuity reduction of 5 percent on $1,500, and 10 percent on $2,100, a total reduction of $285, more than three times the amount paid by the 1963 retiree, and can't provide as much for his spouse. The 1957 retiree who has sufficient annuity to provide a survivor annuity of $1,800 for his spouse, is suffering a reduction of 2½ percent on $2,400 and 10 percent on $1,200, a total of $180. His cost is double that of the 1963 retiree, who can provide 10 percent more in survivor annuity for only $90 per year. The persons receiving the least annuities have to pay the most for survivor protection, and their survivors, who can only look for a percentage of small annuities, are further penalized by a lower percentage formula.

There was a similar problem under the Foreign Service retirement system. For many years prior to 1960, a Foreign Service officer was permitted upon retirement to designate his wife to receive a survivor annuity of half of his unreduced annuity, but he had to elect to receive for his lifetime only 75 percent of this unreduced annuity. He had to pay 25 percent of his annuity to provide his wife with a survivor annuity of 50 percent. In 1960, a new law changed this system and permitted a Foreign Service retiree whose annuity would be at least $4,800 to provide his wife with a survivor annuity of $2,400 per year, at a cost of only $300 per year—2½ percent on $2,400, and 10 percent on $2,400—which corresponded to the formula in effect at that time under the civil service retirement system. Also, this law set a minimum survivor annuity of $2,400 for the Foreign Service retirement system. The law was not made retroactive for persons previously retired.

Public Law 89-308, approved October 31, 1965, eliminated these inequities from the Foreign Service retirement system. From now on, the annuities of former retirees who elected survivor annuities at the cost of a loss of 25 percent of their annuities, will be recomputed on the more liberal 1960 formula of $300 per year to provide survivor annuities of $2,400. Also, survivor annuities which were under $2,400 per annum are now increased to the new minimum of $2,400 per annum. In addition, Public Law 89-308 gives a new opportunity for former retirees who did not elect survivor annuities at the time of their retirement to now elect such survivor annuities and pay back the costs for prior years by monthly installments of 25 deducted from their annuities.

This law is directly in point for the civil service retirement system.

There was discrimination against older retirees in the matter of costs imposed for the privilege of providing survivor annuities in the Foreign Service retirement system as in the civil service retirement system. It has been eliminated in the Foreign Serice retirement system and should be eliminated also in the civil service retirement system. There was discrimination against survivors of older retirees in the Foreign Service retirement system as in the civil service retirement system. It has been eliminated in the Foreign Service retirement system and should also be eliminated in the civil service retirement system.

Costs are always an important item for consideration in connection with proposed legislation. We cannot give any official figures, because we do not have the basic data which would be required. However, we can present some estimates based on the latest figures we have been able to obtain from the Civil Service Commission.

As of June 30, 1965, there were 171,577 widow and widower survivor annuitants on the annuity rolls, of which 72,955 were widows and widowers (only 94 widowers) of employees who died in service. There were 157,924 widow and widower survivors of former employees who died or retired prior to October 11, 1962, and the total annuities paid to them were reported as $13,125,220 per month, or $157,502,640 per year. This indicates that the initial cost of bringing survivor annuities under the civil service retirement system up to the present standard of 55 percent of base annuities would be 10 percent of the present total or $15,750,264 per annum. This cost might rise slightly as new survivors are added to the rolls, partially offset by present survivors who die, but will reduce annually before long, and ultimately pass out altogether.

Costs of the recomputation of reductions in annuities of retirees are more difficult to estimate, but there are some figures to go on. On June 30, 1965, there were on the rolls 7,325 persons who retired in fiscal year 1948, 8,423 who retired in fiscal year 1949, and 9,693 who retired in fiscal year 1950. From this we estimate that there are now approximately 12,000 former employees who retired between April 1, 1948, and September 30, 1949. This includes men and women and persons who retired under conditions which prevented them from designating their spouses to receive survivor annuities. Also, the high cost at that time deterred many from electing survivor annuities. Perhaps one-fourth of these retirees elected survivor annuities, and the probable average increase they would receive from recomputation would be $120 (average annuity $1,800, and average reduction changed from $180 to $60). This would make the cost of adjusting this group $360,000. From October 1, 1949, to October 1, 1956, there were 93,601 retirees who were still on the rolls on June 30, 1965. It is not likely that more than one-third of these elected survivor annuities, and we estimate the average to be restored to each through recomputation at $75 (average annuity $2,000, and average reduction changed from $125 to $50). This would make the cost of adjusting this group $2,340,000. Between October 1, 1956, and October 11, 1962, there were approximately 225,736 retirees who were on the rolls on June 30, 1965, and perhaps 40 percent of these elected survivor annuities, and we estimate the average to be restored through recomputation at $45 (average annuity of $3,000 designated as base for survivor annuities, and average reduction changed from $120 to $75). This would make the cost for this group about $4,063,248. The total cost of the recomputation of annuities would be about $7,763,248.

Under our estimates, therefore, the total cost of eliminating these gross inequities in the civil service retirement system would be about $23,500,000, and would add less than 5 percent to the package bill proposed by the President. This seems to be a small price for eliminating these great inequities.

We have been waiting a long time for adjustments to eliminate these inequities in the civil service retirement system. At our request, bills to correct these inequities have been introduced by numerous Congressmen during recent years. It seems that there is always some other legislation that is given the preference, and the correction of these inequities had to be delayed.

Last year, we were encouraged when we had an invitation to testify before the President's Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems. The invitation requested us to concentrate on two or three of the most important changes we felt to be necessary in the retirement system, and we concentrated most of our efforts on the inequities that needed to be corrected in the costs and amounts of survivor annuities. We were told at that time that the Committee's report would be available by December 1, 1965, and we waited eagerly and hopefully for that report. In the meantime, Public Law 89–308 was approved on October 31, 1965, correcting most of the survivorship inequities in the Foreign Service retirement system, and furnishing a splendid precedent for similar action in the civil service retirement system. It was agonizing to see the Cabinet Committee's report delayed on December 1, 1965, delayed further on January 1, 1966, still missing on February 1, 1966, and finally postponed beyond March 7, 1966. When we were finally able to obtain a copy, we searched through it for recommendations that would apply to us, and searched in vain. Our plea for the correction of survivor inequities was not even mentioned. The only recommendation concerning present retirees and their dependents and survivors was commendation for the new cost-of-living increase legislation approved by the Congress last year. There was one other recommendation that might apply to those now receiving survivor annuities and to future survivors of present retirees, which would permit them to remarry after age 60 without loss of their survivor annuities, but it is not definitely indicated in the report that this privilege would apply to present survivors.

We want to backup our President in his efforts to keep expenses under control during the difficult period when we must carry out military operations in southeast Asia. We commend him for his efforts to bring about comparability in salaries as compared with private industry for the great majority of employees, and holding the line against the threats of inflation at the same time. Our people know what inflation is—they have lived with it for many years. Although we would be assured of another increase sooner if runaway inflation were to come, we don't want the increase that way. It is better for us to keep up the purchasing power of our dollars than it is to have the dollars increased only to fall short again by the time we receive the increase. So we can speak for all retirees and their dependents and survivors when we declare in favor of the President's campaign against inflation. At the same time, we do not think that adding 5 percent to the employee and retiree benefit package, only to correct gross inequities, would contribute to inflation.

Furthermore, we point to one statement in the report of the President's Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems, that such systems should be equitable and just. We cannot see anything equitable or just in the requirement that those who retired after dedicated careers years ago when salaries were smaller must now continue to pay up to 10 times as much for survivor protection as compared with persons retiring today, and still be unable to provide as high a percentage of survivor benefits. We cannot see how it is equitable or just to correct inequities in the Foreign Service retirement system and refuse to correct the same kind of inequities in the civil service retirement system. Equity and justice should never be denied because costs are involved, but here we find that the costs are very moderate, and we do not see any reason for further delay of these necessary corrections.

We plead for provisions to be incorporated in the bill that you will report out after these hearings, (1) to require the recomputation of annuities of all retired employees who retired on or after April 1, 1948, and prior to October 11, 1962, and who elected annuity reductions in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, under the more liberal formula enacted in section 1103 of Public Law 87–793, which is now applied to the annuities of employees who retired on and after October 11, 1962, and (2) to increase by 10 percent the annuities of spouse survivors of all former employees who died or retired prior to October 11, 1962, and the annuities of those who in the future may become spouse survivors of employees who retired prior to October 11, 1962. These two provisions would go a long way to establish equity and justice of survivor annuities and costs in the civil service retirement system, and with the Foreign Service retirement system.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear. We will be glad to try to answer any questions that you may have.

Washington Report of Hon. Lester L. Wolff to Third Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include my most recent Washington report to residents of the Third Congressional District of New York:

Dear Friend: As your representative in Congress, I feel that it is vital to keep you advised of important bills and projects which can affect you and your family. For your convenience, I have taken the liberty of condensing the information on six subjects. If you prefer a more detailed report on any, I would be happy to comply with your request.

APOLLO MOON PROJECT

On February 16 of this year, after little more than 1 year's effort on the Space Committee, I was pleased to announce the largest single contract ever awarded by NASA to produce the lunar excursion module (LEM), $1 billion contract, awarded to our own Long Island Grumman Aircraft of Bethpage.

What LEM means to Long Island

This means more business, more work for residents of the Third Congressional District. Another ancillary benefit accomplished by the LEM contract, is that more and more of the Nation's space effort's highly technical aspects will be concentrated in our area. This is another step toward making Long Island the eastern space center of the United States. We look forward to the building of a space center of related industries and also a greater diversification of present defense industries.

I am working together with others who feel strongly that we must create a solid economic foundation for the business stability of Nassau. Too many years have gone by with little or no attention to this problem. In the past year it has been shown that aggressiveness and coordinated planning can alleviate a major portion of the economic dislocation we have suffered in the past.

NEW GI BILL

This past November I visited Vietnam (at my own expense) for the third time in 16 months. I toured the combat areas and visited the hospitals and various troop encampments with my distinguished colleague, Representative Olin Teague, of Texas, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. During our many conversations with the young men we met, and after reviewing some of their concerns for the future, Representative Teague and I felt that a new GI bill was needed. Upon returning to Washington, we prepared the legislation. I am pleased to be able to report that as coauthor of this bill, I was called to the White House to witness President Johnson signing into law this measure that will aid thousands of our young men who have served both in combat and in times of peace. They will now receive the benefits they so richly deserve. We have available an analysis of these benefits for anyone desiring them.

CONSERVATION

Many years ago I brought my family to Nassau County because we wanted to live in a "countrified" environment. Today, we are faced with the problem of halting the onrush of bulldozers and dredges which are quickly changing the face of the entire area. Air and water pollution have also become increasing menaces. Because of deep concern about these problems, I introduced in the past session of Congress legislation, H.R. 11557, calling for a comprehensive study of the Long Island Sound shores so that we may stop indiscriminate destruction of our homes and set up a master plan to preserve as much of the natural beauty as possible while encouraging progress.

We have made progress

Conferences have been held with Congressman Wayne Aspinall, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to arrange for hearings on this subject. These hearings are now being scheduled and when the dates are announced, those who are interested are invited to attend or submit statements.

I have also requested on-site inspection visits to our shoreline areas by qualified people. Chairman Aspinall has also requested reports from the Departments of Interior, Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget. I will be glad to send copies of the bill to any interested individual or organization. The backbone of this conservation effort to save the urban character of our land in Nassau will be strengthened by your support and active participation.

PET PROTECTION BILL

There has been much interest of recent date over the protection of our pets. In 1965 I introduced legislation, H.R. 9875, making it a Federal offense to transport, sell, and handle dogs and cats inhumanely.

Hearings were held in Washington the week of March 7 on my bill and an approved version should be reported out shortly.

CIVILIAN AIR ACADEMY

This Nation today faces a shortage of 1,800 commercial pilots. With the ever increasing need and the advent of highly sophisticated supersonic and V/STOL aircraft, the number of pilots now being trained by the Air Force and commercial airlines falls very short of our country's needs. I have, therefore, initiated plans calling for the establishment of a Civilian Air Academy similar to the Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy, which would be a 4-year Federal college devoted to the training of civilians to maintain American air supremacy.

AN INDUSTRIAL AND BUSINESS CONTRACT PROCUREMENT WORKSHOP

In an effort to broaden the base of industrial recovery on Long Island, I have initiated a procurement contract workshop which will meet for the purpose of advising industry in our area of the proper procedures for obtaining a larger share of available government contracts. Ever mindful that industry must not be dependent upon Government as their sole source of business, I believe it important that I do, however exert every effort to help the local industry get their just share of available Government contracts. There will be about 21 Federal procurement agencies, many brought here from Washington to this workshop. They will explain the "hows" and "whys" of Government contract competition. I invite all who are in business on Long Island to join at this session to help business help itself. Please call my office for further details.

Coming to Washington?

Need any information?

If my office can be of service to, or if you have any suggestions how I can better serve you, please contact me.

Washington office: Longworth Building, room 1629, Washington, D.C., phone 225-5956.

Regional office: 156A Main Street, Port Washington, phone 767-4343.

Regional office: 333 North Broadway, Jericho, phone 681-4120.

Area office: Glen Cove Post Office, Glen Cove, phone 676-9300.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Your Congressman.

"Nation Guides Its Economic Destiny With Prudent Fiscal Management"—Secretary Fowler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, has given a most learned and informed analysis of economic growth in a speech before the recent National Home Loan Bank Board Conference in Washington, D.C.

Secretary Fowler points out that in sustaining the current record economic prosperity, "we have come to know and to understand the use of fiscal measures, expenditures, and tax reduction to give the economy that extra sense of trust and healthy climate of confidence necessary to continuing growth and expansion."

Under unanimous consent, I include the speech in the Appendix of the RECORD because of its interest to my colleagues and to the American people:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Chairman Horne, gentlemen, here, among so many old friends and colleagues, both in public and private life, I would like to share with you for a few minutes some of the problems we have in Treasury.

Recently a noted newspaper editor commented on the Treasury and its Secretaries. "With rare exceptions," he said, "Secretaries of the Treasury go on to oblivion. If things go well with the Nation's finances, somebody gets the credit; if they go wrong, the man in the counting house gets the blame. In most administrations, the Treasury Secretary is not only unremembered but unnoticed, unheard, and unloved." In referring to me and the frustrations of the job, the writer observed that conceivably mine "could be the hapless term in which the roof falls in, and it certainly won't be repaired unless he has the courage to say no to fiscal shiftlessness, which won't make him popular. His consolation, if that's the word, is that succeed or fail, hardly anyone will remember him. The counting house is no place to seek fame or glory."

But I doubt if anyone, whether he is called Secretary of the Treasury or Chancellor of the Exchequer, enters the counting house seeking either fame or glory. When England's Chancellor of the Exchequer, Jim Callaghan, was recently here conferring with me on problems of the pound, the first question he was asked after speaking at the Press Club was this: "How do you explain, Mr. Chancellor, that an Irishman named Callaghan from a Welsh district is in the House of Commons?" Without hesitating, the Chancellor replied: "That's our way of getting back at the brutal British."

The Chancellor was also asked why it was that the British Empire 50 years ago did not have a balance-of-payments problem when its empire extended throughout the world and the sun never set upon it. After a moment's deliberation, Mr. Callaghan replied: "There were no balance-of-payments problems 50 years ago because we had on balance-of-payments statistics." Secretaries of the Treasury and Chancellors of the Exchequer, alike, can be forgiven a nostalgic thought as to how it must have been in simpler times.

Fortunately, today's flood of statistical information not only highlights problems, but also measures our successes. One heartening success in recent years is seeing a revitalized and dynamic American economy performing once again close to its full potential.

A few years ago we used to hear about the European "economic miracle." The reason for this, you will recall, was that the rate of growth in Western Europe's industrialized countries and in Japan far exceeded our rate of growth in the 1950's. From 1953 through 1960, the growth rate in the European countries was around 5 percent, and Japan did even better. During the same period, the economic growth rate of the United States was a relatively disappointing 2.4 percent annual average. When, as Under Secretary of the Treasury, I went to the first meeting of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in November of 1961, the U.S. delegation proposed that the industrialized nations of the Atlantic Community—Japan was not then, but is now, a member of OECD—adopt a common goal of 50 percent economic growth during the 1960's. The only real concern voiced at the meeting in Paris, in adopting that target, was whether or not the U.S. economy with its slow rate of advance would pull the rest of the free world down or whether we would be able to hold up our share.

Well, in the last few years, we've come to hear about the "American miracle." In 1965, our rate of growth was about 5.5 percent, and averaged 4.5 percent from 1960 to 1965. Western European countries and Japan, on the other hand, according to a recent assessment by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, may have a 1965 rate of growth around 3.5 percent. Vigorous U.S. growth during the entire 1960-65 period has been a key factor helping the OECD as a group to meet, and even exceed at mid-decade, the growth target that seemed so ambitious in 1961.

This same progress has presented us domestically with an entirely new economic environment, a new set of problems. In a sense, most of our past economic experience had been something like riding the roller coaster—up, down, up and down. The aims of economic policy had been largely concerned with how do we go up and keep going up, then, once we start down, how do we pull ourselves out of the dip and get back up again. But, now in the 1960's, we have made steady expansion the aim of economic policy, and demonstrated how it can be done. For 5 years, the economy has been moving upwards. The gap between supply and demand is at its narrowest point since the days of World War II and, for a brief period, during the 1951-52 era. The problem we now face is a relaatively new one for us. The problem is whether we'll have the knowledge, capacity, restraint, and discipline that will be required to keep the economy moving ahead in a noninflationary expansion.

During the current expansion, we have come to know and to understand the use of fiscal measures, expenditures, and tax reduction to give the economy that extra sense of thrust and healthy climate of confidence necessary to continuing growth and expansion.

The various fiscal measures that we have employed—the liberalization of depreciation, the Revenue Act of 1962 with its investment tax credit, the Revenue Act of 1964, and the Excise Tax Act of 1965—have resulted in removing from the private enterprise economy the annual weight of about $20 billion of taxes, at this year's level of incomes. During this period since fiscal 1961 when annual tax reductions have amounted to $20 billion, the actual increase in annual revenues because of an expanding economy amounts to $21 billion. Now these two facts standing together take on added significance when you realize that in the preceding 5 years, when there were no substantial tax reductions, the revenue increase was substantially less. In fact, it was less than half of the $21 billion increase in revenue that we've had in the past 5 years—an increase, I want to reemphasize—that accompanied a $20 billion tax reduction.

Now, I would like to say a word about expenditures during this same period, and I want to focus directly on the last 3 years. There is an illusion that's going around the country—another myth. You read in some of the papers that there has been a lot of profligate expenditure. Let me tell you what the real facts are since President Lyndon Johnson has been in the White House.

When President Johnson took over in 1963 after the tragic death of President Kennedy, the estimate for the 1964 budget was $98.8 billion. By the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1964, the expenditure level had been held down to $97.7 billion, over $1 billion less than the January estimate. And then you will recall that to everyone's surprise, the President unveiled a 1965 fiscal budget with estimated expenditures of $97.9 billion, rather than the considerably more that had been expected. And, by the close of fiscal year 1965, which ended last June 30, the actual expenditure level was $96.5 billion—almost $1.5 billion less than the January estimate.

Last January, President Johnson projected an expenditure level in the administrative budget of $99.7 billion. Had it not been for the $4.7 billion additional expenditure, which is the special costs of Vietnam in this fiscal year, and some $2 billion of uncontrollable expenditures, which the President didn't ask for but were imposed upon the budget by actions of the Congress and by the increase in interest charges on the public debt, the current budget for this fiscal year would be well within the $99.7 billion range. Moreover, we would have ended this fiscal year on June 30 at about that level.

For the nearly 3 fiscal years President Johnson has been in charge, expenditures in the administrative budget would have increased less than $900 million, had it not been for the unavoidable cost increases in Vietnam and the uncontrollable cost increases just mentioned. This should be compared with the average rate of increase in expenditures in the preceding 10 years of $3 billion annually. As a consequence, when we were confronted by the situation of last July and the President announced to the world the underlying reasons why we had to live up to our commitments in South Vietnam and increase our efforts there, we had a solid financial base from which to operate.

I know you've had the pleasure this morning of hearing from our colleague Charles Schultze, Director of the Budget. He told you about the $112.8 billion of expenditures estimated for this coming year's fiscal 1967 budget. Some of you are asking in your own mind "where is that money coming from?" Well, I've thought about this too over the last few months. One part of it is fairly clear. In 1965 we had an expansion of just over $47 billion in our gross national product. We have grown from about a $504 billion gross national product in the first quarter of 1961 to a rate of more than $695 billion in the last quarter of 1965. If this thrust continues, and there is no reason why it shouldn't, we could expect a very substantial growth in revenues.

Now against the $112.8 billion of anticipated expenditures, and after conservative estimation of anticipated receipts, the President had three choices: He could have gone along with a deficit of something over $6 billion—$6.5 to $6.6 billion—he could have cut back substantially some of the new programs that he had already cut back in a very substantial way; or he could have asked for an increase in the rates of income tax on individuals and corporations. He did none of those three things. He decided to raise the money rather than face the deficit, but he decided to do it in a manner that would not involve an increase in the income tax rates or the final tax liabilities of any individual or business in the United States.

He followed the policies which the Congress had adopted, of putting the taxpayers—personal and corporate—on a pay-as-you-go basis, by proposing graduated withholding for the individual, current payment of social security taxes by the self-employed, and a speedup in the accelerated corporation-tax-payments plan adopted by Congress in the 1964 Revenue Act. This latter system had already been scheduled to bring larger corporations to a pay-as-you-go basis by 1970; now it would occur by 1967. The President also asked Congress to defer for 2 years just two of the excise taxes—automobiles and telephones—that Congress had already decided to remove on a graduated basis.

The revenue increases from all those measures during fiscal 1967 would be $4.8 billion, which would bring us to a revenue estimate of $111 billion. This would reduce the administrative budget deficit to $1.8 billion in fiscal 1967 from the $6.4 billion estimated for fiscal 1966.

Now, the President has made it quite clear in his state of the Union message, his economic report, and his budget message that this is the way we see our requirements today through the fiscal period 1967, insofar as Secretary McNamara and his colleagues in the Defense Department can foresee. But we cannot foresee the unforeseeable. If there are increased requirements beyond those predicted today, or if the economy should be overstrained by the requirements placed upon it, the President has left no doubt that there will have to be further fiscal actions to keep the economy on an even keel. This, however, is not entirely a problem for Government. It is also a very important problem for the private sector of our economy.

Our most serious economic challenge in 1966 will be to preserve the essential stability of costs and prices which has contributed so significantly to the very balanced economic progress that I have outlined. Not only have we grown faster than our friends and allies in other countries, but our price level has been far more stable than that of any other industrialized country in the free world. A good deal of this has been due to the voluntary discipline that leaders of business and leaders of labor have imposed upon their own operations pursuant, not in any hard and precise way, but, nonetheless, pursuant to the administration's guideposts for noninflationary price and wage behavior. Now these guideposts are not Government law or fiat. The Government does not have direct wage or price control authority and does not want it. It is striving by every device it can to avoid any necessity for it.

I think we should look at the situation this way: every businessman and every leader of labor must recognize that every decision he makes or influences regarding prices and wages, particularly in the economic situation I have described where we are relatively close to capacity output, affects not only the wages of his union members and the returns of his stockholders, but it also affects every American. As President Johnson said in his economic message: "Shortsighted pursuit of short-run interests fails in the longer run to advance the interests of either labor or management. And it surely does not advance the interests of the Nation." The President has also said that he is confident that the overwhelming majority of private decisions in 1966 will be sound and responsible. I think we all share that confidence.

Now, with the additional costs of Vietnam, which add up to about $10.5 billion more for fiscal 1966 and for fiscal 1967 than we had counted on a year ago, I think it's readily apparent that we've got to keep a very close watch for inflationary pressures where and when they develop. As the President pointed out in his 1966 economic report, the extent of the fiscal or monetary restraint that will be needed to avoid inflationary pressures will depend directly on the restraint and moderation exercised by those who have power over wages and prices.

I have discussed these issues with you at some length because I think it helps to cut through the fog that shrouds much of the public discussion of such questions as "will the Government go for tax increases later this year or next year or at some other time?" As I said earlier, we can't foresee the unforeseeable with respect to Vietnam, but we all can play a very direct role in finding the right answers in both the public and the private sectors of the economy. Those right answers will permit us to maintain the healthy, well-balanced, economic growth pattern that we have now, and the sort of well-balanced, healthy economic pattern that we want to have when we have resolved the problem of Vietnam and we can return once again with our full national attention addressed to developing a truly Great Society.

Thank you.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	2500 Virginia Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4606 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 113 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Bicentennial Anniversary of Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution adopted at the 1965 convention of the Communications Workers of America to plan for bicentennial observations of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

I feel that the interest of the Communications Workers in planning a fitting commemoration of this important landmark in our Nation's history deserves our attention.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 27A-65-18, BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

The signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, not only marked a turning point in the history of the Nation which has since become the United States of America, but it also marked a decisive and dramatic moment in the history of the entire world.

The ringing words of this famed document signaled the call to arms which led to the founding of a new and great nation. It also sounded the death knell for the long era of colonial expansion in the Western Hemisphere by the nations of Europe. Even today, the historical process begun on July 4, 1776, is continuing in other parts of the world where old colonial structures are crumbling and new and dynamic countries are being born.

In a few years we will have reached the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. It would be fitting that the year 1976 be devoted to a yearlong observation of the bicentennial anniversary of this important date in world history.

Like the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence is a document revered throughout the world. We would do well to show the world that its words are deeply honored today in the Nation in which it was signed nearly 2 centuries ago.

This Nation recently gave impressive observation to the centennial anniversary of the Civil War. Countless new histories and studies of this period were published. Battles were reenacted. Fitting ceremonies were held at such places as Gettysburg and Appomattox.

These observations, which were well planned and coordinated, made an important contribution to our awareness and understanding of that chapter in our Nation's history.

A carefully planned bicentennial observation of the signing of the Declaration of Independence could serve a similar and equally important function, reminding the entire world of the Nation's revolutionary heritage through which our freedom was won and our nationhood was established.

The full-scale observation of this 200th anniversary will require much study and preparation. Although the anniversary is still 11 years off, it is by no means too early to begin laying the groundwork for its observation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this 1965 convention of the Communications Workers of America urges that plans and study begin as soon as possible to prepare for the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

CWA firmly believes a nationwide campaign to win congressional approval for the establishment of a commission to undertake this important project is in order.

As loyal, patriotic, and proud Americans, the members of this union pledge themselves to play their part in such a program so that this important historical anniversary will receive the honor it so richly deserves.

Senator Robert C. Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia, distinguished himself during his service in the U.S. House of Representatives, and following his election to the U.S. Senate, he has proved himself to be one of the most effective Senators ever produced by the State of West Virginia.

He is one of the most progressive Senators ever to honor our home State in the august Chamber of the other body.

His performance as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia has been the most outstanding leadership ever afforded to the residents of our Nation's Capital. Yet, a blind and unthinking minority has felt complete unrestraint in launching vicious attacks against this outstanding, hardworking, and brilliant man.

The people of West Virginia, however, as I am sure is the case with the majority of the residents of the District of Columbia, recognize the unjustness of these attacks against BOB BYRD as evidenced by an editorial which appeared in the March 21, 1966, issue of the Sunset News-Observer of my home city of Bluefield, W. Va.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with the Members of the Congress this editorial, which recognizes the stature of this dedicated statesman:

BYRD, SNCC, AND CLERGY

We have commented in this space before about the problems West Virginia's Democratic Senator ROBERT C. BYRD has encountered in his position as chairman of the U.S. Senate's Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

Recently he has been having new troubles in this thankless job. Because of his long and effective effort to clean up welfare abuses in the Nation's Capital, he is being viciously attacked and vilified by leaders of the "Free D.C. Movement," an activity of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, SNCC for short, which seeks home rule for the District.

A scurrilous handbill has been distributed by this group against Senator BYRD, Congressman JOHN W. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina, and a figure labeled "D.C. Power Structure." The three are pictured pulling chains tightly about the neck of a Negro figure.

"Who keeps D.C. in chains?" the inflammatory poster asks. BYRD is accused in its text of "keeping children hungry" and sending welfare investigators into homes "in the middle of the night violating the rights of our women."

What the Senator has done among many other things, of course, is to crack down on the practice of some women of bearing illegitimate children as a means of gaining additional welfare payments.

For this and his other cleanup efforts he has also been bitterly assailed in so-called liberal newspaper and magazine articles, he has been threatened by pickets and demonstrators, and, we are sorry to say, denounced by some clergymen.

He hasn't backed up an inch. Instead he has gone on the offensive against his attackers. In a recent statement on the floor of the Senate he said leaders in the Free D.C. Movement indicate that "a campaign of extortion, intimidation, and coercion will be leveled against all businessmen and merchants—large and small, Negro and white—who refuse to sign the (mayor-council form of government) petition and place cold cash in the hands of the committee."

Leaders of SNCC are seeking $100,000 for their war chest and have threatened a boycott of all stores and businesses that won't contribute or go along with their plans.

In other words, BYRD said, "while the leaders of this movement speak of the right to vote, they publicly deny the individual merchant's right to his own opinion about home rule." This threat, he added, "is ominously reminiscent of Los Angeles."

Noting that SNCC charges the District has "lousy schools," BYRD said it chooses to say nothing of the 27,689 windowpanes smashed in D.C. schools by rock throwers last year, the replacement of which cost the taxpayers $112,868.

But what should "cause serious soul searching," the Senator said, "is the support given to such an irresponsible, questionable, and dangerous movement by certain members of the clergy."

He referred specifically to a statement in the press which quoted Suffragen Episcopal Bishop Paul Moore, Jr., as saying he was "sorry that this kind of militancy is necessary," but that all other means of dealing with the problem had failed.

"In other words," BYRD commented, "you do what he directs or he will apply militancy tactics. This does not sound like the religious leadership, understanding, and tolerance that give significance to our Christian inheritance."

The demand for $100,000 from D.C. stores with the threat of an economic boycott "constitutes nothing short of a high-handed shakedown," BYRD said, adding that those who do not honestly believe home rule to be the best solution for Washington's troubles "may get their windows smashed."

Not every Senator is willing to lay it on the line like that. That's why our respect for BOB BYRD continues to grow. In a disagreeable task that has nothing to do with West Virginia, but one that has to be done nevertheless, he is doing what he always does—a conscientious job without fear of the consequences.

Reasonable and responsible people of whatever political persuasion admire him for it.

Correct Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News comments editorially on the thesis that while containment of Red China is essential, it would be desirable to end China's isolation from the family of mankind.

The paper believes:

> The reexamination of American policy is all to the good if it illuminates the difficulties standing in the way of a change in American-Chinese relations as well as the desirability of such a change.

The editorial on "The Unreachable Dragon" sheds light on a timely matter of great concern to us all, and believing that others will want to peruse its contents, I offer the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

THE UNREACHABLE DRAGON

It is still uncertain whether the reexamination of U.S. policy toward Red China foreshadows a shift in that policy. Some shift of emphasis is evident, however, in the attention paid the hearings last week before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and in the weekend statements of Vice President HUMPHREY. HUMPHREY appeared at least to adopt the thesis that while containment of Red China is essential, it would be desirable to end China's isolation from the "family of mankind."

Peking's answer was prompt and ugly. The Communist Party publication Jenmin Jih Pao said HUMPHREY offered a "kiss of Judas" that "cannot fail to disgust the Chinese people."

This exchange should dispel any illusions that Red China is ripe for offers of friendship, or that dealing with Peking on any rational terms will be easy. The reasons for treating Mao Tse-tung and his crowd as outlaws are still valid, and underlined by every move and statement Peking makes.

But an outlaw that already has some nuclear capability and is rapidly expanding in that field cannot be ignored. If it is true that the United States and Red China are on a collision course, a change of course by one or the other or both is imperative.

While the experts differ on how to "contain" China, there is essential agreement that this phase of our effort is correct. The main drive for a shift of course on our part will come, then, as it applies to isolating Red China. The suggestion is increasingly heard that we welcome Peiping into the United Nations, and perhaps work toward diplomatic recognition of the Communist regime.

But to do either would mean abandoning the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa, whose cause we have espoused since the Communist takeover on the mainland. Even if, in the long run, Nationalist China should weaken in its contention that it is the lawful ruler of all China, there is no sign that Peking will abandon its claim to Formosa.

It is this issue, more than any other, that has isolated Red China. In the periodic Warsaw talks between representatives of the United States and Red China, nothing of substance is talked about because Peking sets as a precondition our abandonment of the Chiang Kai-shek government on Formosa. In short, the isolation of Red China is largely of Peiping's own making, and Mao seems to prefer it that way.

There is, in fact, much internal benefit to Peking in its hostility toward the United States. As long as the people can be persuaded that the United States is a mortal enemy, the Government has a lever for making them work harder to build up the Communist state. A show of friendship on the part of the United States clearly calls for fast rebuttal such as that directed at Vice President HUMPHREY.

The reexamination of American policy is all to the good if it illuminates the difficulties standing in the way of a change in American-Chinese relations as well as the desirability of such a change. But it is hardly a time for believing that a few kind words or simply wishing for better relations will bring them about.

The Question of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following article on Vietnam which appeared in the February 4, 1966, issue of the Weekly Nation, one of the foremost magazines of the Philippines. It presents a view of the Vietnamese conflict from a nation that has long been a stanch friend.

The article follows:

THE QUESTION OF VIETNAM

(By O. S. Villadolid)

(NOTE.—We have chosen the path of helping an ally fight in a war that is as much to the interest of the Philippines as it is to the free world.. The alternative, which is to disengage completely from the Vietnam conflict, is unthinkable.)

"As far as I am concerned," said President Marcos last week, "the Philippines is already involved in the war in Vietnam."

Meeting newsmen at Malacañang, Mr. Marcos said all that has to be decided is what kind of aid to send the South Vietnamese: Engineers? Combat troops? Engineers guarded by combat troops? The President, who is also commander in chief of the armed forces, underscored that the very presence of a Filipino contingent in Vietnam reveals involvement of the Philippines in the Vietnamese war. "The Philippine colors are showing in South Vietnam," he said.

Indeed, as debate over expanded Philippine assistance to South Vietnam headed for early consensus, the question may well be asked: Are we or are we not involved on the side of the free world in the war in Vietnam? The view of the President represents one side. The other side, shared by exponents of noninvolvement in the "dirty" war next door, maintains the fine distinction that Filipinos are merely engaged in humanitarian efforts and warns that dispatch of combat engineers will automatically involve the Philippines in the Vietnam war.

In a very real sense, President Marcos upholds a point of view which commonsense dictates. This can best be illustrated by the case of a Filipino aid official last year in Vietnam who, caught by the Vietcong guerrillas during a raid, raised his hands in surrender and asked that his life be spared because he was engaged in humanitarian work.

"I am a Filipino," he was reported to have said. But the Vietcong raiders shot him just the same. His body was found riddled with bullets—and his throat slit.

NO EXCEPTION

This is the grim reality of any war, and Vietnam is not an exception. While many of us would wish to think that our "no-involvement" in Vietnam could save our men, the ugly reality is that men and nations on opposite sides of the ideological fence are locked in a bitter, desperate struggle in Vietnam for supremacy in Asia. It is a war where the doctrine of Mao Tse-tung's "protracted struggle" through wars of national liberation is meeting its severest test, the outcome of which holds untold consequences for the remaining free countries in the Asian rimland and in southeast Asia. It is not difficult to imagine what the stakes are. Vietnam, a chunk of the former French colony of Indochina, forms an indispensable part of the rice bowl of Asia. It has, for centuries, been the gateway to southeast Asia, where conquering armies, the most recent being the Japanese, passed to bring Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, the Philippines and the Pacific islands near Australia down to their knees. With its archipelagoes, southeast Asia abounds with rich natural resources which any ambitious nation must covet to hold power. Geographically, its strategic importance cannot be overlooked. For it dominates the gateway between the Pacific and Indian Oceans, flanking the Indian subcontinent on one side and Australia and New Zealand on the other. Indeed, the loss of southeast Asia to communism would upset the balance of power against the free world in this area. And South Vietnam's loss would not only make defense of the rest of southeast Asia very costly but unmanageable.

REPERCUSSIONS OF FALL

The importance of South Vietnam to Philippine national security can best be appreciated in the light of the assessment of the recently concluded chiefs of mission conference. The envoys agreed that Philippine defenses against communism would be weakened by South Vietnam's fall, that a Communist victory in that area would encourage the Communists to step up subversion of free governments in southeast Asia, including the Philippines, and that the presence of Asian troops would help win support for South Vietnam. No less than President Marcos, in an interview with the Weekly Nation, said that the Philippine people have a big stake in South Vietnam. "For this reason, the Philippines should participate more actively in cooperation with the free world in stemming the tide of communism in that part of the world," the President said. Obviously to underscore his point beyond equivocation, Mr. Marcos said that "at this stage, I believe that the Philippines should take active part in the Vietnam war, and I intend to convene the council of leaders to resolve dispassionately the pressing need for a more active Philippines role in the protracted struggle for supremacy between our free way of life and the Communist ideology in Vietnam."

What the Philippines will finally give to South Vietnam as expanded assistance is a big question. The South Vietnamese Government has a year-old request for an engineer battalion with its own security support involving 2,000 men. But Senator Jovito Salonga, back from a trip to South Vietnam, announced a desire of Saigon's head of state, Lt. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, for more medical and civic action teams. In this light, President Marcos has correctly decided to send a Philippine survey mission to Vietnam to ascertain what the Saigon government really needs from the Philippines in the anti-Communist struggle.

CAMPAIGN DAMPENED

Dispatch of the mission has dampened a well-organized campaign here of misinformation against the sending of any form of additional assistance to the beleaguered South Vietnamese. Charging that the administration had a commitment with the United States to send combat troops, outspoken advocates of noninvolvement, most of whom are pressing for neutralism in foreign policy here, said President Marcos was doing the bidding of the "dirty American imperialists" to fight in the "senseless American war." "The Marcos administration finds itself locked between the horns of a dilemma," proclaims the propaganda line of the neutralists. They argued that Mr. Marcos' dilemma was "whether to send some 2,000 combat engineers to Vietnam and so please the Americans that they will readily provide this country with a badly needed stabilization loan, or refuse to do so and incur the displeasure of the Americans." This line conveniently obscures the fact that the South Vietnamese themselves have not asked for combat troops from the Philippines, but merely engineers who would help in repairing broken bridges, destroyed schoolhouses and construction of various public works projects vital to the civic-action phase of the anti-Communist campaign.

The resort to obscurantism is not without basis. The idea is to secure early polarization on the hazardous Vietnam problem. By insisting, through false representations, that Philippine combat troops have been promised on pressure from the United States to withhold economic assistance, the neutralists had hoped to draw severe public reaction to their cause of preventing any dispatch of additional help to the South Vietnamese. The maneuver aimed to bring back memories of parity, in which Filipinos, economically prostrate after World War II, allowed their constitution to be amended giving Americans equal share in the exploitation of their national patrimony. To bolster public hatred, the proneutralists went even to the extent of utilizing a top secret document containing the working draft of the chiefs of mission conference 4 weeks ago to mislead the public into believing that even those in the high echelons of government oppose the sending of combat troops to South Vietnam. Mislabeling the working draft as a preliminary report to the President, the proneutralists insisted on the existence of a consensus against troop commitments. Actually, the consensus was in favor of expanding Philippine assistance to Vietnam and that if congress should decide on sending troops, the Philippines must shoulder their keep to uphold national dignity.

CORRECT PERSPECTIVE

The report of the survey mission to visit South Vietnam is expected to set in correct perspective the debate raging on the burning question of combat troops. It is not impossible that the Saigon Government, as contended by Senator Salonga, will now prefer additional medical and civic action teams from the Philippines. If this should happen, there will be little argument even in the Senate where the sentiment is overwhelmingly in favor of technical and economic assistance. The pro-neutralists will, naturally, complain for it is their goal to prevent the sending of any form of assistance to the South Vietnamese. But a real problem will arise if the Saigon Government should insist on troop commitments, even on a token basis. It will arise not so much from a desire to concentrate on noncombatants, but from the lack of funds with which to support an expenditionary force. It is possible that the Philippines will allow the United States to bear the expenses, as she did during the Korean war and in the Congo action. But the inhibiting factor is that both actions were under the auspices of the United Nations.

This, then, is the dilemma for the Philippines on Vietnam. For we have chosen the path of helping an ally fight a war that is as much to the national interest of the Philippines as it is to the free world. The alternative is, of course, unthinkable. It is to disengage completely from the Vietnam conflict and avoid any involvement whatsoever. This will mean that the government shall have changed one of its basic postulates in foreign policy: commitment to the cause of anti-communism. It is a situation furthest from the thinking of President Marcos. "What threatens humanity in another area," he said during his inaugural, "threatens our society as well." He added: "We cannot, therefore, merely contemplate the risks of our country without coming into any decision on our own. Wherever there is a sight for freedom we cannot remain aloof from it." The fight is—certainly—in South Vietnam.

Federal Assistance Spurs Expanded Local Action in Resource Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's land and water resources offer abundant economic opportunities if properly developed. Recognition of this has been reflected in much of the conservation legislation passed by the Congress in this decade.

Resource development in my congressional district in Oregon is a good example. The Upper Willamette resource conservation and development project is one of the first 20 such projects to be carried out as a result of legislation in 1962.

The Oregon project covers 3 million acres in four counties. It has opened many avenues for communities in the area to develop unexplored potentials of their land and water resources. The products of land-use adjustments, forest land improvement, and changes in cropping patterns will lead to the need for new manufacturing and processing enterprises. Expansion of recreation facilities, development of agricultural and municipal water supply, enhancement of wildlife, and protection of the area from crippling and costly floods will improve economic opportunities.

I have been close to this project as the local people have planned it. I have visited the area and talked to the local people. Their interest has been beyond expectation. The project has brought public and private agencies and local people together for a common purpose, and they have each contributed to planning the project. They now look forward to making the plans a reality, with each doing his part.

Stimulated by the enthusiasm of working out the plan, local people have already started many projects that require no Federal cost sharing and some that require only a small amount of technical help. I understand that the other 19 resource conservation and development projects have created this same kind of enthusiasm, with people going ahead on their own before the program actually got underway. Just the act of getting together and bringing out the potentials of the area has given them new life and new hope.

The concentration of conservation and development activities of all the public and private agencies and the local people has promoted closer working relationships among them. It has also served to inform communities of what assistance is available and how programs of the various levels of Government fit together.

I believe this group approach is an especially effective tool to resource development. It enables local people, by their own initiative, to make full use of their resources. It gives support to the concept that local people should be the mainstay of such an undertaking.

The Upper Willamette project is sponsored by six of the local soil conservation districts, which are locally formed and managed units of State government. It is an endeavor in which towns and cities and rural people are participating. When completed, the area expects a $15 million a year increase in their economy, with more than 200 new businesses in the area.

The door has been opened. These people are showing what can be done with a little help. They have my support.

Closing Ranks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article referred to previously today in my 1-minute speech:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Mar. 15, 1966]

CLOSING RANKS

The unanimous vote of 39 Governors attending a White House conference in support of President Johnson's Vietnam policies is the best indication that the administration has survived the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's intensive examination of that policy with support strengthened, if anything.

Such a conclusion is further buttressed by the latest public opinion poll which showed more than 7 to 1 approving the President's actions.

At the White House conference, the Governors were briefed on the current Vietnam situation by Mr. Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk, Defense Secretary McNamara, and military leaders. Utah's Governor Rampton, who was present, described the briefing as thorough and frank, and he said he was heartened to learn "the picture in Vietnam is a lot better than when we were here 8 months ago."

That is heartening news, although it must be tempered with the knowledge that the fighting continues viciously and costly, with no reason to hope that the end is in sight. But while public debate of American policy relative to Vietnam is fully justified when the debate ends, it is well to close ranks in the face of any enemy all too ready to interpret debate in terms of indecision and weakness.

Besides, there is work to be done in Washington—and it is good to have Majority Leader MANSFIELD report that after the weeks of debate, Congress is now "getting into the groove."

Tobacco Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 of this year, the Department of Agriculture held a referendum to determine the standards for tobacco allotments for 1966.

The tobacco growers in my district and in the State of Tennessee voted overwhelmingly against the acreage-poundage program, advocated by the Department of Agriculture.

Because of their negative vote, which I wholeheartedly supported, most of the tobacco growers will now receive a 15-percent reduction in acreage, which they did not want. The tobacco farmers would have preferred that the standards remain the same as they were for 1965.

I do not feel that any cut is justified, and the Department of Agriculture should leave the allotments as they are.

I am hopeful that, in the future, we can prevent the Department of Agriculture from blackmailing our tobacco growers by supposedly giving them a choice, but in actuality, forcing them to take a stand that can do nothing but hurt them.

I insert at this point in the RECORD two editorials, commenting on the meaning of this vote:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, Mar. 12, 1966]

BLOW FOR FREEDOM

Burley tobacco growers emphatically rejected in their vote this week a proposal by the Department of Agriculture that would have substituted acreage-poundage limitation for the plan long in use under which growers were free to market all the leaf they were able to raise on a fixed acreage allotment.

Having rejected the Federal agency's acreage-poundage proposal, most growers will now face a 15-percent reduction in acreage. The vote of the burley growers will be interpreted by some of us, at least, as striking a blow for freedom to the extent that this is possible under any federally imposed marketing control plan. Individual enterprise, which is to say the quality and skill devoted to the production of a burley crop, will continue to be the main factors in determining the profitability of each grower's crop.

Incidentally, a factor in this election was that a substantial number of growers already have only the minimum acreage allotment so that they will not be affected by the 15-percent cut proclaimed by the Department of Agriculture.

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle, Mar. 13, 1966]

QUITE A MESSAGE

Tennessee tobacco growers put on a display of independence last Thursday by voting against the acreage-poundage program while growers of 12 other States were voting for it.

So overwhelming was the anti sentiment in Tennessee that it swung the balance overall, and acreage-poundage failed to get the two-thirds majority it had to have.

Kentucky tobacco leaders are reported stunned, and some are saying growers in our State have "cut their own throats." They may have, at that, since many now face a slash of 15 percent on their acreage allowances. Yet in rebelling against the idea of having poundage as well as acreage controlled, Tennessee growers undoubtedly were showing their weariness over controls in general. And in doing that, they have achieved some personal satisfaction if nothing else.

Acreage-poundage may have been just what the doctor ordered, but the individual farmer in Tennessee is chafing under the doctor's continued ordering and prescribing without being requested to do so by the patient. That, we think, is the meaning of the heavy negative vote (6 to 1), and we hope the message gets through.

Meanwhile, the efforts of all concerned should be directed toward making the present program work. If changes are needed, there will be another day and another vote and another decision. That is the American way.

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to require local public housing agencies to ignore certain income in computing income levels and resultant rent levels for tenants in federally aided public housing projects.

This bill would require local public housing agencies to exclude from tenants' income such part of any governmental pension increase—Federal, State, and local pensions—which the agency shall find to represent a cost-of-living increase, as well as such income as the tenant family spends for medicare coverage.

One of the greatest difficulties in public housing today is the continual readjustment of tenants' rent levels based on changing income levels. Each time a tenant's income goes up, his rent must go up.

This is particularly unfair as regards the many old people in public housing who live on small social security and other pensions. When these people receive a small pension boost, it is often to cover a rise in the cost of living or the expense of a new program like medicare. This type of pension hike should not be gobbled up in increased public housing rents.

My bill provides that the contract between the Federal Public Housing Administration and the local public housing agency must provide that in calculating tenants' income, and rentals based thereon, the public housing agency must omit the amount spent for medicare coverage and also that part of any pension increase which the agency shall find as corresponding to a rise in the cost of living.

Government pensioners living on small fixed pension incomes have it hard enough in these inflationary days without having to see any cost-of-living pension hike they get eaten up by rent boosts. My bill would keep cost-of-living pension hikes and boosts to cover medicare expenses from being counted in income so as to cause public housing rent rises. I think that this exclusion is in the true spirit of the public housing program.

Some Ideas Are Unreal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Joliet (Ill.) Herald-News, Mar. 8, 1966]

SOME IDEAS ARE UNREAL

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—When I listen to George F. Kennan and Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, CHURCH, and ROBERT KENNEDY, I wonder if they live on the same planet, if they have seen this 20th-century world in which we toil.

Let's concentrate on Kennan. His views expressed before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee make me wonder if he has found an island or an ivory tower where facts and events never intrude on his philosophical notions of communism.

Here is an example of Kennan's views on Cuba, taken from the record of the hearings:

"Mr. KENNAN. A great many Americans are concerned, for example, about Castro in Cuba, and at times they have had good reasons to be, and I do not for a moment underestimate the seriousness of the crisis we faced there some years ago.

"But it does seem to me that we must carefully stack up our advantages against our disadvantages in these situations. For the first time in a long, long time, someone else pays the bills in Cuba, someone else is getting milked, someone else has the problems of dealing with the Cuban regime. For once we can sit back and personally I do not think the Russians are going to have any great satisfaction out of their involvement in Cuba over the long run.

"I think they will liquidate it by themselves in the course of time."

Mr. Kennan was talking exactly 1 month after the Tri-Continental Communist Conference in Havana.

Representative Armistead Selden, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, called that conference a "Mein Kampf" of international communism.

Seven hundred and eighty-two Communist delegates and observers from 95 countries were present.

They produced what was termed by the Organization of American States a "declaration of war" against the governments of Latin America.

The U.S. representative at the OAS conference called the Havana meeting "the latest, in some respects, the most blatant and open effort of the U.S.S.R., Communist China, and Cuba * * * to extend their power and influence in the free world."

Not a word of this in Kennan's testimony. Listening to him, the conference never took place, or at least was too unimportant for comment.

On the contrary, he assured us that we can now "sit back."

"It was just a year ago," wrote the Washington Report of the American Security Council on January 17, "that the Soviet Embassy in Havana summoned Communist Party delegates from 22 countries of the Western Hemisphere to a secret conclave. Solidarity plans were mapped for fomenting revolution and guerrilla warfare in six Latin American countries and a fund of $100 million was set up to finance the objective."

Was there any mention of this in Kennan's testimony?

Not at all.

On the contrary, he rejoiced because "someone else pays the bills in Cuba." The fact that the money spent is aimed at destroying us doesn't seem to bother Kennan.

This kind of testimony from Senator Fulbright's "expert" is frightening.

McNamara—Gloom, No Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was any evidence that a credibility gap does exist today, that evidence can be found in the remarks of various Federal Government officials in recent years.

The following article published in 1965 in the New York Herald-Tribune illustrates the crisis in credibility on the part of one Government official:

McNamara—Gloom, No Doom

(Five times before, Secretary McNamara has traveled to Vietnam. Five times he has reported to the President. These are comments reported after the conclusion of each trip: "Progress in the last 8 to 10 weeks has been great * * *. The Government has asked only for logistical support." —May 1962.

("The major part of the United States military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel." —October 1963.

("We have every reason to believe that (U.S. military) plans will be successful in 1964." —December 1963.

("We are confident these plans point the way to victory." —March 1964.

("This is a war for the confidence of the people and the security of these people, and that kind of war is a long, hard war.") —May 1964.

(By the Associated Press)

Saigon.—Defense Secretary Robert McNamara said yesterday the Vietnamese situation has deteriorated in many ways in the last 15 months but "the picture is not all black."

Mr. McNamara, ending a 5-day survey of the Vietnam war, spoke at a news conference hours after Vietnamese police had seized four suspects in an apparent attempt to assassinate outgoing U.S. Ambassador Maxwell Taylor.

The Defense Secretary later flew back to Washington to report to President Johnson on his sixth trip to Vietnam since May 1962.

He refused to discuss how many American servicemen may be added to the approximately 75,000 now on duty in South Vietnam, saying: "I can only tell you that our recommendations will be directed toward fulfilling the commitment of our Nation to support the people of Vietnam in their fight to win their independence."

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, a most persistent theme of Soviet propaganda has been that in the Soviet Union racial and ethnic groups enjoy perfect freedom to pursue and develop their distinct national cultures within the framework of the Soviet system. This clever move had deceived millions of people, but all well-informed people of the free world know that it is a hoax, a mere sham. We know that what the Soviets do is almost the opposite of what they say in this as in many other respects. Not only are the nationality groups within the Soviet Union denied the freedom to follow their own national cultural, artistic and educational development, but this is also forbidden even in the allegedly sovereign Soviet satellite countries. The leaders in these countries do not even contemplate, for fear of brutal reprisals by their masters in the Kremlin, doing anything that would arouse the wrath of their Communist overlords.

The story of the Byelorussians is a case in point. These gifted and genial people, today numbering more than 10 million, have had their ups and downs in their turbulent history. In modern times theirs has been a sad and tragic lot. After enjoying relative peace and prosperity through the Middle Ages and in early modern times, their country was overrun by the Russians in the 17th century and it became part of the Russian empire. For centuries they strove to maintain their distinct national traits and national traditions . They kept alive their sentiment of nationality, and the spirit of freedom they never allowed to shrivel. And in the First World War, when the Russian empire was crushed in the Revolutions of 1917, these people saw their chance to free themselves and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918.

That memorable event took place 48 years ago. Since then untold numbers of catastrophic events have overtaken the Byelorussians, but these events have no extinguished their long-cherished spirit of national independence and freedom. Their independence lasted for about 2 years; and soon Communist Russians put an end to that, making Byelorussia a part of the Communist Soviet Union. There the Soviets imposed their rigid and inflexible tyranny, and turned the country into a large prison house. Amid all the misery and suffering prevailing there for more than four decades, it is encouraging to know that the Byelorussians still cherish their national goal, their freedom and independence. On the 48th anniversary of their independence we ardently hope that some day and soon they will cast off their Communist yoke and regain their freedom.

Rescue Service in Space?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record the following editorial from a recent edition of the New York Times, as I believe the proposal for a space rescue service merits study, as does any suggestion that would increase the safety of those intrepid men who are expanding the limit of man's understanding of the universe.

Rescue Service in Space?

American and Soviet disclosures last week of specific hazards in manned space travel have indicated at least the outlines of needed next steps in space safety.

The Gemini 8 astronauts, it has now been made clear, were in extreme peril while their capsule was rolling wildly. A short-circuit of the type that caused their plight can never be totally eliminated as a risk in the complex electronics of space. From Moscow, meanwhile, has come word that a malfunction a year ago forced two Russian cosmonauts to land in a snowbound forest far from their target area. They could not be rescued for 2 days.

No doubt, engineers will make further progress in building protective and back-up equipment to reduce the danger of breakdowns in flight. Yet, the likelihood that mishaps will occur even with the most ingenious safety system makes it desirable that consideration be given now to the practicality of organizing a space rescue service, preferably under cooperative auspices of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Its function would be to send space craft, on very short notice, to aid a space vessel marooned in orbit and incapable of returning to earth under its own power. In some cases the need might be for additional rocket fuel or replacement parts; in others the primary function might be to save lives by taking aboard the crew of a disabled capsule.

Man has already demonstrated that his basic capabilities in space hold out the potentiality for such an emergency road service in the heavens. He can "walk" in space; he can make precise calculations for the rendezvous and link up of space ships; with relatively little development, tow trucks of the cosmos may be a regular part of the safety arrangements for each new step on the road to the moon.

Mr. Dubinsky's Well-Earned Rest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as were his multitude of admirers and friends, I too was saddened to learn that David Dubinsky is retiring as general president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers.

The news was unexpected and constitutes a tremendous loss to the labor movement. I was saddened because of the great contribution David Dubinsky has made not only to the cause of unionism but to his country, and because it is hard to imagine the international and domestic scene without his active participation. Although no giant in physical size, he is indeed a giant among labor leaders in our country.

Of the many articles, editorials and columns I have read concerning Mr. Dubinsky's retirement, John Herling's recent column in the Washington Daily News seemed to me to express unusually well the essence of the man David Dubinsky is and the sense of loss his members and so many of his friends must feel. I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

David Dubinsky has unquestionably earned the privilege of spending his latter years in a less strenuous life, undoubtedly pursuing interests of special concern to him. It is my hope that he will continue to give to his members and the American people the benefit of his vast experience and wisdom.

Fortunately, Mr. Dubinsky's successor, Louis Stulberg, brings a wealth of experience to his new position. Happily, ILG's petite representative on Capitol Hill, Miss Evelyn Dubrow, will continue to advise us and charm us as we consider legislation of interest to her union and to the welfare of the country. In spite of her own sadness about Mr. Dubinsky's retirement, I am sure she will continue to serve well in her dedication to the principles for which he fought for so many years.

The article follows:

Dubinsky Bows Out

(By John Herling)

The announcement of the presumed retirement of David Dubinsky as general president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union comes under the head of unbelievable news.

At the age of 74 D.D. seems to be able to go on forever, with the acquiescence of members, leaders and the public itself. He has made remarkable contribution to the life of his city, State and Nation. His effectiveness in his American field of interests was matched by his ready response to international causes.

All of this comes quite naturally to him. For in his career there run the streams of several lives. First, as the young teenage revolutionary in Russian Poland, he literally fought czarist tyranny all the way to prison and worked for the unionization of workers.

When he finally escaped from the Russian police, he came to the United States in 1911, burning with zeal for carrying on the work of social justice. He did this through the Socialist Party as well as through the cutters local. Local leadership led to larger responsibility in his international union.

By the middle 1920's, he was deep in a hand-to-hand conflict with the Communists who nearly destroyed the ILGWU. If ever it could be said that history was written—or made—by survivors, it could be said of Dubinsky.

When he succeeded to union presidency in 1932, he was on the eve of yet another career: The reconstruction of his union, its enlargement of purpose, and identification with public causes. No union responded more creatively to the stimulus of Roosevelt's New Deal, whether it was through bringing coherence to a chaotic industry or by stimulating the cultural life of the country through the fantastic success of "Pins and Needles," a musical show of social significance which has become a part of the American theater tradition, or through the aggressive support of the anti-Fascist and anti-Nazi efforts at home and abroad.

He became important in and to the American labor movement. He brought to it sophistication and a sense of maneuver. He participated in the early stages of the CIO and then withdrew from it. When he and his union rejoined the A.F. of L. he became active in unifying the labor movement. By this time his friendship with F.D.R., Governor Lehman, and Mayor La Guardia moved him into the limelight which he has never shunned. Over the past three decades, his sharp jibes and shouting, ebullience have brought laughter and light to occupants of the White House as well as residents of Unity House, his union's summer resort.

We are not attempting here a comprehensive evaluation of David Dubinsky. As a man he can be generous; as a union official penny-pinching. He is by turns effervescently candid or annoyingly secretive. He fluctuates from a mood of bouncing, chassidic enthusiasm to the calculating role of a tight-lipped, cold-eyed cardplayer. His pride has often led him to excesses of affection or to ruthlessness in his relations with his colleagues. With a group of staff employees who took his organization example too literally and organized a union of their own, he became an implacable foe. But he bled a little in the process.

Above all, Mr. Dubinsky has brought elan to his many environments and his friends. His zest is infectious. If you disagree with him, he is apt to regard you as one suffering from an illness of some doubtful origin. Even when you agree with him, he expects you to agree absolutely. He won't take a mere "yes" for an answer, as some of the employers in the garment industry have learned.

Now the ILGWU will be facing real trouble—it will have to learn how to build a life without father. Most of its officials and nearly all of the union's membership have known no other president. What is certain, they will never know another such.

Export Controls on Cattle Hides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues who have expressed deep concern over an injustice to our livestock producers resulting from a Department of Commerce order imposing export controls over cattle hides.

I am no longer shocked when agriculture is singled out to take the loss in a back-door attempt to impose Federal price controls. I do wonder, however, just how long the American farmer will be able to exist on a smaller and smaller share of the consumer dollar.

In a statement presented to the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the House Agriculture Committee, I attempted to show that the entire livestock industry has been adversely affected by the export control order.

I am taking the liberty of inserting my testimony in the Record to call attention to the need for a careful reconsideration of the matter:

Statement Presented to the House Agriculture Committee, Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains, by Maston O'Neal, Member of Congress, Second District of Georgia

Mr. Chairman, like so many of my colleagues who are concerned over any development adversely affecting the American farmer, I was surprised to learn of the decision of Secretary of Commerce Connor to impose export quotas and validated license control over cattle hides.

I have been advised by a number of constituents that the order has already resulted in the reduction of prices on live cattle by the equivalent of 25 cents per hundredweight.

I am deeply concerned over the fact that our livestock producers are suffering as the result of a seemingly arbitrary decision by Secretary Connor. And I should add that the decision is totally inconsistent with previously announced departmental policies to promote the exports of livestock byproducts.

It should be pointed out that the quota does not just affect livestock producers for we do not know with certainty from where the 25 cents per hundredweight on cattle is coming. We are all representatives of consumers and should be particularly interested in the answer to such a question.

Mr. Chairman, I for one question the wisdom of imposing export controls on cattle hides when it seriously affects the entire cattle industry.

The Department of Commerce says its move was designed to check an inflationary trend in leather prices. However, I deem the move unwise and unnecessary, for we are apparently dealing with a temporary situation that should correct itself within a year or so, or perhaps less.

Evidence indicates that the increased demand for exports resulted from the serious drought in Argentina. The reduced exports of hides from Argentina are already being reversed. The South American Republic has traditionally supplied the world market with 9 to 12 million hides per year. Last year this figure was reduced to 6.7 million because of problems resulting from the drought. However, it is estimated that exports from Argentina this year will be 8 to 8½ million hides, and the figure will probably return to near normal next year.

In the meantime the United States has a golden opportunity to substantially increase exports of cattle hides this year with livestock producers and meatpackers reaping the benefits of increased world prices. In addition, a continuation of normal distribution under the free market system without export quotas will certainly prove beneficial in lowering our balance-of-payments deficit. High ranking officials in the Department of Commerce have stated that they want to encourage the export of hides to help our balance of payments. Recent action, specifically the imposition of quotas, is diametrically opposed to the lipservice on the part of certain officials.

As always, I, too, am concerned about inflation. But I am also concerned about the economy of agriculture and the development of exports. I am equally concerned about the balance of payments favoring the United States. Is it naive to think that expanded world trade is a worthwhile goal for our Nation?

If I have not misconstrued the thinking of officials in the Department of Commerce, the export quota was ostensibly imposed to hold down the cost of raw materials for domestic shoe manufacturers.

If my assumption is correct, there is no reason to believe that holding down the price of hides will hold down the price of shoes. Past experiences indicate just the opposite.

It is interesting to note that during the alltime high cattle slaughters of 1963–64, hide prices based on the 1957–59 price index of 100 were down to around 75 while leather footwear prices had risen to 108. The cost of the green hide in a pair of shoes is so little that even a sharp increase in hide prices would cause only a negligible increase in the cost of a pair of shoes. Shoe prices have increased while hide prices were going down, and manufacturers agree that 15 to 25 average pairs of shoes can be made from 1 cowhide. Although the average price on a pair of shoes is already over $10, ominous signs, supported by statements from manufacturers, point to another increase in shoe prices in the not too distant future. This is in spite of the fact that the Secretary of Commerce has taken punitive action to halt any possible threat of inflation in the tanning industry.

It is inconceivable to me that the Secretary of Commerce would impose an export quota that is of questionable advantage to domestic shoe manufacturers in holding the line on prices while it creates an economic hardship for the American farmer. The reasoning behind stealing from poor Peter to pay wealthy Paul taxes my mental capacity.

Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion the action taken by the Secretary of Commerce, with the concurrence of the Department of Agriculture, is just another sad chapter in the story of our American farmer being made the whipping boy under our economic system. Let's face the harsh facts.

A shortage of hides created by problems in Argentina caused world market prices to increase. The American cattle producer, because of adequate hide supplies in the United States, was the obvious benefactor of Argentina's unfortunate circumstances. Due to the fact that the American farmer was and is getting approximately one-half of what he was selling hides for 15 years ago, he naturally increased his exports to realize a better market price. The depressed domestic price then increased, bringing prices nearer to where they should be.

This move was interpreted by Commerce officials, at the urging of shoe manufacturers, as a sign of critical shortage, not to mention inflation. Of course, there never would be any shortage if domestic prices for hides matched world prices. We all know our producers had rather sell at home.

The remainder of the story is quit clear. The obvious solution was to restrict exports because it would hurt no one but our farmers. After all, why should a big sturdy boat be rocked when you find a little one accustomed to traveling on stormy seas? After all, who will speak up for the farmer?

Mr. Chairman, I intend to speak up for the American farmer just as you have along with many of our colleagues who understand the economic plight of rural America.

I sincerely hope that the testimony given during this hearing will convince the Secretary of Commerce that his order is definitely not in the public interest and that he will rescind his order at the earliest possible date.

Fifth Army General Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, after 36 years in the U.S. Army, Lt. Gen. Charles G. Dodge, commander of the 5th Army, will retire March 31, 1966.

Tonight in the banquet room of McCormack Place, Chicago, more than a thousand persons from more than 15 States will gather at a reception and dinner to pay special tribute to General Dodge. The occasion is one of many festivities and special ceremonies which are taking place in the Midwest this week in honor of the general.

Secretary of the Army, Stanley R. Resor, will be the guest speaker at tonight's affair which is sponsored by the Association of the U.S. Army. After his retirement from active service, General Dodge will become executive vice president of the association and will be living here in the Washington area.

Tomorrow, a final military ceremony will be held at Fort Sheridan, with an honor guard and a reception. As commander of the 5th Army, General Dodge's command covered 13 Midwestern States, all of which will be represented at the affairs tonight and tomorrow. A resident of the Fort Sheridan reservation since coming to the command in 1963, General Dodge will be leaving both his home and his work in the Midwest.

From 1930 when he graduated from the U.S. Military Academy until today, General Dodge's record has been one of steady and distinguished achievement. From a second lieutenant, his first assignment in the 3d U.S. Cavalry at Fort Ethan Allen, Vt., to commanding general, 5th U.S. Army, Chicago, in 1963, was a long road with a variety of duties and assignments. He served in the European Theater of operations in World War II, as chief of staff of the 8th Armored Division and later as chief of staff of the 2d Armored Division. Later General Dodge was director, U.S. Element, Allied Commission, Austria Headquarters USFA. When he returned to the United States he served in various capacities until January 1960 when he became assistant commander and commander, 1st Cavalry Division, Korea. Later he held important posts in the Pentagon until taking command of the 5th Army.

His citations and decorations include the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, Army Commendation Medal, American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Army of Occupation Medal—Germany, Russian Award of Guard, Croix de Guerre Avec Palme—French, Order de Leopold Avec Palme—Belgium, a total of 17 all of which are not listed here.

Perhaps it is appropriate to cut off the biography here, for the achievements and interests of General Dodge could cover more time and space than may be allotted here. But it is even more appropriate to give to you the stirring farewell message which General Dodge sent to all who serve under his command.

We wish him Godspeed in his new life of service to his country.

The address referred to follows:

FAREWELL ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. C. G. DODGE

On March 31, 1966, I must retire from active service. I am proud to have belonged to this great Army of ours and I leave with regret that I shall not be able to share with you the challenges that lie ahead.

You belong to the greatest Army in the world, the Army that opened the western plains, the Army that has spilled its blood to gain and maintain the freedoms that we Americans enjoy today, an Army with more than 190 years of tradition, an Army with a great heritage.

You who remain active in that Army bear a sacred trust, to protect the freedom of this land in which we live and to help protect the freedom of others around the world.

You are a part of one of America's oldest and noblest traditions—the tradition of being ready to fight, if need be, in your country's defense. That is your heritage.

As I leave the Active Service, I extend to all of you, the officers and men and women of the 5th Army, my sincere appreciation for the great job you do for your country and my very best wishes for your future.

Good luck and Godspeed to you all.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, March 25 is the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of the Byelorussian National Republic in Minsk.

After centuries of foreign domination, and unsuccessful attempts to revolt in 1812, 1830, and 1863, Byelorussia proclaimed its independence in 1917. Within 4 years, however, Russian domination was reimposed.

The Byelorussians are the third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union.

They maintain their religion and a distinctive language, as well as a sense of national entity. The Soviet Union has devised a role for Byelorussia as a state of the U.S.S.R., a role many Byelorussians refuse to accept. Numbering 15 million people, they are larger in population than many of the vocal members of the United Nations.

Americans of Byelorussian descent continue to call attention to their compatriots' fight for self-determination. By our observance today, we encourage them in their fight for justice.

A Poverty War at Bargain Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the outstanding work that the VISTA volunteers are doing throughout the country, living and working in pockets of poverty, is worthy of more widespread recognition. The Detroit Free Press, in a recent article, described some of these VISTA volunteers and the work they are doing, in a story headlined, "the VISTA Corps: A Poverty War at Bargain Prices." I think that my colleagues in the House will find this article interesting and enlightening, and I make it a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE VISTA CORPS: A POVERTY WAR AT BARGAIN PRICES

(By Rose Allegato)

WASHINGTON.—When 25 VISTA volunteers went to the Gila Reservation in central Arizona, the Pima Indians taught them the rain dance.

For 2 days after, it rained.

"It proves," said one volunteer, "what we can do when we all work together."

He was only half kidding.

VISTA volunteers—now 2,000 strong—live among the poor to help them. In Peace Corps fashion, they work for a pittance and live no better than the people they try to help.

This concept makes VISTA one of the poverty war's most popular programs—and its least expensive.

In its first year, VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) spent $4½ million. This year, its second, VISTA will spend $17 million. (Another poverty program, Operation Headstart, a preschool training project, cost $85 million for only 8 weeks last summer).

"We're the runt of the litter," says Pat Kennedy, VISTA's Deputy Director. He sounds proud when he says it. "'We provide the human element in the war on poverty. We provide people."

Volunteers sign up for a year, get a $100 clothing allowance, living expenses, and $50 a month. The average cost comes to $4,000 for one volunteer in a year. (It costs twice as much to do works of mercy abroad—about $8,000 a year per Peace Corps man).

By June, VISTA will have 4,000 volunteers working in pockets of poverty throughout the Nation, among migrants and Indians, in rural and urban slums, in Job Corps centers, and institutions for the mentally retarded.

More than 75 percent of the volunteers are under 25, swept up in what sociologists claim is the hallmark of the 1960's, the impulse to do something for someone else, inspired largely by President Kennedy.

There is Miriam Kosowitz, 21, of New Haven, Conn., who is in Spruce, Ky., a village off the paved path of richer America.

The rich girl from New Haven had to establish rapport with the mountain folk of Kentucky. She did.

"If they're breaking green beans, I sit down and break green beans," she says.

There are two VISTA girls in Clay County, Ky., who are trying to get Big Creek a garbage dump.

"We're not bringing in a factory that will provide 500 new jobs," Susan Cleves says. "We're only getting the people a garbage dump, which is something else they don't have."

More than 40 percent of rural America lives in poverty. In Appalachia, where 1 out of every 3 families lives below the poverty line, there are about 250 VISTA volunteers. More are wanted.

Some 5 million families, about half the Nation's poor, live in city slums. So VISTA goes there, too.

Take Eric Metzner. He lives in Blue Heaven, a rat-infested apartment slum in Atlanta. A University of Arizona graduate, Eric moved into a three-room apartment on a warm night last August.

"I opened my door, put my television set on a table, turned it on, and the next thing I knew the place was wall-to-wall kids," he says.

The kids still come—with their parents, brothers, and sisters.

His apartment serves as library, employment office, information center, and general gathering spot.

Metzner helps Blue Heaven people—there are 300 crowded into the apartment house—unravel Atlanta welfare red tape. He helps jobless men and high school dropouts find work. And he leads them into community projects.

There's a community center. Metzner and Blue Heaven teenagers chased the rats out of the basement to make room for it. It is well lighted, freshly plastered, and brightly painted.

One of 27 VISTA volunteers in Atlanta Metzner says: "All I've done is to focus the efforts of others. I'm working on a program that will eliminate me."

Deputy Director Pat Kennedy agrees: "Our role is not only to serve the poor but to develop leadership among the poor. We are demonstrating what one individual can do."

To develop this leadership, VISTA recruits volunteers from the ranks of the poor.

There's Beverly Tabaha, 24, a Navajo Indian, who is working as a VISTA volunteer with the Shoshones and Arapahos on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming. When she finishes her year with VISTA, she'll go to Arizona State College, then back to her own reservation to work among the Navajos.

Orlando Vargas, a high school dropout, was recruited for VISTA from Spanish Harlem. He talks the cool language of his contemporaries, and some of Harlem's tragic young drug addicts are boys he grew up with.

About 100 VISTA volunteers have chosen to work among the mentally retarded—the mentally impoverished. They are in eight States and they call what they do "friendship therapy."

Michele Dugan, 21, is one of five VISTA volunteers at San Francisco's Aid Retarded Children, Inc., program.

"For weeks I just sat and watched," she said. "Then I told myself, 'Michele, you've got to learn. You might as well start by making a few mistakes.' "

She started. Now she says: "Maybe I'm not saving the world, but when I see a child who's been working at a puzzle for 4 months put the final piece in place, I know I've given him something."

Every day she supervises six lively retarded children in outside play, indoor crafts, singing and outings.

From California to Oregon, VISTA volunteers are helping migrants improve their health, housing, and education.

Joe Salisbury, 24, a social worker from Rhode Island, lives in a converted stable furnished only with a sink, a wood stove, and a bed. He works among the Mexican-Americans in Gilroy, Calif. He tutors their children and helps them with things like filling out naturalization papers or filing for a loan from the Farmers Home Administration.

Negro VISTA volunteers have been sent to work among the Indians despite warning from experts who claimed they would never be accepted. The Indian reaction to the Negro is: "They're just like the rest of the Indians—only a little darker."

VISTA volunteers work in Job Corps centers. The corps gives the disadvantaged a chance, and VISTA helps them make the best of it.

Volunteers live in the dorms with the boys who arrive in hand-me-down clothes with few skills and little education. (Most of them need reading help, and 10 percent are illerate).

Lamer Marchese, 22, a volunteer from Tampa, Fla., who works at Catoctin Job Corps camp in Maryland, says: "I am guidance counselor, reading, writing, and arithmetic teacher, den mother, referee, father confessor, chauffeur, banker and pawn shop operator. I am tailor, medic, friend, buddy, informer. I'm public enemy No. 1 and the greatest pal in the world."

About 12 percent of the VISTA volunteers are senior citizens—like Jay Holmes, retired superintendent of schools from Spring Lake, Mich., who works with migrants in Gridley, Calif.

Only 12 percent give up during the rigorous 6-week training.

"We're forging new ground," says Kennedy. "We're showing what can be done right here at home. We are the bridge between the haves and have-nots."

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, just 48 years ago, after centuries of enslavement and oppression, the Byelorussian people declared to all mankind they were a free and independent people. This declaration followed on the heels of the Russian Communist revolution and the downfall of the Romanovs. The reality of freedom was short lived, for before a full year had passed, the Russian Red Army marched through the countryside, and Byelorussia was again under Russian control.

Rahel, the medieval Christian chronicler, wrote many years ago:

> To have freedom is only to have that which is absolutely necessary to enable us to be what we ought to be, and to possess what we ought to possess.

Today Byelorussia is not free. The Byelorussians have no way to assert their own national identity. They cannot be what they want to be, or possess that which they want to possess. They are being denied their own individual history, culture, and national pride. They are clearly and simply a ward of the Kremlin.

As freemen who do not take our freedoms and liberties for granted, we are a link between the principles of freedom and self-determination and those who aspire to be free and guide their own destiny. On this 48th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, let us reaffirm to the Byelorussian people that their hopes have not been forgotten by the free world.

Cure for Crisis of Credibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the only cure for today's crisis in credibility concerning Government information would be a little more candor on the part of Federal Government officials.

The ideal of "truth-in-Government" would be hastened immeasurably by passage of a public records law by the Congress. The presence of such a law would give Government officials an excuse for being less devious in their information policies.

Columnist Richard Wilson commented on the cure for the crisis is credibility on January 21, 1966. His column follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 21, 1966]

THE CURE FOR CRISIS OF CREDIBILITY

(By Richard Wilson)

"Crisis of credibility" is the kind of phrase Washington gets enamored of from time to time. What this currently used phrase conveys in the present context is the suspicion that the Johnson administration isn't leveling with the public.

The "oh, yeah?" and "since when?" responses to presidential utterances are proliferating in an embarrassing way. So embarrassing, in fact, that White House staff members are inquiring into the scope of and reasons for this skeptical phenomenon.

U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg is the father of the thought that the credibility of Johnson policies on peace in Vietnam was in question. There was, the Ambassador frankly admitted in explaining the vigor of the question. There was, the Ambassador frankly admitted in explaining the vigor of the quest for peace, a question about the credibility of U.S. eagerness for negotiation which had to be answered.

Perhaps the word credibility in connection with what President Johnson says and does is not precise. Devious may be a better word, or any other word that conveys the impression of artful aims not fully exposed, or a constructive coloration on unpleasant events, or simply the telling of part truths in the pursuit of masked purposes.

It is possible to recite at length instances wherein what Johnson says might be considered at variance with what he does. There was no visible resemblance between what the White House was saying about aluminum and steel price increases and what President Johnon was doing about them. Little believability may have rung through his belated statements on the New York transit strike and the inflationary effects of the wage settlement. A dash of gullibility helps in swallowing his budget forecasts.

But are the maneuvers and techniques of a President in getting what he wants to be judged by the standards that his critics wish to impose? By these standards all questions would be answered with complete frankness regardless of the consequences. The simplest among us could demand from the President the whole truth and nothing but the truth, the exposure of his purposes and methods in the most delicate of negotiations, as well as every thought and act while waking or sleeping.

These standards demand no nonsense or diversions from White House Press Secretary Bill D. Moyers, such as not telling exactly what the President did or intends to do or not responding in precisely the way his questioner desires.

Such standards are obviously both unrealistic and undesirable. They are unrealistic because no President has ever operated that way, and undesirable because if he did he would then frustrate justifiable aims and sometimes the national interest.

But that really is not the question in the present circumstances. The question is whether or not the President's methods are so often devious and circuitous that they arouse skepticism that he is headed where he says he is going or reveal where he has been. It must be this that is of concern at the White House, for it is not likely that confidence in a President can be maintained at the highest level if his credibility is continuously in doubt.

It is absurd to say that the President's credibility has created any kind of crisis, or that he is in imminent danger of losing the confidence of the American people. This is familiar Washington talk, arising in large part from those who disagree more with what the President has done, or may do, than with what has been said.

Johnson is not likely at his age to go through a reformation of the methods and techniques that kept him in command of the Senate for so many years. He does depend upon a certain amount of naturally endowed flim-flammery that often enough meets with dazzling success, and other times falls flat.

It would take very little to dispel the Washington talk about a "crisis of credibility." Just an ounce or two more of frankness and openness would help. A return to the preoperative Johnson when he saw and talked with many more people in various pursuits outside the official family would be good.

The 145th Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 145th anniversary of the struggle for Greek independence. The concepts of freedom and democracy given birth in ancient Greece were the same goals of those valiant Greeks who, many centuries later, took up the cause of freedom against the hated repression of the Ottoman Empire.

Our admiration for the courage and fortitude of the Greeks in response to Communist aggression in the hills after World War II played a major role in the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Greece is a valuable and respected member. Even now Greece's geographical promiximity to the Soviet Union serves as a constant reminder of the struggle for freedom.

The free world can never fully repay its debt to the values and ideals that have come down to us from the Greek heritage. Our repayment is made even more difficult because of the many contributions that are being made to our Nation by the million and one-half Greek-Americans. They are active in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in social, civic, cultural, and community enterprises; they are valued citizens and trusted neighbors.

On the occasion of the 145th anniversary of Greek independence, let us join in thanking our friends of Greek ancestry for their many contributions to our national life.

The 145th Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 25, 1966, we commemorate the 145th anniversary of Greek independence from four centuries of oppressive rule under the Ottoman Turks.

Traditionally, March 25 is regarded as the day when a small band of patriots, under the leadership of Ypsilanti, struck the first blow for Greek liberty. Because the Ottoman Turks greatly outnumbered the Greeks, Ypsilanti suffered an initial defeat, but the struggle continued both on land and on sea for 7 succeeding years.

In the meantime, world events were gradually changing the balance in favor of the Greeks. Such occurrences as the American and French Revolutions, the decline of the Ottoman Empire, the fall of Napoleon, the outbreak of nationalistic revolutions in other countries such as Serbia, and most important of all, the awakening of a strong nationalistic feeling among the Greeks themselves, served to give a cohesiveness to the Greek struggle and to rouse the sympathy and support of Europeans and Americans alike.

Among the Americans who took an active part in the Greek fight for freedom were Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, Gen. George Jarvis, Capt. Jonathan Peckham Miller, and Lt. William T. Washington, who lost his life in July 1827, during a factional outbreak.

And, of course, it is fitting that we remember here the contribution of England's illustrious poet, Lord Byron, who went to Greece in 1824 to help the Greeks and who did much to popularize their cause. Lord Byron finally lost his life from exposure, but his most important poem about the Greek struggle, in which he wrote the immortal line, "I dreamed that Greece might still be free," lived on to inspire the Greeks to continue their fight for freedom.

The years between 1821, when the struggle began, and 1827, toward the close of the war, were marked by a series of both victories and defeats for the Greeks.

Finally, on October 20, 1827, the British, French, and Russian fleets intervened in the Bay of Navarino and dealt a crushing blow to the Ottoman naval power. Sixty out of 89 Turkish-Egyptian vessels were destroyed, the Greeks seized the initiative, and the tide was turned irreversibly in their favor.

Although the Battle of Navarino made the independence of Greece a certainty the fighting continued for another 2 years and almost 5 years elapsed before the new state took shape. In 1832 the Treaty of Constantinople was signed, and with the signing of this treaty, the Turks renounced their claims and recognized Greek independence.

The Greek ideal of democracy, born in ancient Greece over 2,000 years ago, once more prevailed, and Greece took her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to participate in the 145th observance of this significant event, and wish to express my admiration for the indomitable courage of the Greeks and to pay tribute to them for their enduring and universal contributions to civilization.

Informed Attack on Grain Dumping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial March 22, 1966, in the Chicago Tribune gave richly deserved recognition to Representative Ancher Nelsen, of Minnesota, for his able informed attack on the dumping policies of the Johnson administration policies which adversely affect the farmer.

Here is the text of the editorial:

WHERE FARM PRICES ARE MADE—OR BROKEN

Those farmers who look to the Johnson administration to advance their economic interests may find it instructive to consider some statements that have come out of Washington relating to the controversy over Government sales of surplus corn, which caused corn prices to drop.

Representative Ancher Nelsen, Republican, of Minnesota, charged in the House recently that since last January the Government had sold nearly 250 million bushels of corn on the open market for the express purpose of holding down corn prices. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman responded by terming Nelsen's charge "a lot of political noise."

But Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, put the matter in clearer perspective in a recent televised interview:

"Increased supplies of pork depend on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn"; said Ackley, "and we're trying to hold down the price of corn."

Earlier this year President Johnson had occasion to tell Congress that under present law the Secretary of Agriculture "must dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible, consistent with orderly marketing procedures."

It is obviously inconsistent with orderly marketing procedure to dump Government-owned grain on the market in quantities so huge as to cause prices to drop. That would seem to indicate the Department of Agriculture is guilty of flouting the law.

It would also indicate that when supply and demand forces in the marketplace dictate corn prices higher than the Government thinks they should be, it is just too bad. The real dictation comes from Washington.

Vietnam: Why We're There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield, Ill., State Register quotes an American general as saying that if we should abandon our commitment to South Vietnam, we will "face more Vietnams in Thailand, Cambodia, Malaysia, Australia, and New Zealand."

The paper adds:

> This train of events would put aggressive communism much closer to the Western World.

The officer quoted by the paper, Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, replies to the question, "Why are we in Vietnam?" and because his answers seem pertinent, I have permission that the article to which I have referred be included, in its entirety in the Record:

WHY WE MUST FIGHT: VIETNAM PULLOUT WOULD WRECK CONFIDENCE IN UNITED STATES

There are still some people who profess they don't understand why the United States is fighting in Vietnam.

They say they don't understand the nature of this strange and undeclared war.

Some even maintain we ought to pull out.

For all of these doubters, Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, commander of the Fleet Marine Force in the Pacific, recently gave some clear and illuminating answers.

Why are we in Vietnam?

"The answer," said Krulak, "in one word is 'freedom'—the freedom of others and our own freedom; we have a selfish reason; our freedom is at issue."

In the general's view, if the United States should abandon its commitment to South Vietnam, it will "face more Vietnams in Thailand, Cambodia, Malaysia, Australia and New Zealand."

This train of events would put aggressive communism much closer to the Western World. The Philippines would be flanked. Our bases in the Pacific would be imperiled and even Hawaii would be in the sights of what Krulak called "creeping, predatory, vicious communism on the march."

And that is exactly what the fighting in Vietnam is against.

This is not a spontaneous uprising, such as was our Revolutionary War, as some contend.

As to the peculiar nature of the war in Vietnam, Krulak said:

"This is not a battle for hills and mountains, towns and rivers. The battlefield is the people."

And this has imposed a dreadful ordeal on the people of South Vietnam. They are the ones who bear the brunt of the kidnaping, extortion and terror inflicted by the 100,000 guerrillas who supplement the 50,000 hardcore Red troops in South Vietnam.

These sorely beset South Vietnamese plead for our protection. We are giving them all we can. They want schools and hospitals. We are responding. And, says Krulak, "little by little we have won their confidence."

If the United States now were to pull out of Vietnam, as some insist we should, this painfully won confidence would be shattered.

Throughout southeast Asia, if this unthinkable and unlikely retreat were to take place, it would indicate to friends and foes alike that we cannot be trusted.

General Krulak has incisively explained why we must stand and fight.

Mission Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will be interested in a Washington Star editorial hailing the value of HEW Secretary Gardner's visit to Vietnam.

The mission reflects "an awareness that something more than success on the battlefield is needed," the Star believes, and it quotes one general as having said:

> We could kill the last Vietcong guerrilla and still lose the war unless the people can see something worth living and striving for.

The Star adds:

> The Gardner mission should be appraised in this spirit, as a token of our good faith in pledging that we will do what we can to make certain that, after the fighting is over, there will be something worth living for in Vietnam.

The editorial, on this subject of such vital concern to us all, is offered for publication in the Record—where it may be read in its entirety:

MR. GARDNER'S MISSION

This week's arrival in Saigon of HEW Secretary Gardner with a team of 22 specialists adds more than lipservice to the announced intention of the United States to rehabilitate South Vietnam's war-stricken civilian economy. It suggests that the fine words which followed the President's meeting in Honolulu with Vietnamese officials will be followed by action.

The rehabilitation program looks toward the provision of such things as schools, clinics, hospitals, better sanitation facilities, and the like. Something is being done in these areas now, more perhaps than is generally known. But the big part of the job remains to be done, and the importance of getting it done should not be underestimated. It is essential to the attainment of our stated goal—a free and independent Vietnam.

At the top of the priority list, of course, is the matter of getting on with the war. Repair work on the South Vietnamese economy can begin on a major scale only in areas which have been freed from Communist control and which are secured against the return of the enemy. But this does not mean that a significant start cannot be made, and made now.

Secretary Gardner's remarks upon arriving in Saigon suggest that he understands the real nature of the problem. "Our presence here," he said, signals "a vital new phase" of the effort to improve Vietnamese health, welfare, and education programs. "We are not here to provide overnight answers. We are here to learn, to observe, to try to understand * * *. There will be many followup missions that will build on our findings."

These comments, if one chooses, can be dismissed as generalities. But we think there is substance in them. They reflect an awareness that something more than success on the battlefield is needed. One general has put it this way: "We could kill the last Vietcong guerrilla and still lose the war unless the people can see something worth living and striving for."

The Gardner mission should be appraised in this spirit, as a token of our good faith in pledging that we will do what we can to make certain that, after the fighting is over, there will be something worth living for in Vietnam.

Resolute Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor has commented most favorably on the vote Congress gave the President to conduct the difficult yet honorable struggle in which the United States is engaged in Vietnam.

The paper states:

> The size of the vote must have a salutary effect upon those abroad who of late may have been led to believe that there is greater opposition to the President's course than actually exists.

It adds its approval to President Johnson's renewed and urgent plea to "negotiate peace and let war stand aside while the people of Vietnam make their choice."

With permission of my colleagues, I make this editorial on a "Resolute Washington" available for the RECORD, where others may read it in its entirety:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 4, 1966]

RESOLUTE WASHINGTON

The Senate did the right and sensible thing in resoundingly and overwhelmingly voting the $4.8 billion supplemental Vietnamese war budget (the House voted for it even more strongly) and in keeping the famous Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Although not all those who voted affirmatively support all aspects of America's military policy, the vote gave the President the backing he needs to conduct resolutely the difficult, thankless, yet honorable struggle in which the United States is engaged.

The size of the vote must have a salutary effect upon those abroad who of late may have been led to believe that there is greater opposition to the President's course than actually exists. Things are thus back in somewhat better perspective.

At the same time we welcome with equal warmth President Johnson's renewed and urgent plea to "negotiate peace and let war stand aside while the people of Vietnam make their choice." We also say bravo to the President's reiteration that America would stand by the outcome of any freely held election.

As we discuss in the editorial immediately following, we hope that there is a growing realization on the Communists' part that they cannot now hope to win the war in Vietnam. Negotiations must someday come. And, frankly, we do not see how they are likely to come on better terms or at a more favorable moment for the Communists than today. Moscow knows this. Peking may be realizing it. Why not Hanoi?

If such a Communist change is possible, might this not eventually lead to a serious study of the latest proposal from Senator FULBRIGHT, who suggests an agreement with Communist China for the neutralization of all southeast Asia? It is hard to think of any achievement which would draw wider and deeper sighs of relief from the world than this.

Yet it would be naive to underestimate the difficulties in the path of such an accord. Neutralization would have to be underwritten by foolfast guarantees. It would require that both Communist China and the local Communist Parties end all armed attempts to change the status quo. It would necessitate that the Communists also end all subversion, placing their future hopes on free elections and peaceful politicking. On the other side, it would require adherence to democratic principles.

The American people and Government yearn for such a solution. The Communists can have a neutralized southeast Asia tomorrow if they are prepared to make the reasonable adjustments required.

Triumph Out of Defeat—Courage Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I know we are all proud of America's latest pioneers, the Gemini 8's astronauts and their thousands of skilled and dedicated assistants on land and sea.

The Chicago Sun-Times carried a recent editorial praising the men for their courage and self-sufficiency.

The article was written shortly before it was learned what caused the vehicles to gyrate, but the writer points out:

> Faced with trouble they could not possibly diagnose (the astronauts), reacted with the highest sort of courage.

The editorial is typical of many which I have seen, and I make it a part of the RECORD:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 18, 1966]

TRIUMPH OUT OF DEFEAT

Despite the failure to accomplish all that had been planned, Gemini 8's astronauts and their thousands of skilled and dedicated assistants on land and sea enjoyed great triumphs.

The precisely scheduled launching of two giant rockets, one following the other into orbit through a tiny keyhole in the sky, was unprecedented. The chase through space at speeds approaching 20,000 miles an hour, the delicate maneuver of joining the space capsule to the target rocket, was a tremendous achievement and a most important one. In the years ahead, when man continues in his effort to explore space, the docking maneuver will be essential in the joining together of structures in space that will form the bases for further explorations into the unknown.

Whatever caused the two joined space vehicles to gyrate and thus bring an end to the mission is not known. The two astronauts, faced with trouble they could not possibly diagnose, reacted with the highest sort of courage. They extricated their capsule from the target vessel and effected an emergency landing in the far reaches of the Pacific Ocean that came off so smoothly that it almost seemed routine.

That, too, was a great triumph for the detailed planning against emergency, the long and patient training to meet every foreseeable hazard in space or after reentry. Astronauts Armstrong and Scott are safe aboard a naval vessel with their space capsule. The causes of their trouble in space will be explored and solved, as other difficulties have been solved, and new triumphs can be expected in succeeding Gemini and Apollo flights.

By his very nature, man is a pioneer. In days gone by he pushed his frontiers across dread and unknown oceans and into strange lands. His 20th century frontier is the uncharted realm of space. Man brings to that effort the same high level of courage and self-sufficiency possessed by earlier pioneers, as the flight of Gemini 8 so dramatically proved.

A Good Word for L.B.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial recently appearing in the Washington, D.C., Post entitled "A Good Word for L.B.J."

It is comforting to see that a calm, measured, and careful handling of the crisis in Vietnam by President Johnson achieves the approval and respect of an outstanding commentator like Mr. Roscoe Drummond. This excellent editorial merits careful reading:

A GOOD WORD FOR L.B.J.

(By Roscoe Drummond)

I would like to say a good word about President Johnson's management of the Vietnam war. Obviously, there is a great risk of timidly doing too little to arrest the aggression and a great danger of recklessly doing so much that Red China enters the fighting.

With these two opposite perils in mind, I cannot escape the feeling that many more Americans will come to see that the President is bringing wisdom, caution and determination to bear on the conduct of the war.

Surely the touchstone of wisdom in our role in Vietnam is to do whatever is needed to secure South Vietnam from conquest and to use our massive military power in such a prudent and measured manner that Peking is given no legitimate reason to enter the war.

Such a course will not get the easy plaudits of those who want to win quickly at any cost by bombing North Vietnam to bits; will not get the praise of those who want to quit at any cost by pulling out; and will not get a high Gallup rating from those who suggest we haven't the resources to defend South Vietnam and that, anyway, a little aggression in southeast Asia is no concern to the United States.

As these conflicting views find their level in public opinion, I believe that the Nation, on reflection, will feel even more reassured that Gen. Curtis Lemay is not deciding the bombing over North Vietnam, that Senator WAYNE MORSE is not managing the defense of South Vietnam and that Senator FULBRIGHT is not deciding where aggression concerns the United States and where it doesn't.

During the period when he was determining how the mounting attacks directed from Hanoi should be met, President Johnson—as reported by Charles Roberts in his book, "L.B.J.'s Inner Circle"—remarked to his intimates: "I'm not going north with Curtis Lemay, and I'm not going south with WAYNE MORSE."

Fortunately, the President is not easily pressured either by events or by extremist advice.

He did not act hastily, but deliberately; not recklessly, but with great care; not timidly—he committed the United States to do whatever is necessary to defend South Vietnam successfully, but no more.

These ingredients of mind have marked the President's course in Vietnam: deliberateness, prudence, and determination.

They have produced a clear and properly limited objective: to keep South Vietnam from being taken over by force.

And to make it least likely that Red China will enter the war, he is not using U.S. airpower to bomb cities in the north; not sending U.S. ground troops to occupy North Vietnam; not seeking the downfall of the Hanoi regime; not asking for the "unconditional surrender" of Hanoi. He is asking only for an unconditional end to aggression against its neighbor.

The 145th Anniversary of Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 145th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. On this date in 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised a new national flag over his monastery at Kalavryta. This started the bitter climax to the struggle which the Greek people had been carrying on for 400 years against rule by the Ottoman Empire.

The final Greek revolt, against overwhelming odds, lasted 8 years—longer than the American War for Independence. But the indomitable spirit of the brave Greek people prevailed.

On this anniversary we celebrate a triumph of the human spirit over all the obstacles of history. The Greek people have proved their valor repeatedly for thousands of years.

I wish the Greek people peace and prosperity, and I wish all Americans, whatever their national origin, would study and appreciate the reasons for the celebration of this holiday. Our constitutional form of government owes a tremendous debt to the great political thinkers of ancient Greece whose philosophy has become part of our heritage.

Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the week of March 27 through April 2, 1966, has been designated National FHA Week as a tribute to the Future Homemakers of America. This is a national youth organization of more than 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses with local chapters in every State, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The Future Homemakers of America was founded in 1945 as an incorporated, nonprofit organization, supported by membership dues. It was the outgrowth of various State and local clubs of high school economics students which were known by different names and had no unified program. By the end of that first year the national organization had a membership of just under 100,000 in some 2,500 chapters. By the end of the second year, membership had almost doubled, and now as the Future Homemakers of America begin their 21st year they count well over 600,000 members in more than 11,000 chapters. It is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association.

In this age of constant change and challenge, in this era of too much disregard for tradition and precedent, in this environment of population explosion and increased pressures, the need for new patterns in home life is widely accepted. These young people who are in the Future Homemakers of America are serious-minded, community-spirited, fun-loving youngsters who are concerned about the responsibilities of the future and are conscientiously doing something about it. These are the future mothers, wives, teachers, jobholders, voters, and opinion molders of this great land of ours.

National FHA Week finds the 11,000 local chapters spotlighting activities and projects concerned with a 4-year national program of work. Its objectives are to help each member recognize her abilities, strive for their full development, and participate actively in family, community, and world improvement projects.

To further these objectives the elected youth officers of FHA developed nine projects which stress individual development: emphasize mental and physical health; encourage serious consideration in choosing and training for useful careers; develop codes of ethics, morals, and manners; further understanding of people of all heritages, customs, and beliefs; promote appreciation of all family members and their abilities and problems; teach selective spending; inculcate citizenship responsibilities; and encourage using leisure time for activities beneficial to the individual and society.

In these times when so much publicity is given to juvenile delinquents, beatniks and draft-card burners, all of whom are really a small minority of today's youth, it is good to pay tribute to the Future Homemakers of America who are seriously preparing themselves to be good citizens.

Southern Africa: Target of Blockade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article recently appeared in the News and Courier—one of South Carolina's leading newspapers.

In view of the touchy situation in Rhodesia, I found the article to be very interesting. Mr. Thomas R. Waring, the editor, assures me the author's source of information is excellent. Under unanimous consent, I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Congress:

SOUTHERN AFRICA: TARGET OF BLOCKADE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author of this article about a projected blockade and invasion of southern Africa, a foreign military observer who resides abroad, has excellent sources of information in England, Europe, and Africa. He is known to the News and Courier, but prefers not to be identified by name or nationality. His report confirms a recent article by Russell Warren Howe in the New Leader magazine entitled "Showdown in Southern Africa." Mr. Howe, who is traveling in Africa on a Ford Foundation press fellowship, reported February 28 that the Soviet Union is prepared to put its navy at the service of the U.N. for a blockade of southern Africa.)

The British Prime Minister, Harold Wilson, seems to be determined to escalate his vendetta against Ian Smith, the Prime Minister of Rhodesia, who 5 months ago declared unilateral independence from Britain. Wilson promised the assembled Afro-Asians at the British Commonwealth Conference in Lagos last year that he would destroy Ian Smith and his government by March. He then imposed sanctions against Rhodesia and persuaded the United States to join in.

The result has been utter failure, and it is even likely that Wilson knew all along that it would be. It is, in fact, probable that Mr. Wilson's ultimate target is the destruction of civilization in the whole of southern Africa, and that action against Rhodesia provides just the excuse which he wanted.

Wilson insists that there should be majority rule in Rhodesia, irrespective of whether the voters are savages straight out of the jungle, whether they are entirely illiterate or not, and whether they know what they are voting about. There must be universal franchise, which in practice means handing Rhodesia over to a government of black leftwing extremists.

It is hardly surprising that the whites are not enthusiastic. Everything other than a mud hut which exists in Rhodesia today was built by them or other ancestors. They point to other newly independent African countries as examples of what happens under African rule.

The facts are that during the last 6 or 7 years, more than 3 million Africans have been murdered by other Africans as well as several thousands who have been butchered in orgies of primitive savagery. Tribal war, complete lawlessness, massacres, bankruptcy, cannibalism, and chaos have followed closely in the wake of independence and African majority rule. It is understandable that the Rhodesians, rather than submit themselves and their families to this, chose to declare independence. Wilson replied by imposing sanction which has as its declared object the ruin and bankruptcy of the country.

It has been suggested that Mr. Wilson's motive was nothing other than petty spite against Ian Smith, for whom he appears to have a personal antipathy. However, it would seem that Mr. Wilson's motives go far beyond personalities.

It is an article of faith among the Socialists that existing leadership in southern Africa must be destroyed. They say so openly and frequently. Lenin wrote that the way to the conquest of Europe lay through Africa, and it is a fact that Africa provides the free world with much of its raw materials. Without these, employment, and a high standard of living could not be maintained—especially in Europe—and our material ability to defend ourselves would be most seriously affected.

Africa supplies about a third of the total of the world's gold, nearly all our industrial diamonds, a large proportion of the copper, much of the iron ore, rare minerals such as germanium and titanium and the list can be extended indefinitely.

Furthermore, the peoples of southern Africa, in the Portuguese Provinces of Angola and Mozambique, in South West Africa, in Rhodesia and in the Republic of South Africa, are solidly and militantly anti-Communist.

It is extraordinary that America allowed herself to be dragged behind British socialist ideology into imposing sanctions against Rhodesia, and this has cost America a few million dollars already. It is extraordinary that independence from British rule, which was considered to be a cause worth fighting for nearly 200 years ago in America, is considered by the present U.S. State Department to be so bad that America must join in a declared policy to ruin and bankrupt the new, independent state of Rhodesia.

Within this general framework the next part of the scheme is now ready to be put into action. Wilson will announce that sanctions against Rhodesia have failed; that he waives the right for Rhodesia to be considered as a purely British internal problem, and that therefore the whole matter can be debated in the United Nations. Only recently Wilson was in Moscow for talks and already the Russians have asked for the Rhodesia question to be tabled before the United Nations.

Within the last few weeks, Mr. Walter Levy, an oil consultant, went down to Rhodesia and adjacent territories in behàlf of the United Nations. He has returned to America and presented his report.

It is obvious that oil sanctions against Rhodesia can only become effective if oil is physically prevented from coming into Rhodesia from the Republic of South Africa and from Mozambique. To use troops to do this would be an act of war.

It is therefore suggested that a blockade of the whole of southern Africa should be instituted, and this has been under careful study in Washington and in London. The blockade would be mounted on "humanitarian" grounds: "These poor misguided people must be brought to their senses, but we don't want to kill anybody."

It would be composed of United States and British ships as well as ships from India and token forces from other European, Asian, and African countries. It would comprise Angola, South West Africa, the Republic of South Africa, Mozambique, and Rhodesia. Its purpose would be to bring down the white governments in these territories and replace them with black majority rule—which is the declared aim of the Socialists and Communists.

Wilson, who recently refused to supply any British troops for Vietnam, and whose government still trades with Cuba and Hanoi as well as with Red China, knows very well that to use British troops against their own people in Rhodesia would be unpopular in Britain, but if it were done by the United Nations there would not be so much resentment. If it could be disguised as a "humanitarian action," so much the better.

Obviously, if such a blockade were to be successful, it would ultimately be necessary to put in troops to restore law and order, and insure the "free, democratic elections" of new governments. For this purpose a force of about 100,000 men has been under consideration by the authorities who are the sponsors of this conspiracy. This force is to consist of Africans for the most part, but with a stiffening of British, American, Scandanavian, Canadian, and perhaps Indian troops under United Nations command. To make it look more respectable, this force is to be termed a "United Nations police force."

Portugal has an army of more than 80,000 troops in their territories, the Rhodesians could supply another 20,000 at least and the Republic of South Africa could make the total up to half a million men, well armed and well trained. They would fight with the desperation of those who know that if they loose, they would have nothing to live for. It is possible that the South Africans have an atomic weapon. They have certainly the physical means to make one, and the knowledge.

In addition to this force is the fact that a very large number of Africans would fight against any United Nations invader. The Portuguese have many Africans in their armed forces. They are loyal, and among the best fighters against the Communist terrorists. Both in Rhodesia and in South Africa, Africans would fight, black and white together, against a polyglot army as suggested for a United Nations police force.

This would be no easy war. There would be heavy casualties. Americans would have to commit a major army to fight people who are their own allies in NATO and who are foremost in the struggle against international communism.

With the situation in France deteriorating, a military action against Portugal (which is a member of NATO) in Africa would cause the whole collapse of the NATO alliance. Spain is closely allied to Portugal and would not stand idly by while her sister nation was under attack. America has large interests in the Iberian peninsula, strategic and economic. If America is to be dragged into action against Portugal in support of British socialist ideology, the escalating effect in the United States might be disastrous.

Already German, French, and Austrian firms are taking over from former American business in southern Africa. Within the last few days, the U.S. Government has canceled a $1.5 million export order for light sport planes for South Africa, and this order will now be snapped up by France or Germany. Millions of dollars worth of defense orders have been rejected by the U.S. Government from Portugal, from South Africa, and from Rhodesia.

The future, with American involvement in a major war, and repercussions in the Iberian peninsula and NATO, is inevitable if the State Department is not checked. The future for the whole free world is grim if the American people allow themselves to be enmeshed in the socialist schemes of Mr. Harold Wilson and his plans for destruction of Rhodesia and the whites of South Africa.

Already there is a rumor that Britain is planning to lay sea mines in the Mozambique Channel and a considerable British naval squadron is maneuvering off the Mozambique coast.

It is time to stop the folly.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians are perhaps the least known of the many peoples forcibly brought under Soviet communism. One hears of the Ukrainians, the Baltic peoples, and of peoples in the Caucasus. Even those in distant Asiatic countries, such as the Kazakhs, Turkmens, and the Uzbeks, are often heard of in the West. But one seldom hears of the Byelorussians, despite the fact that they, as an ethnic group, are more numerous than most of the nationality groups mentioned. As a matter of fact the Byelorussians constitute the third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union; only the Russians and Ukrainians are more numerous.

The history of the Byelorussian people has been as glorious as the histories of their more powerful neighbors. From the late Middle Ages down to the beginning of the modern period, this sturdy people has occupied the central area east of the Baltic States and north of the Ukraine in northeastern Europe. For centuries they had their independent existence. Then in the 17th century their country was annexed by Russia, and they did not regain their independence until after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. During their subjugation by Russia's czarist regime, Byelorussians managed to retain their ethnic characteristics and national traditions. Their national feeling was kept alive in the course of several centuries. Finally, after the Russian Revolution, when other ethnic groups sought and secured their national independence; the Byelorussians did likewise and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. Then they set up their government and took their destiny into their own hands. Unfortunately this period was very brief, for their country was soon attacked by the Red army, overrun, and despite continued opposition amid the changing fortunes of war, was finally overcome by superior force. It was then made part of the Soviet Union. Thus came to an end the short-lived independent state of Byelorussia whose 48th aniversary of independence is being celebrated this week.

For more than 45 years the Byelorussian people have been living under the oppressive and unrelenting rule of Soviet communism. For a brief period during the last war they experienced the tyranny of Nazi dictatorship, but soon again they were brought under Soviet tyranny. Neither those Byelorussians who have endured the horrors of Communist totalitarianism, nor those living abroad, have recognized the Soviet rule over their homeland. Nor have they become reconciled to the foreign ideas and brutal practices of their Communist overlords. Americans of Byelorussian descent detest and despise both the rulers and their minions in the land of their ancestors. On the 48th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, Mr. Speaker, we join them in this celebration and hope that one day the Byelorussian people will regain their freedom from Communist Russian domination.

The 48th Anniversary of the Declaration of Freedom of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, March 25, we note and honor the 48th anniversary of the declaration of freedom of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The Soviet Union lists the population of Byelorussia as a little over 8 million persons, but scholars place the ethnic population in surrounding areas at a total closer to 18 million. For almost a thousand years this land, bounded by Russia, Poland, and the Baltic States, has been the unfortunate scene of war, pillage, revolution, and counterrevolution.

It was no wonder then that with the downfall of the Tsar the Byelorussian people joyfully proclaimed their independence. Persecution by Russia was not new to the country, for as early as 1832 the Russians had closed all the schools and abolished the predominant church.

In World War I the Russo-German front passed through the area and one-third of the country was occupied by German troops. Following the overthrow of the Tsar, a National Congress was convened at Minsk for the purpose of declaring the Republic free. The Bolshevik Party had other ideas, however, and the Commisar for Nationality Affairs, the infamous Josef Stalin, sent a Siberian armored infantry regiment to Minsk to smash the National Congress. These efforts failed and on March 25, 1918, the National Convention decared the Byelorussian Democratic Repubic to be a fact.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that at that time the constitution of the new republic granted equality to all under the law, freedom of speech and assembly, the right to form labor unions, and to strike, freedom of conscience, the inviolability of the person and the home, and the right of minorities to autonomy. In addition, all large estates were to be broken up and divided among the landless peasantry, the mineral wealth of the country was nationalized and a standard 8-hour workday set.

But the freedom so proudly proclaimed in 1918 was to perish under the Communist heel by the end of 1920 although partisan resistance continued until 1924.

The blood bath of the freedom loving people of Byelorussia was not to stop then, however. Throughout the 1920's and 1930's the Russian persecution continued and with the advent of World War II the area was once again a battlefield. More than 2 million Byelorussians perished.

After the war the Communist Russian masters accused the Byelorussians of collaboration with the German Army and the executions, deportations, and other depredations resumed.

Is it not a sad thing, Mr. Speaker, to look at the history of our country which was so blessed by being removed from neighbors like the Soviet Union and then compare our history and growth to those less fortunate through the quirk of location?

We shared all the noble ambitions that were proclaimed in the Byelorussian constitution—freedom of speech and assembly, religious freedom, the rights of man—yet we were able to make ours work because to a large degree we were left alone during the crucial years. We both were blessed in having brave, patriotic men to lead the cause and in fact even shared one of those men.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, a hero in the struggle for Polish and American independence, led a fight in 1794 against the Csarist Empire in the name of what was then the Grand Duchy of Litva. The Byelorussian people were the heart of the Duchy and their culture and language was that of the Duchy. Kosciuszko was a Byelorussian noble by descent.

America survived and prospered. The Byelorussian Republic and the other of what are known today as the captive nations did not. It was not for lack of fight, or ideals or brave and noble leaders. It was merely because of the proximity of a rapacious neighbor, never to be satisfied, that these countries are no longer free.

As we salute these people tomorrow, let us therefore be ever mindful of our good fortune. Let us also hope and pray that the people of Byelorussia, along with all captive peoples, will soon be free once again.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussians proclaimed their independence from Russia and established the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The history of these people and their struggle to maintain their independence throughout many centuries is fraught with wars, partitions, revolts, and severe trials. Time and again their hopes for liberation faded, but their will to freedom remained strong.

After their declaration of independence in 1918, the Byelorussians passed a provisional constitution guaranteeing freedom of speech and assembly, liberty of conscience, inviolability of the person and of the home, the right of national minorities to autonomy, and equality of all citizens before the law. Byelorussia was accorded recognition by over a dozen foreign states and established legations and consulates in foreign capitals. Unfortunately, this period of independence was short-lived, and once again these people were brought under the subjection of the U.S.S.R.

During World War II, the Byelorussians put up stubborn resistance to the Germans and showed open hostility to the Russians. This struggle on two fronts took a great toll in Byelorussian lives. After the expulsion of the Germans, Soviet forces again occupied the country and incorporated it into the U.S.S.R.

Efforts to eradicate the national spirit of the Byelorussians and their desire for independence have not been sucessful, and to this day the struggle for the restoration of democratic government and self-determination goes on. March 25 is commemorated each year by the Byelorussians throughout the free world as a symbol of their national aspirations, and all freedom-loving people join in their hopes and prayers that the day will soon come when the Byelorussians can join the family of free and independent nations.

State Department Says Nuclear Power Reactors Do Not Help the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. State Department apparently concludes that civil research reactors, power reactors, major components thereof, and fuel and moderators therefor are not very meaningful in relation to Communist-bloc military power. For the benefit of interested parties my letter to the Department and its reply are reproduced below:

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Anthony M. Solomon,
Administrator, Mutual Defense Control Act,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Solomon: As you may know, the recent decision of the International Security Trade Coordinating Committee (COCOM) relating to the export of nuclear power reactors to countries of the Sino-Soviet bloc was the subject of discussions at a public hearing held on January 27, 1966, by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee's Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation. The COCOM decision to which I refer provides that COCOM members will "sympathetically" consider requests by member-countries for the export to Communist countries of civil research and power reactors, major components thereof, and fuel and moderators therefor, when the purchasing country has agreed to allow International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to be applied to the exported facility.

My reason for writing to you relates to your implementation of this decision. According to the State Department's recent report to the Congress on operations under the Battle Act, the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act lists—the so-called Battle Act lists—have been revised to correspond with revisions made in the lists of items embargoed by the COCOM countries. Specifically, I note that the Battle Act lists have been amended so that the above-named atomic energy materials and equipment now appear in category B of the title I list when the recipient Communist nation has agreed to allow the application of IAEA safeguards; when no agreement has been reached as to the application of international safeguards, the subject materials and equipment are considered category A items.

I understand the administration of the Battle Act lists, the items determined to warrant embargo under title I of the Battle Act are divided into categories A and B, with the items shown in the category A list being those for which no exceptions are possible under the termination-of-aid clause of the Battle Act. The items shown in the category B list are those for which the President may grant exceptions under the termination-of-aid clause in unusual circumstances. Thus, under the Battle Act Administrator's recent revision of these lists, any allied nation which hereafter exports a nuclear power reactor to a Sino-Soviet bloc country which agrees to the application of international safeguards thereto may continue to receive military, economic, or financial assistance from the United States if the President so directs. Prior to this revision of the lists the President could not make such an exception.

This change in the Battle Act lists raises several questions. One is whether or not this revision contravenes the general policy underlying the Battle Act, namely, the policy of not giving assistance to any foreign nation which permits the export of arms, ammunition, or other material to the Soviet Union or any of its satellites when such material might contribute to the strength of those States. (See in this connection Senate Report 698, Aug. 21, 1951.) It would seem that a power reactor would contribute to the industrial strength of a country, even if the application of IAEA safeguards prevented the diversion of the reactor to military uses.

A more serious question is whether, as contemplated under your recent amendment to category B, the President may invoke the exception to the Battle Act's termination-of-aid clause in the case of the export by an allied nation of a reactor to a Communist-bloc country. The proviso to the termination-of-aid clause in section 103(b) of the Battle Act provides that "the President * * * may direct the continuance of such [military, economic, or financial] assistance to a country which permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials when unusual circumstances indicate that the cessation of aid would clearly be detrimental to the security of the United States." The distinct implication of this proviso seems to be that while aid can be continued despite the export to Sino-Soviet bloc countries of strategic materials "other than" arms, ammunition, implements of war, or atomic energy materials, such continued aid cannot be allowed where the exported item falls into the category of arms, ammunition, implements of war, or atomic energy materials.

I would very much appreciate receiving your early comments to the foregoing questions.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 4, 1966.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: Your letter of February 17 refers to the recent decision of COCOM relating to the export of nuclear power reactors to Soviet bloc countries and raises certain relevant questions pertaining to Battle Act administration.

You are quite correct in your understanding that the effect of the transfer from category A to category B of title I is to make it possible for the President to exercise discretion under section 103(b) in determining whether or not to continue aid in the case of a power reactor sale by an aid-recipient country to a Communist-bloc country, whereas termination of aid is mandatory with respect to category A. Your questions relate to whether the determination to transfer the items in question from category A to category B of title I contravenes the general policy underlying the Battle Act and whether the President may properly invoke the exception to the Battle Act's termination-of-aid clause in section 103(b) in the case of a power reactor sale by an aid-recipient nation to a Communist-bloc country. It is our view that the title I listing determination taken, including its implications for the President's authority under section 103(b) to continue aid, is in accordance with the provisions of the Battle Act. Moreover, similar decisions have been made in the past and have been reported to the Congress. I believe the following explanation will be helpful to you in understanding the reasons for our conclusion.

In the administration of the Battle Act, and in working out the international control lists under the act, the key judgment which Congress entrusted to the Battle Act Administrator was whether particular items should be embargoed for purposes of the act.

Section 103(a) of the Battle Act (22 U.S.C. 1611b) provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

"The Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to determine within thirty days after enactment of this Act * * * and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, which items are, for the purpose of this Act, arms ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum * * * and those items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war which should be embargoed to effectuate the purposes of this Act: *Provided,* That such determinations shall be continuously adjusted to current conditions on the basis of investigation and consultation."

Section 103(a) of the Battle Act uses two phrases which make clear that the categories of items listed in that section are inherently qualified. They must be (1) items which "for the purpose of this [Battle] Act" are arms, ammunition, and implements of war and the like, and (2) items "which should be embargoed to effectuate the purposes of this [Battle] Act".

The purposes of the Battle Act are perhaps most succinctly expressed in its long statutory title; i.e., "An act to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes." The key words are "control" and "cooperating foreign nations". These statutory words show that the Congress had in mind not absolute, unilateral embargoes but an international cooperative program of control.

In this cooperative control program, as the Congress was aware, the United States necessarily would have a variety of objectives and means to pursue these obejctives.

H.R. 4550 (82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951) was the bill which, with some amendments not relevant here, became the Battle Act. In the House Foreign Affairs Committee report on H.R. 4550, the complex nature of our objectives in controling exports to Russia was discussed, and the report made the following comment:

"In order to carry on strategic operations of this nature it is essential that the executive branch be given a considerable degree of discretion and it is clear that legislation prohibiting broad categories of exports might prevent the attainment of these objectives." (H. Rep. 703, 82d Con., 1st sess., July 16, 1951, p. 12.)

We have reviewed Senate Report No. 698 on the same bill, which was referred to in your letter, and find nothing inconsistent with either this statutory statement of purpose or this recognition of executive discretion. Section 101 of the Battle Act, which elaborates the statement of purpose, states that the objective of controls, so far as the U.S.S.R. and its satellites is concerned, is to impede the ability of such countries to conduct military operations.

We have, therefore, concluded that the act was not intended to require the embargo of items which would not contribute to the military capability of Sino-Soviet bloc countries, even though they might contribute to the industrial strength of a country. This conclusion is consistent with the views of previous administrators of the act and is supported by practice. The periodic Battle Act reports to the Congress provide evidence of the selective listing of items under the act, of periodic changes in accordance with section 103(a), and of the movement of items from category A to category B of title I.

The Battle Act's embargo provisions went into effect on January 24, 1952, and the published reports thereafter included information on the embargo lists, how they were established, and how they are maintained. There are two lists under title I of the Battle Act. The title I, category B list originally included 263 item listings, of which one was petroleum products and equipment for producing them. By the time of the second Battle Act report, 16 new item listings had been added and 15 original listings broadened. The specific item listings in category B were classified for security reasons, but the report could identify the added listings in general terms. ("Problems of Economic Defense," second report to Congress on the Battle Act, January 1953, pp. 7 and 8.)

By the time of the fourth Battle Act report, the decision had been made not to pursue an extension of the control lists to many other items but to recognize the need for simplifying the lists and removing or downgrading items which were no longer considered so important. ("East-West Trade Trends," fourth report to Congress, May 1954, pp. 46–48.) The results of this reappraisal were announced in a press release on August 25, 1954; there was a reduction in the embargo item listings from 297 to 217, and many of the 217 items were redefined so as to split off less important sizes and types of goods covered by the item. ("The Revision of Strategic Trade Controls," fifth report to Congress, November 1954, pp. 39–42.)

The same process, of course, was carried out for category A items. Thus, in the 1958 Battle Act report, revisions in the category

A list were announced in the following terms:

"Some new items * * * embodying recent technological and scientific advances, and whose strategic significance had increased since the 1954 revision, were added. Other items were deleted because of a corresponding decrease in their strategic importance." ("The 1958 Revision of East-West Trade Controls," 12th report to Congress, Apr. 20, 1959, pp. 4–5.)

In the unclassified category A list printed in this report, it was noted, for example, that some changes resulted in the deletion of items from the atomic energy material listing under category A and the incorporation of those items in the classified category B list (p. 12). These changes were of the same type as those about which you have inquired.

This legislative history and reported practice make clear that there is no statutory distinction between category A and category B of title I in terms of the determination of whether an item should be embargoed for the purposes of the act. In determining whether or not an item shall be considered an "atomic energy material" for the purpose of the act, the Administrator considered that the application of IAEA safeguards would give reasonable assurance that the materials would be devoted to peaceful uses only and that the shipment would therefore lack the strategic element to which the Battle Act restrictions were addressed. It follows, therefore, that the Administrator acted in accordance with the listing authority of the act in removing those materials from category A to category B, because they still remain covered under title I. Whether or not the President decides to continue aid to a country selling such a category B item to a Communist-bloc nation will depend upon the circumstances of the particular case.

For the reasons I have set forth in detail above, I consider that the modification in title I treatment of civil research and power reactors, major components thereof, and fuel and moderators therefor is in accordance with the purposes of the Battle Act and appropriately furthers the U.S. policy of discouraging nuclear weapons proliferation and encouraging peaceful uses of atomic energy.

May I add that if you have any remaining questions on this matter, please let me know. We and the Atomic Energy Commission people would be blad to meet with you or other members and staff of the Joint Committee in order to be certain that there is full understanding of our actions under the Battle Act and in CoCom concerning nuclear power reactor subject to IAEA safeguards. We have done this previously, as you know, both through informal discussion and in letters to the chairman, and we would like to be sure that no area of misunderstanding remains.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY M. SOLOMON,
Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs.

Decline and Fall of the 50 States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent privilege to address the Conopus Club in San Antonio. Under leave to extend my remarks I enclose those remarks. The address follows:

DECLINE AND FALL OF THE 50 STATES

I welcome this opportunity to visit the San Antonio Conopus Club at your weekly luncheon today, and am grateful for the privilege of speaking to you for a few moments.

I have chosen for my subject the "Decline and Fall of the 50 States." It could be entitled "The Winds of Change," or perhaps "The Thundering Herd in the Sixties." It will be an attempt to appraise, in brief, some of the developments of this decade.

For several years now we have been repeatedly reminded that the decade of the sixties is a decade of change—a period of forward thrust when America is at last casting aside the shackles of the past and moving ahead on the high road of progress.

Now, the question of just what constitutes "progress," and the direction this "forward thrust" is taking us, have become lively topics of conjecture. The decade having now passed the halfway mark, it would seem to be a good time to pause for a moment and take stock of a few of the things that have transpired and some that are in the works.

While I entertain strong views regarding the wisdom and propriety of many of the changes that are taking place, it will not be my purpose today to argue the merits. Let us take a reading and try to get a glimpse of some of the implications of the winds of change to which the American people are being subjected. Perhaps in that way we can better judge how the ship of state is weathering the storm. Someone said: "I want to move with progress, but I want to read the compass and see which direction I am traveling."

This reminds me of the verse about the Arkansas railroad, which goes like this:

> It giggled in and wobbled out,
> And life the people all in doubt—
> Whether in its zigzag track
> It was going west or coming back.

It is not my purpose to be critical of change. We all know that in this age of science and technology, certain changes are inevitable. The big problem of Government is to try to channel changes in the right direction, while holding fast to those concepts which have proven their worth through the ages.

In this age of change, let us not lose sight of fundamentals, because certainly there are certain enduring principles that underlie all real progress. It was a wise—though perhaps old-fashioned—Solomon who said: "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set."

In approaching this subject I am reminded of the old tugboat captain who had guided ships through the rocks and shoals of Boston Harbor for nearly half a century, and was summarily dismissed by a new reform city government that had been swept into power many years ago. He sought a hearing, and appeared before his critics. One of them asked him: "Captain, can you say that you know for sure where all the obstacles to shipping are located beneath the waters in our harbor?"

The old man thought a moment, and answered: "No, I reckon I can't say I know where all of them are, but I know where they ain't."

And so it is with government. There are certain basic concepts which we know are free of certain destructive elements—and as I see it we must not dare lose sight of those concepts.

Let us summarize for a moment a few of the more radical changes that are being wrought in our society and in our Government. I am thinking in particular about the galloping momentum of Federal power, manifested in so many ways, at the expense of the States.

DEMONSTRATIONS AND CRIME

To begin with, this decade has been shocked and shamed by an outburst of demonstrations, riots, and an alarming upsurge in the crime rate. Indeed much of the rising crime rate has been triggered by agitation generated by civil rights demonstrations. The destructive and bloody race riots have followed on the wake of the emotional hysteria generated by this form of agitation, with many politicians and opportunists sharing in the responsibility.

Even in the midst of a bloody war we have heard the squawks and jeers from draft-card burners, and others, who would give aid and comfort to the enemy. This minority group of pacifists, crackpots, and peaceniks, including some retarded intellectuals, was well described by J. Edgar Hoover as halfway citizens who are neither morally, mentally, nor emotionally mature.

At the same time, and a part of this same movement, America has witnessed the appearance of those who preach civil disobedience, a seditious slogan of gross irresponsibility, which has captured the imagination of citizens who are in many respects immature. We have all been obliged to stand by while celebrity status has been accorded those whose sick minds and corrupt souls tamper with and ridicule our orderly processes of government under law.

And, as I have said, out of all this has come riots and bloodshed, and a conscious defiance of law and order.

DECLINE OF STATES

And along with it have come demands for the Federal Government to invade the sanctities of State responsibilities in dealing with these and many other conditions.

Indeed the genesis of this trend toward concentralization is traceable back to New Deal days, when F.D.R., deterred by actions of the Supreme Court, virtually declared war on that tribunal and proceeded to fill several vacancies with men whom he knew would do his bidding in the interpretation of the Constitution. Whereas the prior Court had upheld the power of the States and the limited power of the Central Government, the revamped Court, and succeeding ones, upheld the expansion of power of the Central Government in almost every conceivable situation where there was a conflict with the States. Thereafter the 10th amendment has been all but ignored.

Whether for good or ill, the skids were thus greased for the Federal takeover, and that is what is happening. The movement is today—in the sixties—being accelerated. Out of the window and into the ashcan went James Madison's assurance to posterity that the Founding Fathers were giving us "two kinds of government, harmonious with each other, but each supreme in its own sphere."

Those who adhere to that philosophy are quite frank and open in their views. Modern Supreme Court decisions are replete with that doctrine, and a subservient Congress has refused to do anything about it. In fact, in the enactment of a succession of laws, usually at the prodding of the Executive, the Congress has been *particeps criminis* to this takeover.

David Brinkley, the well-known radio and TV commentator, in a speech to students at Ohio University last July 17, was quoted as saying:

"The decline and fall of the 50 State governments will be completed within our lifetime. The movement of political power from State capitals to Washington, D.C., is inevitable and unstoppable whether we like it or not."

In another speech at Harvard last March, Brinkley said: "The States will be left with nothing to do but the routine chores like passing traffic laws [on their own highways only, not Federal highways] and planting roses and painting the benches in the public parks * * * while the real business of political leadership will have moved to Washington."

And Brinkley contended this change will give us a better form of government. This, of course, is not a change that he envisions—it is a revolution in government.

Now, the tragic thing about it is that Brinkley may be right. His thinking is shared by many others, and the winds of change that are sweeping over the body politic in the sixties would seem to vindicate that way of thinking.

EVIDENCES OF EXPANDED POWER AND CONTROL IN WASHINGTON

I do not want to appear here in the role of an alarmist or a pessimist. I have faith in the ability of our people to cope with the situation, once they fully understand it and all its implications. In any event, it would seem most desirable that we face up to what is happening, and then form our own judgment about what if anything should be done to try to change the trend. If the people do not like this trend and want to do something about it, they have the privilege of electing men and women to Congress who will apply the brakes and effectively change the trend. It is just that simple.

Let us briefly examine a few evidences of this switchover—this trend toward big government in Washington. I shall not dwell upon the many Supreme Court cutthroat decisions which have played havoc with the part States are supposed under the Constitution to play in governmental actions, rather, I shall refer to a few actions by the Congress, which so often in recent years have bypassed the States and local governments, in moving pellmell toward the decline and fall of the 50 States.

Only last year, riding a wave of emotional hysteria, the Congress enacted a voter registration bill. This was done despite the fact that only the year before the Congress approved a measure to give Federal courts all the authority they could want to protect every citizen in the legitimate exercise of the ballot.

The new law was cleverly worded to limit its application to only a handful of States—where fewer than 50 percent of eligible votes were cast at the preceding general elections. All other States were exempted from its harsh mandates.

The bill gave the Attorney General, at his discretion, the power to send Federal registrars into any of these few States, push aside local election officials, ignore State laws, virtually conduct elections and count the ballots—a measure highly reminiscent of Reconstruction days.

In that unprecedented action, the Congress refused to admit that illiteracy, abysmal ignorance, or moral decay, must be matters for consideration in qualifying a citizen to participate in self-government.

In recent weeks we have witnessed right here in Texas the abuse of that law with respect to voter registration. The Attorney General, evidently assuming that some of our Texas officials are corrupt, dishonest, and irresponsible, sent FBI agents in to spy on county tax collectors while citizens were being registered to vote. Yet, by and large, Texas has one of the cleanest records in the Nation in allowing qualified citizens to vote.

I cite this voter law as an example of the extension and abuse of Federal power in the area of voting—clearly the responsibility of the States and local units of government, and so provided by the Constitution.

Let me cite another example of how the Federal Government, at the instance of the Congress, is moving into local affairs. Last year, by a six-vote margin in the House, a rent subsidy law was enacted. Under it Uncle Sam is to send checks each month to hundreds of thousands of eligible tenants to apply on their monthly rent bills. Under this revolutionary concept, copied from the British, the fortunate eligible tenants will be required to pay no more than one-fourth of their monthly incomes on rent—the balance to be paid by a benevolent government in Washington.

This approach will, obviously, tend to discourage homeownership in America. It will tend to undermine the incentive of individuals to better themselves by their own efforts. In a way, it provides a bonus for shiftlessness and other defects of individual character. We already have ample provision to take care of worthy and needy families who have housing problems.

I might add that Robert Weaver, the new Secretary of Housing, has made it quite clear that a prime purpose of this new concept is to enable and promote integration in middle-income neighborhoods.

That same housing bill, which included the rent supplemental provision, contains a mass of Federal aids and handouts which will cost the American taxpayers many billions of dollars. It even provides for a direct grant of up to $1,500 to certain homeowners for use in refurbishing their homes.

Be that as it may, this is a classic example of "creative federalism," which is involving the Central Government in a myriad of purely local and individual area of responsibilities.

OTHER EXAMPLES

In 1954 Federal tax money was being rechanneled back to State and local levels at the rate of $3 billion a year. Ten years later, in 1964, the figure was $10 billion, and it will be more than $13 billion this year. This grant and aid is administered by more than 120 Federal aid programs, and the outlays account for 15 percent of all State and local revenues. Yet, the simple fact is that for every $3 of tax money that goes to Washington to be used for Federal aid programs, less than $2 ever finds its way back.

The Federal Government is moving feverishly into the field of local education. Last year the Congress enacted a general aid program, applicable to secondary and elementary schools. Already many school boards are fretting because of the many strings attached to the money they spend. In many instances they find the Federal Government giving aid with one hand and then taking it back with the other, under guise of authority to insist that before the money is theirs they must conform with some obscure Federal fiat or a racial custom.

Indeed this use of power to force conformance with Federal edicts and policies has become commonplace. It is a form of legalized blackmail to force recipients of aid in various forms to yield obdience to the whims of the Federal establishment—another gimmick to make the States totally subservient.

Last year and again this year the Nation witnessed a massive drive to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, in order to deprive the States of the right to determine for themselves whether they should or should not have a form of compulsory unionism in order to work and earn a livelihood.

Legislation is now pending to federalize and vastly increase the unemployment insurance in the various States—which if enacted, incidentally, will cost Texas employers alone an extra $100 million annually. This represents a grab for power and an attempt to force conformity on the part of the States in the area of unemployment compensation.

Besides, it is well known that to loosen and expand this program will encourage more people to devise excuses to take advantage of it and quit working. It seems that we spend all kinds of money on promoting employment, then take steps to promote unemployment.

Another example of an eager-beaver Federal bureaucracy which yearns for more power is the depressed area legislation. Enacted in 1961, billions of dollars have already been spent under this program. Later it was called area redevelopment. A year ago it was considered a dead duck, having been quite discredited, but an obedient Congress approved another 5-year, $3 billion extension. The 400 employees in that agency, who were already looking around for new jobs, remained and an additional 1,200 were promptly added.

THE POVERTY NIGHTMARE

We now spend nearly $2 billion in the so-called poverty war—that being but one phase of the battle. No one wants poverty and everyone would like to see it reduced or eliminated. But the country was making great strides in this area long before its presence was officially discovered.

For example, without any special programs, the number of American families with real income below $3,000 a year decreased by 60 percent between 1929 and 1962, while during the same period the number of family units increased by 63 percent.

Indeed, there are now 115 different Federal programs available to combat poverty. The present poverty program is an administrative nightmare, topheavy with administrative costs. In fact, 44 of the top people in that agency draw about $1 billion a year—1 in every 18 employees gets above $19,000 a year. Here we have a sprawling bureaucracy, with overlapping and duplications all over the place.

Now, the only sound program in this area is one to help people help themselves. To the extent that this or any other program does that, on a sound basis, there is no quarrel. But the waste, duplication, and the very magnitude of the undertaking almost defies efficiency in administration.

On the heels of these massive programs there are naturally many ill effects, aside from certain good that is accomplished. In combating poverty, money alone will not suffice. Some of these welfare programs actually encourage unemployment and shiftlessness. There are those who would rather have a welfare check than a job. And there is the problem of how to keep children from becoming infected with a life on public assistance. In other words, this type of aid, improperly applied, can debilitate rather than rehabilitate.

Not long ago a Los Angeles judge told of a young couple with six children, with another on the way, who came before him seeking a divorce. They said they needed the divorce, not because of a domestic rift but rather because, once divorced, the wife could then draw $300 a month in welfare, and the husband was then earning only $250 a month.

There are today 8 million Americans—1 in every 24—receiving some form of public assistance. And this does not include unemployment insurance cases. Direct welfare now costs more than $5.5 billion a year, and is steadily rising at the rate of about a billion dollars every 3 years—despite all the billions that are being spent in the so-called war on poverty.

That raises the question of whether we are treating the symptoms more than the disease. Perhaps more attention should be directed at planned parenthood, free dissemination of birth control information for the benefit of those who seek it. We are told, for example, that 9 out of 10 impoverished women in this country still lack competent birth control information and assistance. More help along that line would give some permanent relief from this chronic and ever-recurring problem.

CONCENTRATION OF POWER MEANS LOSS OF LIBERTY

Thus, we continue this Great Welfare Society outlay of goodies from Washington, despite the fact that we are waging a $10-billion-a-year war in Vietnam. Most of these expensive programs cumulatively bring about an erosion of the States in our scheme of government. Perhaps this would be a good time to be reminded of Woodrow Wilson's warning, when he said:

"The history of liberty is a history of limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because a concentration of power always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

I should like to conclude my remarks with another quotation—this from the prophet Jeremiah, who, in another troubled age, 600 years B.C., said:

"Stand ye in the old ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein."

A Suggestion for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, U.S. economic aid—$77 billion—and military assistance—$34 billion—have amounted to $111 billion gross. These funds, in loans and grants, have been advanced for economic reconstruction and development and for the prevention of subversion in the recipient countries. In addition to rebuilding Western Europe, the United States has undertaken the burden of assisting the economic development of a large number of developing countries. In fiscal year 1966 the United States had bilateral aid programs operating in 72 countries.

The largest recipient of U.S. aid in terms of total dollar amounts is and has been India. Since 1948 we have contributed approximately $7 billion to the support of India. Member countries of the Aid India Consortium organized by the World Bank are currently committing about $1.3 billion a year in aid to India. The U.S. share, including Public Law 480, food for peace, is almost a billion dollars a year. This support has been based both on the humanitarian impulse to help the millions of Indians as well as on a realistic appraisal of India's strategic importance in both size and location.

Between 1960 and 1963 net disbursements of Aid India Consortium loans increased by 125 percent, rising from $384 million to $864 million. This was reflected in greater U.S. aid, which rose from $139 million to $549 million, including local currency loans resulting from Public Law 480 title I sales.

At the same time there was a decline in aid disbursements by Germany and the United Kingdom. The comparison of long-term loans to the government with those to the private sector is highly illuminating. Only $40 million of $904 million in long-term loans received by India in 1963 went to the private—nonmonetary—sector.

The United States ranks second only to IDA in providing the softest loans. In effect we are helping to finance the repayment of some of India's debts to hard loan creditors, as well as finance some of the exports to India from these countries. For instance, in 1963 Germany provided $55 million in economic assistance to India, but had a trade surplus of $164 million. Also, as it stands now, the bulk of our aid is import assistance for the maintenance of Government-owned industries.

The Indian economic development plans have imposed a program on the country which has proved misguided and inadequate. The most essential need of India, improved agricultural production, was neglected in favor of heavy industry; and the problem of population growth was overlooked. Agricultural production has improved somewhat and should increase with a greater supply of fertilizers, but the primitive methods of cultivation remain. India is well blessed with productive agricultural lands, but a technological revolution is necessary for major increases in agricultural production.

This requires the utilization of techniques and talents not now possessed by Indian farmers. A major effort must be made in agriculture, with the assistance of foreign technology and know-how, to modernize farming in India. This will require much greater allocation of human and capital resources, including foreign aid, to improve the agricultural production methods, food distribution system and storage facilities.

The allocation of foreign exchange reserves and the large-scale entry of private investment for fertilizer production was necessary years ago and only came now after the publicity created by the severe drought in India. Indian officials state that this particular area should not be interpreted as a precedent in utilizing foreign investment in all areas. The Indian Government still intends to promote industrial development through the public sector first.

It is readily apparent that a substantial increase in private foreign investment in India is necessary to maintain or increase the rate of growth in the per capita gross national product and to improve the standard of living of the Indian people appreciably. It is a sad commentary on the private investment climate in India that in 1964 total foreign private investment amounted to a mere $60 million, while total annual foreign aid was approximately $1.3 billion. This disparity can be explained to a large extent by the Government's attitude toward private business and individual initiative.

High tax rates on private business—60 to 70 percent—discriminatory allocation of imports to private industry compared with similar allocations to Government-owned industries, preemption of certain areas of the economy for development by Government enterprises, and the requirement of Indian majority control, all discourage much needed private foreign investment.

Other Asian countries, such as Thailand and Pakistan, have realized the importance of the private sector and are working to improve the investment climate. Should the Indian Government change its attitude toward treatment of the private sector and start by altering the above-enumerated impediments and disincentives to private investment, both domestic, and foreign, it could expect a substantial inflow of foreign capital and technology.

The Indian Government has further injured the climate for foreign investments by introducing in the Parliament a new patents bill, which restricts patent protection in India. Industries which consider industrial property rights an important factor in the investment climate will hesitate to enter a country in which the government may destroy the market by undermining patent rights. Inordinate restrictions on private industry and attenuation of industrial property rights will necessarily reduce the amount of technology available to a less developed country.

In his 1966 foreign aid message, President Johnson declared the essence of economic development to be work—"hard, unremitting, often thankless work"—most of which must be done by people in the aid-recipient countries.

The President added:

> Only these people and their leaders can: Invest every possible resource in improved farming techniques, in school and hospital construction and in critical industry; make the land reforms, tax changes and other basic adjustments necessary to transform their societies; face the population problem squarely and realistically; create the climate which will attract foreign investment and keep local money at home.
>
> As I said last October: "Action, not promises, will be the standard of assistance." It must be clear that the principle of our assistance is cooperation. Those who do not fulfill their commitments to help themselves cannot expect help from us.

If the above-noted points were made mandatory guidelines for self-help for recipient countries, the United States would have to end its aid program to India. In view of the total amount of aid being given by the United States, we have the right to expect that India will efficiently utilize all available resources, including aid, to attack its basic problems, so that the greatest possible balanced economic development will ensue. Prior to the commitment of additional funds, Congress should carefully study the reports prepared by the World Bank and the AID mission to India.

Congressman Frank Annunzio Commended for Overseas Credit Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago a Department of Defense directive went into effect authorizing credit unions at overseas military installations.

This victory was the culmination of weeks and months of intensive effort on the part of our colleague, Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO, to bring to an end shameful loan-shark operations that have been victimizing our servicemen.

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which recently conducted hearings on the abuses of service personnel by credit unions, FRANK ANNUNZIO was instrumental in securing a thoroughgoing cleanup of finance companies that prey on servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] has brought credit to the entire House by his forceful campaign to eliminate exploitation of our soldiers. We all owe him a debt of gratitude and I am sure our sense of pride in his dedicated service.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the letters written in recognition of Congressman ANNUNZIO's efforts by Felix Putterman, national legislative director of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, and by J. Orrin Shipe, managing director of CUNA International, Inc., and Mr. W. H. Brietzke, managing director of the Illinois Credit Union League.

The letters follow:

JEWISH WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO: I note with interest that the Department of Defense directive authorizing credit unions at overseas military installations went into effect a little over a week ago.

This action by the DOD represents a major contribution resulting from the investigation you undertook with three of your colleagues in the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Please accept our grateful thanks for the major productive role played by you in protecting our servicemen from gouging by loan sharks. With you we will look forward to the development of credit unions for service personnel that will do much to foster the high morale of our military personnel abroad.

Respectfully,
FELIX M. PUTTERMAN,
National Legislative Director.

CUNA INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Madison, Wis., March 15, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO: It is once again my pleasure on behalf of the worldwide credit union movement to express our deep appreciation for the efforts of you and the other members of the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, Committee on Banking and Currency, to alleviate the burdens imposed on our servicemen by unscrupulous operators. The directive signed by Cyrus Vance, Under Secretary of Defense, on March 3 is a fitting complement to the directive he issued last August.

As you know, the March 3 directive extends the scope of the August directive to military installations overseas. It will now be possible for nearly all our active duty military personnel to obtain the protection of credit union membership. At the same time, it will impose on new and existing credit unions the same high standards demanded of our domestic defense credit unions.

It is a credit to your continuing interest in this matter that the Department of Defense has acted so well and so expeditiously.

Sincerely yours,
J. ORRIN SHIPE,
Managing Director.

ILLINOIS CREDIT UNION LEAGUE,
Bensenville, Ill., March 21, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Speaking for the officers and directors of the Illinois Credit Union League, I am extremely pleased with the role you played in drafting a new Defense Department policy calling for credit unions at U.S. Military Establishments abroad.

It was your emphasis of the need for overseas Defense credit unions through a personal survey of servicemen's credit problems that brought about this forthright directive.

We congratulate and thank you for the loyal support you have given credit unions in the brief time you have served in Congress and look forward to a long and harmonious relationship.

Cordially yours,
W. H. BRIETZKE,
Managing Director.

Support of National Independence in East-Central Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with Vietnam, with NATO, and with the crises of Africa and Latin America, we have tended to lose sight of the fact that millions of human beings are still suffering under the cruel oppression of Communist regimes in Eastern Europe. While there has been a certain measure of independence gained by regimes which are part of the Soviet bloc in Europe, within those regimes human freedom is still tragically restricted.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations has done a great deal to call our attention to the continuation of repressive policies which deprive the peoples of Eastern Europe of the basic right of self-determination we consider essential.

Under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorandum prepared by the assembly entitled "Support of National Independence in East-Central Europe."

The memorandum follows:

SUPPORT OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE, MEMORANDUM

In his state of the Union message to the U.S. Congress on January 12, 1966, the President of the United States pointed out that the most important principle of the American foreign policy was "support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves—and shape their own institutions" because "the insistent urge toward national independence is the strongest force of today's world." The Assembly of Captive European Nations welcomes the spirit of the Presidential message, which is in full accord with the purpose of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, namely, "to uphold, serve, and further the rightful aspirations to freedom, national independence, and social justice of our people."

The assembly believes that, despite the fact that the eyes of the world are at present focused on other crucial problems confronting mankind, the issue of the captive nations belongs in the forefront of international issues. Our conviction is strengthened by the recent developments in East-Central Europe, characterized by new repressive measures against the captive population and by hardening of the Communist line. It is sufficient to point to the recent arrests in Hungary, the campaign against the religious hierarchy in Poland, and the attacks against writers in Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia—an ominous parallel, no doubt, to the writers' trials in the Soviet Union.

The new repressive trends in East-Central Europe indicate that—

1. The Communist regimes invariably draw the line in cultural liberalization whenever the Communist Party's monopoly on ideas is threatened.

2. A large measure of subservience, varying in extent and intensity from country to country, to Soviet (or, in the case of Albania, Chinese) foreign policy still seems to be the price the insecure East-Central European regimes must pay for the indispensable Soviet support, which is a key to their remaining in power. It is also a fact that, in spite of the considerably varied alleviations and changes in East-Central Europe, the Soviet Union continues to heavily influence the domestic and foreign affairs of the captive countries, and that the Communist Parties in the area are determined to perpetuate themselves in power.

The repressive Communist policies make it even more imperative that the free world explore every peaceful avenue to reach the east-central European peoples and assist them in their efforts to achieve both an amelioration of their living conditions and their political goals of freedom and self-determination.

The assembly's views on some of these main avenues of approach are as follows:

1. The assembly agrees with the present U.S. policy of denying Communist regimes goods of strategic value. We are also on record in counseling against long-term credits to Communist regimes, since granting long-term credits to the Communists would be tantamount to a foreign aid program.

The assembly welcomes initiatives that tend to help alleviate the plight of the captive peoples If foreign trade, however, is to support the national aspirations of the now subjugated people of east-central Europe, it should be used to strengthen and encourage these peoples. It should not be used by the despotic Communist regimes to bolster their positions in the countries over which they at present rule. The capitive peoples would greatly profit if East-West trade were to influence the east-central European economies toward preferential treatment of consumer goods production at the expense of heavy industry. Judging by past Communist performances in keeping tight rein on the captive peoples' quest for political freedoms, western trade with the East—aimed at political objectives—does not at present appear to have a meaningful chance of success.

There is no clear-cut proof that cultural exchanges and trade with the West alone have lead to liberalization, relaxation of tensions or concessions of any kind since Stalin's death. So-called "de-Stalinization," and its attendant outgrowth, has been and is initiated and exerted primarily by internal forces—namely, by opposition and resistance on the part of the east-central European peoples to the regimes and regime policies.

2. We believe that full reciprocity should be demanded in cultural exchanges. At present there is a pronounced imbalance between the freedom enjoyed by Communist propaganda and propagandists in the United States and any similar U.S. activities in east-central Europe. A steady flow of Communist propaganda to the communities of peoples of east-central European descent presents many latent dangers. Much of this material is cleverly written and its political message is understated. With the free world not being granted similar privileges in east-central Europe, the Communists are in the advantageous position of selecting their target audiences in the West while they are not facing a corresponding challenge at home. The assembly therefore deems it its duty to combat forcefully the effects of such propaganda material.

Trade and cultural exchanges, important as they are as means of helping the internal changes, cannot by themselves secure self-determination in east-central Europe.

It is our conviction, buttressed by firsthand experience, that a policy of peaceful evolution must not digress from the primary objective—an east-central Europe unfettered by the fiats of totalitarian regimes.

It is equally important that the captive European peoples be aware of the continued determination and willingness of the free world governments to lend their full moral and political support to this national objective.

Any notion of permanence of the status quo in east-central Europe runs against the vital interests of both the captive European nations and the absurd idea that the Communist sphere of influence is off limits for the free nations, while the non-Communist world is a private hunting ground for Communist aggression and subversion under the guise of "national wars of liberation," and other spurious labels.

It is our opinion that a clearcut expression of U.S. nonacceptance of the present illegal and abnormal status quo in east-central Europe would contribute much to the morale of the captive European peoples. The United Nations and major international conferences offer a most appropriate forum for such a policy statement by the United States. Moreover, at the United Nations and before the eyes of the world, Communist methods and wrongdoings can be effectively exposed and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights used as an important weapon to foster the struggle for freedom in the captive countries.

In these days of swift historic changes, when an impressive number of formerly dependent states have gained independence, the plight of the Communist-ruled east-central European nations remains a black mark on the conscience of humanity. Although Communist aggression in other parts of the world may at times divert the free world's attention from the European scene, the new challenge for the forces of freedom lies in their ability of assuring the east-central European peoples that they have not been forgotten.

In this context, the assembly deems it appropriate to draw attention to a report of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives. The report, dated October 29, 1962, recommended, in part, that the United States—

1. "Take prompt, continuous, and energetic steps to make clear to the rest of the world that the United States continues to support the policy of refusing to accept the status quo in Eastern Europe, and the right to self-determination of the peoples of the captive nations;

2. Avail itself of every opportunity to expose—especially to the peoples of the developing countries—the methods, the implications, and the consequences of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, attaching to this task as much importance as our Government does to the championing of the right to self-determination and national independence of the nations of other continents."

Consequently and in summary, the Assembly of Captive European Nations urges the Government and the Congress of the United States—

(a) To use more extensively the international forums in promoting the respect for the right to self-determination of the captive peoples of east-central Europe;

(b) To reaffirm on all appropriate occasions, and especially on the occasion of the Polish millennium, the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian National Revolution, and the national days of the captive countries, the unflinching stand of the U.S. Government and Congress regarding the restoration of national independence and freedom of the subjugated east-central European nations;

(c) To insist on the principle of full reciprocity in cultural exchanges with the East, be it in the field of publications, art, dissemination of information, or tourism;

(d) To use the apparent eagerness of the Communists to expand trade with the West as a lever to ensure that such trade expansion will politically and economically benefit the captive peoples and will not be misused by the regimes to strengthen their hold on the people;

(e) To ask the President of the United States to issue a forceful Captive Nations Week proclamation and to support the observance of Captive Nations Week by appropriate manifestations in the Senate and the House of Representatives;

(f) To lend all-out assistance to the Assembly of Captive European Nations and its member organizations—symbols of the continuity of the struggle for liberty of the enslaved nations of east-central Europe.

Prof. V. Stanley Vardys Surveys the Fate of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania Under Soviet Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, V. Stanley Vardys, associate professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin, has written an excellent article surveying the fate of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania under 25 years of Soviet rule.

Professor Vardys points out that the Russians have pursued a "melting pot" policy in the Baltic Republics. He concludes, however, with the observation that:

> It does not seem that the Baltic melting pot will complete its works in the immediate future.

The article, from the April 1966 issue of Foreign Affairs, follows:

HOW THE BALTIC REPUBLICS FARE IN THE SOVIET UNION

(By V. Stanley Vardys)

The Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, which had been independent between the two world wars, were annexed by the Kremlin in June of 1940, during the dramatic days when Paris fell to the Germans, and became republics of the Soviet Union. In thus reversing the course of modern Baltic history, Moscow separated the Baltic countries not only from Western Europe, toward which they had been oriented in international politics, but also from the nations of Central and Eastern Europe with which they shared most of their social and cultural characteristics. At present one of the main Communist propaganda themes aimed at the postwar generation of Balts is that the independence of their parents was a historical mistake, a deviation from their manifest destiny to be part of Russia. In the Soviet view, Baltic countries should not be independent; their national survival and progress can be assured only by the Leninist nationality policy of the U.S.S.R. Under Khrushchev, the goal of this policy was to establish melting-pot conditions for "the creation of a single nation with a single native [Russian] language."[1] Khrushchev's successors have continued to pursue this objective.

The purpose here is to sketch how the policy has affected the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian national personalities and how the native Communist elites have responded to the integration of their republics into the Soviet Union.

II

The impact of 25 years of Soviet rule in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania has been very far-reaching, especially in demographic, economic, and cultural respects. First, there has occurred an enormous influx of Russian settlers who came to serve in the Moscow-planned industries and thus to replace at least partially the labor of the more than half a million people deported from the Baltic States by Stalin. As a result, the percentage of Russians in Latvia has climbed from prewar 10.6 to 26.6 percent in the census year of 1959, and in Estonia from 8 to 20.1 percent. In Lithuania the Russian numbers increased more modestly, from an estimated 2 percent before the war to 8.5 percent in 1959. To these Russian percentages we must also add the Ukrainian and Byelorussian immigration.

Available evidence also shows that since 1959 the number of Russians has continued to increase at a rapid pace, again primarily in Estonia and Latvia. According to the Soviet Latvian economist Mezgailis, between then and 1962 Estonia and Latvia imported 40 percent of the necessary new labor power, mainly from Russia and Byelorussia. In Lithuania, only 8 percent of the total annual population increase has been reported to be technical, that is, immigrant. The Russian demographic pressure grows further as a result of the "exchange" of cadres, and in Estonia and Latvia by the considerably greater Slavic birth rate. Western observers estimate that if this population movement continues at the present pace, Estonians will be in a minority in their own country by 1985 and Latvians by 1975.[2] The situation in Lithuania is better because the country is less industrialized. The danger to Lithuania lurks in the Kaliningrad (formerly Koenigsberg) region, now inhabited by more than 660,000 Russians. It seems conceivable, and under Khrushchev it was highly probable, that this territory, now an oblast of the Russian Republic, may be added to Lithuania; such an arrangement, which is possible under the planned revision of the Soviet Constitution, would immediately reduce the proportion of Lithuanians to about 60 percent.

These demographic changes were the principal result of an intensive growth of industries. As the inefficient collective farming could not release a sufficient number of Kolkhozniks to man the new factories, and as Moscow made its plans without taking certain Baltic realities into account, the workers were imported, especially in the case of Estonia and Latvia. According to Soviet data, Estonia's production in 1965 was 18.6 times higher than in 1940; Latvia's and Lithuania's production in 1964, it was claimed, had increased 16 times. Estonia is today the most industrialized of Soviet republics. In the mid-sixties, it made over 30 percent of the Soviet Union's larger electric transformers and mined 65 percent of the entire Soviet oil shale. Latvia made 47 percent of all Soviet automatic telephone exchanges, and Lithuania contributed 33 percent of certain electric welding instruments. The republics made agricultural machinery, TVs, radios, refrigerators, cement, bicycles, and furniture, and built ships. More than 70 percent of the total economic production now is industrial. Although Latvia and Estonia, as before the war, remain more highly industrialized than Lithuania, the index of industrialization in all three generally ran ahead of the Soviet average Baltic Communists are very proud of these indeed impressive accomplishments. Their joy, however, may be mixed because they know that very many of the new industries can operate only on substantial quantities of imported materials and that they were developed without regard to local needs and the availability of local labor and without respect to the preservation of native ethno-cultural values.

---

[1] A. A. Isupov, "Natsional'nyi sostav naseleniia SSSR." Moscow: 1964, p. 9.

[2] East Europe, April 1965, p. 20.

Thus the economic and demographic policies of the Soviet Union have combined to create economically dependent industrial melting pots in the Baltic States. In cultural and social fields the aim has been to "internationalize" Baltic cultures. Conditions for what is called the "mutual enrichment of cultures" are especially ripe in large towns. In 1965, 62 percent of the Estonian and 60 percent of the Latvian population lived in cities, in comparison to 36 percent and 35 percent before the war, while Lithuania's percentage was 43 percent, compared to the prewar 23 percent. It is estimated that about one-half of the population of large cities like Riga and Tallinn is Russian. This makes the use of Russian a daily necessity and helps to encourage mixed marriages, linguistically mixed entertainment and recreation facilities, and creates a Russian elite which is favored linguistically and for various government positions.

The Soviet cultural and social policy is thus a policy of integration and assimilation. While on the one hand each Baltic republic can produce statistics surpassing Western Europe in the increase of schools and students, the cultural communication, now developed on a mass scale, is highly saturated with ideas and practices aimed at transferring Baltic loyalties from their own to the Russian nation. This process consists of two complementary aspects—alienation from native culture and traditions and inculcation of melting-pot values. An example of the first is found in the rewriting of Baltic history to show an alleged cultural and political affinity with Russia; of the second, in the way the Russian language continues to squeeze out the native languages in public meetings, in print (especially scientific publications) and in education. On April 18, 1965, Pravda reported the existence in the Baltic republics of bilingual schools, where some classes are taught in the native tongue and others in Russian. In Latvia, the number of such schools, designed to encourage the use of Russian and to integrate children socially, runs into hundreds.

The Soviets apparently have made some ideological gains; for example, in alienating sections of the youth from religion (though not in converting them to atheism) and in superficial Communist indoctrination which produces more pliable citizens. The population on the whole seems to have become resigned to the reality of the Soviet regime.[3] The Soviets have not succeeded, however, in weakening the ethnic and cultural identity of the Balts, nor have they been able to change the priority of loyalties from native to Russian.

What has been the role of the Baltic Communists in this Soviet effort to integrate and to assimilate the Balts? Since they have no autonomy but merely act as the Soviet Communist Party's provincial leaders, they have no choice but dutifully to execute central policies. Almost daily, however, those Baltic leaders, like their East European colleagues, find themselves squeezed between Moscow's demands and their own countrymen's antagonism to Moscow. In trying to appease both, their general pattern has been to seek out the limits of Moscow's tolerance and to retreat, if not yet too late, in face of an accomplished central policy directive. What those limits are, and the potential for self-assertion, can be gaged from some of the more conspicuous cases in which Baltic Communist leaders have been involved. So far, their initiative has been only in economic and cultural, not in political matters. For them, the political relationship to Moscow was settled when the Baltic States "joined" the Soviet Union in the summer of 1940.

It was natural that since the effects of Soviet-style industrialization on a large scale first appeared in Estonia, the first important reactions of Baltic Communist leaders were registered there. The result was the dismissal in 1949–51 of the Estonian Party's first secretary, Nikolai Karotamm, and a nmber of other top Communists. The exact grounds for this have never been explained, but in April of 1951 Karotamm's successor, Ivan Käbin, suggested that the Estonians had resisted the immigration of Russian cadres, had attempted to keep the Estonian Communist Party in Estonian hands and had endeavored to defend some Estonian national traditions.

The new leaders, alleged to be more favorable to Russian influence, kept quiet until after the XX Party Congress in 1956 which raised hopes of autonomy. But on September 22, 1956, Alexei Müürisepp, then chairman of the council of ministers and at present chairman of the Presidium of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, published an article in Izvestiia in which he scored Moscow's economic planners for neglecting the republic's "special economic needs." He sharply criticized the established economic interdependence which did not allow Estonia to use its own materials for Estonian industries and protested the export of Estonian products before the republic's own needs were met. In this very revealing bill of complaints he also criticized the policy of labor supply, singling out for condemnation the displacement of Estonian graduate specialists and the importation of Russians to take their place.

Since Khrushchev was then preparing for the decentralization of economic management, Müürisepp did not lose political favor. However, Latvian and Lithuanian attempts to resist Moscow's policies after the creation of sovnarkhozes in 1957 met with different results. In Latvia, a group of leaders allegedly headed by the deputy chairman of the council of ministers, Eduards Berklavs, was reported to have opposed a further development of heavy industry in the republic and demanded preference for industries for which Latvia had raw materials and could supply laborers. They also wanted their industries to satisfy Latvian consumers first. They further demanded priority for Latvians in admission to party membership and a knowledge of Latvian as a qualification for government and party jobs. In 1959, after an involved investigation, Berklavs and some of his colleagues were fired and disappeared, while others were dismissed from their positions. The purge continued for about 2 more years.

Lithuanian reactions, primarily because of slower industrial development, were of lesser proportions. The economic issues involved are not clear, but public warnings against "national communism" in economic and even in political affairs, the purge of some members of the party's central committee for nationalism as well as the downgrading of old party stalwarts like Kazys Preiksas, indicate that the Lithuanians, too, probed the limits of the autonomy of 1957 too far. In the late fifties, the Lithuanians "sinned" primarily in the educational and cultural field, especially in schools of higher education and in the Ministry of Culture. They were charged with supporting nationalism and the nationalists. As a result, the rector of the University of Vilnius and a number of professors in this and other schools were dismissed for a string of nationalist deviations.

Since the Baltic Communists were unable to stop the dangerously large Russian immigration, they now seem to be working to slow it down. The Estonians are reported to have tightened residence requirements for newcomers to their larger cities. Furthermore, like all the Balts, they hope to reduce the need of imported labor by shifting new industries to small towns where an untapped labor source still exists among housewives and others not gainfully employed. These new industries would be in the light-industry category and would need few imported supplies. Lithuania seems to have the most concrete plans for such development. Arnold Weimer, chairman of the Estonian sovnarkhoz who was purged in 1951 as chairman of the Council of Ministers, assured Theodore Shabad of the New York Times in the summer of 1965 that "no more Russians are being settled in Estonia under government plans." The measures described, however, can hardly be considered sufficient to stem the tide of Russian immigration, because since October 1965 the control of the economy remains firmly in Moscow's hands.

In the cultural field, a number of Baltic Communist leaders also have attempted to maintain the rights of the native language and autonomy in literature and the arts. Continuous battles, some visible, others less so, are fought for cultural positions, with the natives mostly losing but trying again when conditions appear more favorable. In August 1965, for example, Estonians and Lithuanians led in the successful endeavor, important for preserving the native language, to save 11-year secondary education. The exception was granted by Moscow at a time when the reduction of secondary schooling to 10 years was ordered everywhere else. To make their success the more notable, they had even dared to issue public requests in the local and the central press.

It must be added, however, that these Baltic efforts may very likely have succeeded because of incidental help from public opinion abroad. Judging from the amount of publicity given to the matter in Moscow and the Baltic Republics, it seems reasonably certain that a resolution of the U.S. House of Representatives (H. Con. Res. 416), passed on June 17, 1965, and calling attention of American and world opinion to the denial of self-determination to the Baltic States, set the stage for a favorable response in Moscow. The Soviets have always been sensitive to

---

[3] This change of attitude contrasts sharply with the violent opposition of the regime just after World War II, when Soviet rule was resisted by force of arms. In Lithuania, for example, a guerrilla war between 1944–52 caused at least 40,000 casualties, half of them guerrilla, half Communist. These are Soviet figures and probably should be revised upward.

American opinion in such cases, and on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Soviet occupation of the Baltic countries may have felt embarrassed to disregard the Baltic pleas, especially since the United States still does not recognize the Soviet annexation.

Despite such occasional successes, the degree to which it is possible for Baltic Communists to protect the economic and cultural interests of their people is rather severely limited. This is due, at least in part, to their own ideological attitudes, but mainly to the Russian controls over the party and government apparatus and the lack of native strength in the local Communist parties. About 1957, Moscow fully restored the system of Russian "doubles" in party and government offices. In the midsixties, furthermore, the percentage of ethnic Balts in their own parties was still very low, despite the lessened reluctance by the younger generation to join party ranks. The Estonian and Lithuanian parties have only about 60 percent native ethnic members, while the Latvian membership in the Latvian party has shrunk to less than 45 percent. In all three cases the percentage of ethnic natives is considerably lower than their percentage in population, showing that the Russian minority exercises a disproportionate share of influence in republic administration.

The Baltic future, then, cannot be determined by the actions of Baltic Communists, but will depend on the results of the broader Soviet nationality policy in the area. At present, Moscow focuses attention on creating melting-pot conditions which are expected to forward a natural process of assimilation. However, the pace of this endeavor is already slackening. The splits in international communism, the slowing down of the Soviet economic development, the competition for power inside the Kremlin and the recurring international crises do not favor concentrated domestic action. These factors might induce an occasional breathing spell, as happened between the overthrow of Khrushchev in October 1964 and the centralization of economic management in October 1965; pressures for russianization might thus be slowed down. For these reasons, it does not seem that the Baltic melting pot will complete its work in the immediate future.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as we again celebrate the anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day, March 25, 1918, it is gratifying to be reminded of the importance of ideas in a world which seems to be impressed chiefly by facts and actions.

We are, to be sure, honoring a very important fact—the emergence of Byelorussia as an independent democratic republic. Yet that fact and, alas, even the existence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic in its truly independent form were of short duration in the annals of history.

The idea behind that fact was, however, hundreds of years old, and it had persisted and has since persisted in spite of all attempts to eradicate it.

The very briefness of the actual existence of that independent Republic emphasizes the strength of the idea that brought it into existence and which has kept it alive in the minds of the Byelorussian people for the nearly half century since repressive Soviet measures turned it into a component part of the Soviet Union.

The alleged sovereignty of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in the United Nations is a hollow mockery. It is merely a designation by the Soviets for the sole purpose of an additional sympathetic vote in that assembly; and completely violated by them in all other respects.

Despite earlier Russian and later Soviet domination and cruel repression of all evidence of nationalistic tendencies in the Byelorussian S.S.R., however, the idea of true independence for Byelorussia has continued to flourish for centuries. For the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic which we celebrate today was the culmination of the hopes and efforts of the people of that country who had sought to be free for hundred of years. In spite of cruel buffeting from one to another by their covetous neighbors—Russia, Poland, Germany, and Russia again—the Byelorussian people had nevertheless maintained their determination to be free, their faith in the eventual attainment of freedom, and also their homogeneity of culture and custom. Despite all outward pressures they were to succeed in bringing their idea to fruition; and for a short time the Byelorussians enjoyed true independence.

When the Soviet armies crushed the Byelorussian Democratic Republic as an independent nation, and took it over completely, destroying all but its nominal outward independence, the idea of true independence did not die. Despite all Soviet efforts to eradicate it, it persists.

We in the United States, who have cherished the idea of freedom from our earliest beginnings, honor it today in the Byelorussian anniversary celebration. Againis all odds, the free spirit of Byelorussia prevails.

America's Prize-Winning Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Parade magazine, which yearly makes an award for the new highway which best embodies the principles of beauty and utility, has selected as their 1965 winner, the Carson Pass Highway—California State Route 88.

This historic road well deserves the honor that has come to it.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, an article from Parade magazine giving the history and development of this fine highway route.

AMERICAN'S PRIZE-WINNING HIGHWAY

(By Ed Kiester)

A hundred and twenty-two years ago, the famed scout and trapper Kit Carson led Capt. John C. Frémont's exploring expedition over the Sierra Nevada into California. In the years that followed the Carson Pass Highway became the route of wagon trains and forty-niners. Today the historic mountain-pass road, designated State Route 88, is improved and widened but is just as breathtakingly beautiful as when Carson traversed it in 1844. And five expert judges have chosen a new 16-mile section east of Sacramento as the Parade scenic highway for 1965.

Given each year since 1960, the Parade scenic highway award annually designates the new highway which best embodies the principles of good design, beauty, and utility. For building this year's winning highway, the California division of highways will receive a bronze plaque. Louis G. Kroeck, district design engineer, will be given a scroll. The Amador County Chamber of Commerce, which submitted the nomination, receives a $500 U.S. savings bond.

The judges singled out five other new highways for special mention. They are:

Interstate Route 495, Boxborough to Southborough, Mass.

Interstate Route 95, Fredericksburg to Woodbridge, Va.

Route 22–322, north of Amity Hall, Pa.

Interstate Route 85, from Route 98 to Route 51, Georgia.

Interstate Route 89, in the Boltan-Richmond area of Vermont.

Judges for the contest were John Gibbons of the Automotive Safety Foundation; Jack Wood of the American Planning & Civic Association; Charles N. Brady of the American Automobile Association; Wilbur O. Garmshausen of the Ohio Department of Highways, representing the American Society of Landscape Architects; and Jack Ritter of Engineering News-Record.

In choosing the Carson Pass Highway, the judges gave the award for the first time to a two-lane highway—and for the first time to a road more than a mile high. The prize-winning section, which runs from Foster Meadows Road to a point east of Silver Lake, threads along a ridge at an average altitude of more than 5,000 feet. In some places it rises to more than 8,500 feet.

MAGNIFICENT COUNTRY

In such an area you might think it difficult to build a modern highway, yet the new Route 88 has no grade greater than 5 percent, has curves of moderate radius. At the same time it takes full advantage of the scenic view. "This is magnificent country," engineer Kroeck says, "and the objective is not to spoil it but to open it up." To do so, Kroeck provided for 12 scenic overlooks and parking areas where motorists could pull off to enjoy the view. One of these, according to the Amador Chamber of Commerce, "affords a truly spectacular view of Silver Lake." Enigneers also followed a policy of "selective thinning" to clear away those trees that blocked good views while retaining others of the evergreens that enhanced the landscape. They also planted cuts and fills immediately with shrubs and seedlings, and as a final touch, obliterated the old, winding road so that it would not mar the landscape.

The new Route 88 had been planned from the first to be a showcase of Sierra Nevada beauty, and as such it to be taken into the newly designated State scenic highway network. Five years on the drawing board and 2 years in construction, it was built according to "esthetic guidelines" set down by the Division of Highways in line with new and nationwide interest in highway beautification. As the Nation's web of scenic highways expands, America can expect many new and spectacular highways all across the country. But few will be as beautiful, as breathtaking, or as historic as the Parade Scenic Highway for 1965.

United States Now Taking Communist Tri-Continental Conference in Cuba More Seriously

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day, the distinguished columnist, Mr. Ray Cromley, wrote in his column which appears in the Washington Daily News of the growing concern by the United States with the recent Communist Tri-Continental Conference in Cuba.

Last month here on this floor I called attention to the fact that the Communists had spelled out their plans for subversion and terror on three continents if their present war of subversion of South Vietnam succeeds.

It is reassuring to me to see that others are now beginning to reflect the importance of the Tri-Continental Conference.

Mr. Cromley's article follows:

MOSCOW TURNS HAWK IN THE ANDES

(By Ray Cromley)

Now, after several weeks of detailed study, U.S. officials take very seriously the recent Communist Tri-Continental Conference in Cuba.

This analysis makes clear:

Russia has radically shifted its program for Latin America. The past 2 years, apparently, Moscow has wanted to go slow in promoting Latin revolutions, except in a handful of countries. The Russians, seemingly, were playing it safe.

Now Brezhnev seems to be backing Castro in pushing for revolts in every Latin country as the opportunity arises.

The Soviet Union apparently has decided to back this new program with increased funds, arms, and supplies.

INSTRUMENT

Major emphasis will still be on Venezuela, Colombia, Guatemala, and Peru. The Venezuelan Communist guerrilla chieftain, Pedro Medina Silva, was chosen head of the new organization that will funnel Red supplies to the Latin underground.

But the new objective—it now appears—is for Red guerrillas to be prepared for Dominican Republic-like opportunities, whenever and wherever they may appear.

The Reds are unhappy that they were not better organized and supplied at the time of the Dominican revolt. They hope that through this new program, next time they will be able to move in and take over a country before the United States is able to move in in force.

The Russians now seem in Latin America to be backing the tough Red Chinese line promulgated by Mao Tse-tung.

COMPETITION

Some analysts here believe this Russian shift is in part a Russian attempt to take the initiative from Mao, who had been capturing the imagination of tough, militant young Reds in South and Central America.

In part, it's thought this new organization for promoting revolts (the Latin American Solidarity Organization) is intended to stir up enough of a furor to weaken the U.S. military effort in Vietnam.

Another Dominican Republic, or a series of similar episodes, the Reds reason, would strengthen the hand of those who argue that the United States cannot at one and the same time fight to win in Vietnam and keep its commitments in Latin America, Europe, and Africa.

There is some evidence that the Russians have been discouraged of late with the failure of their attempts to win over governments with political activity, subversion, and other means short of guerrilla wars. They are thus now in the mood for putting a greater push behind underground wars through the world—in places where Russia can step aside if things go the wrong way. Analysts believe the Russians will make certain wars that escalate won't involve them.

Most probable result here: A step-up in the U.S. training of Latin military officers and police in counterguerrilla tactics.

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson Sets High Standard of Conduct in Turbulent Washington Life—Tribute by Doris Fleeson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star of March 22 the distinguished columnist, Doris Fleeson, brought to our attention the poised and radiant performance of our gracious and gentle First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Earlier this year Mrs. Johnson, at a White House ceremony, unveiled the portrait of one of her duly great predecessors, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mrs. Johnson pointed out:

> The Constitution of the United States outlines the responsibilities and duties of the President. It does not even mention the First Lady. No one, except her husband, chooses her, no one, except her husband, and herself, defines her role. Given this vague mandate, a long line of American First Ladies have brought anyone a number of admirable qualities to their eras.

To her era, Mrs. Johnson has brought dignity, taste, and serenity.

MRS. JOHNSON REMAINS UNFLAPPABLE

(By Doris Fleeson)

In the present peevish atmosphere of Washington, the one unflappable individual, as poised and radiant as ever, is Mrs. Lyndon Johnson.

In the face of sharply mounting troubles for her husband, her personal strength and dignity have never been more apparent nor more eloquent. She does not permit herself to be aggressive or defensive. No quotable phrase or impulsive gesture escapes her control.

Months ago she explained that she would cut back her public appearances this year to be with the President and prepare for their younger daughter's wedding. This aim has not prevented her from pursuing her interest in beautification, Operation Headstart for seriously deprived preschool children, and similar projects. But the pace is gentler, the travels curtailed.

The political touch is as sure as ever. The midterm elections are at this point confusing; nobody is quite sure how the Vietnam trauma will be reflected in the voting. Conflicts of ambition and personality are popping up all over the country, posing in many cases the delicate issue of youth versus age.

Mrs. Johnson, as consummate a politician as the President, who has not hesitated to take political risks where they seem to be indicated, is avoiding even the appearance of involvement in these vexations. She still does not efface herself.

Next week she will spend 5 days in her home State on an adroit combination of her interests. Her program includes participation in the ambitions of Austin and the gayety of San Antonio, the planting of a tree bought by daughter Lynda, and her most rugged conservation adventure yet.

The White House women correspondents, a soft-living lot, blanched when staff director Elizabeth Carpenter outlined her own personal rehearsal of 2 days in the primitive Big Bend country, including 6 hours on a raft shooting the Rio Grande rapids. That Mrs. Carpenter, definitely not an outdoor type, survived unmarked did not reassure them.

It is certain that only Mrs. Johnson could secure wide press and public notice for her State's effort to lure more tourists to Big Bend, exciting as it is in some respects.

Mrs. Johnson's remarkable equanimity has long been an effective thermostat for the blast furnace that is Lyndon Johnson. It has never been more important than now, with a little war escalating into a potential nuclear trigger and a thriving boom accelerating into inflation. Compared to these problems, the campaign difficulties are flea bites.

Perhaps Mrs. Johnson's greatest service in Washington these days is simply in setting standards for the men. While so many of them, in and out of the administration and Congress, are running about as if they were losing their heads, she is serenely keeping hers.

United Steelworkers of America Buy Canned Chocolate Milk for South Vietnamese Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the hardship and human misery inflicted on the civilian population in South Vietnam touch all of us. Just this week, I found on my desk a copy of a letter from Mr. Walter J. Burke, secretary-treasurer of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO–CLC, to various officials of his union. Mr. Burke, who is a personal friend of mine and with whom I served on several statewide civic and governmental committees in Wisconsin, outlined a project which shows the great heart of the international union movement in this country.

The United Steelworkers of America—USWA—are now raising funds to buy canned chocolate milk for the South Vietnamese children to halt malnutrition and other related diseases. This immense project deserves the encouragement of everyone interested in alleviating the miserable plight of the people of Vietnam—today's battleground against communism.

Mr. Burke's eloquent letter speaks for itself.

I am pleased to place it in the RECORD.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 21, 1966.

To all United Steelworkers of America district directors, staff representatives, and local union recording secretaries.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: One of the most unfortunate side effects of the Vietnamese conflict is the great hardship being inflicted upon the civilian population. Human misery visited upon any group is to be deplored, but it is particularly touching as it involves small children. There is a great deal of such misery in South Vietnam today.

You may not realize that workers in South Vietnam have bonded together in bona fide labor unions in an effort to improve their lot. The central organization, comparable to the AFL–CIO in our country, is known as Confederation of Vietnamese Workers.

Under current circumstances the union, of course, has been forced to undertake added responsibilities. One of these is to provide schools and social centers with limited clinical facilities. There are 21 of these now in existence, scattered throughout South Vietnam. All are small one or two-story structures.

Diseases, mostly of the skin and intestinal disorders, which are so rampant among Vietnam's children, are in part at least caused by malnutrition.

One of the foods which is most scarce is milk. But ordinary milk, or even reconstituted powdered milk have their limitations in so hot a climate where the water is not always sanitary. A safer and more appetizing form of milk is canned chocolate milk.

We propose purchasing a quantity of this and possibly other safe nutritional foods to be distributed by the Vietnamese unions in their schools as a sort of midmorning meal. It may be, however, that because of war conditions we would have to substitute another program.

This gift would be far more significant if it came about as a result of action by individual union members in the United States.

We ask, therefore, that the local unions of the United Steelworkers of America contribute to this very worthwhile cause. The amount can be modest; it's the principle that counts. We desire to have participation by every local union in our organization.

Please make out the check to Walter J. Burke, for the Vietnamese Children's Fund, and send it to 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,
WALTER J. BURKE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Vietnam Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam commands the continuing attention of us all. We talk of little else. We read more and more about the various issues involved and the various proposals for ending the war.

The confusion remains. The questions raised in the following editorial in the Pittsburgh Catholic written by the distinguished Right Reverend Monsignor Charles Owen Rice still plague us. Father Rice, who is pastor of the Holy Rosary Church in Pittsburgh, Pa., lucidly outlines the points which lack clarification in our thinking about this war. I commend this editorial to the reading of my colleagues:

VIETNAM QUESTIONS

(By Msgr. Charles Owen Rice)

Successive administrations have brought the United States deeper into the Vietnam conflict. We have escalated, but each step was taken in the expectation that it would hasten the end of the war. It was all done on expert advice and with expert assurance. New actions were taken to uplift our Viet allies, to crush or discourage the enemy, to express our solid determination to stay to the finish and above all to get the thing over wtih.

Nothing has worked. Everything has failed. Our allies are weaker than ever. The enemy is still full of fight. We have won no meaningful victories and peace is as far away as ever. How much longer are we to proceed in this fashion? How many more escalations must there be until our decision makers see the light? Will they ever see, or will they plunge deeper and deeper into the bog? It is truly frightening.

Those who stand strongly for peace and disengagement are not impressed by the experts. Why should anyone be impressed by them? They have advised wrongly at every turn. They have been promising victory, or at least turn of the tide, all in vain. Things do not work out as they predict because they are psychologically unable to see the truth. They are living in the past and on another continent. The military is always prepared for a war other than the immediate one. The diplomats and the strategists are pursuing a line of attack that would have worked well with Hitler, would have kayoed Kaiser Bill, and would have made hash of the Forces of the Confederacy, but is missing fire in southeast Asia.

As Tolstoy pointed out out in "War and Peace," confusion and misinformation accompany all wars. In this one our confusion goes beyond methods and enters into our aims. What are we trying to do? Are we out to deter an aggressor? Who is the aggressor? Eighty percent of the men who fight against us are natives of the region we are trying to subdue.

Are we standing up to Communist China? There are no Chinese fighting men involved. These are Chinese weapons but our foes have more American weapons than Chinese.

Are we there to help the South Vietnamese? We blow up their villages, poison their crops and kill their kids. Strange help, that. In a sincere effort to help, we have people working with the peasants to build a strong agricultural economy, but these good people are not running the show, actually they are subject to the overall military strategy.

Why are we there? We are told that it is to honor a sacred commitment. Who was authorized to make such a commitment in the name of the people of the United States? Did a completely legal government accept it? What government now exists that is possessed of the right to ask us to remain at so great a cost to its people? Secretary Rusk has discovered that the South East Asia Treaty Organization commits us and gives us the right to remain in South Vietnam. That statement surprised more people than it convinced.

We are told that continuing the war will prevent Communist expansion in all of Asia. It, in truth, is not able to prevent the expansion of communism right where the war is being fought. Communism has fattened on modern war. War's dislocation and destruction put the Communists in power in Russia, Eastern Europe, and China. It will help them again in Asia. Their propaganda is tailored to the human misery of the Asian masses and all our military might cannot circumvent it. Ideas, even bad ones, cannot be stopped by bullets, fire or hardware.

The war we are capable of waging, regardless of how we intensify it, is not the sort that can defeat our present opponent. Even the dreaded third world war would not knock him out, it might help him.

So, we shall either fight forever or make a sensible peace. Let us begin by studying ways to live with the enemy, that is, seek an accommodation. If we can subdue our old-fashioned sense of manifest destiny and subordinate our military, making them servants again, not masters, then we shall have a chance for peace.

Prayer Decision Statement by Citizens for Public Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an outstanding memorandum entitled "Peoples' Amendment for Public Prayer," issued by Citizens for Public Prayer, Central Massachusetts Area, Rutland, Mass., in my district, under the direction of Father Robert G. Howes, and carrying the description, "Action Memorandum No. 1, 1966."

I think that this memorandum is very opportune and timely, and it comes when several public opinion polls indicate that a preponderant majority of Americans favor repeal of the prayer amendment.

I have been interested in this question for sometime past, and have addressed the House on the subject, and have made repeated efforts to repeal or change the prayer amendment, so that the legal right of the American people and their children to pray as they see fit would be restored.

Let all Americans who believe in prayer join in the efforts for repeal. In that event, the voice of the people will prevail.

The memorandum referred to follows:

PEOPLES' AMENDMENT FOR PUBLIC PRAYER

(Action Memorandum No. 1, (1966), of Citizens for Public Prayer, Central, Massachusetts area, Rutland, Mass.)

1. This memorandum is based on a very close familiarity with the prayer amendment effort as it happened here in Washington the first time around (2 years ago). We who believe in this amendment must move out beyond naiveté if we are to win this

time. What is suggested here, then, may appear tough and bold, but is the only way. If the goal we seek is as noble as any which has ever opened before a people, our means toward it must be insistent and unrelenting. Otherwise, that small and vocal band which opposes us will once again defeat the will of the American people.

2. Letters to your Representatives in the Congress must multiply and must be repeated again and again until firm evidence is provided you that those Representatives have in fact acted now for amendment. Unfortunately some citizens are being answered by some of their Representatives here with a statement that they have introduced a pro-prayer bill. Since all bills are now blocked in committee, such an answer is interesting but, frankly, useless. When a citizen receives this answer, he must immediately write his Representative again doing three things:

(a) Thanking him for having introduced the bill,

(b) Asking to know what precisely the Representative proposes to do to blast his bill out of the committee where it is now blocked. Asking also if the Representative has signed the discharge petition to force action on the amendment proposals, and

(c) Asking the Representative to speak out in the very near future on the floor of the Congress or in some other major public forum denouncing those who prevent action on the pro-amendment bills and demanding the right to vote on those bills.

3. Once again, so important is this matter of preserving public reverence, the question must be put to—

(a) State legislatures with a demand that they record themselves again, as many did before, for the peoples' amendment for public prayer;

(b) Every candidate for major State office;

(c) Every candidate for local school board; and

(d) Every city council, board of selectmen, school board, with a demand that they record themselves again at least for the right of the people to decide this matter as their conscience dictates to them.

4. It must be carefully remembered that there are not one but three fundamental aspects to our effort in behalf of a peoples' amendment for public prayer:

(a) There is the aspect of the brotherhood of prayer itself. This is education for citizenship in a pluralistics society. The little moment of prayer cannot do everything. It can do much. Its removal is a denial of a room for God in that place where most of the children of the United States begin to learn the arts and sciences of community.

(b) There is the aspect of fallout. Once establishment is equated with any accommodation of government with religion, even as spirit, whether nondenominational and voluntary or not, a rule is set up and by this rule every other practice of public reverence, if the Court follows its own logic, must be denied.

(c) There is the aspect of democracy itself. A Gallup poll 3 years ago showed 72 percent of the American people demanding prayer in the schools. A Louis Harris poll in October of 1964 showed 88 percent in favor of prayer in schools. A poll of his northern Virginia delegation a few days ago by Congressman JOEL BROYHILL shows 78 percent in favor of a constitutional prayer amendment. And yet for 3 years no effective action has been forthcoming in the Congress to meet the clear will of the Nation. Unless something can be done soon to break the logjam on this critical matter, the conclusion is inescapable—there is something very seriously wrong with the democratic process. Even those who do not accept the prayer amendment position we espouse should join us in deploring tactics which permit one chairman of a House committee to prevent even the chance of a free floor vote on this so very vital issue.

5. Those who believe as we do that so long as the erroneous interpretation of the first amendment by the Supreme Court stands all public reverence is in danger must particularly seek the support of their clergy. Petitions in favor of the peoples' amendment for public prayer should be presented to local and staff clergy as well as to church-affiliated laity for signature. This, surely, is a business in which the clergy of the United States should be leading their flocks.

6. We must remind ourselves again and again that we are in a fight where victory alone counts. We either win or we have lost. We are not engaged in an exercise in legislative gymnastics. We are not in this to hear ourselves talk. We are doing this because we are convinced that the two prayer decisions are very seriously wrong on historic, moral, and psychological bases. Win we must. Promises are meaningless to us—good will means little. We have got to count noses and votes. We have simply got to keep speaking, writing, organizing, pressing until we do win and public reverence is once again safe in this once reverent republic. There is no other way.

7. These objections continue to arise against us. In each case, here is a brief response:

(a) Objection: Why not pray at home? True, why not pray at home, but why not also commonly, side by side, in school? Is God only someone we talk about privately, someone we hide away in private corners but never let out when others are around? God belongs as much where we congregate as where we stand silent and alone.

(b) Objection: Whose prayer? This is one of the most insidious of the objections. We believe very strongly in the commonsense of the American people. We believe that left to their own local devices in this matter they would continue to act as they did in the past with a minimum of mistake and a maximum of decency. To suppose that any religious group, in a slight majority in a given school district, would be so callous of its neighbors' rights as to demand a clearly sectarian prayer in that district's schools, is to impugn the native generosity of the people of the United States. We believe, as it did for nearly two centuries, prayer in our schools would be operated with a barest exceptional case of intolerance and with a great rule of patience and forebearance on all sides.

(c) Objection: You're putting discord into the Nation. This is an exact reversal of what has in fact happened. The apple of discord was thrown among the American people on this matter by an erroneous Court when it destroyed a practice which had been going on for many generations with a minimum of objection. Far from being a source of discord, the effort for a prayer amendment (as the polls show) has united the American people as seldom before in a great grassroots ecumenism.

8. Here, to refresh your memory, is the sense of the Becker amendment. The new amendment will no doubt run similar:

"Nothing in the Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to, prayers or Biblical Scriptures in any public school or governmental institution or place, if participation is voluntary. Nothing in the Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a supreme being in any governmental, or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States."

Rhodesia: What of the Africans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, people who are predisposed to support the Smith regime in Rhodesia have sometimes visited that country and reported back that the African population is content and even happy with the present government. But as a recent article in the Manchester Guardian Weekly stated:

> The visitor does not sense what is simmering under the surface.

The article is a very thoughtful expression of the attitudes of the African population in Rhodesia. I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the Members may gain a deeper understanding of the Rhodesian situation.

RHODESIA: WHAT OF THE AFRICANS?

(By the Bishop of Matabeleland)

"I saw no signs of unrest." So said a British MP in Salisbury recently. And any visitor to Rhodesia is always struck by the quietness of the country—or at least the part he sees. The black population appears to be going about its business. You hear tables of strikes, of police brutality, of fear, and intimidation. Yet everything looks—just normal. No sign of any trouble at all.

What is the answer? Are Africans just apathetic? Do they not care? Certainly, in the towns, which is all most visitors to Rhodesia see, many of them are terrified of losing their jobs. There is much unemployment. They are threatened that if they strike, for instance, they will be dismissed instantly. And their suspicion—no doubt well founded—is that there will be others who will soon step into their shoes if they do lose their jobs. So they carry on as if nothing were happening in the political field—publicly at least.

The visitor does not sense what is simmering under the surface. It looks like apathy. After all, there has been no serious trouble. A feeble attempt at a strike in Bulawayo, one or two agitators shot by the police (that is the story)—it doesn't add up to much. So the Africans can be ignored. Let us get on with negotiations to end the Rhodesian affair. A few from Britain and a few from Rhodesia—perhaps from the lower levels just for the sake of appearances—could get the thing cleared up speedily. The Africans are not really interested; they are so apathetic they will accept anything that is agreed and firmly enough imposed.

Are they so apathetic? Admittedly they are patient. They have suffered much. Parts of the Matabeleland area of Rhodesia have had 3 inches of rain in the last 12 months. You can't get very excited if your life is as precarious as that—for those conditions are not unusual. And they have a tradition of law abidingness. Their whole tribal tradition is based on a hierarchical system and they expect to obey authority. Moreover, they have had 70 years of colonial rule, and not rule from Whitehall, but the colonialism of a dominant white minority making good use of their labor and determined to keep the "munt" in his place. And their undoubted advance—and let us not deny that there has been a considerable advance, in education, in prosperity, in comfort and civilized amenities—has depended on their being amenable to their white masters.

So by tradition they will accept much—even though behind the deference or the cheerful smile there may be a deep and rankling resentment.

Many undoubtedly are at a loss to know what is going on. They do not understand the issues. The whole present unhappy affair looks to them like a sort of game played (they fear at Africans' expense) by the whites. Most older Africans have had very little education—if any at all. Their apprehension of politics is by no means lacking, but it is simple; and the complexities of economic sanctions are beyond them. They have seen so many puzzling things during the last few months. Sir Humphrey Gibbs, stated by the British Government to be the ruling authority in Rhodesia, but obviously not in control—where is his authority—stripped of the trappings of power, his guards removed, his official car given to a rebel usurper? This is not how the African conceives of authority. No wonder it all looks like a game.

But it should not be assumed that the level of political interest is low. On the contrary, many observers who have the opportunity of assessing this matter would agree that there is a far keener and more mature political concern among Africans than among a comparable cross section of Europeans.

But there is inevitably frustration. It is difficult to keep political concern alive in present circumstances. First, all African political leaders with any measure of support in he country are safely out of circulation. This must be counted one of the Smith regime's cleverest moves—though one has to concede that they learn it from the predecessors, Edgar Whitehead's United Federal Party. As soon as any political leader shows himself he is sure to be apprehended on suspicion, and he will probably not be heard of again for a long time. There are ample means of "putting away" those whose continued liberty is an embarrassment; and it is simple to justify such actions by labeling them "saboteurs," "agitators," "thugs," "intimidators," or something similar. Restriction for 5 years at a time is possible; and now with a "state of emergency" covering the whole country, detention in jail without trial is possible, and it is an offense for anyone to mention the whereabouts of any detainee.

One imagines that this was commonplace in Nazi Germany, or in occupied France during the last war; but in a country as short of leadership as Rhodesia there is little chance of an effective underground movement developing. Moreover the police are extremely efficient. In fact they are everywhere—ubiquitous Land-Rovers and trucks with their wiremesh windows are a familiar feature of the Rhodesian scene. And the fear of the police is quite shocking to those whose experience has been largely of the British "bobby." They are aided by a considerable number of "informers." The extent of this unpleasant growth is unknown, though one doubts whether it is as great as most Africans suppose. What is certain is that "intimidation," a word much bandied about, is practiced now upon the African people far more by the government than by the African "agitators." Stories of smashing of people's homes by police who are dissatisfied with the replies to their questions, of the beating of suspects in order to extract information—these are what we hear, and the result is a bitterness and terror, and a complete mistrust of the police which augurs ill for the future. And the District Commissioner who in a time of extreme drought could dismantle the wells in his district, so that the people had to dig for water—he is hardly likely to retain their respect. "You see the hare making water in the bush," he said to them when they complained. "You don't see where it goes to drink, but it must get water from somewhere. Go and do the same."

This kind of suffering is unseen—but it is there nonetheless. As far as Britain is concerned, said President Nyerere recently, the African might not exist. An exaggeration no doubt; but there is yet an uncomfortable measure of truth in it. So much of the talk of negotiations seems to suggest some sort of rapprochement with the present white regime—and little else. To the African mind such negotiations would only indicate that his suspicion of British intentions was well-founded; a rebel does not become less a rebel with the lapse of time—and meanwhile hundreds of Africans are eating their hearts out in prison or restriction camps, and their families, deprived of a breadwinner, are often almost destitute. Where is the justice of negotiations with the Smith regime while such evils go unchecked?

And let it not be forgotten that all this goes on under the provisions of the very constitution which some would like to see made the basis for a settlement. So the African is only confirmed in his conviction that the opposition of the Nationalists to that constitution was abundantly justified. How can this be a good constitution if it permits a state of affairs to develop which is totally contrary to the declaration of rights? What is the point of a constitutional council which is powerless to do more than delay discriminatory legislation, and which can be bypassed by an unsympathetic government with a two-thirds majority and with the power to insure such a majority by reducing the number of "B" roll seats?

Much has been made of the bitterness of the white Rhodesians toward Britain and especially toward Mr. Wilson. By all means let that be recognized, and every effort made to break down such a formidable barrier to a just settlement. But account must be taken of African bitterness, too. There is little sign of a determined effort to deal sympathetically with what is likely to be an even greater obstacle to the future peace and happiness of all races in Rhodesia.

War on Poverty a Boon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Detroit, Mich., News of Wednesday, March 9, 1966, pointing out that the war on poverty has been a boon.

This excellent editorial is based on a careful study by Mr. Tom Joyce, an extraordinarily able young reporter, who has examined the program in depth:

PLENTY OF FEDERAL BOONDOGGLING BUT WAR ON POVERTY A BOON

With this edition of the News, a careful study of the first 18 months of President Johnson's much ballyhooed war on poverty by Reporter Tom Joyce is concluded. The basic question posed at the start was whether this war was a "boon or a boondoggle."

Without question we believe it is a boon.

It is very easy to criticize this scheme. Born as a political campaign tool, it has been a political pawn ever since. True to the traditions of the Federal bureaucracy, it has attracted its share of incompetents, redtape, and corruption. It has meant more Federal fingers in local affairs, huge costs with small dividends and a good deal of controversy.

We do not expect the criticism to stop, nor should it stop if there is something to criticize.

Let us hope, however, that the critics give ample thought to the facts as developed through the efforts of Joyce and others who have taken the time to make on-the-spot investigations.

For every person who reads about a rumble at a Job Corps training site, there are others who were there and can testify that job skills are being taught effectively to young people who would otherwise be destined to swing aimlessly through a lifetime cycle of poverty.

For every person who believes "you can't erase poverty," there are others who have been working in the slums and have seen this poverty cycle being broken.

In the strict sense, it is probably true that some people will always be poor because their health, age or intellect frustrate all efforts to lift them out of misery. But each new effort to ease the burden of the 34 million "poor" uncovers more effective ways to reduce that number.

The best time to fight poverty is right now, when abundance is so evident. It is also the time when progress comes hardest, for the poor are more easily overlooked. And the clear need for controlled Federal spending to ward off inflation further complicates the problem.

In view of the evident successes of those poverty war programs dealing with youth and job training for those with the most limited skills, it seems obvious that the strongest possible support must be given such programs.

A task of this immense size demands priorities, and if the first year and a half of experience has taught anything, it has taught that the poverty cycle can most effectively be broken at the level of the young.

Looking back on these first 18 months, we don't agree with those who claim money's being poured down that ever-present rathole. More accurately, we have been throwing it like a handful of seeds over an acre of fertile soil.

Some of the seeds have blown away in the wind; others have fallen on rocky ground; some have produced healthy young plants and many have not had time to germinate.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, we pay tribute to the inspiring courage and fortitude of the Byelorussian people.

The Byelorussians are among the less numerous and little known Slavic peoples on the east European borderland, east of Poland and west of Moscow. For centuries they have been subjected to ruthless Russian czarist regimes, and their struggle to gain independence and liberty continues to this day despite deprivations, hardships, national persecution, economic exploitation, and social oppression. They have never forgotten their distinct national identity.

On March 25, 1918, the events of World War I and the Russian revolution gave the Byelorussians their long-sought opportunity to break away from the shackles of their oppressors. They proclaimed the establishment of the Byelorussian Republic, and organized a new government designed to give them educational, cultural, and social opportunities which had been denied to them for so long.

But these 10 million hard-working and liberty-seeking people were able to enjoy the fruits of freedom only for a short-time. Early in 1921, Soviet forces attacked and overran their country. Since then they have been living under the unrelenting and oppressive rule of the Communists.

Despite this tyranny, the Byelorussians have not abandoned their ultimate goal for freedom and independence, and they ardently look forward to the day of their liberation.

On this anniversary of their independence day, let us all fervently hope and pray for their freedom and independence.

New York Times and Hartford Courant Endorse Urgently Needed International Wildlife Conservation Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years now, I have been urging action by the United States to bring about an International Conference on Wildlife Conservation under the sponsorship of the United Nations.

Such a conference is very urgently needed. Every day that passes without the invigorated program of worldwide conservation that the Conference could bring sees many species of birds and animals slip closer to extermination.

Some 250 species are now endangered and many more will be if man continues his present reckless course.

The threat to wildlife is worldwide. But it is particularly acute in the developing countries. In their drive for modernization and development, many of these countries have failed to recognize the potential economic benefits as well as the esthetic and cultural advantages in conserving their wildlife resources.

For many nations, notably those in Africa, wildlife can be the focus of a profitable tourist industry. Wild animal populations, managed on a scientific basis, can be a significant source of food and of foreign exchange earnings through sale of animals and animal products.

Even when the value of saving their wildlife is recognized, the developing nations lack most of the prerequisites for carrying out an adequate conservation program. They are unable to prevent the organized poaching of animals whose parts are in high demand. The leopard and the rhinoceros, for example, are in peril because of this illegal slaughter—the former to supply the fad for leopard skin coats, the latter because Asians believe powder made from its horn is a sex stimulant.

An International Wildlife Conservation Conference should bring together government leaders on the ministerial and cabinet level who need to understand, and have the power to act on, the world's conservation needs.

The Conference would focus on three major steps:

First. Action to control international trade in wildlife and its products through national regulations and international convention.

Second. Study to determine how wildlife conservation and management can help the developing countries to increase their food production, make better use of their land, and increase tourist revenues.

Third. Assistance by developed countries individually or through the United Nations to help developing nations establish or improve training schools for wildlife or conservation specialists, establish conservation departments, and prepare wildlife conservation laws and regulations.

House Concurent Resolution 440 expressing the sense of Congress that such a conference should be convened is pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has introduced a companion measure (S. Con. Res. 52) in the other body.

I spoke of the need for an International Conference on Wildlife Conservation in a speech March 11 to the 30th annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation in Pittsburgh.

The New York Times and the Hartford Courant subsequently published editorials urging such a conference. I include the editorials hereafter:

[From the New York Times]

EVERY LIVING THING

The American bald eagle is the Nation's proud symbol. But its home is in the wild, lonely places, and the relentless outward push of civilization erodes its habitat. At the rate at which this great bird is disappearing, the eagle may soon become a bitter symbol of man's carelessness toward his fellow creatures on this planet.

What has happened to the eagle is not unique. More than 200 distinct species of animals that existed at the beginning of the Christian era have disappeared. As many more are in danger of extinction today.

Consumers in the United States and other wealthy countries have selfishly contributed to the destruction by their fads for leopard-skin coats, polar bear rugs, and other exotic articles. Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, has urged a United Nations conference to develop regulations controlling the international trade in wildlife and its products, and he deserves support in this effort.

The newly independent countries of Asia and Africa are not able on their own to cope effectively with the perils to wildlife. Their people are hurrying desperately to make the transition from a pastoral economy to a modern agriculture and industry. Their impulse is often to get rid of wild game just as the 19th-century American plainsmen slaughtered the buffalo. Moreover, they lack the financial resources to protect their heritage of animals and birds.

The World Wildlife Fund, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., exists to meet this problem. It duplicates the work of no other conservation organization; rather, it channel funds to organizations working on specific projects. It helps train biologists and ecologists and to spread around the world the idea of national parks and game preserves. The fund enables private citizens to carry out the moral responsibility set forth in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis, where it is written that God said to man: "Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant,
Mar. 15, 1966]

SPOTTED, AND ON THE SPOT

It's no longer a question whether the leopard can change his spots. The fact is, right now he's on one, it's marked X, and if he doesn't get off, he won't have to worry about spots or anything else any more, not no how.

That's what Representative HENRY REUSS of Wisconsin, said at the annual meeting of the National Wildlife Federation last week. What the Congressman described as the fad for leopard-skin coats is a peril to this species of fauna that could lead to its extinction, and something ought to be done now to prevent this, he declared. His solution would be a United Nations conference to call on all countries to join in preserving wildlife, so that future generations will have the same opportunity as people today to see animals and birds in the natural habitat.

Representative REUSS is especially anxious to help new countries, as well as old, develop sound conservation programs. He would also like to see international trade in wildlife and its products put under controls. It isn't just fashion fads that Mr. REUSS is worried about. There is a whole realm of superstition periling wildlife. In the Orient, a whole rhinoceros is hunted and killed because its horn is worth its weight in gold. Powdered, it is thought to be a sex stimulant, and wealthy Orientals vie to get their hands on a little of it.

Representative REUSS is right, of course. It isn't only cases like killing off the egrets for their plumes that come to mind. This was willful and vicious destruction of wildlife. But as he points out, in many far corners of the world animals and birds are being hunted out by the native population, who don't realize that, like bison or passenger pigeons, something they need is being exterminated. It isn't only, as Representative REUSS said, that future generations should be able to watch the leopard gambol on his native heath, or wherever. It isn't alone the beauties of nature are the concern of conservation, and, of course, Mr. REUSS didn't mean it only that way. Conservation serves many an economic purpose too, and problems like these have not yet forcefully struck many of the newer countries.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*	1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*	
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg*	914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*	
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*	1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*	301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn*	119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George, *Idaho*	
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*	800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	4517 Wetherill Dr., Westmoreland Hills, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*	The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*	
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	

Appendix

Labor Shortage in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 25, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Governor Scranton recently commented that he never thought that he would "live to see the day when Pennsylvania would have a labor shortage, but that is what we have got." Speaking to a group of field workers in Harrisburg, the Governor added:

> Our record in employment and unemployment is a direct result of business and industry discovering the new Pennsylvania in record numbers.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on this meeting which appeared in the New York Times of March 20, 1966, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR NOW SCARCE IN PENNSYLVANIA

(By Robert A. Wright)

HARRISBURG, PA., March 19.—"I never thought I'd live to see the day when Pennsylvania would have a labor shortage, but that's what we've got."

Thus did Gov. William W. Scranton cite a new problem for his administration in summing up this week the accomplishments of its industrial development program.

He spoke to some 200 fieldworkers from throughout the State who met at the capitol to review the program's progress and chart its future course.

SEVENTY-SIX THOUSAND JOBS IN A YEAR

If a scarcity of workers represents a problem for Pennsylvania, it is certainly a more welcome one than the State's economic woes of the last decade. From 1950 to 1962, the State's unemployment rate averaged about 50 percent above the national average and was second highest, next to West Virginia's. Last year, it fell below that for the Nation, to 4.4 percent, and it has continued to fall.

At the same time, employment in Pennsylvania has been rising. In January it was the highest since 1953, with an increase of 76,000 jobs in a year.

"Our record in employment and unemployment," the Governor told the development conference, "is a direct result of business and industry discovering the new Pennsylvania in record numbers."

Mr. Scranton noted that announcements of new and expanded plants in the State had set a record in each of the last 3 years, totaling nearly 2,400 since January 1963. These plants brought with them at least 100,000 additional jobs.

In an interview in his baroque office in the capitol, the Governor declared:

"The most exciting part to me is not the statistics but the change in morale. The thing that beats in my head at night before I go to sleep is, 'Are we really laying the kind of foundation that supports the future?' That's why it is pleasing to me that you don't hear about emigration any more."

HEAVY TAX ON BUSINESS

For years, Pennsylvania was content to depend on its vast natural resources and a few basic industries. All business was heavily taxed. Anthracite coal was badly hurt by automation, depletion of reserves, and competing fuels; steel markets began moving west and the textile industry south; the railroad industry receded. As industry moved out, so did the workers, particularly the young.

The State's development program has dramatically reversed both flows. The program, supervised by John K. Tabor, secretary of commerce, operates through several State agencies, which take advantage of Federal aid programs.

Business locating in Pennsylvania can obtain up to 100 percent financing. The State, through the Pennsylvania Industrial Authority, provides as much as 40 percent and local areas provide the rest.

The bureau of industrial development, with seven national "salesmen" and nine regional representatives, is primarily concerned with attracting and locating new businesses.

TOURISM IS INCREASING

The bureau of business services helps business obtain State aid and advice.

The bureau of community development directs the mass transportation program, the Appalachia program and Project 70, an urban renewal program.

The bureau of travel development has helped the economy by promoting tourism, which rose 20 percent last year.

The "100,000 Pennsylvanians" is a group of 138,000 private citizens who work with the department of commerce to promote the State. Mr. Scranton, pointing out that the committee included members of all sectors of the economy, termed it "a tremendous blessing."

Combined with a bipartisan tax policy that has reduced the corporations' share of taxes from 46 percent in 1953 to 21 percent last year, these efforts have successfully wooed new business.

A CLUE FOR NEW YORK

If New York wonders where its businesses are going, it might look to Pennsylvania. One example was the move to Duryea, Pa., from Brooklyn by the Topps Chewing Gum Co. Groups in Pittston, Wilkes-Barre, and Scranton banded together to sponsor a $3.6-million plant that will employ 700 persons.

Governor Scranton noted, however, that there had been a flow to the State of the "blue chip," high-pay, steady employment companies and major expansions of existing industries. He cited the Radio Corp. of America in Wilkes-Barre, Scranton, and Washington; the General Electric Co. in Erie, the Boeing Co. in Delaware County.

"The key this year will be training and development of manpower, not only to meet our current problems, but for the future," the Governor said. Pennsylvania has used the federally aided manpower development and training program more than any other State and also has its own programs to train workers.

Clinton Training Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, probably no other phase of the antipoverty program has been subject to more unfavorable publicity than the Job Corps training camps. This is perhaps to be expected of an ambitious undertaking of this sort, but there are certain trends developing which I believe will reverse this attitude and encourage greater understanding and respect for the operations of this program.

In this regard, I am grateful to my friend, Kermit R. Brown, of Casper, Wyo., for calling to my attention the activities of the General Electric Co., in the Job Corps training efforts .

Under terms of a contract announced this month, the General Electric Co. will organize and operate an education program and facility in Clinton, Iowa, for the next 16 months with a contract option for an additional 4 years.

Enlisting the skills of private industry in the education and training of citizens who might otherwise tax the welfare rolls is a commendable effort.

It will take advantage of private industry's competence in job training, a competence which has heretofore been developing on a somewhat limited scale. It can also do much to alleviate the charges of those who criticize per se the efforts of Government employees in this antipoverty effort. However contradictory it may seem, there are some who would automatically place more faith in this Job Corps project, simply because it is being executed in this case by private industry.

Another important consideration is that contracts of this sort will help develop private industry's expertise, and increased awareness of the benefits of job retraining, hopefully leading to the day when industry may initiate even more training programs with private capital.

I commend General Electric for their exemplary efforts in this regard, and congratulate them on this contract. The statement, dated March 10, follows:

JOB CORPS TRAINING CENTER FOR CLINTON, IOWA

A Job Corps training center for nearly 600 young women, ages 16 to 21, will be operated by the General Electric Co., in Clinton, Iowa, the Johnson administration announced today.

The center will be known as the Clinton Training Center, and will be located in a former veterans residence center operated by the Veterans' Administration. General Electric is under contract to organize and operate an education program and the facility for the next 16 months, with a contract option for an additional 4 years. The program for the young women will include basic education, work skill training, home and family life education and citizenship education.

Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of General Electric, commented on the contract award at ceremonies in Washington marking the first anniversary of the Job Corps. He said the Clinton center will offset the mounting national problem of the school dropout with the combined resources of industry and education, and that General Electric "likes to think that stepping up to the challenges of our society is part of our business."

The heart of the problem, Mr. Phillippe said, was that "growing numbers of young people somehow aren't learning the skills they need to lead productive and useful lives. As a result, many are becoming the economic dependents of society, with no hope of ever changing that status. To solve a problem of this magnitude is not going to be an inexpensive proposition. But it will pay out if enough of these disadvantaged youngsters can be shown a way to make use of their lives."

"What we see in Clinton is a chance to contribute to our society, a chance to help some people lead more useful and economically independent lives, and a chance to learn something important ourselves," he added. "That is why we are here today, confident that we will succeed."

The basic education of the Clinton trainees will include reading, writing, speaking, and arithmetic. Work skill training will be provided in over 40 business and service occupations; however, there will be continual evaluation of the program and new training programs may be added to meet new job needs.

The enrollees also will receive counseling and guidance, leadership and self-government training, physical health and fitness training, and education in the beneficial use of leisure time. Enrollees will be taught how and where to find jobs at the completion of their training, which will average about 1 year, and General Electric and the Office of Economic Opportunity will help enrollees find employment.

Mr. Phillippe pointed out that General Electric, which employs over 300,000 people worldwide, is in a unique position to make a contribution to the training of these young people.

"Being a large employer of women," said Mr. Phillippe, "we know what it takes to qualify for a job, and equally important, to hold a job. Our experience, combined with the outstanding teaching staff we will assemble from around the country, will give General Electric a solid base from which to tackle this difficult assignment."

General Electric, according to Mr. Phillippe, educates and trains thousands of employees daily in company classrooms, and its annual training expenditures exceed the instructional budget of most major universities.

Mr. Phillippe said that "the people of Clinton are to be congratulated for their efforts and encouragement in helping make the training center a reality. In time we are confident we will all mutually have great pride in the contributions the facility will be making to the young women and the Nation."

The center consists of some 60 buildings on an 80-acre campus on the northern edge of Clinton, Iowa, located on the Mississippi River approximately 130 miles west of Chicago. Clinton, with a population of 35,000, is highly and diversely industrialized and in the heart of a rich agricultural area. General Electric has nearby manufacturing plants in Morrison, Ill., and Burlington, Iowa.

General Electric plans to receive the first group of trainees at Clinton late in June.

Short- and Medium-Range Jet Airliner Service at Washington National Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 25, 1966

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on April 24, the Federal Aviation Agency will open Washington National Airport to small- and medium-size jet aircraft. This decision represents a significant improvement in service between the Nation's capital and all of New England and the FAA is to be commended.

With the new jet service, New England will be 30 minutes closer to Washington. This will result in increased travel and trade between the two areas and will have a salutary effect upon both economies.

The New England Council, which represents the business, industrial, and government leaders from the six New England States, has recently issued a release praising the FAA for their action and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL PRAISES FAA ACTION

The New England Council said, today, that the Federal Aviation Agency's decision to open Washington National Airport to short- and medium-range jet airliners on April 24, will bring the Nation's Capital 30 minutes closer for New Englanders.

"We have urged the opening of Washington National for this type of jet-traffic and we praise the FAA for making this constructive decision," said Crocker Snow, director, Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission and chairman of the New England Council Air Transportation Committee. "Because of improved airline service, travel times between New England and the Nation's Capital will be substantially reduced, allowing a greater exchange of visitors and businessmen," said Snow.

NEC Executive Vice President Gardner A. Caverly pointed out that 500,000 persons travel by air between Boston and Washington each year, and this important service will be improved with the opening of the Washington National Airport to this kind of service.

According to the FAA's announcement, "Prior to the development of the smaller 2- and 3-engine jets, Washington National could not handle 4-engine jets on a regular schedule. The introduction of such smaller jets has altered the picture of air carrier service at Washington National since these newer, smaller airplanes can use the two longer runways at National regularly."

The FAA further said that jet service at National "will assure Washington that the airport will remain a close-in air carrier airport as the airlines replace their propeller-driven planes with pure jets."

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of Byelorussian Independence Day this year marks the 48th anniversary of March 25, 1918, that day on which the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was proclaimed. While that day is of extreme importance to the Byelorussian people as the culmination of their efforts at self-determination, their long-dreamed independence from Russian domination, it is also of significance to freedom-loving people the world over. For each such triumph in the age-old struggle for the betterment of mankind is a milestone toward the goal of those who believe that true democracy is the route leading to a better life for all humanity.

At that time in 1918 when the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was established a provisional constitution provided for the basic freedoms for all citizens of the new democracy. The rada—council—of the first legal government of this republic was representative of all of the populace, including such national minorities as the Jews, Poles, and Russians. The constitution guaranteed within the boundaries of the Byelorussian Republic freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, the right to form labor unions, and the right to strike. It guaranteed liberty of conscience, inviolability of the person and of the home, the right of national minorities to autonomy, and the equality of all citizens before the law.

The fact that these hallmarks of democratization were to enjoy short success, and that the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was itself of short duration, does not detract from the lasting significance of the effort. It is, in fact, the more remarkable that, despite the sorry fate that was soon to overcome this triumph of independence, the spirit of the people was to persist through all frustrations.

The physical boundaries of the Byelorussian territory were rent asunder when the Bolsheviks signed the peace treaty with the Germans at Brest-Litovsk. The Germans occupied three-fourths of the Byelorussian territory. They adopted a hostile attitude to the new government because of what they termed a radical social policy, and completely disarmed it. Left completely defenseless, the Byelorussians were then at the mercy of the Soviet forces, who reoccupied the territory.

A new effort at independence on the part of the Byelorussians was crushed soon after. The Soviets established the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to rival the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

As we all know, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was to be independent in name only. Domination by the Soviet Union was to be complete.

Nevertheless, despite all Soviet efforts at control, the spirit of independence among the Byelorussian people could not be eradicated. It has remained until this day. And, Mr. Speaker, it is this indomitable spirit of freedom which we today honor in celebrating Byelorussian Independence Day.

The Challenge Is Yours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 25, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Jeffrey B. Kimball, legal assistant to Massachusetts Attorney General Edward Brooke, recently gave a most impressive address to the Michigan Young Republican College Convention. He points very clearly to some of the important challenges which face the Republican Party and I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE IS YOURS

(Keynote address by Jeffrey B. Kimball, to Michigan Young Republican College Convention, Detroit, Mich., Mar. 11, 1966)

It certainly is a pleasure to have been invited to Michigan again, a State where the Republican Party has been making tremendous gains and setting an example for the rest of the country to follow. You are to be complimented on the outstanding accomplishments of the senior party under Gov. George Romney and State Chairwoman Elly Peterson and on the fine work of your ever-efficient Young Republican organization under Walter Briggs and Jerry Van Wyke. I also wish to convey to you the best wishes and sincere regards of another outstanding Republican for whom it has been my privilege to have been associated with during the past year, the attorney general of Massachusetts, Edward W. Brooke. And we certainly look forward to seeing him join with Congressman BOB GRIFFIN as freshman Senators in Washington next year.

Most of all, however, I appreciate the chance to appear before this great convention because it affords me the opportunity to discuss one of the most pressing problems which we Republicans face—building the future of our party. And it is my hope that today's talk will stimulate increased discussion among all of you in this critical area. For the Republican Party needs nothing so much as it needs debate, criticism, reappraisal, and above all ideas.

The great question confronting us today is not whether there is a need to alter the present direction and image of our party, but rather what is the best method for achieving this goal. For nearly a decade, the Republican Party has slowly been relegating itself to the status of a permanent minority. Unless this trend is quickly stopped and reversed, we may well find ourselves joining the Federalists, the Whigs, and the Mugwumps as forgotten relics of the political past.

Each of us is familiar with the statistics and the records. And, more than alarmed, we should be disgusted with what we read. Every election night since 1958 we have stayed awake, suffering the agony of watching our party incur mounting defeats, until today we have less than a third of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress, less than is necessary to sustain the veto of the Republican President we are unable to elect. We all know the figures, that there are only 17 Republican Governors, that only 5 States have Republican executives and legislatures, that the Republican presidential ticket received less than 40 percent of the vote in 1964, the worst defeat in our party's 108-year history. But even more shocking is the fact that among every economic, religious, and ethnic group, Republican influence has sharply declined. We see this among employers and employees, urban residents and rural farmers, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, college graduates and high school dropouts, white and Negroes, management and labor, among all groups within our society. And it is this across-the-board rejection that we must reverse.

The Republican Party can no longer allow itself and its candidates to continue to campaign against Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal legislation of the 1930's. We can no longer sit by and permit our party to put forth candidates and issues which are out of touch with the present situation and for whom we must constantly apologize. But rather we must begin to accept the realities of today's world and to deal with its existing problems. And yet we continue to meet at party conferences, falsely delude ourselves that we are really in step with the times, and thus practice self-deception by mutual consent.

The year 1966 is the year of opportunity. The Democratic Party has failed to live up to the trust that has been placed in it by the electorate. They have failed to formulate a forward-looking program to deal with future contingencies, preferring the ad hoc approach totally influenced by political considerations. But until we begin to offer constructive alternatives and responsible programs, we cannot expect the country to turn to us for leadership. We must take the initiative. We must provide the necessary leadership to move this country constantly forward—the leadership which is presently lacking. Only then can we once more become the majority party.

For too long Republican successes have depended upon passing dissatisfactions with the incumbent Democratic officeholders. What we must seek are permanent victories based upon the voters' confidence in our party, its candidates, its programs, and above all its sincerity.

One hundred and twenty-five years ago, Abraham Lincoln said "If you would win a man to your cause, you must first convince him that you are his sincere friend." And this principle is still valid. For the question which the voter asks and which we must ask of ourselves is what kind of people are we. For the kind of people we Republicans are, far more than the issues and the candidates, determines whether the voter will place his future in our hands. The Republican Party suffered a humiliating defeat in 1964 because the American people questioned our sincerity and our concern in dealing with their problems.

Therefore, let us determine what kind of people are we. For if we Republicans limit our leadership to a select few, how differently, asks the voter, would we govern the country? And if we Republicans allow our policy to he influenced by political extremists, how differently, asks the voter, would we govern the country?

Yes, just what kind of people are we? For it is this image we project that determines if the voter will even consider our programs and candidates. We must convince the electorate that we are concerned, that we truly care. For as Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote, "What you are speaks so loudly, I cannot hear a word you are saying."

There are Republicans who have convinced the electorate of their sincerity. Republicans in whom the voters have placed their trust—George Romney, Edward Brooke, Mark Hatfield, William Scranton, John Chafee, and James Rhodes. We would do well to take a lesson from them.

And so let us consider at least two proposals on the road to recovery. First, we must once more be the party of inclusion, not exclusion. We must welcome to our ranks all who seek to continue those basic principles upon which our party was founded. More importantly we must actively seek these people out. We must make a plea to the intellectual, to the member of the minority, to the union member, to all whom we have avoided in the past. Only in this way can we become truly a national party, representing the interests of all the people.

Since our inception in 1854, the Republican Party has reflected a hegemony of diverse philosophies, but yet has been held together by one concept—the dignity of the individual and the equality of all men. It was on this principle that the Whigs, Free Soilers, dissident Democrats, and a host of minor parties were able to unite and become the party of inclusion—the Republican Party. It was this principle that dominated our party for the next century, a century which saw forward looking and progressive legislation under 64 years of Republican Presidents and 52 years of Republican Congresses—the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, ending slavery and guaranteeing equal protection of the law to all; the enactment of the civil service system; the trust busting era; the civil rights legislation of 1957 and 1960. And it is only through a continuance in this belief that we can hope to survive the present crisis our party has refused to effectively face. Though the problems which have divided us may be great, the principle which has bound us together is immeasurably stronger.

We must be a national party, the party of all; but we must also be watchful for those who would subvert our purpose and turn us from our goal. We can never be the home of the racist and the bigot. Our heritage and tradition prohibit us from allying with these purveyors of fear, hatred, and terror. We must turn away the John Bircher, the Ku Klux Klan member, the political extremist who would introduce a philosophy alien to our principles. Civil rights and the integrity of the individual are the essence of our belief. They are what the Republican Party is all about.

Secondly, our party must begin to deal with the problems of the metropolitan area. We can no longer limit ourselves to an untenable "Southern strategy." Rather we must devote our efforts to the dynamic problems of the spreading megopolis—no longer a future concept, but a current reality. We must realise that 70 percent of our Nation's population lives in the great urban centers. We must concern ourselves with their problems—mass transportation, slum clearance, job opportunities, and a host of other matters unknown a century ago.

But not only must we address ourselves to these problems, we must also accept that, with the growing complexities of our urban life, there is a definite need and a proper place for Federal assistance. Let me emphasize assistance, not control. We must no longer be afraid of the Federal Government, but rather must work with it, utilizing all of its resources to aid us in building a truly "great society," not a myth for political gain.

Our national chairman, Ray Bliss, has long advocated the Republican Party taking a greater interest in the urban area, as evidenced as early as 1962 by his "Big City Report." He realizes, as we must, that the old line Democratic city organizations are unable to cope with the increasing problems of our ever-expanding cities. A void in leadership exists. It is our duty to fill this void by concerning ourselves with this area which we have traditionally shunned. For we now know that Republicans can win in the cities, John Lindsay and JACOB JAVITS, carried the city of New York. Edward Brooke carried the city of Boston. There are Republican mayors in Louisville, Akron, and Honolulu. And in 1960 Richard Nixon clearly would have been elected President if we had devoted more of our efforts to city organization. Yes, the opportunity is there. We must seize the initiative.

We owe it to our country as well as our party to once more become a potent political power, offering a constructive, forward looking, progressive program, which reflects the needs of the people and builds for the future generations. We must truly offer the voter a choice. It is our duty as a major political party. Indeed the basis of this country's political heritage has always been a strong two-party system—an incumbent party and a constructive opposition. And it is here that we have failed. We have been an opposition which merely opposes. We must instead offer constructive alternatives and, even more, initiate positive programs where the administration has failed to act.

We see that the national Democratic Party, in its frantic drive for "government by consensus" has been attempting to make "docile instruments" of the American people. The President, in both his foreign and domestic policy, has made it quite clear that docility is one of the qualities he cherishes most among his subjects. And yet such a policy is alien to the American tradition. Our great nation was born through a revolution that has seen the establishment of a democratic society, the dynamic growth of industry, the tremendous advances of science and technology. We have always taken the bold step forward, shown the way, set the pace for the other nations to follow in the areas of social, economic and political development. It is all of this which the administration's policies will change. For as John Stuart Mill wrote, "A state which dwarfs its men, in order that they be more docile instruments in its hands, even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."

Therefore, I call upon the Republican Party to change all this. We have a sacred responsibility to the American people to be the voice of intelligent and constructive opposition. There is plenty wrong in the world and within the United States, problems not being solved by the Johnson administration. Surely we have the ingenuity and leadership to offer something better.

And so it is incumbent upon us, as Republicans, to nominate candidates who can and will win by carrying forth the true message of a vital, dynamic and aggressive party. And what must this message be? It must be that the Republican Party is the forward looking and progressive party, well aware of the needs of the country and well aware of the duties and responsibilities of a government of the people. A party which recognizes the great challenges of the future and is ready to cope with them. A party which continues in the tradition of the Abraham Lincolns, the Theodore Roosevelts, the Dwight Eisenhowers. But though we may look to the past for our heritage, we must look, as we have always done, to the future for ideas.

It is apparent that the Republican Party is facing a great ideological confrontation within its ranks. The result of which will not only determine the future course of our Party, but whether there shall be any future at all. Let all Republicans, therefore, join in this battle of ideas. Let us set our party on a realistic course, ready to effectively deal with the problems of today and of tomorrow.

In this election year the challenge is again offered us to contest the policies and programs of the Democratic Party. This challenge must be taken up and effectively answered back. I am confident that if we have the wisdom and the willingness to face the problems of our times, that 1966 will hold forth great victories for our party. But to achieve this end, a beginning must be made. The time is now. The place is here. The challenge is yours.

A Tribute to the Late Honorable John F. Baldwin of California

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN, of the California 14th District, is a great loss to us all. In life he was recognized as an outstanding leader in his particular field of legislative interest. In death he is remembered with the greatest respect, on both sides of the aisle, as a man of principle and a most competent colleague who has served in six Congresses. And all of us who knew him as a friend and who warmed to the glow of his kind and gracious personality are saddened far beyond mere words.

JOHN BALDWIN made his name in the Congress, and prior to that in 5½ years of service in the U.S. Army, as a finance expert of extraordinary proportions. Having majored in accounting and finance at the University of California, from which he was graduated with honors before obtaining a law degree from the same institution, he was well equipped for the role he chose to play in life. As a lieutenant colonel in World War II, he became Director of Training for the Army Finance School, Chief of the Foreign Fiscal Affairs Branch in the Office of Fiscal Director of the War Department, and executive officer of the Office of Fiscal Director in the Mediterranean Theater. He was decorated for his services.

In civilian life, JOHN BALDWIN established a thriving law practice in Martinez, Calif., thereby attracting the attention of local political organizations. In 1954 he was nominated for Congress and elected, and the following decade was reelected five times in succession. In the House of Representatives he was named to serve on the Public Works Committee, where he promptly established himself as a financial wizard. At his untimely death during his 51st year, he was the second ranking Republican member on the committee, and greatly admired by all.

With a deep sense of appreciation and respect for this fine man, I salute his name on this occasion, and hail him as a person of great ability and integrity, who has brought honor to his family, his district, and his country. I extend my sincere sympathy to his wife and three daughters.

Appeasement Then: Appeasement Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 25, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, some critics of present U.S. policy in Vietnam propose appeasement of Communist China as a means of ending the war in South Vietnam. They fail to see the very clear analogy between bowing to Red China now and yielding to Hitler in the 1930's. A recent editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer observed:

> This kind of thinking springs from stupidity or refusal to face the facts.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPEASEMENT THEN: APPEASEMENT NOW

What could turn out to be one of the critical miscalculations of our times is the appeasement of Communist China proposed by critics of U.S. policy, in and out of the Senate, as a means of ending the war in South Vietnam.

Because appeasement became a dirty word when its practitioners paved the way for Hitler's rise, it is the fashion among those who would give in to Mao Tse-tung to insist that there is no analogy between bowing obediently to Red China now and yielding to Hitler in the 1930's.

They say that the Nazis were bent on expansion and conquest, whereas the Chinese Reds are so preoccupied with domestic problems that they can't concern themselves with territorial aggrandizement, even if they had the capability for it.

This kind of thinking springs from stupidity or refusal to face the facts. To say that a Communist power is unconcerned with "territorial aggrandizement" is to turn resolutely from reality. All that the Communists want is the world. They will, just as the Nazis did, take everything they think they need, and that they can get.

The Russians would be surprised to know that Red China seeks no territorial acquisition, in face of the fact that Peking claims something like 500,000 square miles of Russian geography. The Tibetans would doubtless like to know what Peking's seizure of their homeland can be called if not "aggrandizement," and so would the Indians pushed from their borderland homes by Chinese aggression.

Red China tried to add South Korea to the Communist terrain, just as it is trying to add all of Indochina. It has sought to spread its influence, with varying results, wherever it could gain a toe-hold, from Indonesia to Cuba. One of its avowed purposes is the conquest of Formosa, and the extinction of the island's anti-Communist population.

To yield piecemeal to this insatiable monster, to surrender to it and its puppets the people of South Vietnam in the hopes that it will forever be content, and disturb us no more, is not just wishful thinking: it is suicide.

You Don't Have To Wait Until 1984

SPEECH
OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, George Orwell shocked this Nation in 1949 by writing the novel, "Nineteen Eighty-four," a chilling look into the future.

Now, 17 years after Orwell wrote his prophecy, it appears some of the author's predictions are becoming a reality.

Through the efforts of Senator EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri, a great deal has come to light regarding electronic eavesdropping by Federal employees. The Senator from Missouri has unfolded tales of deceiving juries and judges, wiretapping, lockpicking, and outright lying by Federal Government employees. He has brought to the public's attention a dangerous trend in Government.

I place in the RECORD today an editorial concerning Federal snooping from the Chicago Tribune of March 19, 1966:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 19, 1965]

YOU DON'T HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL 1984

Senator E. V. LONG, of Missouri, a Democrat, unfolded a shocking story of the invasion of privacy by Federal snoopers in his talk before the Executive Club here yesterday. He said that agents in many branches of the Government are trained in electronic eavesdropping, wire tapping, and lock picking, and are sworn to lie about it if they are detected or challenged.

The Senator said that the constitutional right to privacy is being dangerously and recklessly ignored and violated, and asked, "How long must Americans tolerate Federal law enforcement officials who break the laws they are sworn to uphold? How long must we stand for agents who deceive a U.S. attorney, deceive a Federal jury, and deceive a Federal judge, as we found they are doing in San Francisco?"

Senator LONG is chairman of a subcommittee investigating such illegal operations of Federal agents. The inquiry has disclosed the use of such ingenious devices as a martini olive containing a tiny transmitter; electronic listening devices which can pick up voices at a distance of hundreds of yards, and standard (but unlawful) telephone taps.

In San Francisco, Mr. LONG said, the Internal Revenue Service has placed "bugs" in public telephones over a wide area. It runs a snooping school and as graduation presents hands out a set of lock picks. The Federal Narcotics Bureau, the Senator said, regularly employs wiretaps. Its agents are expected to lie under oath about their activities, and revenue agents called as witnesses in tax cases testify under a similar injunction, on pain of dismissal if they tell the truth.

Federal agents are so enthusiastic over their methods of surveillance and detection, the Senator said, that they are exporting their equipment and training to foreign governments. Mr. LONG said that a foreign aid official was ignorant that his subordinates had trained aid recients in wire tapping and electronic snooping, the equipment for which was given away free.

"Big Brotherism," he said, "is spreading around the world quickly enough without our speeding it up."

Readers of George Orwell's chilling prophecy, "Nineteen Eighty-Four," know that a total tyranny requires constant surveillance of the subject herd in order to enforce discipline through terror. In everyone's living quarters there was a telescreen which received and transmitted simultaneously. Any sound that the slave-citizen made would be picked up, and as long as he remained within the field of vision, he could be seen as well as heard.

The slogan of the master-state was, "Big Brother Is Watching You." That watch was perpetual, as long as life lasted, and the only possible freedom was death.

When Orwell wrote in 1949, he thought it might take 35 years—until 1984—for the all-encompassing totalitarian despotism to achieve full sway. Of course, tyranny had become firmly rooted in Russia, in the eastern European Communist satellites, and in Red China. It had imposed itself on Germany in Hitler's time and in Italy in the days of Mussolini. It has risen since in Communist Cuba, and authoritarianism is installed in much of Africa.

We might have fancied that the United States would be exempt from these feverish fantasies, but we are on our way. Nothing ought to concern citizens more than the fact that their liberties are already under attack through surreptitious and insidious invasions of privacy by faithless agents of a government supposed to serve them.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 25, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, today, March 25, marks the 145th anniversary of Greek independence. On this day in the year of 1921 the Archbishop of Patras unfurled the national flag of Greece and the revolution against rule by the Ottoman empire.

The independence of Greece is one of the most glorious events of the 19th century. The fight for freedom by the Greek people attracted the support of many outstanding world personalities and we all remember the glorious efforts in this endeavor of the great poet, Lord Byron.

It took 8 years of hard fighting to regain the political independence of Greece. This was accomplished through the supreme sacrifice which Greeks cheerfully made for the attainment of their most cherished ideal—the ideal which has been the base of Western civilization—freedom. Today Greece stands as a fortress of freedom in the Mediterranean and stands as true and staunch ally in the continuing struggle for self-determination throughout the world.

Here in our own country the Greek American community has made a great contribution to our culture, to our economy and our democratic spirit. On a day such as this it is a great privilege to join with the rest of the free world and with all of our Americans of Hellenic origin in observing March 25 as Greek Independence Day.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence and organized a democratic republic. The emergence of this people as an ethnic entity dates back to the 9th and 10th centuries, and as a political entity to the 11th century. From the 11th century until now, the Byelorussians have sought to achieve national independence. They have endured persecution, terror, and murder, political division, repression of their cultural institutions, exile, and repeated conquest. Yet the flame of this nationalism has not been quenched throughout eight and a half centuries.

The brightest hope in modern times for emergence of an independent Byelorussian nation came with the 1918 effort to establish a national Byelorussian government representing minorities and guaranteeing basic social forms, freedom of speech and assembly, and providing protection against arbitrary and unwarranted search and seizure and other authoritarian excesses which characterize the tyranny to which the Byelorussians have been subjected so often. The Bolsheviks, already in power in Russia, strongly opposed Byelorussian autonomy, and Josef Stalin attempted to crush the independence movement but was unable to obliterate the nationalist fervor.

After declaring their independence on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian nation was given de jure recognition by over a dozen foreign states. However, the peace treaty between Germany and the Bolshevik Russians at Brest-Litovsk led to the occupation of three-fourths of the Byelorussian territory, first by the Germans, and then by the Russians after German withdrawal.

The tangled and fast-moving events of post World War I, as the peace treaties were signed and national borders were adjusted, led to partition of Byelorussia by Poland and Russia in 1921. Appeals for aid from outside nations during an uprising by the Byelorussian Democratic Republic against the Russians in 1920 had been ignored.

Following the 1921 agreements, both Poland and Russia initially allowed considerable cultural freedom and local independence for Byelorussians. However, these freedoms were repressed drastically in Poland in 1926–27, and, in a radical shift in Russian policy, were ruthlessly crushed in a campaign of terror and betrayal in 1928. The events of World War II, although offering temporary hope to the Byelorussians, did not result in any improvement in Byelorussian autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, March 25th is being celebrated by Byelorussians throughout the free world as a symbol of their national aspirations. The tenacity and loyalty of Byelorussians in their struggle for national autonomy is an impressive display of human persistence and commitment to the cause of individual freedom. We deplore the repeated imposition of tyranny on the Byelorussians, and we salute their valiant and continuing efforts to achieve nationhood for their people.

A Veteran at the Woodbine Nursing and Convalescent Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter which highly commends the Veterans' Administration and a private nursing home facility, the Woodbine Nursing and Convalescent Center in Alexandria, Va., for their close cooperation and concern for the comfort and care of one of our Nation's World War I veterans.

It is encouraging to note that at a time when the responsibilties of both government agencies and private enterprise are steadily increasing with regard to the ill and the aged, our traditional concern for an individual's happiness and welfare is still our prime objective.

The letter to which I refer, concerning Mr. Robert Storey, is herewith set forth.

Alexandria, Va.,
March 17, 1966.

Hon. Compton I. White, Jr.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman White: In this age of rockets, missiles, and speed, when far too few can do more than complain about everything from the price of soup to the way the war is going in Vietnam, let me take just a few minutes of your time to express my sincere thanks on behalf of my late, dear friend, Mr. Robert Storey, a Veteran of World War I.

Thanks for your efforts in interceding on his behalf in November of 1965, affording his quick entry into a nursing home. As this was a struggle on my part for almost a year, Dr. T. J. Ready, and his staff, at the U.S. Veterans' Hospital, Washington, D.C., were very helpful to Mr. Storey, and myself.

I don't believe you could get better medical attention anywhere than the U.S. Veterans Hospital. Mr. Storey was transferred in January of 1966 at Government expense, to Woodbine Nursing Home on King Street in Alexandria, Va. A very nice place of rare beauty with outstanding facilities to care for our aged veterans. The staff at Woodbine are to be commended. They take excellent care of all who enter, regardless of race, color, or creed, millionaire or pauper. All can expect and receive the same excellent care.

Woodbine is only 5 minutes' drive from my home, so I could visit Mr. Storey often. The location of the home was arranged by Mrs. Johnson, a social worker at the Veterans' Administration hospital, at Mr. Storey's request, so that he could be near my home. I think the Veterans' Administration social worker staff was very nice and must surely have gone to great lengths to honor Mr. Storey's request this way. So you see, Mr. White, why I am certain that the last 2 months of Mr. Storey's life were spent in a measure of happiness, thanks in many ways to a great and untiring individual like yourself. May the good Lord bless you and His light shine on you and lead your footsteps the rest of the days of your long life.

As I write this letter, I swell with pride to think that I, too, am part of a country where those who have served her can be sure they will never be turned away cold or hungry, or wanting medical attention, regardless of their rank, or station in life, with unselfish lawmakers and representatives like yourself tending to the affairs of the veterans of this great country. We should never have any worry or misgivings about our rights being guarded.

We buried Mr. Storey, aged 71 years, in grave No. 1863, section 34, Arlington National Cemetery at 9:30 a.m., March 11, 1966, so he may rest forever with those who also served and those whom we shall never forget. The U.S. Marine Corps, who oversaw the services at gravesite were perfect beyond description. The three gun salute, then taps, and a final farewell to an old friend.

There is no other country in the world where a humble individual can go to his final rest with the same treatment as if he were an admiral or general. For I, too, one day shall pass this way.

I will say thanks again, Mr. White, for helping to make Mr. Storey's final days on this earth happy and pleasant.

I remain always,
Your friend,
R. L. Wilkinson.

Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BUCHANAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, we mark the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. It is significant that so many Members of this body should commemorate a holiday which might seem to some to have very little to do with the United States.

However, in its way, March 25, 1918, is as important a date as any that we celebrate in this country, for that day so many years ago the people of Byelorussia declared their independence and established a Republic separate and apart from the Bolsheviks who had seized control of czarist Russia. For but a few short months, the Republic of Byelorussia prospered and then the Red army swept across its plains and forests and communism clamped its iron hand on the people.

To this day, communism rules Byelorussia and to this day the people of Byelorussia refuse to submit, insisting that some day, one day, they shall be free again. March 25, 1918, is a symbol, then, of man's indomitable spirt and thirst for freedom. I salute the spirit and symbol of the people of Byelorussia and join with my colleagues in assuring them that their example is a shining example in a world too often dulled by compromise and accommodation with the enemy.

The Union Pacific Benefits Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, one of my pleasant chores as Wyoming's Congressman is to constantly alert leaders of industry to the tremendous potential of my State and her sister States of the Intermountain West.

In this effort, there are many valued allies, among them the officials of the Union Pacific Railroad. The New York Times recently carried an article which outlines the efforts of Mr. Edd Bailey, president of the Union Pacific Railroad, and Mr. John W. Godfrey. These men are both closely identified with Wyoming, Mr. Bailey as a native of Cheyenne, and Mr. Godfrey, whose wife, the former Ann Kershisnik, is a former resident of Rock Springs, Wyo. Rock Springs is where I was born and raised; Cheyenne is my home.

In addition to providing impressive examples of the Union Pacific's efforts to bring industry to the West, the New York Times article is of merit for its succinct summary of the attractions of the West. Mr. Godfrey notes:

> Large urban areas simply cannot add to plants since the land ajoining their present factory is tremendously expensive. Then, too, ever since World War II there has been a preference for decentralization with a search for sites that can serve specific markets, provide water, labor, materials, and transportation. Here in the West, there's still choice land—and not tremendously expensive.

I respectfully call the attention of my colleagues and all industrialists with a mind to profitable expansion to the abundant potential of the West. The New York Times article of March 6 follows:

[From the New York Times]

Union Pacific Uses Special Car To Attract Industry to Its Area

Salt Lake City.—Down at the Union Pacific depot, the odor of charcoal-broiled steaks wafted from the exhaust stack of business car No. 114. In the elegant meticulously maintained dining room of the yellow gray and red private car on the depot siding, railroader John W. Godfrey, looking Madison Avenue-ish by virtue of his gray flannel suit, trim mustache and heavy-rimmed spectacles, was "selling" a Utah industrial site to a bevy of eastern manufacturers in a setting any advertising man might envy.

While a white-jacketed waiter unobtrusively served steaks, salads and an after-luncheon drink, the visiting industrialists peered through gently falling snow as a switch engine trundled them past the trackside property they had come west to inspect. Mr. Godfrey spread the necessary maps before them and gave assurances that the acreage in view was properly zoned for industry and "developed with paved public streets having water, gas, electric power, and sanitary sewers available."

In recent months, car No. 114 and the busy Mr. Godfrey have been seen—and visited by industrial site seekers—at Denver, Las Vegas, Spokane and Los Angeles as well as Salt Lake City, plus far smaller communities such as Morgan, Utah; Green River, Wyo., and Greeley, Colo. The car's mileage log is one tipoff to the new emphasis the Union Pacific is placing on luring new industry to its rails. Mr. Godfrey's title is another.

A NEW POST

Long the district engineer for the road's south-central district he was named, less than a year ago, to the new post of assistant to the president for industrial relations. Discussing Mr. Godfrey's appointment recently, Edd H. Bailey, president, said, "We wish to stimulate our industrial development program, coordinate and expand the efforts of several departments concerned, and to meet the complex requirements of industry."

Although 412 new industries located online in the 2 years before he took on his new assignment, the railroad's top industry seeker "expects to better that record." He and Mr. Bailey, along with "site salesmen" all along the lines of the big carrier, feel they have a considerable number of "plus factors riding with us."

Mr. Godfrey puts it this way: "There's a definite surge of industry westward, to communities where there is open space for expansion. We've encountered companies in such cities as Chicago and Philadelphia that simply cannot add to plant since the land adjoining their present factory is tremendously expensive. Then, too, ever since World War II there has been a preference for decentralization, with a search for sites that can serve specific markets, provide water, labor, materials, and transportation. Here in the West there's still choice land—and not tremendously expensive.

HOW HE FUNCTIONS

How does Mr. Godfrey function? He said: "Yesterday the Omaha office put through a call to my car here at Salt Lake City, a man phoning from an Eastern State wanting comparative studies of costs of producing and shipping his products in Western States. We told him we would immediately provide statistics on labor, marketing, and resources, focused on the special problems of his industry. Here in Utah I called in our statewide industry expert, Claude Summerhays. We also bundled in facts provided by the University of Utah, the State industrial commission and the publisher of the local newspaper. At the same time we did the same for this prospect in five other States where conditions might meet his needs."

One of Mr. Godfrey's duties is to cooperate with chambers of commerce, State industrial commissions, local industrial parks, and banks "without selling too hard, and without getting involved in interstate or intercity warfare for a specific industry."

Indications are that the soft-sell, tendersteak approach is successful, with both large and small industries.

Mailing Privileges of Members of the U.S. Armed Forces

SPEECH

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. If the gentleman from New York will refer again to that language about which he has spoken, he will see that the main thrust of the bill is to serve the servicemen overseas. That is the main thrust, and that is what the Post Office Department is supposed to do and, as well, they are supposed to divide the mail as best they can. But the main thrust of the bill is to serve these servicemen overseas.

Mr. DULSKI. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation to provide the benefits of faster and more efficient and less expensive mail service to our servicemen stationed overseas. This bill before the House attacks what is probably the most universal and chronic complaint of servicemen overseas—the long delays in mail service between them and their families and friends back home.

I have discussed this problem in Europe. I was in company with our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Morrison] on that trip to Europe last fall. We talked with General Lemnitzer, supreme allied commander, Europe, who said that in his considered opinion the one single thing that would boost and maintain the morale of troops stationed overseas would be faster communication between them and their homes.

This legislation has been favorably reported to the House by our committee. This year's legislation is an extension of the committee's action last year in providing airlift of certain mail to servicemen in combat areas.

Mr. DULSKI. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Housing Problems and Human Problems—Speech Before National Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure and a privilege for me last night to join with our colleague from Georgia, the Honorable Charles L. Weltner, and two outstanding U.S. Senators who formerly served in the House, Senators Margaret Chase Smith and Lee Metcalf, in a panel of the annual meeting of the National Housing Conference.

I have received many comments from housing and redevelopment experts who attended the meeting on some of the statements I made in my talk, and I therefore believe it will be of sufficient general interest to the Members of Congress to be placed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record. I discussed not only the problems of rehousing the people in our slum areas but also the problems of building human values to go with the higher real estate values. We are already engaged in St. Louis in a project to try to renew the lives of those on public assistance or in need of special help, by providing training in new job opportunities, particularly for the mother on aid to dependent children whose youngsters are old enough to spend most of the day in school. This is one of the issues I discussed.

My statement before the National Housing Conference is as follows:

Address of Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan, Democrat, of Missouri, Before the 35th Annual Convention of the National Housing Conference, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Sunday Night, March 20, 1966

It is always a pleasure for me to attend and participate in the meetings of the National Housing Conference, because so much of my time and effort as a Member of Congress is devoted to the study of legislation in which this organization and its members are vitally interested. It is a particular pleasure for me to be here tonight on the same program with a young colleague on the Committee on Banking and Currency whose political horizons, I am sure, are unlimited, on the basis of outstanding performance already, and also to join with two of the most distinguished alumni of the House of Representatives now serving in the U.S. Senate.

My colleague, Congressman Charles Longstreet Weltner, of Georgia, gave the House one of its most memorable moments of high drama during my whole 14 years there when he went to the well of the House in 1964 to announce that he would vote for the conference report on the Civil Rights bill, and, in a short but truly eloquent speech, explained why. He has done many fine things since then, but that moment in his career will stand out for most of us no matter to what heights he may rise. He is a man of courage.

Senator Metcalf, of Montana, was a first-rank leader in the House, serving on our most important committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, before he followed another Montanan from the House to the Senate, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. Those of us who served with Lee Metcalf in the House will always remember his parliamentary skill and his courage, too.

Courage also distinguishes the political career of Senator Margaret Chase Smith, and it is a delight to share this platform with her. I remember a cartoon I saw a long time ago, back in the forties, showing a newly elected male Senator wrapping a Roman toga about his shoulders and picking up his suitcase to go from the House of Representatives to the Senate, meanwhile waving a farewell to some of the three-name glamorous women then serving in the House—Margaret Chase Smith, Clare Boothe Luce, Helen Gahagan Douglas and, I think, Emily Taft Douglas—and saying "Sorry girls, but woman's place is in the House." Well, as we all know, Helen Gahagan Douglas was Nix-ed in her try; Emily Taft Douglas never tried for herself but helped elect her husband to the Senate instead; while Margaret Chase Smith made it agayne, and agayne and agayne, as FDR would have said it, and every woman in public life is proud of what she has accomplished. She certainly proved the validity of the Civil Rights Act prohibition against discrimination by reason of sex in employment, for no Member of the Senate is more conscientious, or, in fact, has as good a record as she does for attendance and faithfulness to duty.

Thus woman's place is both in and out of the House; woman's place I am happy to add, however, is very much in housing, as Marie McGuire has demonstrated, and as many other women active in this field have also shown, and as our presence here tonight attests I am wondering if any women were engaged in the General Accounting Office study of the alleged extravagance of having balconies attached to public housing units. As I think all of you know, I would prefer to see public housing units intended for families with children built close to the ground—I shudder at the high-rises—but if you have to build them at all for families with children, then a balcony is no extravagance at all if it can be included within the limitation imposed on public housing unit costs. I'm sure it doesn't take a woman to recognize the validity of this point, but I'm sure that any GAO panel which studied the issue would have difficulty reaching any other decision if a woman, or some women, were helping to make the judgment.

The Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee has been engaged since late February in daily hearings on new housing legislation, and we still have a week to go. Your president, Nathaniel S. Keith, appeared on March 9, and made an excellent witness, as always, even if he did startle us a bit by suggesting that the entire $2 billion $300 million called for in the proposed demonstration cities program should be authorized to be made available immediately upon the enactment of the legislation, at one fell swoop. That is quite a fell swoop.

Nevertheless, it is clear to all of us serving on the subcommittee that the programs envisioned under the Demonstration Cities Act are going to take a lot of money in order to make a dent in the problems of our cities. Pretending that this is going to be just some kind of small-scale pilot project to cost a few dollars here or there would be completely unrealistic. Of course, considering how our gross national product has leaped and soared in recent years, it is obvious that our economy can withstand tremendous additional demands for those public services which are, in effect, self-liquidating or which contribute to further economic strength, but this is always difficult to get across.

The original Urban Renewal Act, back in 1949, was held up to scorn as a budget-buster and economy-wrecker, and yet look at what it has accomplished for the economy of this Nation. If any of you want some more dramatic illustrations of that than you may find in your own cities or in the surrounding areas, come to St. Louis and see what has been done there. We were not a dying city when our renewal began, but we were limping pretty badly in many respects. Using a map of the United States as a dart board, you could hit almost any major city or any one of hundreds of smaller communities with a dart thrown at random and find other illustrations of this same wonderful phenomenon.

But problems remain, and multiply. We have not—not any of us—reached Utopia in urban living. If the traffic doesn't kill us, or the air pollution strangle us, or the polluted water poison us, or the garbage engulf us, or the slums break our hearts, rampant crime always offers us other pathways to violent death.

When we hid our slums away in shantytowns and ghettoes, the so-called respectable elements of the community could breathe easy and pay little attention to the misery in countless slum homes where parents might be trying with all of their strength and cunning to make a warm and decent home for the children. Now, however, the once hidden slums are visible throughout our cities, because we were never able over the years since 1937 to catch up with the need for adequate housing in a greatly expanding urban population. We can see them, we can smell them, and each time we do we can recognize how far we have fallen behind in solving our housing problems.

Let me make it abundantly clear, however; what we did do and what we are doing in the housing field has not been wasted effort. Without those efforts of the past three decades, our cities today would be uninhabitable. But we've got a long way to go to make them pleasant, happy places in which to live. And we have no choice but to try—and that means to continue to experiment with new ideas and new concepts.

But while we use bricks and mortar and cement in new ways, or in improvements on old techniques, we still require a mammoth attack on human apathy—we have got to renew people as well as buildings and neighborhoods.

We all say that, and I'm sure we all agree with that and mean it, but our progress in carrying it out is terribly discouraging. The demonstration cities program would certainly help to dramatize the attack, by providing a more coordinated strategy against want and deprivation and lack of opportunity and neglect of opportunity, and ignorance of opportunity, but even without that far-reaching legislation, look at all the tools we already have that we have been using with too little imagination or commitment. We have permitted people to wallow in misery when a little guidance, or a little push—or some tough-talking insistence on opening their eyes to the opportunities around them could help perform miracles of self-help.

I am aware that the officials who run public housing projects have their hands full with all sorts of problems—leaky faucets, trash in the entranceways, vandalism, missing light bulbs in the corridors, Saturday night obstreperousness, and so on—and probably there arent' enough hours in the day to do all of these chores and still be educational guidance counselor, social worker, home economics demonstration agent, after-class elementary or high school tutor, recreation leader, college counselor, marriage counselor, etc., etc. But there are resources of that nature in the community, if the people who need them are made aware of the services available to them and how to obtain them, and—particularly—are encouraged to want them.

We have manpower development and training; we have adult education; we have vocational rehabilitation; we have the Land-Grant College Extension Service; we have all of the paraphernalia of the war on poverty; we have the visiting nurse service, the Salvation Army, the free inoculation of children against the crippling diseases, the multitude of new educational programs. Are we making sure that every problem family we touch during our day's work—and some of us touch a lot of them—is guided to take advantage of the advantages of living in an American city in the 1960's?

I know that in my case, a major share of my time each day—every day—is spent answering letters from people with problems who are bewildered about their problems and unable to solve them and unaware, in most instances, of the existence of help available to them, whether it be in food stamps, welfare, disability benefits, artificial limbs, training or retraining, scholarships, loans, hospitalization, credit advice—you name the program, Federal, State or local, public or private, which can help people and I am involved in it as a regular thing, directing people who need help to the help available to them. The war on poverty program was set up to do many of these same things, but no matter how much appears in the newspapers or on radio or television about the agencies available and the help they can give, countless people just don't know—don't get the word. Many of them must be taken by the hand and half pushed, half dragged and continuouosly reassured and encouraged to seek help. How much of this do your people do? Do you feel it is enough? The parents in some families may not always be the best material in the world to work with on the family's upgrading, but if there is any chance at all of reaching the kids to encourage them to try to make their way, it's worth it.

In this day and age, in an economy expanding so fast we are being told in some quarters that it may be "overheating," and with unemployment low enough to worry some experts that we may run out of manpower, I think we have to get a little tougher about redirecting some of our welfare attitudes. You don't dump people out to sink or swim, for those who are career dependents upon the public charge will only sink—and be heavier financial burdens on the public as a result. But once the children are all old enough to be in school most of the day, the mother who has been scraping out a disastrously inadequate living on aid to dependent children should be shaken up enough by someone in authority to want to work and to learn to do worthwhile work. I am afraid we will never see the day when public assistance in most States will meet minimum needs. Therefore, the more we can encourage—push—able-bodied aid-to-dependent-children mothers into contributing to the work force when jobs are abundant at good pay—by teaching them skills to assure a decent wage and good working conditions—the better favor we are doing them and their children, if the community will only provide some after-school supervision and recreation.

I repeat that I am a firm believer in the mother of young children being at home with them. But as the President's Commission on the Status of Women so clearly proved in its report to President Kennedy a few days before his death, most women do work during much of their adult years, with those having the higher skills being most likely to work longest. The big problem in this connection which none of us has solved and which must be solved to get career aid-to-dependent-children mothers out of the house and into the work force, where they can earn decent livings and live like free Americans once all of the youngsters are in school most of the day, is to make sure they have and can afford a decent place to live if they do work. I am thinking now particularly of the family in public housing. What incentive is there for a mother to find a job which will not pay her enough to afford a decent dwelling unit in the private real estate market, but will pay her just enough to make her ineligible any longer for public housing and push her back to the slums? Can we work on that? I think it is urgent that we come up with answers.

Much of our affluence today rests on double breadwinners in many families—husband and wife both working, both earning. Whether we approve or disapprove of this, it is an economic fact of life today. This undoubtedly leads to some child neglect which is visible and deplorable, and probably to a lot of psychological damage not readily seen. We must recognize the price we pay for things. But with so many families having two incomes in order to achieve what we call the American standard of living, it is almost impossible for a woman on aid to dependent children ever to earn enough to make working worthwhile to her or her children if she is untrained, uneducated and unmotivated. So it is no wonder she may be content—if that is the word—to continue to drift where she is.

For such women and for all so-called "disadvantaged" Americans, to the extent that we can reach them—and many of us can reach many of them—we should knock ourselves out trying to get the word across: the word that there is opportunity today for those who would make themselves receptive to it. There are free classes to learn how to speak in preparation for numerous job vacancies in which good voice and diction are essential; there are free courses in every skill in demand; there is even financial maintenance while learning; there is a crying need for people with warmth and human kindness in all of the disciplines related to health care; there is reward, too. But when the family's standard of living must inevitably fall in its most essential feature—in housing—once the income should go up just a bit, well we aren't going to accomplish this objective of upgrading very easily. Public housing tenant incomes must have limits and ceilings; but then comes this gap. May I ask a question: Are you "selling" the concept of rent supplements and other ideas of that nature with enough zeal in your communities?

As passed by Congress, rent supplements now may go only to those who are already in the public housing income brackets. So the gap persists. My bill for 3 percent direct loans to nonprofit organizations to enable them to rehabilitate older housing for sale to low-income families covers the same income range as the rent supplement programs. At present, only the below market interest rate FHA loans take things several steps further for the inbetween public and private housing tenants. My next question is this: Are public housing authorities sharing their expertise with, and encouraging, private groups in the community to get into this field to serve families just above the public housing income level but too low for full-cost private housing?

The more I learn about housing, after 12 years on the subcommittee, the more impressed I am on the need for more generalists as well as specialists in the field; for people who when faced with a problem involving a family needing help, will get on the telephone and call around to as many different agencies as can contribute anything at all toward the solution of the problem or problems; people who will come to the conclusion, if no satisfactory solution is found, that new laws or new programs must be enacted to meet unsolved problems; and who will then make such that those of us who have responsibility for passing the laws—Federal, State, and local—are made aware of the needs and are pressured into doing something about them, if new laws can be of any use in a particular situation.

A lot of you here fit into the category of the kind of good-doers I described. I would like to see the day when everyone who deals with the public in any capacity, as public official or private businessman or worker, would do more than just shrug at a problem he didn't know how to solve for some despairing human being standing before him. If everyone meeting the public and dealing with the public would only recognize that there are people who would be willing to tackle the problem and help solve it—and would intelligently direct the poor soul to someone who would try, at least, to invent a solution if none existed—I think our cities would be far less of a jungle, and far more of a community. Thank you.

The Leakiest Winter on Record

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Clayton Fritchey has served as a newspaper reporter, editor and publisher, and as a special assistant to General Marshall, President Truman, and the late Adlai Stevenson. He is currently a columnist for Newsday and its syndicate and Washington correspondent for Harper's magazine.

Mr. Fritchey is well equipped to discuss the question of news management by the administration. He does so in the article, "The Leakiest Winter on Record," which was published in the March 1966, edition of Harper's magazine. The article follows:

THE LEAKIEST WINTER ON RECORD

(By Clayton Fritchey)

In some cities, it never rains except it pours. But in Washington it just "leaks." In this respect the American Capital differs from most other centers of government. In the totalitarian countries, of course, there is no "leaking" of information at all, except on pain of death. In most of the other democratic capitals, the press generally learns what the government wants it to learn, and not much more.

That's not the way it is in Washington, especially in recent months. Whether or not this is related to the Johnson administration's zeal for managing the news, there has never been a time when the marketplace has been so enlivened by the publication of hitherto secret insights into the intimate processes of government.

Is this bad or good? There is a growing belief that, on balance, disclosure is preferable to nondisclosure. But the question is a close one which inspires violent feelings and rude debate, for it involves grave problems of propriety and security.

It is no longer just the old problem of leak versus counterleak, from warring bureaucrats. That still goes on, but lately Washington has been inundated by a torrent of inside, classified information coming from other sources: through retiring Government officials; through memoirs and biographies; through informal, private "declassification" of hitherto classified data; through the last thoughts of prominent officials disclosed after their death; through the spilling of testimony given in secrecy before congressional committees; through the effort to influence high policy by the ventilation of critical intelligence.

It is fascinating and dramatic to watch. It keeps the Capital continuously excited. And nobody quite knows where it is going to end.

Washingtonians were intrigued by an extemporaneous exchange on this subject recently when both Dean Acheson, the former Secretary of State, and Historian Arthur Schlesinger appeared at a Democratic luncheon. Acheson hinted that he was prepared to write a sequel to his personal memoirs "Morning and Noon," but he added, he had left the State Department without "denuding the Government of its papers." He is just now getting permission to dust off the hitherto undisturbed State Department files in an Alexandria, Va., warehouse.

Schlesinger was unperturbed. He stoutly defended his right as a historian to deal with contemporary events. To suppress information until everyone is dead struck him as "a most curious view." He found it inconsistent for newspapers to campaign for freedom of information and the "people's right to know," and at the same time criticize him for his efforts to inform, as in his recent book about Kennedy.

It all ended serenely. Acheson said he would be pleased to have Schlesinger write his biography "if he will wait until I am safely tucked away." And Schlesinger, in turn, said he'd be pleased to have Ted Sorensen, another Kennedy biographer, write a book about him.

Schlesinger could have reminded Acheson, but didn't, that he had President Kennedy's personal approval for writing about even so touchy (and still classified) a matter as the Cuban invasion of 1961.

At the start of his administration, Kennedy said he did not want his staff recording the daily discussions of the White House. But after the Bay of Pigs he said to Schlesinger, his special assistant, "I hope you kept a full account of that." The historian reminded him of the earlier prohibition. Kennedy then said, "No, go ahead. You can be damn sure that the CIA has its record and the Joint Chiefs theirs. We'd better make sure we have a record over here. So you go ahead." So he did. This incident deals with the heart of the matter, for it eloquently reveals that in the competition for status in Washington, it's every man for himself, up to and including the President. This is the kind of competition on which the press flourishes, for it flushes out both fact and fantasy. It reminded Kennedy of Oscar Wilde's remark that "in America the President reigns for 4 years, but journalism governs forever."

Kennedy, Sorensen reports, gradually became more philosophical about a reporter's role in securing unauthorized information. He felt it took two to leak a secret, and "he blamed the premature or unauthorized publication of official information on the source, not the reporter, sometimes even requesting an FBI or informal investigation to find out who in Government had violated security regulations." When one official with intimate friends among the press was resigning, the President told Sorensen he was "tempted to tell this man, as he took his farewell, the name of his still undisclosed successor, but the wrong name, simply to see if it turned up in certain columns or newscasts."

It might be said in passing that official efforts to track down the source of leaks are hardly ever successful. While the writer was at the Pentagon during the Korean war, and later at the White House as a Presidential assistant, numerous investigations of leaks were ordered, but the culprits were never found.

The sudden death of Kennedy, and the massive, authoritative biographical works of Sorensen and Schlesinger so soon after the event, have provoked a situation quite different from the conventional leak. They personally participated in many of the dramatic events they write about. They were truly on the inside. And they make no bones about having kept notes for posterity, although both thought the material would be used much later when the President himself wrote his own memoirs.

WHOSE SECRETS?

The question of which files belong to the Government and which to its employees is an ancient one. Chalmers Roberts, the diplomatic correspondent of the Washington Post, noted that "apparently Sorensen took along a set of the (secret) letters (between Kennedy and Khrushchev) when he moved out of the White House. He also seems to have had at hand * * * General Taylor's never-published report on the Bay of Pigs disaster and numerous other documents. * * * Nobody has yet raised a fuss about Sorensen's use of what surely are classified documents, but a look at the principle involved is in order because he has done so."

George Washington established the principle that a President's office files, his papers so to speak, are his private property to dispose of as he pleases. President Washington simply sent his home to Mount Vernon, and that was that. Every succeeding President has done much the same.

The second half of President Eisenhower's history of his White House years has now been published. In it, as Roberts points out, "are many documents, or parts of documents and letters, which bore secret or top secret stamps before he took them to Gettysburg and declassified them on his own." Only a former President's own sense of what is fitting provides any limit on what he may publish.

For those below the rank of President, carbons, microfilms, and photocopies enable them to leave the original documents in the files for ultimate transfer to the National Archives. There is every opportunity for top officials to make copies for their own take-home file. "Classified" papers, of course, are another matter, especially when it comes to military and diplomatic affairs. Defense and State operate on a timelag principle before anything can be released, and sometimes the lag is absurdly long. The White House, however, is under no such restraints.

For former White House aids, Roberts observes, "the rule seems to be: take and use what you can get away with * * * and if anybody should complain that you are printing items you used to say were top secret, all you have to do is reply that now you are writing history."

It's a good answer. Leaks or no leaks, both Schlesinger and Sorensen have been writing history, and priceless history at that. It is clear that their primary motive was not to sell secrets, but to enrich our knowledge of an exciting time. Their sense of propriety and national security will serve as a good guide for similar books in the future.

WHAT WASN'T PRINTED ABOUT THE CUBA INVASION

As long as there is Government and a free press there will be continuing differences between them on freedom of information. Generally, of course, Government will be against disclosure, and the press will be for it. But not always. It is doubtful whether any good purpose was served when the Government panicked and made public the actual correspondence with Amintore Fanfani, the President of the U.N. General Assembly, over the now famous "peace feeler" from Hanoi.

Even the Washington press corps was dubious about this. The general feeling was that the State Department was more worried about its reputation than the success of the peace exploration. But the press can also reverse its role from time to time, sometimes out of a sense of patriotism or—like the State Department in the Fanfani incident—out of fear of criticism. The results have seldom been good for the long-range interests of the country.

We now know, belatedly, that shortly before the Cuba invasion in April 1961 the New Republic was about to publish a "careful, accurate, and devastating account" of the secret plans for the assault. The editor, Gilbert Harrison, sent advance proofs to Schlesinger at the White House, who asked himself whether the Government could properly ask an editor to suppress the truth. Kennedy, however, had no qualms. He wanted it killed. Harrison complied at once—"a patriotic act," Schlesinger says, "which left me oddly uncomfortable." As well it might.

At about the same time, the New York Times also discovered a landing in Cuba was imminent, but the head of the Washington bureau, James Reston, was against publication. He reasoned that publication would either alert Castro and jeopardize the success of the expedition, or cause abandonment of the project, with the Times inviting charges of grave interference with national policy. "This was another patriotic act," muses Schlesinger, "but in retrospect I have wondered whether, if the press had behaved irresponsible, it would not have spared the country a disaster."

Knowing, as we now do, how great were the President's misgivings and how close he came to calling off the invasion, it seems reasonable to suppose that it would not have taken place had there been advance disclosure; but public opinion never had a chance to save the President because the public was not informed. Later Kennedy, in anguish, was to say privately, "How could I have been so far off base? All my life I have known better than to depend on experts. How could I have been so stupid to let them go ahead?"

It may be useful to keep these incidents in mind when we hear Eric Sevareid castigated by some of Adlai Stevenson's friends for publicizing a confidential talk he had with the late U.N. Ambassador just before his death in London. In the opinion of the writer (who was the Ambassador's special assistant at the U.N.) Sevareid's account probably faithfully reflected what Stevenson said, but there would have been no report at all had he lived. This raises again the question of propriety and security, for Sevareid's posthumous report certainly dealt with highly secret matters.

Whatever the judgment may be elsewhere, in Washington—even in some official circles—the feeling is that Sevareid rendered a public service by forcing the State Department to admit that it had spurned peace overtures from North Vietnam, even though it was publicly blaming Hanoi for refusing to consider peace negotiations. This admission has certainly cleared the air in Washington; and the public everywhere is better informed.

Sevareid's interpretation of Stevenson's frame of mind and his views on foreign policy in general may be seriously disputed, but on balance the country is better off for his intimate report.

All governments instinctively believe, or they pretend to believe that leaks invariably compromise national security, but in practice, they more often just compromise the efforts of governments (always for the best of motives, of course) to fool the public.

Speaking of "patriotic" government lies, Prof. Eric Bentley suggests it would be helpful if we could know "when our leaders are not lying, so we can talk over the truth—the actual facts—with them. When Mr. Bundy implies that if we know the inside story about Vietnam, we would approve of each stand our Government has taken, including no doubt stands that contradict one another, is he patriotically lying? Is Johnson's explanation of what he did in the Dominican Republic a tissue of lies?"

Well, governments seldom tell outright lies. They are more likely to hedge, to insinuate, to be disingenuous; but one thing is sure—they do seek in every possible way to justify their actions. And the Dominican intervention could not be a better case in point. The administration (after intervening) tried out various justifications for size, but finally settled for the proposition that Communists had taken over the rebellion and the United States was saving the country from a fate worse than death—Castroism.

CHASTISEMENT FOR AN UNRULY SENATOR

This charge met with much public skepticism, but the extent of its exaggeration, and the extent of the U.S. Government's secret cooperation with the militarists in trying to suppress the revolt, finally became definitely known only through a very big leak on Capitol Hill. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee conducted an investigation into the Dominican intervention, in the course of which it took volumes of secret, authoritative testimony. On the basis of this record, the chairman of the committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, publicly denounced the Government's actions. He was denounced in turn, and accused of distortions. Later, however, when the actual testimony was leaked to the press, FULBRIGHT was vindicated—but not at the White House. When foreign leaders are given state dinners in Washington, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is automatically included. But Senator FULBRIGHT was noticeably absent at President Johnson's dinners for President Ayub, Prime Minister Harold Wilson, and Chancellor Erhard. That will teach him not to contradict teacher.

The Freedom of Information Committee of Sigma Delta Chi, the national journalistic society, charges in its annual report that the Johnson administration has tried to "warp the proposed Federal public records legislation into an almost unlimited authority for the President to establish broader security practices." One of the principal complaints is the policy of increased centralization of information releases at the White House, and increasing sensitivity over leaks having no connection with national security.

Perhaps American journalism should give some thought to the Swedish rule that all government documents must be made available for inspection by any member of the public who wants to see them. "The effect of this remarkable arrangement," says Andrew Shonfield in a new book,[1] "is most apparent in the level and quality of information available in the newspapers." He quotes Prof. Nils Herlitz on what happens:

"Every day in the great offices in Stockholm, documents which have been received will be brought to a room where representatives of the newspapers are welcome to see them. A representative of the leading news agencies will never fail to appear, and through him a flood of news will go to the newspapers and to the general public. * * * Just as publicity in the courts all over the world makes it possible for everybody to know how justice is administered, the publicity of documents has the same effect insofar as documents reflect the activity of the authorities."

There are exceptions to this rule of ubiquitous publicity, but, according to Shonfield, it is not left to the discretion of the official buraucracy to decide what is to be withheld. Specific legislative authority has to be given in the Secrecy Act.

This is a far cry from administration policy. Recently Dean Rusk told Walter Cronkite, "I think there's a built-in conflict of interest * * * between the news media and the Secretary of State. You're interested in the drama of the news. What we are working for is the repose of solutions and peace. * * * Our business is, in a sense, to get foreign policy off the front page back to page 8."

NEWS BY SECOND SIGHT

There is in Washington another form of information to which the Government might have more legitimate objections. It usually is presented to the public as exclusive news, which it often is; but in other cases it has its origin in the occult powers of the more gifted correspondents, some of whom have extrasensory perception.

A notable example is brought to mind by the immnient retirement of McGeorge Bundy, the co-Secretary of State who has directed the White House foreign policy section under both Kennedy and Johnson. Mr. Bundy, as everybody must know by now, is going to be the new president of the Ford Foundation at $75,000 a year. The announcement of his appointment did not, however, come from the White House or the Ford Foundation. It came from James Reston in an exclusive New York Times story. There was no confirmation of any kind for weeks, but during this interval it was fascinating to watch the superstructure of conjecture that was day-by-day built on Mr. Reston's foundation.

Shortly after the first story appeared two other authoritative columnists quickly tuned in, and the public got these additional exclusives: (1) Bundy would be succeeded by White House Press Secretary Bill Moyers; (2) Jack Valenti, in turn, would become the Press Secretary.

We were even let in on the President's private feelings about all this: He wasn't upset over Bundy leaving. Indeed, he welcomed the opportunity "to close down the little State Department in the White House basement." On top of all this, a well-trained lady columnist reported that in the wake of these changes and others to come, the President had created a new task force to solve the administration's brain drain.

At this point the most authoritative Washington columnist of all (at least for White

---

[1] "Modern Capitalism" (Oxford University Press.)

House affairs) also tuned in, but his antenna got different signals. Bundy, he reported, was going to leave all right, but the logical successor was not Moyer but Clark Clifford or Walt Rostow.

Moreover, the little State Department in the White House was not going to be closed down. It might not be as powerful as in the past, but is would remain a vital post. Matters were further complicated by another "inside" report that Bundy would be succeeded by Defense Secretary McNamara, although McNamara had just been appointed by another columnist the head up the new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

Now if Moyers doesn't succeed Bundy, how can Valenti become Press Secretary? Don't worry, another columnist has just revealed that Valenti is going to Rome as the new U.S. Ambassador.

In a testimonial to the retiring Bundy, his close friend, Joseph Alsop asks how a man (Bundy) "can be disinterested who is also so obviously ambitious and so evidently enjoys the exercise of power?" The answer, Mr. Alsop says, "is that a public servant who is not ambitious and does not enjoy the exercise of power is at least a flawed if not an entirely useless instrument. A hesitancy in the face of power was in fact the flaw of the late Adlai E. Stevenson." Could Mr. Alsop be referring to that flaw which made Mr. Stevenson so hesitant about sharing Mr. Bundy's enthusiasm for those famous exercises of power, better known as the invasions of Cuba and the Dominican Republic? I fancy not.

Plan for Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune calls the Asian Development Bank "the beginning of a major partnership between the underdeveloped countries of Asia and the advanced, industrialized nations of the West."

It points out that the West, together with Japan, "will supply part of the capital and most of the equipment needed for building roads, bridges, ports, railways, and the other basic elements of a modern economy."

The program for the bank might be called a little Marshall plan, the Herald Tribune believes, adding "the analogy is made because the new bank has aroused the hope of duplicating in Asia some of the magic which the Marshall plan achieved in Western Europe."

I think my colleagues will be interested in the analogy and the facts of this article, and with this in mind I offer it in its entirety for publication in the Record:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 22, 1966]

Asia's Marshall Plan

President Johnson, in signing the bill authorizing U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank, referred to the new regional lending agency as "an economic Magna Carta for the diverse lands of Asia." The description sounds like the valiant effort of a tired ghostwriter. Asian members and beneficiaries of the bank will settle for a more modest title—"a little Marshall plan."

The analogy is made because the new bank has aroused the hope of duplicating in Asia some of the magic which the Marshall plan achieved in Western Europe. It is far smaller in scope, of course, because our contribution of $200 million and the total capitalization of $1 billion are only a fraction of the $5.4 billion with which the United States initiated the postwar European reconstruction program. It is also much smaller than the $10 billion or more which the United States proposes to put into the long-term Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

But it is the beginning of a major partnership between the underdeveloped countries of Asia and the advanced, industrialized nations of the West which, together with Japan, will supply part of the capital and most of the equipment needed for building roads, bridges, ports, railways, and the other basic elements of a modern economy.

As in the case of the Marshall plan, the United States extended a welcoming hand to the Soviet Union; and, as before, the latter has declined. In the first instance, Russia would have been a recipient of Marshall aid; in the present, it would have been a contributor to Asian development. Though different in character, its negative response now, as before, was politically motivated. But the economic program succeeded without Russia in Europe, and should be able to do so in Asia.

While Russia's negavitism is not too surprising, that of France is painfully embarrassing—possibly as much to the French as to the Americans. For France was one of the primary beneficiaries of Marshall aid; and it is France which, having achieved prosperity with American help, now declines to join in duplicating the aid program, even on such a limited scale, for Asia. This might be described as not doing for others what you would have others do unto you.

Will Russia Win the Wet Space Race?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, increasingly evidence is mounting that this Nation's merchant marine and fisheries industries are in trouble. In shipbuilding, the United States now ranks 12th among the shipbuilding nations.

Of the fish consumed in this country, 62 percent are imported. That means $500 million flows out of this country to pay for fish imports each year. America's fishing industry is now catching only the same amount of fish that it did in 1948.

My distinguished colleagues on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Representative Paul G. Rogers, of Florida, and Representative Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts, recently studied the marine, oceanographic, and fisheries efforts of the Soviet Union and Poland.

The findings of this firsthand study are laid out in a fine article by Representative Rogers in the March 1966 issue of Under Sea Technology magazine. The facts in this article clearly show that the United States is facing stiff competition from Russia in the "wet space race."

Mr. Speaker, 71 percent of the earth's surface is water, and we cannot ignore the competition of the Soviet Union for leadership in the productive use of the high seas.

Will Russia Win the Wet Space Race?

(By Representative Paul G. Rogers, of Florida.)

More and more attention is being focused on the race between the United States and Russia for conquest of outer space. While many of our national resources have been diverted toward America's flight into space exploration, there remains an equally vital area of discovery which is virtually untapped.

The exploration of the seas represents a reservoir of benefits which lay at our feet. We have only to walk to the shores of the United States to have access to waters which, with technological effort, will yield countless advantages.

The Russians are already running in this race for ocean conquest. It is time this Nation quickened its pace. Progress in the "wet space race" is swift, and unless we move with new fervor soon we may be too late.

Congressman Hastings Keith, Republican of Massachusetts, and I reached the above conclusion after a recent inspection tour of ocean science, fisheries, and merchant marine installations behind the Iron Curtain. The inspection was made at the request of Chairman Edward Garmatz (Democrat, of Maryland), of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Russia's progress in the ocean has been phenomenal. Since World War II the Soviet Union has emerged as a powerful maritime nation. Shipbuilding has become a matter of such high priority in Russia since the war that today nearly 90 percent of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old. By comparison, the United States has declined as a maritime power, and today almost 90 percent of our commercial fleet is 20 years older or more.

Shipbuilding is of such low priority in the United States that last year this Nation fell three places in world rank to become 12th among shipbuilding nations.

Today more than 24 percent of the ships are being built for the Soviets. As of last October, 1965, the U.S.S.R. had 464 merchant ships of 1,000 gross tons or more under construction or on order. As of this same time, the United States had only 39 such vessels on order or under construction. Pathetically, our shipyards are operating at half capacity.

But shipping capacity is only one aspect of Russia's progress in the seas. Below the surface the U.S.S.R. is making strides which must be brought closer examination.

The Soviet Union has placed a very high importance on oceanography. Although there are a number of phases of ocean science in which the United States is clearly ahead, we must be aware that the Soviets are not complacent. On the contrary, oceanography is fast becoming a major scientific effort in the Communist world. Centrally directed by the state, Soviet sea scientists are dedicating themselves to firmly establishing Russia as the ruler of Neptune's kingdom.

Just how does the United States measure up to Russia in the science of the seas? Russia claims some 1,500 oceanographers backed up by 7,500 or more men and women working full time in the field. The status of sea scientists is being upgraded, and the field is being made more appealing to young people. It should be mentioned also that the Soviet Institute of Oceanography has been expanded five times its original size in the past 15 years.

It has been estimated that the United States has approximately 700 oceanographers with some 2,000 to 2,500 full-time technicians supporting them. We are increasing our ranks by approximately 10 percent per year. Soviet may actually be increasing 15 percent per year. In any event, it must again be emphasized that the Soviets are not complacent, but eager for growth in oceanographic personnel. Neither must be satisfied, and we must take steps to make ocean science a more popular field.

As for organization, the U.S. Government operates oceanographic programs from 18 or 20 Federal agencies. Of course universities, laboratories, and industrial research supplements the Federal effort. By comparison, the Soviet Union places all oceanography under the control of the state. However, it was stated during our visit in Moscow that 8 to 10 organizations were involved in the marine science field.

In our discussion with the Russians, it was revealed that a reorganization in the ocean science field is in progress. A National Council for the Utilization of the Resources of the Sea has recently been created. A new director of the Institute of Oceanology, Dr. A. S. Monin, has been appointed, and I think we can predict a greater emphasis is to be given to basic research.

While the United States has maintained a lead in basic scientific research, it has been generally regarded that the Soviets have emphasized the applications of research, rather than basic investigations. In certain phases of applied research the United States maintains a lead. The field of oceanographic instruments is one in which this Nation is ahead. Also, the use of computers applied in the assemblage of marine science data is an American achievement, though under study in the Soviet Union today.

In discussion, Soviet authorities noted that the Institute of Oceanology is becoming more interested in sea-air interactions, particularly in support of weather services. The institute's new Director Monin is a specialist in this field.

In the U.S. Government we have just witnessed the establishment of the Environmental Science Services Administration within the Department of Commerce. ESSA now combines various functions within the U.S. Weather Bureau and U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey. Also newly created within ESSA is the Institute for Oceanography, under the capable supervision of Dr. Harris B. Stewart, Jr.

The United States can also claim a lead in deep-sea mining, drilling, and deep-sea research vehicles. However, the Soviets maintain a fleet submarine, the *Severyanka*, for fisheries research. The vessel is fitted with floodlights, portholes, and closed-circuit TV for observing undersea life, and also monitors the operation of fishing gear.

It is evident that the U.S.S.R. has taken a clear lead in the important field of fisheries. Numerous imaginative experiments have been conducted by Soviet fisheries experts, one of which involves the use of explosives detonated near the ocean floor to bring food to the surface, replenishing exhausted food sources.

In short, the Soviets have made fishing a science. By application of ocean science data, the U.S.S.R. landed 4.48 million tons of fish in 1964, increasing nearly one-half million tons over its 1963 catch. Conversations with officials of Soviet Ministry of Fisheries brought forth that the 1965 catch reach 5.6 million tons. The 1966 goal is 6.2 million tons, with 1967 having even a higher goal.

By comparison, the U.S. fishing industry has declined in relation to those of other nations. Our catch today is about what is was in 1948. Our share of the total world catch has slipped from 12.4 percent in 1948 to less than 6 percent today. Furthermore, 62 percent of the fish consumed in this country is imported, and each year Americans spend over $500 million on fish imports.

The Soviets have also experimented with "fish farming." One of their achievements involved the airlift of 60–70 million pink salmon eggs and fingerlings from the Far East where they were transplanted in the Barents Sea. Also, work was underway in 1965 to transplant the king crab.

The Soviet fishing fleet makes extensive use of refrigerated and canning equipped mother ships which accompany trawlers to sea. The catch is tranferred from the trawler to the mother ships, which are, in effect, floating fish factories. Processing the catch at sea also enables the trawlers to remain at the fishing grounds for extended periods instead of returning to port to offload the catch in order to avoid spoilage.

Approximately 80 percent of the Soviet catch is obtained on the high seas, and 20 percent from inland waters. Concentration on the seas appears assured as information gained on our tour suggests that the U.S.S.R. will expand operations in tropical waters. The increasing number of Soviet trawlers in the South Atlantic, Caribbean, and Gulf of Mexico near Florida and Cuba offers additional evidence of this phase of Soviet fisheries operations.

Pollution of inland waters is a concern in the U.S.S.R. just as it is here in the United States. However, in Russia water pollution is a criminal offense. Authorities cited a case involving a plant which dumped improperly treated waste into a nearby stream, killing sturgeon fingerlings. The plant manager was jailed.

The Soviets have been successful in fisheries because they have applied to their fisheries operations the tools learned in marine research. With this success, they are encouraging more oceanographic effort.

In the United States today there is an emerging awareness on the part of the public, the Congress, and the industrial community that the oceans represent a vast untapped resource. This emerging awareness is greeted by an enthusiastic community of scientists and ocean technologist eager to move into a concentrated campaign to promote full utilization of the seas.

The Congress has completed all but final action on legislation which will provide an overall national survey, or inventory, of our oceanographic capabilities. If the United States is to move ahead in sea explorations, it is advisable to know in which direction. Once our national inventory has been completed, the legislation requires that specific recommendations for (1) goals to be reached, (2) an organizational plan, and (3) funding to be made to the President and the Congress.

About 71 percent of the earth's surface is water, yet today we know more about outer space than the earth's inner space. This Nation stands at the threshold of man's final conquest of his environment. Is a man on the moon more vital than man in the sea? Will these men be Americans, or Russians?

The crucial question is one which must be answered. The answer must come soon. Our very survival may depend on what that answer is.

A Law Against Invasion of Privacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, today I received the following telegram:

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly protest following matter and urge your intervention to prevent flagrant abuse of local government power.

Last night at public urban renewal meeting Mayor Harry Lister of Rockville Centre announced hiring private agency to investigate recent report of Nassau County Human Rights Commission which blamed village officials for racial tension in urban renewal area. Agency is Vincent Gillen who conducted General Motors probe of Ralph Nader. Gillen detectives were present at meeting unannounced. Mayor acknowledged presence but refused to identify men.

For mayor to use private detectives to investigate local critics and government agency critical of village is open abuse of public trust and public funds. Mayor is willing to spend taxpayers' money to attack critics and whitewash self but refused for years to spend enough money to relieve unbearable conditions in urban renewal area. Proposed investigation cannot be impartial since mayor announced it would present his side of story. He can do this without aid of private detectives. Clear implication is that investigation will result in personal attack on critics and invasion of privacy in manner of Nader probe.

Are citizens to be subjected to same tactics by their own elected officials who last year arrested women, later acquitted, for protesting denial of right to speak at public meeting? Who concealed microphone in village hall to record conversation of critics, who last night suggested investigation and possible discipline of priest who helped write diocesan commission report critical of village?

We implore you to intervene in mayor's action which has no place in civil government in America.

ROCKVILLE CENTRE TENANTS
ASSOCIATION,
MRS. ALFREDA BREWSTER, *Chairman.*
ROCKVILLE CENTRE COMMITTEE
FOR HUMAN RIGHTS,
DR. JAMES BERNSTEIN, *Chairman.*

Mr. Speaker, I responded to the above telegram as follows:

MRS. ALFREDA BREWSTER,
Chairman, Rockville Centre Tenants Association, Rockville Centre, N.Y.
DR. JAMES BERNSTEIN,
Chairman, Rockville Centre Committee for Human Rights, Rockville Centre, N.Y.:

I acknowledge and am shocked by the contents of your telegram relating to events in Rockville Centre. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I recognize the responsibilities of Congress to protect the right of privacy of individuals. I will place my comments on this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to call the attention of my colleagues to these events. It is my hope that 10 years of history and tensions will be merged and buried with the first shovel of dirt turned on the Rockville Centre Urban Renewal Project.

Sincerely,

HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the following newspaper articles from Long Island's two daily newspapers provide the background to the events which have occurred in Rockville Centre, N.Y.:

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, Mar. 24, 1966]

"PRIVATE EYE" SITS IN AT VILLAGE MEETING

(By Paul Wiseman)

Rockville Centre village officials hesitantly admitted last night that at least one of the 70 persons sitting in the audience at a village urban renewal meeting was a private detective invited by the officials to observe the meeting.

Minutes before the meeting started, this reporter noticed some village officials apparently briefing a stranger. Asking who the man was, the reporter was told: "His name's Fairfield. The village's hiring him to investigate urban renewal."

The stranger identified himself to the reporter as Irwin Fairfield of Vincent Gillen Associates Inc. of Garden City. A congressional committee discovered earlier this week that General Motors had used the Gillen firm to investigate the author of a controversial book charging that Detroit-built cars were unsafe.

General Motors publicly apologized for the probe which asked questions about the author's sex habits, political beliefs and attitudes toward Jews.

As last night's meeting got underway at 8 p.m. at the village's recreation center, Acting Village Clerk Arthur DeMott, sitting on the stage with the other board members, was expectanly watching the doors to the meeting room. Suddenly he left the stage and walked to the back of the room to chat with an unidentified man who had just entered.

After several minutes, the man took a seat in front of Fairfield and then leaned back to exchange some words with him. Asked by a reporter who the man was, Fairfield said: "What are you asking me for? I have nothing to discuss." At the end of the meeting Fairfield and the other man left together.

Mayor W. Harry Lister announced at the start of the meeting, that the board was "retaining an organization of professional management and personnel consultants" to make a thorough study of the Nassau Commission on Human Rights' report which largely blamed village officials for racial unrest in the urban renewal area.

When Dr. James Bernstein, president of the Human Rights Committee, asked whether the village had hired a private detective agency, the mayor hesitated briefly, then said: "We haven't hired totaly * * *."

Bernstein challenged him on the secrecy of the matter and Lister replied it would not be secret as soon as the village decided whether to hire the firm.

Trustee Albert Rubin then interrupted the exchange saying that the board would not release details of its investigation until the county commission makes public the means it employed in investigating the village situation.

* * * * *

Local civil rights groups have asked the county commission to hold public hearings on the urban renewal controversy, contending such hearings would allow the village to cross-examine witnesses. The village board has avoided making similar requests to the county body.

When Bernstein asked Lister if there was a private detective present at the meeting at the board's request, the mayor did not answer directly. Bernstein then turned about and facing the audience asked: "Is there a detective in the audience?" No one responded and Lister said: "Wait a minute, who's running this meeting? * * * There is a man in this room representing a firm.

Lister was told that if the village retains Gillen, he will specify that no inquiries may be made by the firm into any individual's sex habits or other personal privacy.

* * * * *

Lister said he expected it would take from 30 to 60 days for an investigation commissioned by the board to be completed. The investigation, he said, would take the form of interviews with "residents and nonresidents of the urban renewal area, including officials, to come up with factual statements in regard to the critical observations in the commission's criticisms and conclusions."

Mrs. James Bernstein, wife of the doctor, quipped that since the board was hiring the investigative firm to present its side of the story, "how can you say in advance that it's going to be factual?"

A spokesman for the Tenants Association said after the meeting, "This is the second time in the last few months that the village is using taxpayer's dollars for underhand investigations of its critics. First the bugging, now the dicks." The "bugging" referred to the microphone found by this reporter last November in the public telephone booth in the village hall. Later explained at the time that the bug was intended "to record the antics of (Dr. Ralph G.) Sorley"—the village's most outspoken critic.

[From Newsday, Mar. 24, 1966]

HOUSING MEETING ENDS IN EVICTION OF 11

ROCKVILLE CENTRE.—The village board, whose policy is to have residents save their urban renewal questions for its special meetings devoted to the subject about every 2 months, sometimes has trouble answering them all in one night.

Last night, for instance, the village police force had to eject 11 questioners from the meeting hall after the meeting was over who just kept sitting and waiting for more answers.

The 11 officers, members, and supporters of the tenants association, which has led urban renewal area tenants in a campaign against the village's administration of the program, had come to the Rockville Centre Recreation Center to find out what the village board had to say about a Nassau Human Rights Commission report last month condemning the board's administration of the project for discriminating against Negroes in the administration of its urban renewal project.

MEMBERS STAY IN SEATS

But at 11 p.m. after several hours of vigorous questioning, the board adjourned the meeting but association members decided to stay in their seats until they were satisfied. The result, said Charles Scwartz, 20, of 130 Lakeview Avenue.: "They carried us out and dumped us on the sidewalk." Rockville Centre police said their reports showed only that "the hall had to be cleared," according to a spokesman, who said he did not know if any of the demonstrators were removed bodily. He said no arrests had been made.

Scwartz, who said, "We didn't leave because we weren't satisfied with what the board had to say" in response to questions from the tenants' group about the composition of the grievance board which the village trustees have promised to establish. The grievance board, which was one of the recommendations of the county human rights commission report, would mediate disputes between the predominantly Negro tenants of the village-zoned temporary housing in the West End urban renewal area. The village and the tenants, however, have different ideas about who should sit on the board. The Tenants Association is claiming the right to represent all tenants on the board, but according to Dr. James Bernstein, chairman of the Rockville Centre Committee for Human Rights, Mayor W. Harry Lister "told us he did not think the association is representative enough." Bernstein added: "He's going to do everything he can to avoid appointing someone from the association to the grievance board." Lister's telephone was reported off the hook last night by the telephone company, and he could not be reached for comment after the meeting.

INVESTIGATION PLANNED

Bernstein also said the mayor told the tenants he was hiring a management consultant firm, which he refused to identify, to investigate the village's urban renewal program and issue a report in answer to the county human rights commission. "It sounds to me like he's hiring some private eyes," Bernstein said. "I gather they are even going to investigate the county commission." Bernstein, who said the mayor denounced the commission's report as prejudiced and libelous in parts, said, "We feel the commission must hold a public hearing now. The village has no plans to talk to anyone about the recommendations in the report."

It is the responsibility of Congress to protect the rights of the individual against the resources of government and corporations which threaten the right of privacy and to draft legislation which will put teeth in the unwritten law against invasion of privacy. The right of law-enforcement officers in the field must be clearly defined. The exposure of recent cases of government snooping and industrial espionage by the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, and the recent events in my own Fifth Congressional District point up the need for legislation.

The charge that the mayor of Rockville Centre plans to spend taxpayers' money to hire private investigators to investigate critics of the urban renewal project is shocking. Last November I was shocked when I discovered a microphone hidden in a public phone booth in the Rockville Centre Village Hall. The purpose of this secret installation, as stated by the mayor, was to record conversations of one of the mayor's critics, but a grand jury returned no indictment against the village official who installed the microphone.

The laws pertaining to wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping vary from State to State and a thorough study of these laws is needed. Incidents highlighting invasion of privacy sometimes receive national attention, as in the General Motors case, and other times receive only local attention as in Rockville Centre, but the invasions of privacy are equally serious.

The drafting of legislation to define the limits of government and corporation investigations will not be easy; however, we should not be deterred in making an effort to clarify allowable legal limits for such investigations. It is high time that we investigate the investigators so that we may guarantee to our citizens their rights and privacy.

The courts have been able to define civil liability for invasion of privacy without infringing upon the right of free speech. It is time to protect individuals from such abuses by providing criminal liability.

Food, Drugs, Cosmetics, and Politics—Remarks by Congresswoman Sullivan at Conference of Maryland Consumers Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in 14 years in the House of Representatives, it has been most unusual for me to be absent from Capitol Hill when the House was convening, yet I felt that it was important for me to play "hookey" for an hour or so last month to attend the "Calling All Consumers" conference of the Maryland Consumers Council, Inc., at the Adult Education Center of the University of Maryland.

The growing interest in consumer issues and in consumer legislation has been most encouraging to me. The Maryland group has been an effective organization in this field, so my visit to their conference on February 9 was both to encourage them in their efforts and to obtain their valuable help in my legislative efforts.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the Congressional Record my remarks at the Maryland Consumers Council conference, as follows:

Food, Drugs, Cosmetics, and Politics

(Remarks by Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan, Democrat of Missouri at "Calling All Consumers" Conference sponsored by Maryland Consumers Council, Inc., Maryland State Home Demonstrations Department, and College of Home Economics, Adult Education Center, University of Maryland, Wednesday, February 9, 1966, at 1:45 p.m.)

In coming here today, I am breaking one of my cardinal rules as a Member of Congress, which is never to leave the Capitol when the House is in session. Of course, rules are meant for breaking, but this is a self-imposed rule which I break so seldom that—when I do—it is with almost superstitious dread. For, almost always, there are quorum calls and roll calls which I miss. And, to a Member of Congress who must run for reelection every 2 years—and who must win reelection every 2 years without fail if I am not to lose my seniority on committees where one's standing is crucial to effective representation of the people back home—missing quorum calls can be embarrassing, while missing rollcalls can be serious.

More than that, however, I find it personally important to listen to the debates on important issues so as to be able to vote intelligently. And, as many of you know, it is often the nonrecorded votes in committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union—during the final shaping of legislation—which are most important. The fact that the record does not show you were absent on such a vote is not very much solace if your absence has contributed to the gutting of an imporant bill, or has made it impossible for those who feel as you do to push through a useful amendment.

Thus, I feel somewhat guilty in being here—in all fairness I must tell you that. Usually, I avoid this feeling just by turning down automatically any invitation, whatever its source, if it entails leaving Capitol Hill on a weekday when the House is meeting. The event must be, in my opinion, of great importance to legislative objectives close to my heart in order to tear me away from the House—and your meeting today does come within that important category. Thus, while I cannot in all honesty use the customary greeting of telling you how happy I am to be here—for I am a bit nervous about it—I want you at least to know that I feel it is worth the effort and the discomfort. For I think a group such as this one—interested in what the individual and the dedicated group can do to achieve consumer objectives—can do a great deal for the issues in which I am deeply involved as a legislator.

Besides, your program chairman, Carla Williams, is very persuasive. If you have heard stories about how effective a certain individual who lives and works at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington can be in getting Members of Congress to do things he wants done, I can tell you that Carla Williams does the twist with great skill also. My presence here today is proof of that.

Actually, I wanted very much to come and the only pressure she had to apply was in convincing me back in December that there could not possibly be important legislation on the House floor today. If she consulted the Hagerstown Almanac for that prediction, I am afraid it was not quite accurate. Hence, I shall talk and run—go right back to the House immediately, instead of tarrying for questions or staying for what I know will be a very illuminating session on packaging abuses and their prevention and cure led by Senator Hart, whom I have always respected but have come to know and admire tremendously through our participation together on the National Commission on Food Marketing.

As a consumer-minded Congresswoman, I am, of course, interested in all of the subjects you are covering in this excellent all-day program today. There is hardly an aspect of your discussions on which I have not at some time introduced bills, offered amendments, participated in hearings or debates or otherwise become deeply involved. I am still involved in most of them. But I do not want, in these few minutes, to go back over ground you have already covered this morning or which you will cover in detail later this afternoon. Instead, I am going to concentrate on the one area in which a bill I have drafted and introduced is unique. I am referring, of course, to H.R. 1235, an omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

By concentrating on that, I do not want you to think I am disinterested in tire safety—I am sponsoring in this Congress, as I cosponsored in the last, the tire safety bill originally drafted by former Congressman Kenneth Roberts of Alabama, long the leader in Congress in the broad field of automobile safety until the Goldwater sweep of Alabama in 1964 sacrificed one of the most effective battlers for consumer safety in Congress; I am the sponsor on the House side, also, of the Douglas truth-in-lending bill; I am still working for the extension of Federal meat inspection into intrastate commerce, where perhaps 20 percent of our meat sales take place without proper sanitation and wholesomeness inspection—I believe mine was the first bill introduced in the Congress on that subject. I had been working on this idea 4 years ago and was just about to introduce a bill to carry it out when President Kennedy's consumer message came up to the Congress on March 15 and, among many other things with which I am sure all of you are familiar, mentioned this particular problem without, however, suggesting an answer. So my bill went in that very day. It would set up major consuming areas, such as are now authorized for Federal poultry inspection; and, under my bill, all meat going into those areas, whether from within or without a particular State, would have to be federally inspected. If this technique is a worthwhile mechanism for poultry inspection—and the Agriculture Department assures me it is—then I think it could well be used in meat inspection, too. Unfortunately, however, although this unusual intrastate inspection provision has been in the poultry inspection law since 1957, it has never been used. I've been trying to get my people in St. Louis, and the Department of Agriculture here, to follow through on the idea of having St. Louis declared a major consuming area under Federal poultry inspection, and you people in Maryland might well look into the possibilities of having parts or all of your State so designated also—if uninspected poultry in intrastate commerce is a health hazard in your State.

There are so many areas of consumer protection which need improvement, expansion, reform, and understanding—but, as I said, I want to concentrate this afternoon on the one area in which the legislation I have introduced is unique and in which the needs are extremely urgent.

My omnibus bill on foods, drugs and cosmetics was first introduced on the first day of the 87th Congress, back in 1961. It grew out of 8 years of accumulated grievances over the piecemeal approach I had seen the Congress take year after year in closing gaping loopholes in the by-then decrepit 1938 act. As one loophole had been closed, another had opened up. Each of the major enactments in this field since 1953 has been an important contribution to consumer health and safety—but they have been spread over too long a span. And none—not one—went far enough. In passing them, we always knew we were merely putting what I call a blowout patch on the law, instead of replacing outmoded sections we knew were no longer adequate.

When I protested—and other Members of Congress also protested—the answer from those in charge of the legislation—and this goes back a long time, to 1953—was that if we tried to do too much at one time, we would "stir up the dogs"—get too many powerful interests united against us, and, by rousing so much corporate ire we would lose support in the political arena of Congress for any legislation at all—including those proposals which industry was perhaps ready to acknowledge should become law.

Hence, in 1953, we achieved only a blowout patch on the factory inspection provisions of the law, closing a loophole opened by a court decision which had held that Food and Drug inspectors could not inspect a plant unless the management invited them in at management's convenience. You can imagine how typical the plant sanitation and other operating conditions would be on the day management selected for a Federal inspector to visit. We overcame that problem, but did absolutely nothing that year about drug safety, or food additives, or cosmetic safety, or any of the other glaring gaps we knew at that time existed in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. A select committee of the House, under Congressman James J. Delaney, of New York, had thoroughly documented the need for such corrective legislation several years earlier; hence, no one could plead ignorance about the needs back in 1953. It was merely a case of political timing—having the votes, inspiring public interest, getting administration support.

It took until 1958—5 years later—to enact the Food Additives Act; and until 1960 to get into the law an anticancer clause—a Delaney clause—dealing with the coloring matter in cosmetics. But outside of the coloring matter, no ingredient of cosmetics—to this very day—must be pretested for safety.

Nor must therapeutic devices be pretested either for safety or efficacy.

We had known about about the vast bootlegging of the nonnarcotic, habit-farming dangerous drugs like the pep pills and barbiturates and the various mind-affecting drugs, but we couldn't nail down until just this past year—1965—legislation which gave the Government adequate powers for dealing with this frightful menace to health, highway safety, and youthful sanity.

The prescription drug efficacy and safety requirements we long knew we needed were not enacted until 1962, in the Kefauver-Harris Act. And we succeeded at that time only because of the thalidomide tragedy.

But each time we achieved one of these partial solutions to the problem of strengthening our Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, my satisfaction in the accomplishment was clouded by a realization of how much remained to be done—and was not being done.

Hence, on the first day of the 87th Congress, I submitted H.R. 1235, and I have been reintroducing it, under the same number, in each succeeding Congress. Out of it have already come the major provisions of the 1962 Kefauver-Harris Act and the 1965 Drug Abuses Control Act. But there are 12 or 13 other sections still left from the original bill on which no action has been taken, plus numerous new provisions written in since 1961, including one closing a loophole on cancer-causing coloring matter in animal feeds which got into the Kefauver-Harris Act for no logical reason whatsoever, and over my bitter objections at the time. It serves absolutely no purpose—none. Similarly, the prohibition in the current version of H.R. 1235 against the sale in interstate commerce of flavored aspirin for children—the greatest single cause of poisoning of children under 5 and the greatest cause of death among children under 5 from accidental ingestions—was not in the original 1961 version of the bill.

But practically everything else in this 45-page bill was placed in it originally 5 years ago and still cries for enactment after all of that time. And they are things which affect you—your families—your homes—in the foods you eat, in the proprietary medicines you are persuaded to buy, in the worthless or even dangerous medical devices of all kinds hawked as cure-alls by charlatans, or in the therapeutic materials and devices used in good faith by ethical practitioners who assume they have been proved safe and efficacious; and in the cosmetics which go on the market for testing by you as to their safety.

In a news article recently discussing the various consumer measures which might come up in this Congress, one writer was a bit confused by the multitude of subjects and items covered in my bill and, after referring to the section requiring pretesting for safety and efficacy of therapeutic and medical devices before they could be sold, then proceeded to use the same terminology in reference to cosmetics.

Believe me, ladies and gentlemen, much as I might—as a good consumer—like the idea of forcing cosmetic manufacturers to prove the efficacy—the effectiveness—of their products, as well as their safety, my feminine intuition tells me that this is sheer impracticality. And it would probably be a great disservice to women to try to accomplish such a thing. For if we had such a provision in the law, how dull our dressing tables would look; how forlorn our hopes to be beautiful. We buy the beauty preparations not out of conviction that they will make us beautiful, but rather out of fervent hope. The advertisements skirt the edge of credence, and take delightful advantage of the truth—but while knowing all that, we nevertheless have our dreams and indulge them somewhat extravagantly.

No, I do not think I would sponsor legislation to require proof, before a cosmetic is marketed, that it will positively do for us the things the manufacturer skillfully leads us to hope, or wish, it would. So, there is no proof of efficacy requirement in H.R. 1235 dealing with cosmetics.

But there is a requirement for advance proof of safety. There is a requirement that the ingredients be listed on the label—in a way we can see them and read them, so at least we can steer clear of those containing ingredients we know will cause us allergic pain or suffering; there is a requirement that hair dyes be proved safe to use (there is no such thing in the law now); there is a further requirement that the customer be fully warned on the label of the dangers inherent in the use or abuse or mishandling of any cosmetic item (and that also is not true today). Hair sprays which mention casually, in tiny type where it is hard to read, that the product should not be inhaled or used near burning cigarets, or be sprayed into the eyes, carry these admonitions either because one or more of the States may require it, or because the manufacturer feels some responsibility for user-safety, but the Federal law does not require it and many sprays do not carry such warnings. Furthermore, many women use them dangerously in utter ignorance of the danger. Have you ever been in a beauty shop where the air was one big cloud of hair spray while lighted cigarets burned in almost every right hand? Wow.

We have a law—the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act of 1960—which requires adequate warnings on all household products which are dangerous to children or adults—warnings and instructions for first aid or for antidotes. This law does not apply to any food, drug, or cosmetic—presumably because the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act provides sufficient protections. But that act does not do so. Hair sprays are only one illustration. All of the pressurized cans of foods, deodorants, and other push-button items covered by the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act are similarly exempted from effective regulation as to hazardous conditions of use, or handling, yet they are all dangerous at certain temperatures, or in misuse. But Uncle Sam cannot do anything about it to protect you if the manufacturer is lax about warning you. On other household items he can, but not on foods, drugs, and cosmetics. This is shameful.

I want to digress for a moment from the gaps in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to mention another area in which hazardous products are generally exempt from proper labeling and warnings—those used in industrial and commercial processes. I have a separate bill in on that; but I just wanted to mention that, while the breadwinner in the family may enjoy some protection at home under the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act from hazardous household products such as bleaches, paints, solvents, waxes, polishes, and so on, when he goes to work and perhaps uses the same types of products, there are no Federal standards for requiring safe handling of these materials or giving him necessary warnings about dangers or antidotes. I learned about this problem by accident, as we do about most problems in public health and safety, when—some years ago—I arranged to have the U.S. Public Health Service make one of their famous detective-story investigations into a plant situation in St. Louis where the workers were all suffering from mysterious skin diseases and even more serious complications. The formula for a chemical used in one of the plant's processes had been changed by the manufacturer without notification, and what had previously been a safe use of this chemical suddenly became a dangerous one. The Public Health Service pinpointed the problem after an exhaustive study. My bill (that one is H.R. 1179) would authorize the Secretary of Labor to specify the procedures for safe handling of dangerous industrial products and thus provide a means for preventing such accidents in the future. But I digress. To get back to H.R. 1235—I have cited enough examples, I hope, to impress upon you the need for a thoroughgoing redrafting of our basic consumer protection statute, and yet I have only covered a small portion of the things in H.R. 1235. I hope you will all ask your own Representatives in the Congress, or either or both of your Senators, to obtain a copy of the bill for you. I ask that for two reasons: first, it is one way of assuring your opportunity to know the details of the entire bill, without having to sit through hours of a discussion such as this; secondly, it is also a good way of bringing to the attention of your own Member of Congress, and your Senators, the existence of this measure. I am sure Congressman Sam Friedel knows about it—he serves on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has had the bill before it now for 5 years; your other Members, however, may not have had a chance to look into it. With more than 12,000 bills introduced in the House, and thousands more in the Senate, so far in this Congress, it is impossible for any of us to be aware of more than a fraction of them. But if all of you ask for a copy of this particular bill, H.R. 1235, your members are going to wonder why—and perhaps will take the time to read it, too. That helps.

I sincerely believe that if you will study the measure, you will join me in urging action on it—in this Congress.

In talking to consumer groups about the need for corrective legislation in the field of foods, drugs and cosmetics, I always stress the need for political action. This does not mean that you all have to run for Congress; it does mean that you have to pin down your own Congressman or Senator on these issues—ask him his opinion about gaps in the law and whether he will support needed improvement. If he is courteous and reasonably responsive—as most Members try to be—do not feel you are imposing if you ask him to be specific. We always try to be specific when we feel we know enough about a subject. If we do not know enough about it, and if constituents keep insisting we should know, we make it our business to find out what the facts are.

I did not come here to ask you to browbeat the Maryland delegation in Congress. Most of the members of your congressional delegation are certain to support good consumer legislation if the opportunity presents itself. But, with so many other things to worry about and work on, they can't always be experts on every subject—unless you provide them some inspiration along certain lines.

If every delegation in the Congress were as forward looking as your own, I am sure this legislation would have been passed long before now.

Nevertheless, as I always point out in talking to consumer groups, and as I should explain to you, too—Congress is like the accelerator of your car—that is, very sensitive to pressure. You make it go by putting your foot down. In the field of food, drug and cosmetic reform, it is going to take a heavy jolt to get action, however, because the industries covered by the law like it pretty much as it is now—even though they fought hard against the enactment of most of the improvements which they now say make the law adequate. The law is not adequate—it is a sieve of deliberately written special exemptions, unanticipated shortcomings, and obsolete deficiencies. How hard will you put your foot down—you and like-minded consumer groups throughout the Nation—to insist that this law be updated to do the job the public requires? Will the consumer put his foot down hard enough? I hope so.

Managing the News

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, journalists in Washington, D.C., are heard to complain frequently today that the President and agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government are trying to manage the news. Newsmen also protest their lack of access to Government information, as well as increasing instances of deception by Government spokesmen.

The following article from the January 31, 1966, edition of U.S. News & World Report, entitled "Back of the Uproar About L.B.J. 'Managing' the News," analyzes the relationship between the executive branch and the press:

BACK OF THE UPROAR ABOUT L.B.J. "MANAGING" THE NEWS

Now President Johnson's relations with newsmen are turning sour. Reporters, complain of a "big blackout," grumble about L.B.J.'s "guided democracy."

What is happening? In what follows, Washington insiders put it all in perspective.

Lyndon Johnson and some of his key aids are not, at the moment, the favorites of reporters and commentators.

As Mr. Johnson enters the second year of the term he began on January 20, 1965, a change is evident.

A President who not long ago was the most accessible of all Presidents, holding frequent news conferences, taking reporters on walks, seeking questions to answer, suddenly seems withdrawn, supersensitive to reporters' mistakes, critical of newsmen, no longer outgiving.

Now Mr. Johnson is pictured as trying to "manage" the news, to impose a modified type of official censorship, to build a "guided democracy" in which the public could learn only what the President thought it should know.

Much was made recently of the fact that newsmen and others who telephoned the White House were required to give their names to its switchboard operators. Sardonic articles were written about this practice, which was instituted in November, and was dropped in mid-January.

Reporters air other complaints. They grumble about the necessity of making formal appointments before being allowed to enter the Executive Office Building across from the White House. They say that high officials are muzzled unless expressing the official "line."

Those with long experience in Washington recognize that Mr. Johnson is simply carrying forward a trend that has been developing over the years.

Most Presidents are concerned with their "image." They want to see their own viewpoints in print. Each, for many years past, has been sensitive about such matters as the angle at which pictures are taken and the impression that pictures give. Mr. Johnson is by no means unique in this regard.

Presidential relations with the press, history shows, often have presented problems.

Theodore Roosevelt was so eager to achieve a "good press" that he installed the first White House press room. But he was accused of favoritism and created hostility among the less favored.

WILSON TO HOOVER

Woodrow Wilson started the practice of holding White House news conferences regularly, but his ideas of what constituted news often did not coincide with those of the correspondents. When the United States entered World War I, Mr. Wilson considered it unwise to continue holding regular sessions with newsmen. Later, when he fell ill, he was isolated from all contact with the press.

Warren Harding, who had been a newspaper editor himself, pioneered the freewheeling news conference. There were no restrictions on questions and he tried to answer them all. But this ended when Mr. Harding jeopardized the disarmament conference of 1921 by giving an off-the-cuff interpretation of the treaty exactly opposite to that which had been given previously by Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes.

Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover required written questions. When depression hit, Mr. Hoover's relations with the press suffered. Reporters complained in those days that the White House used pressure to downgrade or cover up unpleasant statistics.

F.D.R.: TROUBLES, TOO

Franklin Roosevelt was a master at use of news conferences to sell his ideas and programs. He met with newsmen twice a week. But F.D.R. had his troubles with reporters who failed to see things his way.

Harry Truman was very informal in his news conferences, expressing himself freely on delicate subjects, even though this sometimes backfired. Mr. Truman got along well with most newsmen. The executive offices were open hunting ground for reporters, with officials easy to reach and usually informative.

Dwight Eisenhower was more austere, more reserved, less accessible. It was in the Eisenhower administration that steps began to be taken to impose privacy and secrecy. One such step was what came to be known as the "beaverboard curtain," a wall that screened from the view of reporters visitors who entered or left the private office of the President.

J.F.K. AND L.B.J.

John Kennedy was adept at news conferences, but many newsmen thought that by turning them into TV shows he cut down on spontaneity and made it difficult for reporters to follow through on tough questions.

In the Kennedy administration, reporters were kept away from the side door of the White House, which enabled many Presidential callers to come and go in secrecy. Also, Kennedy aids made intensive efforts to control the flow of news. Those efforts, however, were not always successful.

The Johnson administration has brought what some newsmen call "the big blackout." Mr. Johnson and his press secretary, 31-year-old Bill D. Moyers, have adopted every measure taken by past administrations against unfavorable or premature news stories and have added methods of their own.

The entire Executive Office Building, for example, is sealed off from newsmen. A reporter can get in only by appointment. Appointments are hard to get. Even the cafeteria, previously open to the news corps, now is off limits.

BARRED FROM COFFEE

White House press credentials are being closely checked. In a departure from custom, White House police recently recorded all visits by reporters. The press no longer is permitted to patronize the coffee machine in the west basement of the White House, an area where they once chatted with Presidential aids.

All of Mr. Johnson's telephone talks with newsmen are recorded. The President himself often phones members of his staff and asks them to repeat to him conversations they have had with reporters. White House special assistants are required to report regularly to Mr. Moyers on talks they have had with members of the press.

The President repeatedly has lectured Government officials on the necessity of speaking with one administration voice, whether they are dealing with Congressmen or newsmen. News contacts with congressional leaders, Cabinet officers and other officials who visit the White House are severely restricted.

GOOD NEWS ONLY?

Some other "news management" techniques—

Favorable statistics—such as those showing a lower rate of unemployment or impressive economic growth—are released through the White House, not through the Government agency concerned. But the White House seldom, if ever, releases news that is not so good.

Reporters whose stories are considered "out of line" often are called in to face the President or one of his aids. Reporters' requests for interviews with the White House staff frequently are taken directly to the President for decision. In contacts with the press, most aids give only innocuous or "image polishing" answers to questions.

Of the President's "image," one White House correspondent says:

"A vast and growing publicity machine located inside the White House and fed by satellite publicity machines in every U.S. agency studiously nurtures the picture of a President who is concerned about, and 'on top of,' every crisis in the Nation and in the world."

An official White House photographer accompanies the President everywhere. His pictures, invariably flattering, are always available to the press.

AS MOYERS SEES THINGS

Controversy resulted recently from Mr. Moyers' comments—in a televised interview—on Presidential news conferences and other matters. Some of Mr. Moyers' comments—

On news conferences: "It's to serve the convenience of the President, not the convenience of the press, that Presidential press conferences are held."

On the job of press secretary: "My job is to make sure that the President's viewpoint is known. In Washington, the press generally tends to write its opinion of a matter, and then to seek out facts for it."

On the need for secrecy: "It's very important for a President to maintain up until the moment of decision his options, and for someone to speculate days or weeks in advance that he's going to do thus and thus is to deny the President the latitude he needs in order to make, in the light of existing circumstances, the best possible decision."

"NOT INSENSITIVE"

On Mr. Johnson's sensitivity: "The President is not insensitive to criticism. He, too, is a human being, and when other human beings form what he considers to be false judgments about him, he reacts."

Some of the press corps contend that the President "overreacts."

One reporter observed: "While apparently 'home free' in the public opinion polls, the President seems to be in constant terror of a slip that would send his popularity plummeting. One theory you hear is that Mr. Johnson, because of his relatively humble beginnings, suffers from a feeling of insecurity."

Another newsman said: "In trying to control the news, the President is just doing what most of his predecessors have done, from George Washington to Jack Kennedy. The difference is, Lyndon does things in a very big way. His success at managing Government news makes the efforts of previous administrations seem insignificant."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereo (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

What the Adult Health Protection Act Will Mean to Optometry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the American Optometric Association luncheon at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., on March 24, 1966:

What the Adult Health Protection Act Will Mean to Optometry

(By Congressman John E. Fogarty at the American Optometric Association, Washington, D.C., Mar. 24, 1966)

Thank you for your invitation to participate in the American Optometric Association's Conference on Aid to the Visually Limited. While I would have been happy to attend this luncheon under any circumstances, I must admit that your invitation did reach me at the proper psychological moment. I was just putting some finishing touches on a bill I was about to introduce on the House floor to be known as the Adult Health Protection Act of 1966.

The bill calls for the establishment of adult health protection centers at which persons over 50 would be given free a battery of tests designed to detect abnormalities and diseases at an early stage. And, included among the diseases or conditions to be tested under this program is vision impairment.

It is obvious that no age group in our Nation has a greater need for vision care than the millions who have passed their 50th year. And it takes little analysis, by and large, to determine that a major proportion of this group is not adequately prepared financially to translate this urgent need into realization.

While no one can predict accurately the appropriate interval at which our older people should have an eye examination, I believe your association recommends that a complete eye examination and visual analysis should be seriously considered at least every other year. It is true that those who wear glasses may not need a change of lenses that often, but examination at regular intervals is definitely essential. The screening examination for early signs of visual impairment that is provided for in my bill will act as a forerunner to referral to professional practitioners for those who require such services.

When I talk to a gathering of this nature—a group of professionals—I always do a little homework beforehand to acquaint myself with the aims and objectives of the group, and to reinforce my knowledge of the profession, its practices, its impact on the Nation's health, and what it is doing or might do to further the health goals of the Nation.

But I should note that, in this instance, my homework was a matter of reacquaintance—a refresher course, if you will. I had delved deeply and at great length into the field of optometry in the past several years when we were working to include schools of optometry and optometric students in the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and its amendments.

I believe you and I were equally gratified when we won our case, and schools of optometry became eligible for construction grants and grants to improve educational program quality; we were equally gratified when students at these schools became qualified for benefits from the student assistance features of the legislation—student loans and Federal support for scholarships.

To return to my earlier statement: during my "homework" period, I came again to a little volume edited by Drs. Monroe Hirsch and Ralph Wick, titled "Vision of the Aging Patient—An Optimetric Symposium."

While I was quite aware of your profession's interest in the aging and aged, I had not realized how far that interest reached back into time. Dr. Henry Hofstetter's introduction, for example, reminded me that "Optometry, perhaps longer than any other professional group, has had specific concern with aging," and traced that concern back for some 500 years. And, while Dr. Hofstetter cited the age of 40 as a clinical point of demarcation between young and old, I was especially interested when he wrote that "* * * from a purely physiological point of view, 50 to 55 years of age would have been a more logical point of demarcation."

This certainly added validity to my choice of the half-century mark as the age at which our adult population would become eligible for the services of our proposed adult health protection centers.

And Dr. Vincent Ellerbock, writing about partial vision: "It now is apparent that both cataract and glaucoma are subject to detection and care and in a great majority of cases need not produce any serious loss of vision." This statement certainly fortified my belief that detection—followed by the application of preventive measures—spelled out the most practicable way to assure the continued health and well-being of our aging generations.

My reading produced one other plum. The value of proper eye care for our older people has rarely been expressed more succinctly than by Dr. Ethel Percy Andrus, then president of the American Association of Retired Persons. In the foreword to Drs. Hirsch and Wick's symposium, Dr. Andrus noted in part "the increased provision for eye care and the early detection and control of eye disabilities is one of the important trends in the current nationwide movement for the welfare of the aged. The human need for protecting the eyesight of the elderly cannot be magnified. Preserving for them their vision opens for them opportunities for more abundant living, and so assures for them wider dimensions of health and enjoyment."

I believe you can understand more readily now why I am pleased to appear here today, and most grateful for the invitation to join you.

I note that this conference will deal with the identification of visually limited individuals—how to serve not only their visual needs, but also their social and economic needs; and how to effect their proper care. This overall concept, as it relates to obtaining treatment for the less affluent of our aging citizens, moves hand in hand with that of my bill.

In 1956, when I recommended a White House Conference on Aging, I said that "aging touches or pervades most aspects of American life today; urban and rural living; wages, salaries, pensions, insurance, and other affairs of our economy; biological and psychological fields; and civic and political matters."

In 1957, shortly after its establishment, the special staff on aging of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated the problem in a slightly different manner: "We must help older people * * * to employ better the skills, the experiences, and the resources they have gained over a lifetime. To the extent we succeed in meeting this challenge, we shall have built a tremendous reservoir of strength for the Nation. Otherwise, the growing number of older people * * * will become an overwhelming social, medical, and financial burden on their children, the community, and the total economy."

The progress that has been made in the intervening years is a source of pleasure for all of us. Many opportunities have been afforded our older citizens for increasing their self-sufficiency and continuing their usefulness to the community. And yet, the task of deriving the utmost from their full potential remains a substantial one.

Admittedly, we are doing a great deal to make it possible for more of our elderly people to live healthier and more productive lives. But much more remains to be done in this area, and it is here that the impact of the Adult Health Protection Act will be felt. Only by early identification and subsequent control of disease and prevention of illness and disability can we begin to keep our adult population in a state of good health that will enable them to sustain a potential we will find it worthwhile to tap.

The bill I have introduced is an outgrowth of an idea I expressed last fall when I helped dedicate Cranston, R. I.'s first low-rent housing development for the elderly. I stressed at that time the urgent need for long-term comprehensive care for the elderly—an entire program of services to provide all the needs of life. I called that concept living care.

At about the same time, on the Senate floor, Senator Harrison Williams, of New Jersey, reminded his listeners that the dramatically increasing numbers of our aged and aging population presented a "growing problem with special significance for chronic diseases." His program was called preventicare.

Acting independently, but with the same long-term goals in mind, Senator Williams and I had come to the same conclusion.

What we are proposing—I know that most of you are aware that Senator Williams has introduced a similar bill in the Senate—is that it be the sense of the Congress that "the Federal Government has a duty to assist the adult population of the United States, particularly the aged and the aging, in protecting, maintaining, and improving their health."

Specifically our aim is to launch a genuine nationwide preventive medicine campaign, in the form of a $60 million, 3-year demonstration program, including training and research, in health protection centers. Having fought—and to a great extent won—the battle against infectious diseases, we consider it most logical to combat the chronic diseases with the same kind of aggressive, thoroughgoing, and determined approach. Experience has shown us that complete prevention can be attained in many instances and that disability, crippling, and premature death can be delayed by preventive methods and techniques.

Through grants, we would encourage and assist the planning, establishment, and operation of 5 regional and 20 community adult health protection centers; provide assistance for training the essential manpower that would ultimately be involved; and assist in conducting research related to the centers and their operation.

The health protection centers would make available to any person over 50, on a voluntary basis, a series of basic tests that would detect abnormalities in the cardiovascular, respiratory, gastrointestinal, genitourinary, and musculoskeletal systems, as well as defects in metabolism and in the organs of special sense.

The tests would be administered by qualified technicians, nurses, and other medical specialists, using automated equipment capable of providing rapid and reliable results. These results, available within a matter of a few hours, would be referred to the individual's private physician or, where the individual had none or was indigent, would be referred as determined by local practitioners.

I want to repeat that in every case the results of screening tests would be forwarded to a practicing physician. I am emphasizing this feature of the program because some people who have only scanned our proposal have the misconception that the centers are to be diagnostic and treatment centers.

This is not the case. Where treatment is indicated, the function of the center staff will be to assure that the patient is properly referred and brought under a doctor's care. And in those cases where the screening tests reveal no sign of incipient disease, test results will still be forwarded to a physician, since they will provide a firm basis for any future complete physical examination, whenever accomplished.

In passing, a word or two about the application of automation to health checkups. Probably the best-known program is that of the Kaiser-Permanente Group, operating in the Oakland, Calif., area, which has supplied much concrete evidence of the value and practicability of automated preliminary health tests. For those of you who might like more specifics on automation in a health program setting, I refer you to the published writings of Dr. Morris F. Collen, director of medical methods research for Permanente.

My correspondence tells me that automated multitest screening programs are presently in operation on a limited basis in Michigan, Indiana, and here in the District of Columbia, generating great interest because of their ability to discover ailments in apparently healthy people before any symptoms make their appearance. In a dozen other instances, States, universities, and individual communities are contemplating use of a similar technique.

An audience of this nature has humanitarian as well as a professional interest in people and their good health. Because of this double-barreled interest, I emphasize to you the importance of this proposed program. We have made great progress in advancing the cause of our older citizens, but our entire investment to date—although it represents many, many millions of dollars—although it has broken new paths and added new dimensions—will lose a great deal of its meaning if we not do more to help our aging population to anticipate their golden years. We must do everything within our power to make certain that more and more of our citizens reach that period of their lives with a clean bill of health.

I sincerely believe that the program we are recommending represents the surest and most practical way to accomplish this. Certainly more aging people stand a chance to do so if their medical histories reflect concerted preventive action against those disabilities that cause so many of them misery and untold suffering today.

There is still another preventive angle that is implicit in this program, and that is a human and psychological one. Properly utilized, this program will prevent an incalculable number of our aging citizens from entering into the isolated and secluded type of existence that has been their portion so often in the past. On the contrary, by bolstering their sense of well-being, it will help them to add their renewed vigor and experience to a host of community projects from which their personal dividend will be better and more substantial lives.

A New York Herald Tribune editorial of a few weeks back stated that "Only now is it widely realized that the health of an individual or a family is not simply a private affair, that preventable illnesses and death due to ignorance and neglect are a waste of the Nation's most precious resource—its people." I could not have asked for a better articulation of the basis of my concern for our aging people. And I am heartened to find that many of our leading physicians have expressed their agreement with our plan wholly, in principal, and almost without exception in design.

With medicare, we began to apply the Golden Rule to the golden years. Our proposed program—The Adult Health Protection Act of 1966—conceives of the years after 50 as the time to make certain that more of our citizens will enter the golden years in full possession of their faculties, physical and mental. We consider it a logical extension of medicare.

I am encouraged by the support that our proposal has gained thus far. I have great respect for those who may oppose it in good conscience. To those who cry "creeping socialism," I can only say that every man is due his personal prejudices. In this regard, I believe all of you know that my prejudices are in accord with those of President Johnson, whose health proposals this year set as the Nation's goal: "Good health for every citizen to the limits of our country's capacity to provide it."

I have no doubts as to this country's capacity to provide the health opportunities that the Adult Health Protection Act contemplates. The need for the program is urgent; the technology for the program is at hand. I am confident that the Congress—with the expressed support of professional organizations such as yours—will make the right choice.

A Foreign Policy of Self-Interest and Self-Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach consideration, again, of the challenging subject of foreign aid and assistance I should like to repeat and emphasize my past convictions and urgings that the time is long overdue for these programs to be sensibly based upon the principles of American self-interest and the demonstrated willingness of the recipients to help themselves.

I very strongly feel that most American taxpayers firmly believe that the so-called giveaway era should be rightly ended and it is only good sense and simple justice to ask and expect that the nations we have aided and are aiding will fully and effectively cooperate with us for common survival.

Our continued assistance to countries who have become fully rehabilitated and completely revived economically should be terminated and principally directed to those nations that actually need help and are capable and disposed to use that help to improve their farming techniques, schools, hospitals, and basic industry. I think that the majority of our citizens strongly believe in charitable, reasonable sharing of our resources with less fortunate countries but I think they believe with equal emphasis that our aid should be restricted to those nations that demonstrate—not simply promise—foundation reforms in land ownership and tax laws that hitherto seemed always to favor the wealthy and further oppress the poor.

Another implement, of what I hope will be a new foreign aid and policy posture, which appears very wise and worthy is the food-for-freedom program being stimulated to increase American agriculture exports to food-shortage countries. The statistics about malnutrition, partcularly in the children of the developing countries, are startling.

Half of them die before they reach their sixth birthday largely because, the medical men tell us, their undernourished bodies cannot combat minor childhood diseases. Even out of those that survive we are told that 7 out of 10 suffer continuously from the effects of malnutrition which causes physical and mental retardation. Certainly we are starting at the foundation when we help to properly feed these children in the less fortunate countries and certainly we should request, encourage, and welcome the contributions of other countries which are also blessed with agricultural abundance. Let no one ask and expect the American taxpayers to do it all alone especially in the face of ever-increasing tax burdens being placed upon them for domestic progress at home and military involvement abroad.

I strongly think that most of our fellow Americans will be very glad to observe a more positive attitude in our foreign policy and more hopeful signs of our determination to provide forward-looking leadership to underdeveloped countries in their and our everlasting struggle to conquer the age-old enemies of us all—tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency of sensible restriction and reform in the creation and application of our foreign aid programs has been obvious for a long time and the sooner we respond to that urgency the more economical and efficient our programs will be and, I dare say, the more universally respected we shall become.

Apathy in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, apathy is the burr under the saddle of any legislator, and the greater his awareness of the apathy, the more painful it becomes.

Many of Wyoming's 23 counties are essentially rural, which means that effective channels of communication between a Congressman and his constituents are not always functioning. For these rural residents, the county political organization is almost the only means of voicing their opinions on matters of government.

It is, therefore, distressing to learn that in some instances, these county political organizations are not doing all they can to provide this stimulating forum for discussion of issues related to government.

When the county political organization fails to take the lead in stimulating public interest in the affairs of government, then apathy is bound to result.

Perhaps a classic example of this kind of apathy that a Congressman must ride is evidenced in the following editorial from the Pinedale, Wyo., Roundup written by Chet Mariner, and entitled "People Take Their Politics Seriously in Sublette County We Have Always Been Told."

I can only hope that this experience will prompt other county political organizations to undertake a searching reexamination of their own records, for, without the specifics, this story might apply to more county conventions than we would care to admit.

And, Mr. Speaker, lest my Republican friends in Wyoming think I am making too much of this shortcoming on the part of the Republican Party, let me note that, according to this editorial, the Democrats in Sublette County do not even bother to have a county convention.

Woe is my party in Pinedale, Mr. Speaker. The article follows:

People Take Their Politics Seriously in Sublette County We Have Always Been Told

Ever since being in this community we have been told that the Republican Party is the predominant—in fact the only—political party in the county so we attended the Republican county convention Friday evening expecting to really see a turn out of county leaders as well as to be present at a supposedly interesting meeting.

If the meeting Friday night was any example at all—then we certainly would never want to attend a meeting where the people didn't take the politics seriously.

There were possibly 40 or 50 persons in attendance at the meeting and things moved along rather sluggishly while the group discussed and voted on a new set of bylaws which had been drawn up. Someone would make a motion—eventually, someone would second it—the president would then call for a vote for and maybe one or more persons would whisper "yea," the call for negative votes was almost always no vote at all. So all motions carried—how, we'll never know.

Finally the bylaws were passed and the election of officers got underway. The name of Bob Harrower was brought up for president, he was elected unanimously by the usual method of someone nominating him, no other nomination, so a motion that nominations cease and a unanimous ballot cast—again the voice ballot didn't sound unanimous but it carried. CeeCee Slafter was elected secretary by the same method and the vote here sounded quite a bit stronger. Donald Wassenburg was then elected treasurer by this procedure.

Then came the nominations for State committeeman—and here the names of Bill Isaacs and Jim Greenwood were brought up which called for a secret written ballot. Upon counting the ballots, including two proxies, the votes were counted and Greenwood received six votes while Isaacs received four. So it was discovered by your editor that there were actually only 10 votes in the entire group. However at this point the Pinedale delegation questioned the vote as they had cast five votes for Isaacs, including the two proxies.

After much discussion it was finally noted that the bylaws which had just been passed stated that proxys could be cast only by a resident of the same precinct so these were ruled out and it was decided to start over. With this action the Pinedale delegation did not nominate anyone and Greenwood was elected as State committeeman, Rachel Scherbel was then elected State committeewoman without opposition.

Thus we found that when things were really all settled there were just eight persons present who could cast ballots—well, not really, as one voter was also voting for his wife who was not present, but who had given him the proper authority.

This leaves us wondering—is anyone in the county actually interested in politics—because if this is the county's major party and the other party doesn't even hold a convention, then just eight people are interested. What a farce. Not one of the county's elected officials was on hand and yet they are supposedly members of this political party. So, we find that when the chips are really down no one is actually interested in politics—and this is an area where we are told the majority of the residents are rugged individuals who are violently opposed to all giveaway programs and the State and Federal ownership and management of their lives.

With this kind of interest, anyone could be elected to any office, and the county could well be disbanded without anyone actually caring too much. Is it any wonder that the State and Federal Government are taking over and running our country when this is the kind of interest we can incite in the handling of our own problems.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the fate of the Byelorussian people and their history are so inextricably mixed with that of the Russian people that it is not easy for some to distinguish the two peoples. Their difficulty stems from the unfortunate fact that for centuries the Byelorussians have been subjected to Russian rule, and the Russians have done their utmost to eradicate all Byelorussian national traits and traditions. But the Byelorussians have not forgotten their distinct identity, and they have always wanted to regain their freedom and independence. The year 1918 offered them the opportunity they had long awaited.

In that year, when the despotic czarist regime of Russia was no more, the Byelorussians felt themselves free and proclaimed their national independence on March 25. Then they set up the Byelorussian National Republic, and the 10 million Byelorussians were happy under their own Government. But their independence was of very brief duration. Early in 1921 Soviet forces finally quelled a long and determined resistance, put an end to the independent Byelorussian Republic, and then incorporated the country into the Soviet Union.

Fortunately, that did not mean the end of the spirit of freedom and independence among the Byelorussian people. Even though for more than 45 years they have been enduring the oppressive yoke of totalitarian tyranny, they still cling to their idea of freedom and carry on the struggle for the attainment of their national goal. Mr. Speaker, on the 48th anniversary celebration of their independence we all echo their genuine sentiment and hope that they will attain their objective.

De Gaulle Back Is Arched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion of the reasoning and effects of General de Gaulle's recent anti-NATO and anti-U.S. pronouncements. The Park Forest Reporter, known for its independent and imaginative editorial commentary, carried an editorial on March 23 which gives us an interesting interpretation of General de Gaulle's policies and their effects:

De Gaulle Back Is Arched

Go and never darken our shores again is the admonishing tone of Charles de Gaulle and the French leader is firm, unyielding and defiant in his aim to oust the United States from its NATO bases in France by 1970 or sooner, if the United States so desires.

Le grande Charles' pontification was not totally unexpected by observers of the foreign scene. Washington sources point out that his empirical ambitions for his country dictate a go-alone policy particularly on defense matters. An upcoming meeting with Moscow will place him in a liberator's role, if he proves his point. Canada has already agreed to recall her forces. Our actions will obviously be considered longer.

The French President's ambition to depose NATO forces from the soil of France was followed last week by an offer to admit Great Britain to the Common Market. De Gaulle torpedoed a similar move only 3 years ago. Wisely, Prime Minister Wilson, in the midst of a national election campaign, which favors his government's retention, hasn't fallen for the bait. The entrance conditions were not spelled out by De Gaulle, and Wilson, apparently only 10 days from victory, has shrewdly refused to be drawn into the controversy. His Tory foe has taken a stand to join the Common Market.

So while De Gaulle is expelling foreigners on one side, he's coveting them on another. It will be interesting to learn of Wilson's demands, if his party wins decisively on March 31.

Whatever the outcome, De Gaulle will never win a medal for diplomacy.

Just and Timely Consumer Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, whenever and wherever the average American's life and health and money are at stake, and he cannot reasonably and adequately protect himself in these vital areas, it is the duty of his Government to act in his behalf.

Unfortunately, it is all too obvious that in today's mass consumer market commercial selling practices and appeals have grown, perhaps unwittingly, dangerously confounding, and even hazardous to the ordinary customer.

In the field of staple purchasing comparative cost shopping is practically impossible because of the fractional weights, odd-sized boxes, and doubletalk small print wordage on the product covers. In our modern so-called supermarkets one seldom, if ever, sees a weighing instrument in evidence for the shopper's use even if she or he were so inclined.

In the area of consumer credit only a very few experts understand the true interest charges projected.

In the vital area of nonprescription drugs it is practically impossible for the ordinary person to tell what is helpful from what is harmful or harmless because of the continuous assault on his senses of exaggerated television advertisements and rival claims.

As the President recently emphasized, the day and time has come for clear labeling, true descriptions, and commonsense rules to be applied in retailing merchandise to the American consumer.

To enable him to protect his life and his health and his hard-earned money it has become essential for the American consumer to be given what she and he are demanding; namely, lifeguarding controls on labeling and marketing of hazardous drugs and substances; reasonable and appropriate weight standards to facilitate comparative shopping; and clearer, more definite information about the cost of a loan to a borrower.

Mr. Speaker, this modern-grown problem, essential to the basic interests of the American family, is one that shall have to be legislatively dealt with sooner or later and the sooner the better. No reputable business will be adversely affected if we exercise, as we should, every legislative concern to encourage industry self-regulation and refrain from any excessive intrusion upon the traditional ethics and competitive practices in our private enterprise system. I hope that sensible and adequate legislation to accomplish these prime objectives, in the best interest of both the consumer and industry, will soon be presented to the Congress.

Speech of Congressman W. R. Poage at the National Convention of Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 14 in Denver, Colo., our distinguished colleague, the honorable W. R. (BOB) POAGE delivered an exceptionally fine speech to the national convention of the Farmers Union. For as long as I have known him, I have been impressed that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has in his mind the finest storage of knowledge of things agricultural of any man in the country. Had his views prevailed over the years agriculture would be in a much better economic position than it is today.

I commend to each Member of the Congress a careful perusal of Mr. POAGE's outstanding speech, a copy of which it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN W. R. POAGE AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF FARMERS UNION, MARCH 14, 1966, IN DENVER, COLO.

Mr. Chairman and my friends, you have honored me by including me on your program at this historic meeting. When I was first invited, I realized that this meeting would be at a time when I should be in Washington, and the closer we have apprached the meeting date the more pressing have become the demands at Washington, but when I was told that this would probably be the last meeting at which Jim Patton would preside as president, I decided that I was going to be present—and now that I am here I am more convinced than ever that this is where I wanted to be today.

Frankly, I am glad to be here because I look upon Jim Patton as a fine and worthy personal friend of more than a quarter of a century. Jim Patton is a great man, as all who know him can attest, but entirely apart from the personal features, I would want to attend this meeting because I feel that it marks the opening of a different era in agriculture—not one based upon any conflict with Mr. Patton's views—probably one based upon a great deal of the very effective work that he has done over the past generation, but nevertheless, a completely different era.

Historically, Jim Patton, more than any other men in the United States, has been recognized as the spokesman for higher farm income. Though I have often disagreed with him as to the most effective means of obtaining his objective, I have never disagreed with him as to his goal—a better living for farmers everywhere.

We are still plagued with the same questions as to how we can best attain an increase in farm income, but we have made considerable progress. We have not solved our problems and we never will because these problems are just like the problems of making a crop. They are new each year. We have, however, as I see it, made far more progress than we, ourselves, sometimes realize. In the relatively short time since I went to Congress we have observed a complete revolution not only in our methods of production but even more in our pattern of rural life. And certainly while we have lost much of value, we have also made great strides in the living conditions of our rural people.

I am old enough and I lived close enough to the frontier to have hauled water in barrels on a sled from the stock tank to serve our domestic needs. I have seen our roads change from axle-deep mud to paved highways. I have seen our rural homes electrified, and I have seen the old woodpile replaced with bottled gas, and the surrey, or more often the wagon with a few chairs and quilts in it, replaced by an automobile of some type. All of this is certainly tangible evidence that the living standards of the American farmer have been improved and they will continue to improve, but the point which disturbs us today is that these living standards have not improved as rapidly as have standards or opportunities in our urban centers.

This is due solely to the fact that farm income has not increased as rapidly as has urban income and is not today comparable with the income of the city worker. As a result, rural areas have been and still are losing population at an alarming rate. We are likely to be misled if we look only to the improved circumstances of those who remain on our farms. We must remember that there are fewer people on our farms. But surely it is no answer to suggest that we should try to reduce the living standard of our urban friends or to slow down the progress of industry or of industrial workers.

On the contrary, we live in an era of interdependence. Agriculture cannot succeed without a successful development of industry and urban citizens. We know that unless our neighbors in the cities have adequate buying power that our farm people will not have an adequate market. Probably our greatest challenge today is to show our urban neighbors that agriculture is not yet receiving its fair share of the national income. I am one of those who believe the American people are fair; that when they know the facts, they will deal fairly with their fellows.

I think I can understand why the housewife who sees the price of groceries going up very naturally complains that the farmers are charging too much. Of course, that housewife does not realize that she is today buying more and better food for a smaller percentage of her family's expendable income than did any people anywhere at any time in history. Right now I believe Americans are spending just over 18 percent of their income for food. In Western Europe it takes 25 to 30 percent and in the Soviet Union it takes about 50 percent, while in India and Red China it takes from two-thirds to three-quarters of the family's total earnings just to buy the grossly inadequate food to which these people are accustomed. I think, therefore, that it is clear that American consumers, far from being mistreated or overcharged, are a most favored group. But, on the other hand, I hope that we can all agree that it should be our purpose to continue to provide food and fiber on highly favorable terms.

To do this our farmers must be assured of adequate and stable markets. We have heretofore tried on the one hand to keep our production of farm products at reasonable and adequate levels, but on the other hand we have tried to maintain fair but not excessive prices. This is really all that our farm programs have ever sought to accomplish and certainly if we could accomplish this, any program would be a success.

Last October Congress passed a basically equitable farm bill—one which made substantial changes in the involvement of the Government in American agriculture—one which opened the door to more competitive agriculture and at the same time substantially protected the income of our farmers. We all knew that the bill was no panacea. Indeed, it did not even represent a consensus of opinion on the subject. It simply reflected the fact that here we had the best compromise of conflicting views which could, under the circumstances, be secured. Possibly the fact that no group or individual is entirely satisfied with its provisions is a good thing. It proves that the democratic process is still working and that no one can dictate to this Nation.

Whether this program will hurt or help us as individuals must depend in a large part on the way it is administered, and with no desire to question any individual's sincerity, I must point out that I have already had to question several phases of the administration of this bill. I think that the Department has, unfortunately, misinterpreted and misapplied it, but the guidelines of the bill move a long way from the old and discredited idea of production for the loan, although they do not go as far as some of us would like for them to go.

I have often stated that I would like to see cotton and other commodities sell for whatever they would bring in the markets of the world and have the Government make up the difference between such a free price and a fair return to the producer, just as we have long done with wool. This bill does not go that far, but it does go far enough that the bulk of most of our crops are going to move into the market rather than into storage, and the public is going to save billions of dollars in unneeded storage.

But the basic problems of American agriculture are still just what they have been for a number of years. They resolve around our ability to produce more food, feed, and fiber than can be disposed of at profitable levels. Farmers, like all other producers, must receive enough for their product to pay all costs plus enough to maintain at least some kind of minimum living standards. In a completely free economy it is difficult for producers, and especially for the producers of agricultural products, to receive enough for their products to even recover production costs in those years when the volume of production exceeds the volume of demand.

Unfortunately, the need for some kind of governmental intervention has been most clearly recognized and, indeed, most effectively used by some of those who have historically been most critical of farmers for seeking any type of governmental control. Probably the best illustration of the necessity of governmental intervention is seen in the operation of our private power companies.

Like other utilities they long ago recognized the futility of producing more power than the market would take or of building unnecessary or duplicating facilities to serve a limited market. Although we are very likely to find their spokesmen insisting that everybody else should live in a world of complete and unlimited competition, very few of these spokesmen would for a moment volunteer to meet unlimited competition in the field of electrical energy. On the contrary, they recognize that investment in duplicating unneeded generation and distribution is unsound and in the long run that such investment imposes a needless burden on the public. And they can be found at the head of the line demanding governmental protection of their geographical monopolies.

I need not tell a Farmers Union audience that it is just as unsound to produce two bales of cotton where only one is needed as it is to put two lines of electric poles down the streets of Denver, and that it is just as unsound to buy a combine to handle wheat for which there is no market as it is to build an unneeded electrical generating plant. And I don't think that I need dwell upon the necessity of balancing supply with demand. I trust that we can accept this need as an economic fact.

What we must do now is to look into the future. How can we expand the demand for farm products? Only by expanding demand can we build a permanently greater agriculture—one in which more people can enjoy more of the good things of life. An expanded demand for agricultural products benefits not only the producer but the consumer of those products.

I think we can all agree that our first responsibility and our first opportunity is to supply the consumers of the United States with all of the food and fiber they need. Basically, we are doing this but there are still ill-fed and ill-clothed people right here at home. Probably the greatest domestic expansion should be anticipated in the consumption of fiber, both wool and cotton, and in the consumption of the high protein foods—primarily dairy and livestock products. In these fields we need an opportunity for all to share.

I think that the proposed restrictions on the school milk program and the school lunch programs are ill advised. I am not one who believes that our Government should take over the responsibility of the family grocery bill. I prefer to see people work for what they get, but I do challenge the validity of the argument that we should abandon the school milk program because it ofttimes makes milk available to children whose parents could pay for it. If we were to accept this new and restrictive philosophy, it seems to me that we must abandon our whole public school concept.

The public schools of America were founded on the assumption that every child, rich or poor, is entitled to an education at public expense. I think this is a sound concept and I think that the school lunch and school milk programs have pretty well become a part of our public free school concept. If they have, there should be no discrimination against the rich, but even assuming that this might carry us too far, I think we will agree that we should never subject a group of our children to the stigma of pauperism in any of the activities of any of our free schools.

And when you go any further than we are now going in separating those who are able to pay and those who are not able to pay, I think you are going to establish an unfortunate and very undesirable class or caste system in our schools. I would far rather say that some who could pay do not than to say that some who should get the benefit of these programs should be denied.

But the fact remains that after we have provided all of the food and all the fiber that is needed for all the people of the United States, we still have the productive ability to feed and clothe a great many more people. Certainly not all the needy of the world, but a great many more than we have in our own country, and we will all agree, I am sure, that it should be our purpose to use this productive ability for the benefit of our farmers and for the benefit of those who need our production.

Normally, about one-fourth of our agricultural production is exported. Of course, in the case of wheat the percentage is much greater. In the case of corn the percentage is lower, but by any standard our export market is vital to our domestic agriculture. For a number of years we have moved approximately one-third of our agricultural exports under what we have come to know as Public Law 480. While we have received lots of foreign currency and some dollars under this program, we have, by and large, looked to the American Government to provide the funds needed to purchase these commodities from our farmers. Right now there is a lot of talk, and I am afraid some overly optimistic talk, that we are going to be able to suddenly make a 180 degree turn and abandon all production controls as a result of a program of feeding and clothing the world, which effort will, allegedly, in some manner use all of our agricultural productivity.

Certainly I recognize that there has been a decided improvemet in the position of our wheat and our feed grain surpluses. Indeed, they are fast approaching a desirable relationship. Certainly I recognize, as every thinking person does, that the population explosion in many of the nations of the world is creating a tremendous demand for agricultral commodities. I think there is some possibility that we can produce and distribute more American commodities for use in meeting this demand and at the same time help both American producers and hungry and underdeveloped people in other parts of the world—and like each of you—I want to move just as far as we can in this direction. This will, however, be possible only in the event that we can achieve a far better balance between production and demand than we now have at home.

Certainly we are not going to deliberately increase our production of cotton, for instance, when we have 14 million bales of surplus staring us in the face. Certainly we are not going to deliberately return to the production of enough wheat and feed grains to rebuild the surpluses that we have worked so hard to eliminate. Certainly no tax conscious Congress or administration would deliberately impose the added cost of additional production on our taxpayers while we are still paying storage on stupendous quantities of unused farm products. In other words, we have got to make the present law work. We have got to cut down our existing surpluses still further before we can begin to dream of the happy days when all farm production will be uncontrolled.

Then we have got to recognize and accept the fact that if we are going to use any substantially larger share of our agricultural production in the feeding of underdeveloped people, that the Government is going to have to pay the difference between a fair price for the production of these commodities and the price which the underdeveloped people can pay. Definitely they cannot pay on the American basis. A man who is making 30 cents a day can't buy much 30-cent cotton or two-bit pork, and yet I don't think that there are many who would want to urge that our American farmers should have to produce and sell on a 30-cent-a-day basis.

Actually, the only hope that I can see for any immediate substantial increase in the use of food and fiber for the underdeveloped people is to finance it through the aid of our Government. This is, of course, what our committee is working on in its consideration of the reorganization and modification of the present Public Law 480, and what has recently been termed food-for-freedom program. This is no recently discovered shortcut to unlimited domestic production or prosperity and, even at the risk of being misunderstood, I feel I must warn that this proposal definitely does not justify the highly bullish psychology of some farmers. If this engenders widespread false hopes, it could do incalculable harm.

The 480 program originally consisted of three titles. Title I provides for the sale of our agricultural commodities for local currencies. It also provides for the gift and loan of such currencies back to the purchasing governments. In past years this program has served well but in many countries of the world, particularly those in greatest need of our commodities, the volume of this local currency or counterpart now held by the United States is getting completely out of hand. Neither this country nor the purchasing countries can allow these funds to build up much further.

Titles II and III both relate to giving food to needy people. This concept will undoubtedly be retained in principle and rather large quantities of grain will doubtless continue to be shipped to India to meet the existing famine conditions there, but these titles offer no longtime or commercial market for our commodities.

Title IV, which was added to the original bill as the Poage amendment, provides for the sale of our surplus agricultural products for dollars on longtime credit and at attractive interest rates. Frankly, I think we are going to have to remove the requirement that the products be in surplus and that we are going to have to make our credit terms even more favorable, but I think it is good to go just as far as we can toward assuring the United States of the ultimate dollar payment for as much of this food as can be sold, and that is basic to the concept now being considered by the Agriculture Committee.

As the nations of the world develop economically we can sell more food for dollars and for cash. Just a few years ago Japan was buying surplus food for local currency, but today Japan is our best cash dollar market. We are, however, if we are to expand our production, going to have to realize that for a long time to come we will be selling much of that production in the underdeveloped countries on a concession basis, and we are going to have to recognize that there are very formidable limits as to the amount we can move on such basis and on the amount of food and fiber that these underdeveloped countries can receive and distribute, even if it were all supplied as a gift.

Right now there is a serious question as to whether we can move any substantially increased volume of food into India. India clearly needs larger quantities of food. We have the food. We are willing to give it to meet famine emergencies but are the ports and transportation facilities within India adequate to move much more than we are now sending? In any event, this donation program is no longtime solution of either their problem or ours. Only by increasing productivity in the underdeveloped countries can we or they hope that they will be able to meet their dietary needs, and right here seems to be one of the most practical opportunities that I can see for the mutual benefit of both the United States and our hungry friends.

As I see it, this opportunity lies in the susbtitution of food for fiber in the productive pattern in India. India presently devotes about 20 million acres to the production of cotton—about 8 million more acres than the United States used last year, although India produces a good deal less cotton. We have far greater reserves of cotton than of any other agricultural product. We have called upon our cotton producers to cut their acreage to a much greater degree than the acreage of any other crops has been cut. Indeed, we have dropped froom a maximum of 43 million acres down to a probable 10 million acres this year. I recognize that no country can make a complete and abrupt change on any such scale as would be involved in the complete elimination of cotton production in India, but I know of no reason why the farmers of India could not be reasonably expected to reduce their cotton acreage by at least as much as American farmers reduce their cotton acreage in the year of 1966 as compared with last year. Apparently this reduction is going to amount to at least one-third.

If India would make such a reduction and devote what has been cotton land to the production of food, her own economy would be greatly strenghtened. In turn the United States could supply cotton under the same favorable terms that we are presently supplying wheat. Both countries would be benefited.

I don't know how far we could carry this idea but it is true that the four largest recipients of American food aid—India, Brazil, Egypt, and Pakistan—are all substantial cotton producers, yet they are all deficit producers of needed food. To me it seems to make a lot of sense to suggest that they get out of the production of a commodity of which we have such substantial surpluses and produce at least a larger part of the food they need at home.

One of the most widespread fallacies indulged in by Americans in connection with our aid to foreign countries seems to me to stem from a misunderstanding of the basic nature of foreign trade. Altogether too many people take the position that if we help foreign nations increase their own production that they will become less attractive markets for American products. History proves just the reverse. The more advanced and prosperous nations provide the better markets. Canada's production parallels our own, but Canada is our second best customer. Canada has only half the population of Mexico but she buys 5 times as much goods from the United States—10 times as much per capita. She does so because she has buying power. If we expect to sell to the nations of the world, we must help them develop buying power. Our farmers can't make a living selling to a country with a 30 cents a day wage scale.

At the end of the war we could do nothing except give aid to western Europe and Japan. Their productivity was paralyzed. Their living standards were very low. With our help they restored their industry and their agriculture. They raised their living standards. They are now buying our goods and paying cash for them.

Need for our products does not of itself create a market for our products. Basically, we must, from a selfish as well as a humanitarian standpoint, help these nations build their own purchasing power. There is a great opportunity to use American agricultural production and I think it can be made much greater as the world develops the ability to pay for our products, but I think it would be a great mistake for you to indulge in the assumption that we are standing on the verge of some newly discovered outlet for American products that will enable us to remove all of our controls over agriculture.

We should feed and clothe a larger part of the worlds population, and we will do so, but we will do so only as the American farmer is assured of a fair and reasonable share of the national income in return for his investment and labor because if he doesn't get such a fair share, he is going to be forced to devote his talents—even more in the future than he has in the past—to other activities. It takes a lot of capital; it takes a lot of brains to produce cheap food and fiber, and in this modern economy of ours you can't get either capital or brains in large quantities unless you can offer a reasonable financial reward. That is why city people as well as rural people—indeed, even more than rural people—must be vitally concerned with the maintenance of sound farm programs and, of course, that is why the Farmers Union, and all other farm organizations that really represent farmers, must be concerned, as you are, with the development of sound programs for the movement of food and fiber to the people all over the world.

Vice Adm. William F. (Red) Raborn Jr. Is Recipient of Forrestal Memorial Award

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday night I had the honor of attending the 12th annual Forrestal Memorial Award dinner sponsored by the National Security Industrial Association. The purpose of this association is to maintain a close working relationship and to promote mutual understanding between industry and those agencies of Government responsible for the national defense. The Forrestal Award is given annually in honor of those who have furthered these objectives. A long line of distinguished Americans have received this award, commencing in 1954 with President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Last night's recipient is an outstanding American and a personal friend, Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., better known to his friends as "Red."

"Red" Raborn has had a distinguished career serving his country, beginning in 1924 when he was first appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy. He served in a variety of posts with the Navy during World War II, including operations against enemy forces in the Philippine Islands, the South China Sea, Iwo Jima, and the Japanese homeland.

Admiral Raborn is probably most noted as the Director of Special Projects of the Department of the Navy. In this capacity he was charged with the task of developing a fleet ballistic missile system. His management genius and his leadership resulted in the successful launchings of Polaris missiles in 1960, 2 years ahead of the planned schedule. One of the management systems that he developed in producing the Polaris missile is known as the program evaluation reporting technique, commonly known as PERT. The widespread adoption of this method by large sections of American industry reflect his perception and resourcefulness. "Red" has been the recipient of many awards, both military and civilian, during his career including the Distinguished Service Medal and the Collier Trophy Award, presented by President Kennedy in 1963.

I have long been associated with "Red" Raborn and can think of no man more deserving of the award. Over the years I have known him, I have always admired him as a warm and human man, deeply dedicated to the concept of team work.

After he retired from the Navy in 1963, he accepted a position as vice president of Aerojet-General Corp. I was sad to see my good friend depart from the service of his country, although certainly he had earned the opportunity of spending more time with his family and to provide the larger measure of material things for them which employment in private industry made possible.

As would be expected when the President called on him to return to the service of his country in April 1965 as Director of Cental Intelligence, "Red" responded without hesitation. I was personally delighted that he accepted and brought to the CIA his talents and dedication. He has been totally cooperative and responsive to the needs of the CIA Subcommittee of Armed Services of which I am chairman and has seen to it that this subcommittee has been kept thoroughly and currently informed.

"Red" has applied his highly developed management skills to the direction of the Central Intelligence Agency which plays such a vital part in the defense and security of this Nation. I can attest that he is doing an outstanding job as Director of Central Intelligence and is a credit to this Agency which has had other outstanding Directors in the past. This is small tribute to offer to a man of Admiral Raborn's dedication, patriotism, and loyalty but I hope in some small measure it may contribute to greater recognition that in one of this Nation's most important jobs, the occupant fully deserves the commendation of "well done."

Letter From Cadets at U.S. Merchant Marine Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our young men today stand ready, as have past generations, to serve our Nation with courage and conviction, and under permission granted, I include in the RECORD the following letter to President Johnson from the cadets at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy which is located in the district I have the honor to represent:

REGIMENT OF CADETS,
U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY,
Kings Point, N.Y., January 10, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: We, the class of 1966 at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, in light of the recent student demonstrations against our Nation's present involvement in Vietnam, feel compelled, as responsible and patriotic Americans, to speak out in support of your policies. We believe that it is in the best American tradition to support a people who are struggling to retain their independence, as the Vietnamese people are now doing. We as a nation have committed ourselves to defend the free world and to bring about a just and honorable peace. Not honoring our commitments now would destroy the respect of the rest of the world for our pledge, and also leave the rest of southeast Asia helpless in the face of Communist aggression.

Our class, as well as supporting our Nation's stand, is anxious to do something concrete in aid of the war effort—and we can. The war has led to a crisis in the maritime industry, which includes a severe shortage of officers to man the ships now being removed from the reserve fleet. We are looking forward to aiding in filling this void, thereby serving our country and meeting our moral obligations. This is in keeping with all the traditions of the Cadet Corps created in the Second World War. In addition to 68 graduates, 142 cadets while still in training died at sea for their country. Six cadets received the Merchant Distinguished Service Medal. We appreciate the opportunity our country has given us, and we now stand ready, willing, and able to do what we can for our country.

Very respectfully,

——— ———.

A Sierra Madre, Calif., City Council Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of a resolution recently unanimously adopted by the City Council of Sierra Madre, Calif., expressing support for our servicemen in Vietnam.

The city council states in its resolution that it "hereby extends to the members of the Armed Forces its fullest support and warmest devotion to them as they perform their hard duty, thus assuring them that the spirit of patriotism is not dead in this country and that they are neither forgotten nor unappreciated by us."

This is a very commendatory action on the part of the Sierra Madre City Council and I believe the resolution will be of interest to the Congress and the public.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 2213 OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SIERRA MADRE EXPRESSING SUPPORT AND DEVOTION TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THIS COUNTRY

The City Council of the City of Sierra Madre does hereby resolve,

Whereas young men of the city of Sierra Madre and of the United States engaged in mortal combat in Vietnam; and

Whereas vociferous groups and individuals in our society have, by demonstrations and otherwise, indicated a lack of support of our Armed Forces; and

Whereas these actions have been given such vast publicity in the press, on radio and television, that many people, including those of hostile nations, have been erroneously led to believe that the majority of our people are not willing to support our Armed Forces; and

Whereas members of our Armed Forces have expressed concern and shock over the apparent attitude of those whom they are fighting, and are desirous and deserving of a forthright statement of our support for and interest in them: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this council, as the duly elected representatives of the people of Sierra Madre, deplores the fact that the publicity given to the opinions of such a small minority of our people has tended to mislead the world into considering this country as deeply divided; and be it further

Resolved, That this council hereby extends to the members of the Armed Forces its fullest support and warmest devotion to them as they perform their hard duty, thus assuring them that the spirit of patriotism is not dead in this country and that they are neither forgotten nor unappreciated by us; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the U.S. Senators from this State and to Congressmen from this district for their information and edification, and to the several communications media for widespread dissemination to the public at large.

Adopted this 8th day of March 1966.

JAMES F. ABERNETHY,
Mayor, City of Sierra Madre, Calif.

Attest:

L. MARIE WARFEL,
City Clerk.

Jim Patton: A Quarter-Century of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to pay a tribute to my good friend Jim Patton. My acquaintance with Jim began in the days when I was helping my father with his congressional responsibilities some 15 or 20 years ago. Like most others, I was surprised to find a farm leader so well informed and so sympathetic to the problems of the urban workers.

When I was elected to Congress 11 years ago, I found Jim a warm and knowledgeable friend.

Jim Patton will be remembered for his distinguished leadership of the Farmers Union for more than a quarter of a century. But he will be remembered for far more than a militant farm leader. He has been a great leader and mover in a host of liberal causes. He will be remembered for his vision, his rare courage, and for his willingness to join in the battle for any just cause where the public interest was involved.

Jim Patton was one of the stalwart leaders in the Roosevelt administration who helped organize the international Food and Agriculture Organization and the other specialized agencies of the United Nations. He was a leader in, and an early president of, the organization of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, a federation of national farm organizations.

He was a leader in the group which sponsored full-employment legislation leading to the Employment Act of 1946 and the creation of the Council of Economic Advisers. His labors on behalf of medicare and the liberalization of the Social Security Act have earned him a secure place in the affection and gratitude of millions of Americans.

He has always been a leader in the efforts to develop the natural resources of this great country of ours in the interests of all the people. And we all are aware of his leadership of international efforts to free the world from hunger; a campaign which led to President Johnson's recent declaration of a worldwide war on hunger.

I join with other Members of Congress who have said, "Voices which champion the cause of the farmer are sorely needed in the United States today and Jim Patton's voice has been heard." We will miss him speaking as the president of the Farmers Union, but I am sure we will continue to have his help on national and international welfare problems.

The U.S.S. "James K. Polk"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, just the other day I received a letter from one of the finest and most able men in the U.S. Navy today, Adm. Hyman G. Rickover. The letter was instigated by the launching of a new Navy Polaris submarine, named in honor of one of our illustrious Presidential predecessors, James K. Polk, and the letter presents a descriptive account of the historically significant life of Polk. In the hope that this statement will be of interest to my colleagues in the House and Senate, the full text of the letter follows:

AT SEA, NORTH ATLANTIC,
March 14, 1966.

DEAR MR. POWELL: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 35th Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *James K. Polk* was built by the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn. We also have in operation 22 attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of 57.

This ship is named for James K. Polk (1795–1849), ablest President between Jackson and Lincoln, and one of the few who rose from log cabin to White House. Born in North Carolina, the eldest of 10 children of a plain farmer, Polk grew to manhood in Duck River, Tenn., a rude frontier settlement on the edge of the wilderness. His ancestors were Scottish Covenanters who migrated to Ireland early in the 17th Century and to America a hundred years later, settling first in Maryland and later moving westward in search of a freer and better life. The future President's family found in Tennessee the hoped-for land of promise where unremitting toil was all that was needed to attain prosperity and an honored place in the community. Young Polk worked long hours on the farm and, since there were not schools, was taught the three R's by his parents. He was good at mathematics and liked to read. When he reached seventeen, his father was able to grant him his wish for an education leading to a professional career.

Though never in robust health, Polk was all his life a prodigious worker. He accomplished much because he had enormous drive and great talent for systematic and sustained mental labor. It took him but three years of formal instruction to make up his educational deficiencies. At 20, he was admitted to the University of North Carolina with sophomore standing, graduating with first honors in mathematics and classics. He read law and, before he was 26, had become one of the leading practitioners in Columbia, Tenn., as well as a promising candidate for public office.

After one term in the State legislature, he entered the U.S. House of Representatives where he served from 1825 to 1839, the last 4 years as Speaker and leader of the Jacksonian forces. Polk would have preferred to remain in Congress but was drafted by his party to run for Governor of Tennessee, to save the State for the party. Elected in 1839, he lost in 1841 and 1843—the only setbacks in an otherwise uniformly successful career. In those days, rival candidates used to travel the country together, putting up at the same inns, often sleeping in the same bed, taking turns addressing the same meetings to which voters flocked from distant parts, as much for entertainment as for political discussion. Polk ran on his record as Governor. He had given his State an excellent administration, rescued it from near bankruptcy, and initiated significant reforms. His rival, semiliterate but shrewd, never discussed issues but took pains to amuse the audience. He won, it seems, chiefly because he was the better storyteller.

Polk was being considered for Vice President when the Texas and Oregon issues burst upon the country causing a deadlock that could be broken only by nominating Polk as a compromise candidate for President. The 1844 election was one of the most hotly contested the Nation had ever experienced. The issues between Democrats and Whigs were sharply drawn, feelings ran high, the country was almost evenly divided. Odd as it seems today, the candidates for the Presidency did not campaign actively since it was then considered unseemly to give the appearance of seeking this high office. Polk won with 170 electoral votes to 105 for Clay. Though at 49 he was the youngest President, he was committed to a more ambitious, more precisely stated administration program than any of his predecessors. All of it was carried out in the single term to which he had limited himself voluntarily when accepting the nomination of his party.

In the domestic field, Polk's achievements proved ephemeral, but his views, consistently Jacksonian, still have historic interest. He was a strict constitutionalist because he was certain this alone could preserve the Union. He opposed the protective tariff because he deemed it "unjust to tax the labor of one class of society to support and fatten another." He feared that Federal funds for internal improvements would destroy State sovereignty. It was better "to live as free men in a trackless wilderness than ride as vassals down a broad highway." He wanted Federal funds kept separate from the private banking system to prevent their being used for credit expansion and cheap money. The Federal Government, he thought, should be brought back to "what it was intended to be, a plain economical government." In the foreign field, Polk's success was both spectacular and of enduring importance to the Nation. An ardent expansionist, as was natural given his pioneer background, Polk added more territory to the United States than any previous President except Jefferson.

He settled the 40-year-old Northwest boundary dispute by skillful diplomacy and admirable nerve in face of a possible two-front war, inducing Britain to relinquish her long-standing demand for a boundary along the Columbia River, which would have cost us the State of Washington, in exchange for abandonment of our claim to what is now British Columbia. On the basis of discovery and settlement, this was the most we could justifiably ask or, for that matter, realistically hope to obtain without resorting to war. Our Southwest boundary was moved to its present location as a result of Polk's able management of the Mexican War and the ensuing peace negotiations. Mexico was generously compensated for the loss of California and New Mexico though not of Texas which had been lost 10 years earlier in exactly the same way as Mexico herself had been lost to Spain—by a successful indigenous revolt. We paid Mexico considerably more per acre than Napoleon had charged us for the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. When Polk left office, the United States stretched from "sea to shining sea."

Polk stood out among leading figures of his day in his unfaltering devotion to the national interest, uninfluenced by personal or parochial considerations, yet most 19th century historians accused him of precipitating the Mexican-American War in the interest of slavery expansion. This verdict has since been reversed in consequence of the publication early in this century of relevant official documents from the archives of Texas, Mexico, and Great Britain, which made it possible to see the issue more accurately. When Polk took office, the annexation of Texas was already an accomplished fact. Having warned us she would consider this "equivalent to a declaration of war," Mexico promptly severed diplomatic relations. Both sides moved troops to the Mexican-Texas border. Unfortunately, the two countries disagreed as to whether the Rio Grande or the Nueces constituted the boundary. It was in the disputed territory between these rivers that hostilities broke out spontaneously and a war that neither country really wanted began.

That Polk was able to execute his entire domestic and foreign program is the more remarkable in that he was neither a charismatic leader identified with some great popular movement, nor a politician adept at manipulating people and events. How he was able to resolve the great issues pressing upon him can best be understood by reading the diary he kept while in office.

The President emerges from its pages an able and astute administrator who approached every problem with a logical mind and a keen sense of political realities, who gained his objectives by stating them with precision and justifying them with well-reasoned argument. One cannot but feel that he understood the issues he dealt with better than most of his experts, whether they involved war strategy, military supply, diplomatic negotiations or how to get congressional approval for his measures when the nominally dominant Democrats were so rent by faction that every Executive request was attacked by at least one element in his party, enthusiastically supported by the Whigs.

Written for personal use, as a reminder of the official happenings crowding his overfull days, the diary gives an intimate glimpse into the Executive Office during a transitional period in our history; a time when, as a result of war, technological change, and the physical growth of the country, certain aspects of the democratic process, certain political habits had become outmoded, but the American people were not yet prepared to relinquish them. Take the fine old tradition that every citizen has access to the President. It had become an intolerable burden, for the business of the Nation was now so large it demanded all a President's time and energy. Polk found that "no President who performs his duty faithfully and conscientiously can have any leisure." He rarely took even a brief vacation and often had to toil far into the night to complete official tasks for which he found no time during the day, so beseiged was he with people wanting to shake his hand or pay their respects, and with officeseekers and patronage-soliciting politicians who, as he wryly put it, seemed to feel that providing jobs was "the chief end of Government."

Or take the persistence of divisive geographic and ideological interests which, in Polk's time, tended to take precedence over the national interest. So much so that politicians in all sections of the country indulged in the mischief of threatening to break up the Union whenever national action went against their parochial interests. The well-publicized quarrels in the Senate, which were caused by intrusion of these divisive factors into every foreign policy issue, were a serious handicap to Polk when he was engaged in difficult negotiations with Britain over Oregon, or sought by diplomatic means to end the war with Mexico. The American people and their leaders had not yet accepted the maxim we now take for granted that "politics end at the water's edge."

One cannot read Polk's diary without warming to this thoughtful man of uncompromising integrity whose political philosophy, as he once said, "was not of yesterday," but "formed upon mature consideration," and adhered to whether it was expedient at the moment or not. Having achieved the objectives of his administration, he refused renomination and retired to private life. He died 3 months after leaving the White House.

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1966 marks the 48th anniversary of independence of a large Eastern European people who are not independent. I doubt if the Byelorussian people are celebrating their independence anniversary tonight except with remembrances for the old and hopes for the young, but we here in free America can pay tribute to these peoples and let them know that as long as we in the United States do not lose our hope and remembrances of days past, their future is not an entirely dark one.

In remembering Byelorussian independence we are in fact remembering a great principle of political man; namely, self-determination. It is a principle and a goal of all democracies, whether actual or theoretical; it is the foundation of the American system of government; it is a thought that ennobles man. Simply, self-determination is the exercise of a basic human right which speaks of organized men determining their own national destiny in dignity and honor.

Self-determination is not a 20th century concept; rather it is as old as man's ability to think rationally about himself, his relations with other humans, and his relationship to his state. Through the centuries the great minds of political philosophy have worked the principle of government, self-determination found its shape in the 18th century enlightenment, which was based on the assumption that men were capable of making rational decisions affecting their personal and national lives.

Here in this country our Colonial Fathers fought for this right in 1776 and the years following, and put the concept into practice with the establishment of a new kind of government in 1789. That constitution stands today as a shining beacon for all who would know that self-determination is a working principle.

That is why we in this country must not lose faith. That beacon must never go out. The Byelorussians saw that light 48 years ago, declared themselves independent and put into motion a government embodying the idea of self-determination. Soviet Russia never permitted those forces of government or the Byelorussian people the opportunity to determine their national destiny.

Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to that nation. Today we hold out the beacon of hope. Today we reassert our own faith in the principle of self-determination. Today we remind the Byelorussian people that that principle will be kept alive long after Soviet colonialism has disappeared from the face of the earth.

John Baldwin

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it is with utmost sincerity that I say that our late friend and colleague, JOHN F. BALDWIN, was one of the most effective Members of the Congress I knew and observed during his tenure among us.

JOHN BALDWIN was a Member for 12 years, but the accumulation of his ideas and work here for California and the Nation will have salutary effect for generations. He was among the most stimulating and inspiring colleagues I have known. He was an originator of ideas and gave fine example to all of us on the Public Works Committee by his willingness to undertake any study or task. JOHN BALDWIN brought more than a sense of duty to his work.

We valued his many gifts and talents, but especially his incisive mind which could penetrate to the base of the most complex problems quickly. Coupled with this was his ability to analyze problems. Eloquent and highly articulate, I was always impressed by his ability to present legislation and the reason for his views on the floor of the House, as well as in our committee.

His good deeds remain to benefit all of us in the country. His ideas and work for traffic safety, development of watersheds and conservation of our natural resources, economic recovery of Appalachia, highway construction, redevelopment of older roads, and his interest in future prosperity for Alaska can be his lasting monuments.

His genuine dedication to his tasks was illustrated within recent weeks, when he left his bed in the Bethesda Naval Hospital to attend hearings before our Public Works Committee and when his contributions were made, returned to the hospital. It is only one example of how he insired us all.

JOHN BALDWIN's passing left a void and we will miss his physical presence among us, but he will remain with us in the memory of him as a really great and good man who used unusual gifts generously for the benefit of many millions.

Mrs. Fallon joins me in condolences to Mrs. Baldwin and the three daughters who survive him. We pray that the justifiable pride they can take in a husband and father who had a parental concern for the welfare of all Americans will help assuage their grief.

Freedom Resolutions for Lithuania and the Baltic Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at mass meetings of Americans of Lithuanian birth or descent held in the city of Worcester, Mass., on February 20 and February 27, last, resolutions were unanimously adopted to seek United Nations acion in obaining independece for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

These resolutions were forwarded to me by the following officers of the Worchester, Mass., Council of Lithuanian Organizations: Mr. Prahas Stanelis, president; Mr. Richard J. Sarapas, chairman, resolutions committee; and Mr. Pranas Racukaitis, chairman, observance committee. At this point, I would like to include the resolutions and they follow:

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the free Baltic republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the select committee of the House of Representatives, created by House Resolution 346 of the 83d Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

Whereas the opinion of the free nations and the free people of the world is to eliminate any kind of colonialism and imperialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring the question of the liberation of the Baltic States before the United Nations and ask that body to request that the Soviet Union do the following:

1. Withdraw all Soviet troops, secret police, agents, colonists, and all controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

2. Return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations be further requested to conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Russian Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the U.S. Senators and U.S. Congressmen representing the people of Worcester in the U.S. Congress for appropriate action; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded, for their consideration, to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur Goldberg, and State Representative Vite J. Pigaga.

Washington Snow Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much of the credibility gap, which concerns us since the deliberate misinformation stemming from the Johnson administration grows more obvious. The Suburban Life, a major newspaper chain serving the western suburban areas in Chicagoland discusses its doubts about the administration's statistics in a most timely editorial on March 24:

Washington Snow Job

Every wind that blows from the east brings to our ears the anguished cries of Washington politicos about the plight of the United States and how the war on poverty will bring this Nation to the pinnacle of the Great Society.

Left and right we hear of how bad off we are, how millions are walking the streets looking for employment, and how their families are one step ahead of starvation.

But from the Illinois Labor Department comes word that the unemployment compensation tax rate notices will show lower rates for thousands of employers.

"The taxes are lower in 1966 because employment has been high and unemployment and total benefits have been low in recent years. Although the average weekly benefit amount increased from $38.61 in January 1965, to $43 in January 1966, total benefits paid decreased $1.6 million, from $10.6 million in January 1965, to $9 million in January 1966.

"The volume of unemployment compensation claims is at the lowest level in many years. Number of unemployment compensation claimants in each of the first 3 weeks in February 1966, was the lowest since comparable weeks in February 1965," states the news release.

Manpower Trends, a publication of the Illinois State Employment Service for the Chicago area states, "The continuing economic upswing in the Chicago standard metropolitan statistical area at the beginning of 1966 cushioned the usual postholiday cutbacks, resulting in a less than average drop of 69,500 in nonagricultural wage and salaried employment during the December–January period. The 2,674,900 level was a record for the month, with 92,900 more at work than in January 1965.

"The high level of manufacturing activity was the main factor in this excellent beginning."

In this area, at least, there are plenty of jobs open for skilled help.

And industry has not waited for Uncle Sugar to pass out the sweets. It has taken it upon itself to upgrade and institute new apprentice training programs.

Because of this, industry is getting what it wants, skilled help. And it is getting it now, not when the costly and bulky Federal programs slowly move their trainees into the employment picture.

But the wagers of the war on poverty must continue to paint a dark picture n order to justify the expenditure of the huge sums of money they are pulling from the taxpayers' pocketbooks.

Ernestine Arnold Meyer Cites the Importance of Water in the Natural Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Ernestine Arnold Meyer has recently written a sensitive and poetic article entitled "Some Reflections on Water." She concludes with a strong and noteworthy appeal for conservation of our water resources, of our forests and watersheds, and of the land.

Mrs. Meyer rightly stresses the need for man to take an ecological view of his situation, to consider his relationship to other life and to his environment.

Mrs. Meyer is the widow of J. H. Meyer, a former newspaper editor and longtime member of the Legislative Committee of the Steuben Society of America. Mr. Meyer was a man of great ability and dedication who devoted his talents to many good causes.

Since I would like to share Mrs. Meyer's reflections with my colleagues, I include her article from the February-March 1966 issue of the Steuben News:

Some Reflections on Water: Awareness Preserves Beauty and Natural Order

(By Ernestine Arnold Meyer)

"Dust thou art" says the Bible, but this is only figuratively the case, for although we sometimes exclaim: "I'm dry as dust," our bodies consist of 72 percent water.

True, at the end of our days, we return to Mother Earth, but animal life began, so they say, in the ocean. We still have the salt in our blood (and sweat and tears) to prove it. We are indissolubly (no pun intended) one with it. We can live 30 days without food but only 3 days without water.

Every living thing, be it plant or animal, even to infinitesimal viruses, must have water to live; to carry on the life processes. Otherwise, how would nourishment be brought to all parts of a living system, or how would wastes be removed?

What, then, is this matter, this important thing, this water?

It is a substance that yields to the gentlest touch of fingertip, but strike it with the flat of your hand and you'll find it hard as granite. (Have you ever tried to dive and landed a "belly-flopper"?) It gives way so easily that a pebble can drop practically without hindrance to the bottom of the deepest ocean; yet, in its might, it can hammer down steel piers and great stone walls. One pint of it weighs a pound.

A knife can cut it, but it reunites immediately. You cannot walk on it, but it will support steel, or even concrete ships, weighing hundreds of tons.

It can flow downward, but not upward. But, no, wait a bit, it does flow up first, when you siphon it through a tube, before flowing down. However, if, for instance, you pour water into one of the open ends of a U-shaped glass tube (so that you may observe it), you will find that the levels in the two arms are even and will remain so however much you may tip or tilt the tube. It will ever seek its own level, but will never, of itself, rise higher than its source. Strangely enough, the little round water surface, itself, in each arm of the tube will not be flat, but will be concave, for where its outer edge meets the glass, it will seem to climb up the sides of the tube.

A single drop of water forms a sphere. But a quantity of it, poured into the strangest shaped vessel imaginable will assume that shape, although the surface exposed to the air always remains flat. Again, why will a drop keep bouncing on a hot surface, for seconds, without dwindling, whereas greater amount boiled in a saucepan, diminshes gradually? Many substances (such as gases and metals) expand appreciably when they are heated and contract again when they are cooled. Water, on the other hand, while it does contract somewhat with the cold, expands exceedingly when it turns to ice. Such is its power in this case, that it may crack huge boulders or break strongest metal apart. (Hence, "antifreeze" in your car radiator). Nor, soft and pliant as it apparently is, can it be compressed (the principle on which hydraulic presses, elevators, et cetera work).

A molecule of water is composed of two chemical elements: hydrogen and oxygen: two parts of H to one of O: H_2O. And it feels wet. Have you ever thought how you would try to describe "wetness?"

Were I a scientist, I could probably go on far longer telling you about the amazing properties of this wondrous, mysterious element: water. As it is, I can only say, consider it, marvel at it.

Let us now turn our thoughts to its effect upon our senses. How we love the feel of it, as we trail our hands or feet in it, when we go boating. What ecstasy to swim naked on a starlight night and feel the velvet smoothness of the water gliding along one's body. How refreshing the coolness of a "dip" after a hot, tiring day. At another time, the warmth of a bath may soothe and relax our overwrought nerves and aching muscles. The mentally disturbed, when placed in a warm bath become calmer and the physically disabled are reclaimed, in certain instances, by the action of whirlpools of water. And what more stimulating and invigorating to anyone, than a stinging cold shower following a hot one.

So much for our reaction to the feel of water; now, what about its taste? Do you remember the tale of the drinker who sacrificed house and home to his craving for liquor? With his money gone, he was forced to drink water and after his first deep draught, exclaimed in astonishment: "Wie gut schmeckt das Wasser"—and then added ruefully—"haett' ich mein Haeusle noch." Do you also recall the time when New York City's tap water was called the "Croton cocktail," so delicious was its taste?

As for the sight and sound of it, what landscape, for instance, is not enlivened by the glint of water, and how often the hush and serenity or the noisy turbulence of a body of water seems to accord with the tranquility or turmoil of our own emotions.

Let us now consider the relationship of water to the weather. Sunny days are delightful and a joy, but continuous sunshine would be a catastrophe; to make life livable, it must alternate with rain. Gentle rain. How we yearn for its benison after a long, dry spell; and how heavenly is the fragrance of good, wet earth afterward.

Almost three quarters of the earth's surface is covered by water: Oceans, lakes, rivers. Sun and wind play over their surfaces, causing evaporation (as they likewise take moisture out of the soil). Less obviously, but constantly, every green and living thing—every tree and plant and blade of grass, brings water up out of the earth and releases it in minute particles into the surrounding air. Here warmth and air currents carry it high into the atmosphere, where it forms clouds and, when conditions are right, descends as rain. Some of this is absorbed by the earth, and seeping down will eventually accumulate in deep, dark, hollow places, where it rests, clear, cold and pure, until perhaps, an artesian well brings it sparkling to the surface, for our use and pleasure. Or it may find its own way out of darkness into light and charm us as a bubbling spring, or overawe us as an explosive geyser. Most of it, however, runs off into rivers, lakes, and oceans, where the round of events then begins anew.

"Only 0.035 percent of the water outside the oceans (which hold 97 percent of the planet's whole supply) is in the atmosphere at any given time. But that tiny percentage is always in transit. It accounts for a yearly rainfall on land 30 times as great as its own momentary burden over the land.

"How decisive the seemingly minuscule can be in the delicate balance of life. A gram of water in the vapor state holds 540 calories more heat than a gram of liquid water at the same temperature. So that fleeting fraction of vapor in the air, precisely because it is always elusive, holds from the earth's surface heat shocks capable of destroying all life." [1]

In winter, the cycle of the hydrosphere (the "hydrosphere" is the oceans and the atmosphere working together to water the land) persists, but the raindrops have become snowflakes. Have you ever had the opportunity to observe closely the fleeting beauty of these crystals? They say no two are ever alike. And this fragile loveliness, which is frozen water, brings nitrogen down out of the air, to the earth. For this reason, snow is often called the "poor man's fertilizer." Furthermore, as it covers the earth, during our winters, it is truly a blanket, keeping the temperature of the ground beneath it relatively high and constant.

In Alaska, for instance, it was demonstrated, that with an air temperature as low as —40°, the temperature at ground level, beneath 3 feet of snow, was and remained 27°. Thus insulated and protected by the snow from alternate freezing and thawing, tender plantlets are not heaved out of the earth and possibly killed through injury to their delicate rootlets. Yet—and here is another apparent paradox in nature, in which water plays an important role; where the ground is not snow covered, it is this very alteration of congealing and thawing of the moisture in its upper layers, mainly in spring, which loosens it and makes it more pervious to air and water.

In conclusion, we may ask ourselves: What has man's attitude been toward this precious element, this incredibly wonderful substance upon which we are so dependent, since it, together with food and air makes possible our life on this planet? Does he stand in awed contemplation of its response to immutable natural laws? Does he appreciate, cherish and conserve this marvel among many marvels? Or does he all too often besmirch, befoul and poison it? Has he not polluted wells and streams, made cesspools of rivers and lakes, and contaminated ocean fronts until sickness and death of human, animal and plant life have resulted?

It is said, that God created man only a little lower than the angels, yet, alas, how frequently does his selfish and mercenary impulses turn him into a destroyer.

Does he recognize and preserve the means by which the earth absorbs rainfall and melting snow, so that our sweetwater sources may be sufficient for our days? Or does he, blinded by greed and ignorance, hew down, and abandon vast tracts of forest land? In such denuded areas, the rain, its force neither checked by living leaves above, nor absorbed by a leafy sponge below, rushes off torrentially. Its uncontrolled violence sweeps away precious leafmold and richest topsoil, which are lost to us forever, leaving the land gullied and unfruitful. Rivers, suddenly swollen, rage and destroy, instead of flowing serenely onward within their banks.

Again, as population density increases in certain areas, more havoc is wrought by the greedy developer. First he levels the ground and bulldozes away all vegetation, then covers the earth with thousands of huddled homes, and acres of concrete and blacktop surfaces, streets, and highways. Here, again, in another fashion, is water absorption thwarted and the precious element forced to run uselessly off into the sewers.

In hope of gain, man plows the prairie and the mat of grass and roots which holds the soil and absorbs precipitation is destroyed. In hope of gain, grazing lands are overgrazed, killing the grassroots and creating barren lands: a desert. For a handful of gold, the hoggish few have left to the rest of us scene of death and desolation, where once there was beauty and design.

When will we realize that Nature was not created to be "conquered" by man, but that man himself is but one small component part of the sublime "scheme of things, entire"? That by exploiting her ruthlessly we make her our enemy and that it behooves us rather to try to understand the wisdom and wonder of her ways and adapt ourselves to them.

As our knowledge of nature constantly widens and deepens, we become ever more aware that there prevails in her an exquisite and delicate balance. Our eyes are opened to perceive, that each varied form in this world plays its appointed and harmonious part in the eternal symphony of existence.

Thus may we see the universe reflected in a drop of water.

Hon. John Baldwin

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the loss of a fine public servant and a dedicated Member of Congress, JOHN BALDWIN. Those of us who were privileged to know him and to work with him can only too well appreciate the full expenditure of his talents and energies on the causes and purposes in which he believed.

JOHN BALDWIN was a man who had a feeling for the rightness of upholding the fundamental principles which have allowed this Nation to develop to its great stature among all nations. He was always aware of the people, as both master of their Government and servant of the basic American ideals. He enjoyed a quick capacity to recognize the issues which would strengthen our freedom of thought, expression, assembly and petition, and he was equally quick to aline himself on the side of those proposals which restated the freedoms in any situation.

He realized that we must be strong as a nation but maintained that political and economic power must be balanced to develop our strength without threatening our individual liberties. For his great skill and energy, his personal kindness and sense of fairness, we shall miss him in these Halls, but those whom he has left behind at home may feel proud of his work and confident of the good memories which they share with many of us in Washington.

He has left the stage, but the applause will linger for many years as we remember from time to time the pleasure and satisfaction of our years in his company.

Future Homemakers of America—More Than Two Decades of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure most Members of this House are aware, we are marking, this week, National FHA Week, as a tribute to the Future Homemakers of America.

There may be some confusion, in that the initials also designate the Federal Housing Administration, and the Farmers Home Administration—both of which are Federal agencies which have made important contributions to the public welfare in rural areas and in the cities—but what we have particularly in mind at this moment is another FHA, composed of young women who will become the wives and mothers of our Nation, within a few years, and many of whom also will undertake additional efforts as teachers, or workers in offices or industrial plants.

It is important to recall, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Future Homemakers of America was founded more than 20 years ago and now consists of more than 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses in 11,000 chapters among the 50 States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Additionally, it is important that we recognize, in saluting these young women this week, that the programs in which they are participating have the official sponsorship of the U.S. Office of Education and of the American Home Economics Associations.

With the growing importance, in recent years, of home economics as a serious concern of every homemaker, whether she might live in the city or in the country, it is worthwhile, I think, that we have this annual recognition of the program of the Future Homemakers of America.

Even though I am sure all of these young ladies can make wonderful fudge, we have come to the realization, in recent years, that homemaking—and training in home economics—means much more than learning how to make a good fudge.

---

[1] (The Crisis in Water) "What Brought It On?" by John Lear in Saturday Review, Oct. 23, 1965.

I am glad to have this opportunity to commend to the attention of the House the current observance of National Future Homemakers of America Week.

Vietnam Protests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Gladys Messex, of Pocatello, Idaho, has been a teacher in the Pocatello school system for many years, and is a dedicated wroker with the young. I am sure she sees with a great deal of satisfaction the accomplishments of many of her former pupils—accomplishments which she, through her influence during the youngsters' formative years, helped to bring about.

In addition to her work as a teacher, Mrs. Messex also wrote a regular column, "Chalk Dust," for the weekly newspaper, the Intermountain, published in Pocatello.

I was particularly impressed by Mrs. Messex' column of March 17 which is especially pertinent and thoughtful. It is my earnest hope that, by placing this article in the RECORD, it will be seen and read by many of those thousands of misguided unfortunates who took to the streets this past weekend to protest our policy in Vietnam, and that it will help awaken them to the realities of what we are doing in Vietnam—and why.

The article follows:

CHALK DUST

(By Gladys Messex)

Thick clouds covered the besieged Montagnard and American defenders of the trianglar fortress at Ashua. One minute jet time from Da Nang's powerful air support, they were cut off. "We have closed our show at Ashua," said someone over the radio.

Not yet, however, was this newest tale of gallantry and heroism against impossible odds to end in that war where a man prefers death to the cruelties of capture. Marine helicopter crews dumped their weapons and flew in to bring out 59 wounded survivors the next day, just staggering off the ground with their overload under enemy fire.

HERO

Idaho's own here, Maj. Bernard Fisher, of Kuna, followed his crashlanding wingman down to rescue him right from under enemy guns and headlines touched even those who somehow remain always emotionally uninvolved. Toward that war in the so far away places with strange sounding names Americans in numbers displayed something more than their normal irritated indifference. With flight officer sons and remembering all sorts of former students, I've long been committed. I wept.

SALUTE

A salute then to the Green Berets, the USAF Commando Wing, the planes of the Navy, Marine helicopter pilots, and crews, and all who may feel they've been forgotten in an unpopular war. I suspect a new collection of ballads and hero stories were born last week in a war on the other side of the world while men laid down their lives for their friends.

A LETTER

Another who's committed is Judy who finally got fed up with a lot of things and wrote this letter to the Sacramento Bee. Perhaps we should listen to what a young officer's wife has to say:

"This letter is in answer to the many persons bewailing our participation in the Vietnam conflict.

"The young men fighting in the armed forces over there are not dying because they enjoy it; dying certainly is not fun. They realize it is necessary to fight to preserve free Asia from the cancer of Communist Red China. North Vietnam is just one of the fronts where the United States is fighting for our freedom.

"To a woman who complained that her son of 2 years will grow up and have to fight in Vietnam: No, he won't. If the Communists are not controlled by then, he'll be fighting right here in the United States. America is the goal of Red China and the Soviet Union, our industry, our people, and the destruction of freedoms that allow Americans to voice their views whether or not they agree with the policy of our present Government.

NOT FOR FUN

"Our friends are fighting in Vietnam at this time not because it is 'fun' but because they know they are giving their lives to preserve our country for their children and the children of all Americans. They are the mature thinkers, not the Berkeley rioters, the sign carriers, and the 'great unwashed' who marched on Washington that disgraceful day. Why don't such as these volunteer to go to Vietnam and find out exactly why this is going on, instead of complaining and doing nothing?

"I won't say anything to the draft card burners; their consciences will take care of that. I just hope for their sakes they grow up to see the childishness of their ways, plus all the propaganda they've handed to Communist leaders."

Judy is my son Clark's wife. I think she's in the right family.

Happy Birthday—Congresswoman Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 29, is the birthday of our esteemed and distinguished colleague, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON. She has rendered outstanding service to the Nation over the course of 26 years as a Member of the House. Her work as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has brought her great distinction here at home as well as winning great admiration from many foreign governments with whom our country maintains relations.

Our distinguished colleague has established an equally great record in the field of civic services, particularly public health and nursing, education, and in the social services. My home city of Cleveland has been the beneficiary of our colleague's unique services in all these fields. She has made Cleveland a better place to live for many thousands of families who have been the beneficiaries of her leadership in civic services as well as her generous philanthropies.

I salute my friend and our esteemed colleague, Mrs. BOLTON, for her outstanding work as a Member of Congress and for the tremendous energy and interest she has given to literally hundreds of worthwhile projects in the Greater Cleveland community. I have long regarded her as one of the outstanding women in the United States. I know my esteem for her is shared by my colleagues. On this occasion I extend to her best wishes for a happy birthday and may she have many more years of service to her country and to her fellow man.

Manpower Needs Grow Across United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's New York Times, there appeared an article on the growing problem of manpower needs in this country. The article, under the byline of David R. Jones, indicated some of the techniques various firms are using to find employees in this period of growing labor shortages. The story further indicates that many artificial barriers and ancient prejudices are contributing to this state of affairs. "There are," according to Mr. Jones' story, "still a lot of employers who won't hire a man over 40 or 45 or women or young people." But in spite of this, as this survery indicates, the nature of the labor force and the nature of the demand upon the Nation's labor-finding machinery is changing.

It is precisely because of this fact that the Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, is holding joint hearings, together with the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the other body, chaired by Senator CLARK, on legislation designed to give a new charter and a new structure to the Federal-State public employment services. The newspaper article, for which I have unanimous consent appears at the conclusion of these remarks, and points up the need for new ideas and new procedures if the Nation's skills are to be fully and most wisely utilized.

MANPOWER NEEDS GROW ACROSS UNITED STATES: SURVEY FINDS A TIGHTENING LABOR SUPPLY—JOB LURES OFFERED BY EMPLOYERS

(By David R. Jones)

WASHINGTON, March 26.—The Nation's growing manpower shortage is about to produce a new food blender for Mrs. William A. Volz of San Jose, Calif.

The connection is simple. Mrs. Volz' 30-year-old husband is a senior engineer at the Westingshouse Electric Corporation's Marine Division at nearby Sunnyvale. The company awarded him the food blender the other day for persuading his father-in-law to join the company, as a turret lathe operator, a critically needed skill.

The use of a food blender to lure a worker into a new job may sound a bit unusual, but a New York Times survey of scores of employers in 20 major labor markets this week turned up evidence that such inducements are being used with increasing frequency these days as companies scramble to find qualified people for vacant jobs. These tactics are being prompted by a tightening labor supply across the Nation.

PRESIDENT IS CONCERNED

Federal experts assert there still is not a general manpower shortage. The survey tends to confirm this.

However, talks with employers show the situation is clearly getting tighter and it is expected to grow worse as unemployment slips below last month's 3.7 percent of the civilian labor force.

The tightening manpower situation has already become a major concern of President Johnson. He called earlier this month for labor and management to join Federal agencies in seeking "bold new approaches" to head off a general shortage.

The administration is worried because manpower shortages can promote inflation. They can force employers to bid against each other for the same workers, or to hire less productive workers, either of which pushes up labor costs. Shortages can also create bottlenecks that limit production, encouraging companies to raise prices because they are enjoying strong demand.

The Times survey confirmed the administration's contention that the manpower supply was tightest in the major industrial cities around the Great Lakes and concentrated in certain skills.

The survey turned up only slight evidence that personnel shortages were causing production bottlenecks so far. But it uncovered a relatively large amount of bidding by employers for the same workers.

"We are facing both a regional and a nationwide shortage of people with technical skills," says Charles B. Dates, manager of employee and community relations for the General Electric Co.'s reentry systems department in Philadelphia.

"We have been unable to find the number of qualified engineers, scientists, technicians, and skilled trades people in the Delaware Valley area as quickly as we need them." Mr. Dates explains. "Our placement specialists fan out across the country almost every week, from Boston to Miami to Seattle, Los Angeles. Unfortunately, there are shortages in most of these areas, also."

JOBS FOR THE ASKING

A similar lament is heard from employers in most parts of the United States, particularly those seeking engineers, technicians, machinists, and metal workers. The Douglas Aircraft Co. has dispatched three vice presidents to a Los Angeles radio station to make a pitch for engineers. A Chicago employment agency reports shortages of lathe operators and electrical assemblers.

"It used to be that a stenographer sent out with the prospect of a job would be told, 'We'll let you know in a day or two,' and she would have to pay the agency fee," comments Frank Rogers, of Manpower, Inc., a temporary-help agency in Boston. "Now the company offers to pay the fee, the stenographer says, 'I'll let you know in a day or two.'"

The shortages are not limited to skilled workers.

"This summer we are going to have some difficulty filling low-paid common labor jobs," says a Denver employment service official.

A Pittsburgh area steel executive laments:

"Most of our applicants are kids who have pumped gas or swung hamburgers."

The problem is particularly acute in such cities as Chicago and Milwaukee, where the jobless rate is about 2.5 percent, which is considered full employment after normal job-changing is considered.

"The only other time we had a situation like this was during World War II," says Emil T. Molls, assistant manager of the Wisconsin State Employment Service in Ashland.

TROUBLE IN PRODUCTION

Most companies surveyed say the manpower shortages so far have not hampered production, but a smattering are having trouble.

A Cleveland company reports its shipments would be 10 percent higher if it had the manpower it needed. Firth Sterling, Inc., a specialty steel company in McKeesport, Pa., says equipment it received 2 months ago is sitting idle because it cannot find personnel to put it into production.

The shortage of workers is leading to greater opportunities for many employees, and an increasing number of them seem to be showing more independence. The U.S. Department of Labor reported this month that the employee quit rate in January was 19 per 1,000 workers, or the highest in more than 12 years.

Employees "can select the shift they want; write their own ticket on things like this," says a rubber company official "They'll leave now at the drop of a hat," he continued "and this is causing raising costs."

An Atlanta laundry official says workers "Walk out at lunch or leave at night, and you don't see them anymore."

A Cleveland machinist, discussing efforts by one company to land him, says he told the recruiter:

"Don't bother me, buddy. I've got too many job offers already."

In order to ease their shortages, companies are turning more to rewarding workers for landing needed employees. John F. Mallory, personnel supervisor at Westinghouse's plant in Sunnyvale says the food blender that Mrs. Volz will get is but one of about a dozen such awards granted since the new program started on March 8.

The Sun Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. has drawn about 100 skilled mechanics by awarding $25 to employees who recruited them. One employee who recruited three mechanics received the "grand prize"—a prestigious parking space.

General Electric is looking for 300 engineers at its Evendale, Ohio, jet engine plant and paying employees a $200 bonus to bring them in.

Dobbs House, a Memphis-based operator of air terminal restaurants, is awarding a book of Sperry & Hutchinson trading stamps to any employee who recruits a counterman or dishwasher that stays at least a month.

The United States Steel Corp. is recruiting in Pittsburgh for 1,000 Chicago-area jobs.

Louis G. Seaton, personnel vice president of the General Motors Corp., says the company has been recruiting in West Virginia and Kentucky for the first time in several years to fill Detroit-area jobs.

An official of the Allen Bradley Co., a Milwaukee electrical control maker, says that for "the first time in years there is out-and-out raiding of technical people."

E. F. Foubert, industrial relations vice president of the Rockwell Manufacturing Co. in Pittsburgh, says defense-oriented companies are raiding for skilled workers.

A spokesman for the Martin Co., in Denver says the defense company is short of engineers and scientists.

"We have to steal them from somebody else." he observes. "Everybody in the field is pirating."

The competition for workers is pushing up some wage rates, which is precisely what Federal officials fear will raise labor costs and encourage inflation. Nonunion workers in some southern textile plants have received three wage increases in the last year, for example.

Ken Piper, human relations vice president of Motorola, Inc., in Chicago, reports the cost of unskilled labor has risen to $2.25 to $2.60 an hour from $2 an hour a year ago.

Pay for maids has risen about $1 a day in the year, says a Georgia Employment Service official in Atlanta.

Government officials are seeking to avoid this type of inflation-inducing competition, and to extend jobs to the 3.2 million people still unemployed, by promoting job training programs. Federal manpower programs this year will reach about 250,000 workers, up from 225,000 last year.

Arthur M. Ross, the U.S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics, emphasizes that full employment has still not been reached even though there are growing manpower shortages. There still are 2.6 million workers seeking full-time jobs, and all but 200,000 of them have previous full-time experience, he reports.

STANDARDS ARE CITED

Mr. Ross and other Federal experts contend manpower resources are not exhausted because employment is still growing at a rate that is 250,000 above the seasonal rate every month. They say the real problem is providing workers with the skills to fill the available jobs, and they are emphasizing training to cure the mismatch.

"We've extended our in-training programs and we're cooperating with local and national educational and industrial institutions to try to alleviate this shortage," says an official of the National Acme Co., a Cleveland machine tool company.

Other companies report similar efforts, but some Federal officials contend most employers still do less than they should.

Most manpower experts say many companies are having personnel problems because they are sticking to unnecessarily high job standards.

"There are still a lot of employers who won't hire a man over 40 or 45, or women, or young people," says one Labor Department official.

This official also says that some unions, particularly in construction, are too restrictive in apprenticeship requirements.

"Why does a guy have to spend 4 years to be an electrician?" he asks.

President Johnson earlier this month prodded unions and management to ease such artificial barriers, and to redesign jobs so they could be done with less skill. He particularly asked employers to reconsider requirements so that jobs normally done by adult men could be done by women, teenagers, the handicapped and immigrants.

Some redesigning is underway. A California Employment Service official in Los Angeles says many employers "are relaxing criteria, such as waiving high school diploma requirements and hiring women when they wouldn't have before."

The International Business Machines Corp., recently lured 2,000 housewives to work in a new Denver area plant in what one State employment official says was the World War II "Rosie the riveter idea again."

NEGROES ARE AFFECTED

J. W. Beach, director of the North Carolina State Employment Service, says the tightening manpower situation is helping to open jobs for Negroes in the South.

"The barriers are breaking down rapidly throughout the tobacco industry, and in some textile plants," he says.

Despite some lowering of employment standards, literacy remains a widespread requirement for most jobs. A Chicago public aid official, for example, says that even janitors are required to be literate—"except in a saloon."

"Anybody who can read or write can get a job in Detroit," says one automobile company spokesman. "But for his own safety, and ours, he has to be able to read signs such as 'To stop this machine push button.'"

Destroying the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, during a recent meeting of the Students for a Democratic Society at Purdue University, a young man from Chicago reportedly spat upon the American flag, ripped it into pieces, threw it on the floor and stomped on the flag.

Apparently not one student made a move to stop him, in fact, some in the crowd offered approval.

Desecration of the American flag at the present time carries no Federal criminal penalty. To correct this situation I have authored a bill (H.R. 13942) which would carry a prison term and sentence for such an act.

In order to apprise the Members of Congress of the disgusting incident at Purdue, and enlist support for my legislation, I offer for the Record a complete story of the flag desecration and an editorial from the Indianapolis News.

The account of the flag desecration was written by Mr. Ross Hermann of the editorial staff of the News. Mr. Hermann has done a thorough job, interviewing eyewitnesses and his reporting in depth will arouse great indignation and alarm to those who esteem the flag of this country. I compliment Mr. Hermann, a diligent and effective newsman, for bringing the full details of this incident to the people of Indiana and the Nation.

The articles follow:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, Mar. 24, 1966]

Full Story of Purdue Flag Desecration Told

(By Ross Hermann)

Eyewitnesses to last week's meeting of the Purdue University campus chapter of Students for a Democratic Society report some students cheered and other remained emotionless as a pacifist speaker spat upon, ripped up, and trampled the American flag.

Several witnesses relate about 10 of the 65 people in attendance gave unrestrained approval to mutilation of the flag, while the majority sat quietly, showing little emotion or reaction. No display of criticism was detected.

The student introducing Joffre Stewart, a self-described anarchist-pacifist from Chicago, reportedly accorded him the distinction of having burned the American flag on previous occasions but added: "He has agreed not to burn the U.S. flag during this program."

Appealing to students to "uproot the power structure completely" by refusing to cooperate with the state, Stewart is reported to have unfolded an American flag and begun a rehearsed ritual.

One eyewitness wrote this account:

"Unfurling a small American flag approximately 18 by 12 inches rolled on a 24-inch stick, Stewart says: 'I said I wouldn't burn the flag tonight and I won't.' Turning to a 45-degree position facing away from the audience, standing to the right of the podium, Stewart spits twice on the flag. He then assumes position to the left of the podium, again at a 45-degree angle * * * Stewart again spits twice on the flag. He then tears the American flag apart, throws the American flag to the ground and steps on it."

Another observer, who arrived at the meeting after Stewart's flag demonstration, told this reporter:

"Immediately upon closing of the meeting I moved toward the left front of the room to secure some of the propaganda literature being offered, and it was at this time that I discovered the small American flag lying on the floor in pieces. People gathering literature were milling about, stepping on the remnants and surrounding the speaker to ask questions, all completely unconcerned about the desecrated flag."

The rest of Stewart's presentation, a plea for nonviolent revolution against all forms of government, was—according to several witnesses interviewed by this reporter—liberally spiced with profanity and incitations to illegal action, sometimes of a violent nature, against civil authority.

"How do you get rid of the state?" he was asked. His reply: "By doing it yourself. Burn your draft card and licenses. Don't let the state reoccur by answering with a nonviolent 'no' to everything."

"Could a violent person destroy your system by shooting nonviolents?" he was asked. His answer: "Possible, but the present chance of nuclear holocaust is much worse. I think now is the time to burn down the missile sites."

Question. "Can you give examples of your successes?" In reply, he cited his record of arrests, prison confinement, and commitment to mental institutions. A pamphlet Stewart distributed boasts of three-time imprisonment for going AWOL while a basic trainee in the U.S. Army and 18 arrests for acts of civil disobedience while participating in the civil rights movement.

The immediate aim of Stewart's Purdue talk was to solicit students to march in the March 26 Chicago "peace" demonstration protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam and demending withdrawal of American troops.

Slogans proposed by Stewart to potential marchers include:

1. "Freedom Now."
2. "U.S. Troops Conduct Self-Withdrawal From Vietnam."
3. "Refuse To Obtain Licenses of Any Kind."
4. "Refuse To Pay Taxes."
5. "Refuse To Obtain Passports."
6. "Promote Antistatism."
7. "Nationalism Is Worse Than Sin."
8. "Nuclear War Theat Increasing."
9. "No Compulsory Monogamy."
10. "Experiment With Free Love."

Other material Stewart distributed advertised buttons available from the Solidarity Bookshop in Chicago, including "Dodge the Draft," "Abolish the Draft," and "Burn Baby Burn." The latter is a slogan chanted by Watts, Calif., rioters last summer as they looted and burned private property.

After Stewart's talk, Martin Barroll, chairman of the Purdue chapter of Students for a Democratic Society, reportedly appealed for new members and promised to sponsor "more speakers of this type." He subsequently defended Stewart as "more pro-American than the so-called patriots."

SDS, a national student group advocating a halt to U.S. military action in Vietnam and a radical approach to domestic affairs, is recognized by Purdue authorities as an official campus organization.

An investigation by the university, announced last week by Dr. Donald R. Mallett, executive dean, is presently underway.

SDS received national attention a year ago when its national convention voted to permit membership by Communists. Previously, membership had been barred to authoritarians of both the right and left.

SDS action brought a strong reprimand from the parent organization, the League for Industrial Democracy, which read, in part:

"The League for Industrial Democracy in its long history has stood firmly, as a matter of uncompromising principle, against totalitarianism of both the right and the left. We are therefore deeply troubled that the 1965 national convention of our student department, Students for a Democratic Society, removed from its constitution and membership card the long-standing reference to communism as an authoritarian movement. * * * We seek a reaffirmation of SDS adherence to the traditional opposition of LID to totalitarianism of both the right and the left."

Destroying the Flag

Desecration of an American flag by an antiwar speaker at Purdue University and subsequent investigation by school officials and the FBI have brought to light a glaring deficiency in Federal and State laws.

Joffre Stewart, a self-described "anarchist-pacifist," reportedly spat upon, tore up, and stomped an American flag at a Purdue meeting last Wednesday sponsored by the campus chapter of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), a group in the forefront of agitation against U.S. military presence in Vietnam.

Draft-card burning, a more frequent form of antiwar protest, is punishable by up to 5 years in prison. Desecration of the flag, by contrast, is not covered by Federal law and carries merely a $5 to $10 fine under Indiana law.

By any reasonable scale of values, willful desecration of Old Glory should carry a more severe penalty than destruction of a draft card. Legislators may be excused for this omission, however, if they considered purposeful mutilation of the flag too remote a possibility to warrant anticipatory action.

Now that the unlikely has happened, State and National legislators should direct their attention to setting appropriate penalties.

Missed God's Obituary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter from Frank J. McNulty, a very fitting rebuttal to the "God is dead" blasphemy:

Missed God's Obituary in Tribune

St. Petersburg.—The other night on television, some young preacher was telling a bunch of kids that "God is dead." I hadn't been drinking so I'm sure I wasn't befuddled. I kept listening and, sure enough, that's what they kept chanting, "God is dead." Now that is the strangest thing. I never knew He was sick.

We had a most complete story of President Kennedy's funeral but not a word of God's funeral. As one of your oldest readers, I was always pleased, more than pleased, with your coverage of Pinellas County news. But you slipped up badly on this great event, God's demise. And I think you should be ashamed to let a news item of this magnitude go unpublished. Did the Government black out this news item, or, is it a top secret?

The U.S. Supreme Court kicked God out of the schools. This could have made Him sick, it did me.

That same Court also said that it was all right to broadcast filthy, dirty, pornographic gutter news of sex. And I believe this decision made both the Devil and God sick, it did me.

Here is a ruling so rotten, from a moral point of view, it stinks. Pa and Ma were dead wrong, all the preachers are wrong; don't ask me why? Because the Supreme Court said so.

I guess—with all the crime we see in our country, such as graft, bribery, rape, muggings and outright murder, and the courts coddling the criminal—no one believes in capital punishment any more. But the criminal does. As far as the victim is concerned, it does exist for he is dead but the murderer still lives.

Yes, there is capital punishment for the innocent victim but the murderer still lives. And folks talk of law and order, when the current crime wave would make God or any decent person—perhaps fatally—most fatally sick.

I would like to see, in your splendid publication, the time and day of God's funeral. There should be a good turnout because there is still a lot of good folks left in the world. No, I guess I won't be attending God's funeral, but I indulge the hope that He attends mine.—FRANK J. MCNULTY.

Byelorussian Independence Day: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago, after suffering over a century of political servitude at the hands of Tsarist Russia, the people of Byelorussia established an independent Democratic Republic.

The Byelorussian Republic did not have the good fortune to remain independent for long. After 2 years of hard and gallant fighting, the tiny republic was finally overwhelmed by the armies of the new expansionist government of Soviet Russia. Since then the Byelorussians have continued to resist passively, but determinedly, every Communist attempt to Soveitize their nation.

Today Byelorussia is one of the many tiny but proud nations that suffer under the new form of colonialism pursued by the Soviet Union. Despite their domination by the Muscovite Russians during the last two centuries, historically the Byelorussians developed quite separately from the tribes of great Russia. Even today, their culture remains distinctly different from that of the great Russians. As a distinct and different nationality, the Byelorussians suffer from the degradation of their culture and attempts at forced assimilation by the Russian Communist regime.

As a democratic nation which professes a firm belief in the rights of all nations to self-determination, we cannot forget the plight of the Byelorussians. Someday they must have the right to determine their own future free from foreign oppression. It is appropriate that we continue to observe the anniversary of Byelorussian independence every March 25 and renew our support of their right to self-determination.

Interfaith Service in Sheridan, Wyo., Attracts 550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in the very difficult responsibility this Nation has undertaken in Vietnam, there are too many occasions for doubt and discouragement, too few opportunities to see more clearly the long-range goals that make this struggle necessary.

If the South Vietnamese are too persevere and succeed, they will require more than military and economic assistance. They need as well the moral support of this Nation which possesses the basic freedoms the South Vietnamese are fighting to obtain.

It is personal freedom which bestows both dignity and worth to human existence that the South Vietnamese are seeking. This personal freedom has no place in Communist ideology, especially the freedom of worship which in the free world is a cornerstone of other personal freedoms.

When we compare the freedom of worship enjoyed here in the United States with the suppression and harassment of religion in Communist countries, we can take renewed heart in our determination to help the South Vietnamese secure their freedoms.

Today in the State of Wyoming a historic movement is underway to bring Christians together, brother to brother, in a common venture for peace and unity.

The Most Reverend Hubert M. Newell, Roman Catholic Bishop of Cheyenne, Wyo., was in Sheridan, Wyo., March 21, for the first interfaith service joining Catholic and Protestant clergy and members.

More than 550 persons met and prayed for greater understanding and charity. This was the first of a series of interfaith prayer services for peace and unity to be held in many Wyoming towns.

In my lifetime of 50 years in Wyoming, this is the most heartening example of good will among Christians that I have ever observed and it is a great joy to me personally.

This undertaking, with its monumental overtones, may do much to erase the misunderstandings of the last 500 years which have set Christians into opposing camps.

I personally wish to congratulate all the clergy in Wyoming who labored to make this event a reality, and to express my hope that similar sessions now announced throughout the State meet with similar success.

I want my colleagues to read this encouraging report of progress in Christian unity, and to remember when they read it, that such undertaking's would never be possible in South Vietnam if the United States were to abandon that nation to Communist takeover. It may be well to keep this article in mind when we ask ourselves, why we are in Vietnam. One answer this article provides is: because without our assistance, the people of South Vietnam would never know the blessings of freedom we see evidenced in this action.

INTERFAITH SERVICE HERE ATTRACTS 550

"No one of us is to blame for the disunity we deplore," it was pointed out yesterday by the Most Reverend Hubert M. Newell, D.D., Roman Catholic Bishop of Cheyenne, as he spoke at the first of a series of Interfaith Prayer Services for Peace and Unity held in Sheridan.

More than 550 Catholics and non-Catholics joined officially for the common prayer service at the Holy Name gymnasium. It was the first time such a union has been made in Wyoming.

Present for the service were 8 priests and 14 clergymen from throughout the northeast area of the State.

In his sermon, Bishop Newell said, "With all our hearts, we believe that the Lord is with us this day, and we are confident that He is pleased we have chosen to put aside our differences for the moment, in the interest of the wider beliefs and the greater needs that we have in common."

He said that "though there are differences great and small, and seemingly without number, between the churches, the walls of separation do not rise to the heavens. It is a joy to remember that there are many areas in which we are in greater or lesser agreement."

In speaking of the hope for Christian unity, Bishop Newell said that "in almost every one of the Christian churches, relations with other faiths are being prayerfully reassessed, and there is a spirit of honesty and charity about the studies that promises well for the future."

However, he said, "there are numerous doctrinal matters on which we differ radically, and it would be a disservice to attempt to minimize them or pretend they do not exist. The resolution of these substantial doctrinal differences, the closing of the breach, the healing of the wounds will take time, much theological discussion and study."

He added, "It will require great quantities of good will, an abundance of charity, and prayers without number."

The bishop said that while ecumenism is being studied in the higher levels of the churches, their directives are of special interest to "ordinary people like ourselves." He said that "* * * insofar as it is possible, we would like to make our contribution on increased understanding among the faiths."

He emphasized this point by saying, "An act of Christian neighborliness, of kindness, of charity, that crosses sectarian boundaries, means far more than an academic consideration of doctrinal issues."

This point was the first of three directives given by the World Council of Churches in a 1963 meeting. The second was that all Christians should meet each other as brothers for whom Christ had alread died.

The third guideline warns Christians against allowing brotherly love to degenerate into vague relativism or syncretism. (The relativist thinks there is nothing absolute or final about Jesus Christ, and false syncretism means the harmonizing of all religions, Christian and non-Christian.)

In reference to the possible outcome of these interfaith meetings, Bishop Newell said that the "future of the cause of Christian unity is a personal responsibility."

In regards to the united prayer for peace, Bishop Newell said "there is so much to be done in the way of feeding the hungry, of banishing disease, of providing educational opportunities, of extending the blessings of self-government to underprivileged and emerging nations, that it seems sinful to dissipate the world's resources in wars."

The afternoon service, which was held under the auspices of the Council of Catholic Women of the Diocese of Cheyenne, began with a processional of the priests and clergymen in their ceremonial robes.

The Reverend John Corrigan, pastor of St. Joseph's Church in Cheyenne, was the master of ceremonies. Others taking part in the service were the Reverend Robert Palmer, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Sheridan; the Reverend Harry Nelson, of St. Peter's Episcopal Church in Sheridan; the Reverend Robert T. Hodgen, rector of Holy Trinity Episcopal Church in Gillette; the Reverend Paul Murphy, pastor of the First Methodist Church in Buffalo; the Reverend Larry Brynell, pastor of the Trinity Lutheran Church in Sheridan; the Reverend Cyril Hmelovsky, pastor of St. Mary Magdalene Church in Worland.

Mrs. H. R. Calkins, of Sheridan, was the organist and Mrs. Hugh C. Johnson, of Newcastle, president of the Sheridan deanery of the Council of Catholic Women, was the arrangements chairman.

Similar interfaith services are being held this week in Cheyenne, Casper, Rock Springs, and Worland. Each is paterned after the service following the Ecumenical Council in Rome in which Pope Paul VI took part in services with clergymen of other faiths to pray for world peace and Christian unity.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, when we hail the anniversary of Byelorussian independence we do not have in mind a celebration for the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, a so-called constituent republic of the Soviet Union. We honor instead the tragically shortlived Byelorussian Democratic Republic as it was proclaimed on March 25, 1918. The loudly proclaimed independence of that area, insisted upon at the United Nations by the Soviet Union to gain support for what was to be a series of negative positions by the Soviets in that organization, is a travesty on the true independence of spirit of the Byelorussian people. That independence has been maintained not because of, but in spite of the Soviet Union.

Overruns for centuries by the neighboring Russians, Byelorussia was never willingly a part of their territory or sympathetic with its neighbors to the east. Superior in development and culture, its civilization was much older than that of the Russia which sought to absorb it.

Despite all efforts of its neighbors at domination, Byelorussia has remained separate in its allegiance and true to its own national traditions. It has remained an entity, preserving its identity and its independence of spirit against all efforts to Russify and to Sovietize it.

Though its richer resources have been the envy of the rapacious on its boundaries, they have also been the basis for the higher degree of civilization which the Byelorussians enjoy. Superior as they have been in social, economic, and cultural development, their spirit of individual and national independence is also a product of this refinement.

It was this true love of freedom and loyalty to ethnic origins and native characteristics which led to their brief but real independence, proclaimed 48 years ago. Despite outward political adversity, the spirit of liberty which manifested itself at that time is alive today. That is the true independence which we celebrate today.

East-West Center Continues To Grow in International Stature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, although 6 years have passed since it was established in Hawaii, the Institute for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West continues to excite my imagination. I marvel at the phenomenal progress that is being made by the Center in its efforts to foster and promote understanding among the peoples of Asia, the Pacific, and the United States. And when viewed in light of the present conflict in Vietnam and the ever present threat of world war III, the progress is especially timely and meaningful.

The Center's select scholars, numbering 600 this year and representing 25 countries, will one day be called upon by their respective countries to assume positions of leadership and great responsibility. Their experience at the East-West Center, with its cultural as well as technical interchange, is bound to bring greater tolerance and understanding among these leaders of tomorrow.

It is thus with great pride that I call your attention to an article which reviews and describes the Institute which in its sixth year is continuing to grow and expand under the able chancellorship of the former Ambassador to Indonesia, Howard J. Jones.

The informative article written by Reporter Corinne Opsahl not only describes the program for educational interchange on the senior professional level, but it also includes an interesting description of the grantees program which ranges from purely academic approaches to actual in-service training in the community. The intensified curricular is programed to make possible the maximum assimilation of technical know-how and cultural knowledge at all levels.

Reporter Opsahl also summarizes the scope and progress of the East-West Center Library, the East-West Center Press, the Office of Public Affairs and the community relations program.

I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Reporter Opsahl's article on the progress of the East-West Center, which appeared ir. the Februay 15, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser:

HAWAII'S EAST-WEST CENTER: IT'S NOW HOST TO 600 SCHOLARS OF 25 NATIONS

(By Corinne Opsahl)

The East-West Center, now in its sixth year, has lost its baby fat and is beginning to flex new muscles.

Under the chancellorship of Howard P. Jones, former U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia, the Center today is hosting approximately 600 youthful scholars from 25 countries spanning half the globe.

Founded in 1960 to foster and promote human understanding among people of diverse cultures, the Center has seen more than 300 Asian and 100 American students earn academic degrees while studying at the University of Hawaii on East-West Center student exchange grants.

Three specialized institutes direct traffic in cultural and technical interchange at the Center:

The Institute for Student Interchange (ISI) handpicks the grant and scholarship recipients who will rub shoulders with their counterparts from the United States, Asia, and the Pacific.

Academic ability and past performance are but two measures the Institute for Student Interchange uses in sizing up a potentially successful East-West Center candidate. Also weighed are the needs of his country, his own special interest in Asian-Pacific-American understanding, and his promise as a future leader.

Once on campus, a grantee literally eats, sleeps and thinks cultural interchange. Institute for Student Interchange arranges most of this.

It feeds students international food in an international setting. It pairs them with roommates from different countries in modern Center dormitories.

In addition to arranging student academic programs, Institute for Student Interchange schedules a dizzying procession of speakers, discussions, forums, musical programs, art exhibits and other events to foment continual cultural exchange.

And when they have a spare evening, grantees are whisked to parties in Honolulu's private homes to absorb local cuisine and customs.

Students planning field study in another country or a large American city get intensified briefing aimed at easing "cultural shock."

Finally, when a grant ends, Institute for Student Interchange schedules a farewell "reorientation." On the theory that "forewarned is forearmed," potentially difficult adjustment situations back home are discussed and worked through with students leaving the Center.

This Institute for Student Interchange-administered cultural bath is only one part of the three-fold program at the East-West Center.

The Institute of Technical Interchange (ITI) assigns grantees to some 15 different Hawaii-based projects for on-the-job training.

Tonganese medical workers "live in" at Queen's Hospital for intern refresher courses;

Samoan "ham" radio operators absorb broadcasting techniques at Honolulu stations; Japanese legislative services personnel sit in on Hawaii State Legislature sessions.

Others get inservice technical know-how in such diverse fields as educational communications, commercial sewing, business education, personnel management, theater technical training, horticulture and plant quarantine procedures.

Some field training institutes are programed, and Institute of Technical Interchange also administers a number of worldwide contract training services in cooperation with the Agency for International Development.

Third leg of the Center's cultural tripod is the Institute of Advanced Projects (IAP). It sponsors a program of East-West educational interchange at the senior professional level.

Grants and facilities have been provided for 133 Asian and American scholars to do research and write on international problems. There are presently 44 senior specialists and 45 international development fellows in the program.

Institute of Advance Projects Research Translation Division compiles bilingual dictionaries, translates booklength and monograph materials and produces annotated bibliographies.

Ehe East-West Center has hosted more than 1,000 professionals from the East and West for international discussions. Most recent was an Asian Pacific Conference which attracted 80 participants.

Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary of the United Nations, and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, addressed the conference. Other contributors were Carlos P. Romulo, president of the University of the Philippines, and Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review magazine.

Several programs are central to the entire East-West Center operation:

The East-West Center Library houses one of the finest collections of contemporary Asian-Pacific material in the United States. It includes 175,000 books, 14,000 microfilm reels and 4,000 newspaper periodical subscriptions.

The East-West Center press stimulates the flow of books between East and West. It imports books from Asia and the Pacific, exports books to Asia and the Pacific, and publishes original works.

The Office of Public Affairs seeks to inform key audiences in the 26 countries in the Center's area of responsibility about the existence, identity, and progress of the Center, Office of Public Affairs works with the mass media, produces Center publications including the bimonthly "East-West Center Today," and coordinates special events.

Community Relations provides liaison between the Center and the local community. Arrangements for offering hospitality to East-West Center participants, for organization briefings, tours of the Center, and volunteer activities are made through this office.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 25, marked the 48th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia and it was observed by the Byelorussian Americans in Chicago on Sunday, March 27.

March 25 is the symbol of unity, freedom, independence, and democracy for the Byelorussian people everywhere; however, only in the free world can the Byelorussian people keep these ideals alive and continue their hope for a truly independent Byelorussia. Each year, on the anniversary of their independence day, the Byelorussians in the free world are reminded to strive in a united tradition to achieve the independence of the Soviet dominated Byelorussian nation.

I am happy to join with my colleagues in the House and Senate on commemorating this important day. We who know the blessings of liberty will continue our efforts to secure that liberty for all men.

The Millennium of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, this year is the millennium of Poland as a country. All over the world Polish people and their descendants are attending observances of this momentous occasion. It is at this time that a true perspective can be drawn on the enormous contributions that the Poles have made in the fight for freedom and the determination to fight alien domination.

Last year, a book, "The Mask of Warriors," by Marta Korwin-Rhodes, ACSW, Libra Publishers, Inc., was published. This remarkable book is an authentic historical document based on a diary the author made during the siege of Warsaw, September 1939. It has been named the book of the month—January 1966—by the Kosciuszko Foundation and has received favorable reviews in both England and the United States.

"The Mask of Warriors" presents a vivid, yet realistic approach to an understanding of how an open city was able to withstand the full impact on Hitler's onslaught for 4 weeks. To many, the siege of Warsaw in 1939 represented the first "No" to nazism, a stand for which Polish people sacrificed their lives.

Pervading this central theme is the phenomena of human endurance, courage, and devotion. The author, Marta Korwin-Rhodes, now a psychiatric social worker in Washington, D.C., and recently an American citizen, was formerly a concert pianist before World War II. Coming from a prominent Polish family, she described how the people of Warsaw behaved under stress. Not only those from whom one expects a certain level of behavior, but the little man, the poor and the rich, the noble and the petty crook.

"The Mask of Warriors" discloses facets of the Polish character which several periods of alien domination have never been able to erase. Today, Poland is under Communist domination, but the values of courage and loyalty to freedom are still cherished by the Polish people. This strong will to be free still prevails and will be an important factor in the years ahead.

To those of us who have friends and relatives in Poland this struggle for self-determination will continue until Poland is free. It is appropriate that in this millennium year that we renew our efforts to keep this hope alive. We are indebted to those persons like Marta Korwin-Rhodes whose contributions today do honor to those who have died for this cause of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I have permission to insert in the Record a biographical sketch on Mrs. Rhodes:

Biographical Sketch of Marta Korwin-Rhodes, Author of "The Mask of Warriors"

Life began for Marta Korwin-Rhodes on a great family estate in the Russian Ukraine. The family home was a fortress which had stood for centuries against the attacks of the Tartar hordes sweeping out of Asia like locusts. Life was secure for Marta Korwin-Rhodes. By the time she was 6 she spoke four languages fluently and could ride any horse.

When the flames of revolution swept the Ukraine in 1917, the family took refuge in Odessa. They were held hostages but miraculously survived the massacre of their class. When hostages were exchanged in 1920 their life was resumed anew in Poland. A few years before the outbreak of World War II, Marta Korwin-Rhodes, then Magdalena Lipkowska, gained prominence as a concert pianist and toured all over the world. Her last performance was with the Warsaw Philharmonic and she received a standing ovation for her playing of Bach's Concerto.

The Nazi attack on Poland in September 1939 ended her concert career. She became organizer of auxiliary hospitals and rescue teams. Taken prisoner of war, she engaged in underground work. Caught by the Gestapo, she escaped shortly before she was to be executed and made her way to England in 1940. Feeling that a tremendous effort in rehabilitation would be needed in Europe after the war, she prepared herself for this work. In the evenings she assisted the Ministry of Information, and her days were spent as a student in the London School of Economics and Political Science. Joining UNRRA she returned to Europe as a welfare team director. She was one of three Allied women who crossed the Rhine under enemy fire in March 1945, following General Patton's advance troops. Her work completed, she moved to Canada and later to the United States, always continuing her studies and writing in psychiatric social work. She is a member of the Academy of Certified Social Workers, and became an American citizen in April 1964.

Problems in Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, commercial loans increase the overheating of the economy. There are ample signs and signals to demonstrate this fact.

New plant investment, which was up last year, is projected for an even greater increase this year; up over 8 billion, which indicates an increase of over 10 percent of our gross national product. For 1966, there will be 80-plus billion in new plant expansion. Why does the first increase in interest rate fail to touch it? There are two very good reasons, both of them tax oriented.

First. A tax incentive credit of 7 percent which is well above the interest rise effect. Second. The Internal Revenue Service ruling of March 1965 allowing full deduction on Federal income tax returns for all loan reserves. This encourages banks to double 1965 commercial loan rates.

It is, therefore, evident that a further increase would only result in its being eventually nullified. Please, Mr. Martin, do not give us any more of your "interest increase meat-tax surgery." Our need is for more selective and precise instruments to do the delicate balancing operation.

May we suggest to the Congress the following: First. Decrease the investment tax credit to where it matches a prime interest rate, say, to 5½ percent. Second. Create a tax increase standby of 1 percent income tax and 2 percent corporate tax.

May we also suggest to the Federal Reserve the following: Decrease the money supply by requiring greater reserves from banks. This action will cause banks to use their available money to purchase Federal Reserve notes to soak up available surplus cash which is now going out in commercial loans.

As we have urged for an increase in money supply for expansion, it is only reasonable that we should call for a decrease to apply the appropriate "braking" action.

Forty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great honor and privilege to take part in the celebration exercises of Lithuania's 48th aniversary of independence that took place in my home city of Worcester, Mass., on February 20, last.

At this point, I would like to include an article appearing in the February 21, 1966, issue of the Worcester Telegram, describing the events that took place at this celebration, together with my address to the assembly and the remarks of attorney Anthony J. Miller of Worcester.

The article and addresses follow:

[From the Worcester Telegram, Feb. 21, 1966]

LITHUANIANS NOTE ANNIVERSARY

Thirty-one Lithuanian organizations of Worcester County sponsored a celebration yesterday in the Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club, 67 Vernon Street, marking the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Lithuania, now under Communist rule declared its independence February 16, 1918.

Local and State dignitaries addressing the group included Rev. John C. Jutt, pastor of St. Casimir's Church; Pranas Stanelis, president of the Worcester Council of Lithuanian Organizations; U.S. Representative Harold D. Donohue; Mayor Wells; District Attorney William T. Buckley; State Senator Vite J. Pigaga and Cochairman Anthony M. Seskevich.

Master of ceremonies was Richard J. Sarapas.

Lithuanian songs and folk dances were presented by several groups.

Performers included songstress Miss Nancy Miller, accompanied by Miss Olga Kershis; the Lithuanian Art Lovers Choral Group, directed by Zigmas Snarskis; and the Lithuanian Folk Dance Ensemble, under the direction of Miss Saulute Staska.

The year 1966 has been designated by Lithuanians in all parts of the world as Lithuanian Youth Year.

A national convention of all Lithuanian organizations in the United States will be held June 30 through July 4 in Chicago, Ill.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 20, 1966

Forty-eight years ago on February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared their independence. On that day she became a free independent democratic republic, marking the end of well over a century of persecution under a hostile foreign rule. There was cause for rejoicing and the future was faced with confidence. The people of Lithuania were happy and prosperous under their own sovereignty.

Today, however ,there is no free Lithuania, any more than there is a free Poland, a free Hungary or a free Czechoslovakia. All are completely crushed beneath the heel of the Russian tyrant.

For over 20 years following that day in February 1918, she enjoyed the right of freedom to worship, freedom of the press to speak or write what they thought, freedom to choose their representatives in government, freedom to start a business; freedom to come and go within and outside their country—all these and every other privilege which free men and women everwhere enjoy is now denied these unfortunate people. Like that of her two Baltic neighbors, Latvia, and Estonia, freedom and independence is today an empty symbol.

Little wonder then, that this day which should be one of rejoicing and celebration is filled with sadness for not only the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain, but also their friends and loved ones in this country.

Although we mourn her present plight, there is no cause for despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumphs of oppressors. Her Christian faith which at different times in history saved all of Europe from barbarism, is still with her todday. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. There is no power that can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

All over the world, Lithuanians are gathering at this time to renew their vows to work and strive for the independence of their homeland.

Here, in the United States, I earnestly believe that most Americans are becoming increasingly more concerned about the goals of communism, and Lithuania and other countries stand out in accusing testimony of the failure of freedom-loving nations to act in accordance with the principles for which our people have fought and died in two world wars.

In simple justice, our Government and the governments within the United Nations must insist that Lithuania and all of the other small nations shall be permitted to exercise their inalienable rights to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

The illustrious Lithuanian poet, Maronis, from 1862 to 1932, aroused his nation with his undying verses and instilled all Lithuanians with fervent love of their country, their lanugage, and their people.

He preached, through verses, the gospel of national resurrection and even today his words continue to be a source of spiritual strength, a battlecry, and a promise of ultimate victory.

Although Lithuanians are forbidden to sing their national anthem in their homeland on this 48th anniversary, I am sure that Lithuanians everywhere will be repeating these words of consolation and strength written by Maronis many years ago, when he said:

"Protect, O Almighty, our beautiful homeland,
The soil where we labor, where our fathers rest.
Thy fatherly mercy is boundless and lasting;
Hear us, Thine own children, long ages oppressed.
Foresake not our land, all Highest, while the fury rages;
For Thou art our hope and vision, now and through the ages."

All Americans, not just Lithuanian-Americans, share, I am certain these sentiments and look forward to the time when Lithuania will again take her rightful place with the free nations of the world. Let us pray together this afternoon that the Almighty will speed that happy day.

SPEECH OF ATTORNEY ANTHONY J. MILLER

As a Lithuanian-American it is a great privilege, indeed, to join with our esteemed Congressman, Harold D. Donohue, in this annual program celebrating the proclamation of independence and establishment of the Lithuanian Republic on February 16, 1918.

That fateful day marked the realization of a goal for which our Lithuanian people had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination—1795–1915—followed by German ocupation during the First World War.

No nation ever strove harder of waited longer for independence than did Lithuania.

For over two decades Lithuanian prospered and grew under its newly won independence. Then in the summer of 1940, the Soviets demanded immediate formation of a "friendly" government and occupied the country. A rigged election was held to produce a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

On August 8, at this request, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by the supreme Soviet in Moscow.

Since that unfortunate day our native Lithuania has seen her people executed and deported by the thousands, her land exploited and her independence ground under the heel of Communist terror.

The opposition of the Lithuanians to this Soviet aggression has been nothing short of heroic and provides an inspiring example to the rest of the world.

Our courageous nation has had a long history of fighting off aggressors and it is this tradition which has been one of the underlying strengths of our people in their brave resistance of Soviet tyranny.

I am sure that our fellow Americans and other peoples throughout the world stand in admiration of the stanch faith and undaunted valor of our Lithuanian people who are suffering so terribly under ruthless Soviet subjugation but who, in spite of tyrannical oppression, consistently maintain their spirit and their devotion to the Christian principles of freedom and democracy.

It is the obligation of all free peoples and the special obligation of Lithuanian-Americans to offer every possible encouragement to the persecuted people of Lithuania so that they will continue to be strengthened in their persevering resistance to Communist domination.

Those of us of Lithuanian descent are principally responsible for carrying on the day-to-day struggle to help our home land regain her freedom.

In these dark days when our native Lithuanian people are undergoing terrible persecutions we, who are enjoying freedom, must be ready and willing to make every sacrifice necessary to keep the spark of freedom and independence brightly burning in the hearts and minds of our besieged countrymen. We must convince our subjugated people that we, their free brothers, cannot truly enjoy our freedom unless and until our homeland is free again.

Also, as Lithuanian descendants, we must never cease in our efforts to rally all the free world governments to Lithania's just cause.

We must ever persist in asking and urging the United States and all other governments to bring every possible pressure of diplomatic appeal and public condemnation upon the Russian Kremlin to persuade them to release our beloved Lithuania from tyrannical bondage.

Let us then, on this occasion, solemnly pledge that neither our conscience nor the conscience of the free world will be permitted to rest until liberty and justice reign again in our free and indepent homeland.

Rent Subsidy Worth a Try

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the dramatic changes in urban life which are taking place today, the rapid deterioration of the inner city requires the massive programs contemplated in the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966. The problem is not only related to the low-income poverty areas of the city, it is also related to the higher percentage of senior citizens who through either circumstance or choice are compelled to maintain homes in the inner city.

The magnitude of the problem demands strong medicine. Neither the low-income family or the retired family can afford the expense of renovation and rehabilitation which is necessary to bring their accommodations up to decent, acceptable standards. It is obvious to the serious student of these urban problems that a rent supplement is one valid and necessary approach which should be tried. The following editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of today, March 28, 1966, supports a reasonable trial of the rent supplement program. We in Cleveland believe it to be a necessity. The editorial is as follows:

RENT SUBSIDY WORTH A TRY

Again President Johnson's rent supplement program has stumbled into a bog of opposition in the House.

Last October Congress refused to appropriate any money for it. That stopped it dead.

Now in a House Appropriations Subcommittee the asked for $30 million has been cut to $12 million. Not only that. Congressmen are hanging more hobbles on the program.

Before they render it impotent entirely, so that it can't fulfill its intended purpose, we think this rent subsidy should be attempted on at least a limited experimental basis.

It could help to find a new path out of the slum housing jungle. Nothing else has, very notably, so far.

Low-income families cannot be emancipated from slums simply by being chased out of them by Government bulldozers. They only take the slums along with them because they take their low-rent paying ability along with them to the new neighborhoods.

A $2,400 a year family can pay $50 a month rent. Move it to $100 a month housing and that family either (a) brings along a second poor family to crowd the dwelling; (b) drives the rent down until the landlord cannot afford to keep the house in good repair, or (c) starves and goes without proper clothing, but pays the fair market rent.

This plan of the administration's is to fill the gap between the poor family's rent limit (one-fourth of income) and the fair market rent.

That insures decent housing. Landlords of rent-subsidized tenants would keep up the homes instead of letting them deteriorate. That is the rationale of the program.

But beside cutting back funds, the House subcommittee has added new restrictions. It has added a proviso that the new housing contemplated must be built only where there are "community development" projects afoot.

This proviso keeps such housing out of suburbs generally. It lands the tenants, who were to be freed from poor, crowded areas, right back in urban redevelopment areas.

Already in the bill were rules allowing only the poorest families to be tenants and allowing only nonprofit corporations or housing cooperatives to be the landlords.

Any more restrictions and the experiment won't be worth trying.

The 48th Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marked the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. Public ceremonies celebrating this historic occasion were held in many cities throughout the United States.

Last Sunday such a ceremony was held in my district and it was my privilege to speak before an enthusiastic assemblage made up of friends of a free Byelorussia.

Mr. Speaker, by leave previously granted, I include the text of my remarks on Byelorussian Independence Day:

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

I welcome this opportunity to join with you in celebrating this 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

I am proud of the fact that this center of Byelorussian cultural and religious life is located in the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States.

The officers and members of the Cleveland Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association deserve public commendation for their work in promoting the just cause of the Byelorussian nation and for keeping faith with this historic event in the history of a submerged but not forgotten nation of Eastern Europe.

Your work is in harmony with the oldest, the richest, and the most fundamental political ideals of the United States.

As Americans, we are ever mindful that our country is the birthplace of the national independence movement.

Our Declaration of Independence is a powerful testament to mankind's right to be free and self-governing.

From the time it was issued, nearly two centuries ago, the political ideals it proclaimed have inspired people in many distant lands to secure for themselves the same blessings of liberty which we enjoy as a birthright.

It is these same political ideals which bind us in common cause with the people of Byelorussia and the peoples in all the captive nations of Europe and Asia.

There can be no doubt of a strong historic connection between Byelorussian Independence Day, which we celebrate today, and the political ideals of the United States.

During World War I, President Woodrow Wilson annunciated the principle of national self-determination as one of the major planks in his program to establish peace and world order.

That doctrine held then as it does today, that all people have a natural right to be master of their destiny, to freely choose for themselves the form of government best suited to assure their peace and happiness.

The powerful influence of that Wilsonian principle on the fate of empires and the future of self-government is known to every student of history.

It brought about the collapse of the old European empires, including the downfall of the Russian empire.

Nations long submerged in the grip of foreign rule and occupation rose up to demand their rightful place in the community of free nations.

It was in those circumstances that the people of Byelorussia declared their independence on March 25, 1918.

Within a matter of days a provisional constitution was adopted by a broadly representative council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

The provisional constitution guaranteed freedom of speech, of assembly, of conscience, the unviolability of the individual and the home, the right of labor to form unions and to strike for just cause, and equal protection of all citizens under law.

It is worth noting that all of these basic human rights had been denied the people under the absolute system of rule imposed upon them by the Russian czars.

Some 12 foreign nations extended de jure recognition to newly independent Byelorussia and her future in the community of nations seemed assured.

In less than 1 year the happy era of Byelorussian independence was ended by armed aggression launched by the Red regime which had seized control of the Russian nation.

Thus Byelorussia became the first victim of Communist aggression.

Other newly independent nations soon thereafter became the victims of that same aggression.

Today Byelorussia is occupied by a foreign power, foreigners are in control at all levels of the government imposed upon the people.

There is no self-government, there is no freedom of speech, of assembly, or of conscience; neither the individual nor the home is protected from the unchecked power of the State, labor has no rights and the law of Moscow is no more than the claims of the new imperialism of communism.

But aggression and foreign occupation has not been able to break the spirit of Byelorussion people or to weaken their aspirations for freedom and a restoration of their national independence.

They resist the foreign commissars today just as they resisted the rule of the tsars in past generations.

Their commitment to the cause of human freedom is unbreakable.

It is that spirit which forms the bond of common cause between them and the people of the United States.

That is why the people of Byelorussia are the proven allies of the United States in our struggle to establish a peaceful world in which all nations and people will be masters of their destiny.

Today—at this very hour—our Nation is standing up in defense of the principle of self-determination, the right of all peoples to freely chose the form of government best suited to assure their peace and happiness.

It is for that ideal, and that ideal alone, that we defend the people of free Vietnam.

In that distant land the organized forces of Communist aggression are attempting to impose by force of arms, the same system of terror and tyranny that today afflicts the Byelorussian homeland.

Forty-seven years ago it was open war and aggression which robbed the Byelorussian people of their national independence.

Today that same aggression carries out its evil purposes under the misleading banner of a so-called National Liberation Front in Vietnam.

But the objective is the same—to destroy human freedom and to impose a foreign dictatorship upon all of Vietnam.

No amount of camouflage or propaganda can alter this harsh fact of life.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, exposed the true nature of the conflict in Vietnam.

By unchallenged documentation he laid bare the conspiracy of Hanoi to subvert and occupy the entire Vietnam nation.

He established the so-called National Liberation Front as the military and terroristic arm of the Hanoi Communist regime.

He left no doubt that the conflict in Vietnam is a result of Communist aggression and that our purpose was to meet and turn back that aggression.

President Johnson has made it clear that we will stand by our commitments to defend the people of free Vietnam.

He has made a determined effort to negotiate a peaceful settlement of that war but the aggressors have responded with demands that amount to a complete surrender of freedom's cause.

Nevertheless, there now can be no question as to the cause of war in Vietnam, what we are fighting for and why Communist aggression must be turned back in southeast Asia.

Events of our lifetime have taught us that armed aggression unchecked can sart a chain reaction which could lead to all-out war on a global scale.

The appetite of the aggressor cannot be satisfied by immoral concessions.

The keepers of the peace have always been leaders of courage who made bold decisions on the side of freedom and justice when confronted with a crisis.

President Johnson has demonstrated that courage and has made the decisions to meet and stop aggression.

The goal of our Nation has always been a peaceful world, a world in which justice prevails over the affairs of nations and of mankind.

The journey toward that goal has never been easy, nor will it be easy in the future.

But we are committed to that goal and we must pursue it with the confidence that free men have always had when faced with adversity.

In the pursuit of that goal justice will come to the Byelorussian nation and to all other nations now deprived of their right to self-government.

Tyranny cannot long delay the demands of justice.

I salute the Byelorussian people for their commitment to the cause of human freedom.

Russia Is Still Against Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the State Department motivated line that the Soviet Union is a potential friend rather than foe is stimulating discussion across the country and requires precise rebuttal. A very concise and proper answer is found in an article which appeared in the Copley Press by its international authority, Dumitru Danielopol, which specifically punctures the State Department premise of Soviet friendship for the United States.

IN SPITE OF SINO-SOVIET SPLIT: RUSSIA IS STILL AGAINST US

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—One of the strangest and most persistent notions out of the Sino-Soviet split is that somehow this puts Russia on our side.

Despite the fact that Moscow and its European satellites are pouring arms and economic aid into North Vietnam, despite the fact that the Soviets have refused to cooperate in any effort to reconvene the Geneva Conference, despite the fact that Russian missiles, installed by Russian "technicians" have been killing American airmen, the notion lingers.

It has been expounded again by C. L. Sulberger, the well-known New York Times columnist.

"Russia and the United States," he writes, "are simultaneously both explicit enemies and implicit allies.

"The primordial concern of Soviet policy today is China," Sulberger says.

Because the United States is also "worried" about China, he argues, we must obviously be in the same camp with Russia. But facts belie this theory. The Soviet Union never ceased to support Communist aggression even when it was instigated by the Red Chinese.

The Soviets were present at the Tri-Continental Conference in Havana attended by 82 Communist parties from Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The final resolution of that Conference amounts to a declaration of war on free society, especially on the United States.

It proclaims that wars of independence Communist aggression are justified and "the use of every form of struggle necessary including armed battle" is acceptable.

It seems pertinent to recall what happened during our last "alliance" with Russia during World War II.

At a conference in wartime Oxford, the Spanish scholar and former Ambassador to Washington Savator de Madariage, called World War II a "three sided war."

It started with the Soviets in the Axis camp and ended with them on the allied side. But throughout, Josef Stalin played his own game and never lost sight of his goal—to win the world for communism.

At war's end, Stalin broke every treaty and agreement signed with the allies and ended the big winner with a European colonial empire reaching westward beyond Berlin.

The lesson was a bitter one, but many people still refuse to accept the fact that Russian communism is the sworn enemy of the West.

Even Kremlinologist George Kennan, who has sharply criticized U.S. policy in Vietnam, minces no words about alliance. Last February he told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that in case of a war between the United States and China, "the Soviet Union would aid China."

Any alliance between Russia and the United States would come after we became Soviet America.

Soviets Continue Persecution of Jews and Denial of Religious Freedom to Celebrate Passover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Passover is almost upon us once more. Millions of Jews the world over will again commemorate the liberation of their forefathers from Egyptian bondage. Unleavened bread, or matzoh, will be baked and eaten as it was in the wilderness in the time of Moses.

How glorious it is to be alive, free, and a citizen of America. For Jews and other citizens of the Republic, the cup of foreign suffering has been averted. We can sit down to our tables and participate in our respective religious celebrations in contentment and tranquillity. The blessings of liberty are ours, and we too often take them for granted.

We may worship God according to the dictates of our consciences, secure in the knowledge that they will not be questioned. We fear no knock on our door at night; no nocturnal trip to prison to be held incommunicado; no fear of a trial that is a mockery of justice, and whose verdict is preordained; no fear of concentration camp, or bleak, unrelieved imprisonment.

But for the oppressed of this world, the cup of affliction is forcefully held to their lips, and they are forced to drink ever so deeply. Jews of the Soviet Union cannot truly celebrate Passover. They cannot bake the matzoh they need to properly commemorate their history and celebrate their culture. They are forbidden to adequately teach the fruits of 6,000 years of civilization to their sons and daughters. If they attempt these activities on a full scale, they do so at their own peril. All liberty-possessing people cannot let this pass unquestioned, unrelieved, unopposed.

The Soviet Union is writing yet another page in the book of suffering of the people of Israel. Upon Babylonian captivity, Egyptian enslavement, Spanish expulsion and inquisition, crusades, and Dark Ages savagery, Eastern pogroms, Dreyfus injustice and excruciatingly horrible torments of Nazi genocide, they are cementing another gruesome stone. If Soviet policy does not change, their name shall forever be appended to this particular page of history; befouled with suppression and the crushing of the human spirit by dictatorship.

For it is ever true of dictatorship that it cannot abide full, free expression of religion. Open worship as an expression of individuality blinds the eyes of those who thrive in the darkness of totalitarianism, casting light they continually attempt to extinguish. Yet there are those, who, at risk of all the horrors of a police state, keep the flame of religious freedom alive and alight. We must let them know they are not alone. We must let them see the glow emanating from America.

For here the Jew, along with all other refugees from the oppressors of the world, lives in sunlight. Here we have intertwined the Judeo-Christian ethic with the sublime outpourings of Jefferson. It would ill behoove America to stand silent while Jews of the Soviet Union are deprived of their birthright as human beings.

For their cup of agony of the spirit does run over. They are a living reminder to us that so long as a single human being is denied the right to worship exactly as he pleases, the rest of us live and practice our faiths in perpetual jeopardy. What is even partially denied to one is potentially a complete denial to all.

Let us again remind the Soviets of this monstrous injustice. Let us tell them once again that we regard their actions toward Russia's Jews as a denial of the fruits of 6,000 years of civilization. It must not lie fallow and unused. The enforced silence of these people is as eloquent as any wail of torment. There are nonphysical tortures that crush the human spirit as surely as a gas chamber snuffs out a life.

Let the Soviets remember that free men and those who yearn to be free have survived many burners—both of books and of people. Attilas, Hitlers, and Stalins come and go like quicksilver ephemerally flitting across the sands of time. Their mark is that of a hole left behind by a finger stuck into the water of a pond. Their trail is that of the beast. Their monuments are ruins. When mankind does remember them, it is only with disgust, not reverence.

The suffering of one who yearns to be free is the suffering of all. It is apropos that we say this as the Passover approaches, commemorating the escape of an entire people from bondage at any cost. For men have shown again and again that they will pay any price for liberty. The battle for that liberty is no less today than the struggle was then. We have not forgotten. We shall not forget. One day the Jews of the Soviet Union shall have the freedom God wills for them.

At this time I again call upon the Government of the Soviet Union to grant complete religious freedom to its citizens. Freedom on this Passover to bake matzohs, to observe the Passover properly, to educate rabbis and their children. Let this Passover and subsequent ones be completely free.

For as long as one soul writhes in the mental or physical agony of totalitarian suppression of his body or spirit; as long as one human being is deprived of freedom and yearns for it; liberty will fight furiously, endlessly, for life and full expression.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	2500 Virginia Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Long of Louisiana, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, McGee, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 113 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

National Defense Education Act Loans Needed for "Package" Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have spoken on several recent occasions about the need for retaining the full authorized $190 million in National Defense Education Act loans when appropriations are made, rather than eliminating them or compromising with only partial funding as the administration now wishes to do. I have cited a number of letters from Indiana institutions testifying to the specific need in their own experience.

Among the arguments presented by college finance officers there has been reference in several instances to the manner in which the contemplated change to private guaranteed loans under the Higher Education Act will have an adverse effect upon the "package" concept embodied in title IV. The most detailed letter I have received on this point is that of Norman E. Beck, director of student financial aid, Ball State University, Muncie, Ind.

Mr. Beck writes:

> It will be very difficult to use the guaranteed loan program in developing a package award for a student.

Why? Because of the stress on "need" in order to qualify for work-study assistance and grant aid. The National Defense Education Act operations allow the college to have a much closer control over the supervision of the financial aid provided.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Beck's letter may appear in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY,
Muncie, Ind., March 17, 1966.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Since it has become apparent that the national defense student loan is to be phased out in favor of the guaranteed loan program, as a practicing financial aid officer, I feel that it is imperative that some amendments be made to the guaranteed loan program. When the provisions of the guaranteed loan program were enacted, they were not done so with the idea in mind that they were to carry the major functions presently assigned to the national defense student loan program.

According to the letter and spirit of the student financial aids section of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the colleges are to package aid so that the recipient receives a grant, loan, and job sufficient to meet his needs. The need factor is definitely emphasized in both the educational opportunity grant and the work-study section of the act. In addition to the Federal program, the State and institutional programs are based upon the concept of need because of the influence of the college scholarship service, college compact, Midwest Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, and individual financial aid officers. It will be very difficult to use the guaranteed loan program in developing a package award for a student.

If, for instance, a student received a $400 grant under the Higher Education Act of 1965, a $400 guaranteed loan, and a $350 job, the student could then go to the bank and borrow up to $1,000 even though $400 was recommended. As soon as the student borrows $1,000, I must write to him and inform him that his grant has been withdrawn as well as a portion of the work-study job offered to him. More control is needed by the colleges.

From my conversations with bankers and other financial aid officers, I understand that many banks plan to continue to impose their own regulations as they now do under the United Student Aid Funds, Inc., and State programs. By this I mean that some will not loan to C students, some to married students, some to freshmen, and so forth. If this persists, we cannot be consistent in our work with students.

In addition to the mechanical difficulties involved in this loan, I feel that there are some very definite philosophical questions that need to be answered. If the individual colleges are going to be required to come forth with the matching dollars, every dollar put into this program will, of course, decrease our overall ability to meet the student's needs under the existing programs that we have. As a result of a no need test on this loan, there will be a number of dollars going to students who could attend college without the loan which will deny admission to students who are not as fortunate. If a State authority or the Federal Government itself provides matching dollars, I find it very difficult to rationalize the awarding of loans to students who could get through school without this aid and at the same time phasing out the National Defense Student Loan because of lack of funds.

In short, I believe that the guaranteed loan plan is a legitimate answer to the need for additional loan moneys to support the cost of college in the United States. I am opposed, however, to the exclusion of the need factor in the processing of these loans. I feel that the Higher Education Act, because of the exclusion of the need factor for the guaranteed loan plan, is based on two opposing philosophies. If we are to combine all sources that are available to us to meet the needs of the student, we cannot do this with any degree of efficiency and economy under the law as it now exists.

Sincerely yours,
BALL STATE UNIVERSITY,
NORMAN E. BECK,
Director, Student Financial Aids.

P.S.—Please refer to our letter of February 28, 1966, for further information.

Commissioner Robert Bartley Accepts the Speaker Sam Rayburn Gold Medal in Behalf of the Late Speaker Sam Rayburn at Bonham, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my wife and I were very pleased to be present in Bonham, March 18, when the Speaker Sam Rayburn Gold Medal "for services rendered to the people of the United States" was presented to his two beloved sisters, Mrs. W. A. Thomas and Mrs. S. E. Bartley, in behalf of and in the presence of the members of the distinguished Rayburn family. Also present were faithful former employees, public officials, and many friends of the late Speaker. Attorney Bustle Cole of Bonham was master of ceremonies. Rev. William Cheatham gave the invocation. The welcome address was given by City Commissioner Gene Danner. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, who sponsored the legislation, eloquently reviewed the honors paid, recognition given and accomplishments of Speaker Rayburn. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Robert A. Wallace referred to the many virtues of Speaker Rayburn and the benefits derived therefrom by the people of our Nation. The benediction was given by Rev. Jack Carson.

The impressive presentation of the medal was made by Miss Eva Adams, Director of the Mint, at the beautiful and historic Rayburn Library. The medal is only the 11th of its kind authorized by Congress for some one other than a President of the United States. The occasion was a most inspiring, meaningful, and uplifting one. I commend the reading of the remarks of Commissioner Bartley to each of you. Commissioner Bartley ably and accurately described some of the ways by which Speaker Rayburn reached the many sound decisions for which he was and is noted. His statement was particularly significant to my wife and me because of our long association with this highly respected and very remarkable man. I served in Congress with Speaker Rayburn about 19 years and was on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which he had been chairman.

Speaker Rayburn possessed an abundance of great qualities. He was honest, able, and fearless. He was patient, studious, cautious, and courteous. Never was he one to waste words. One of his great qualities was the directness with which he could approach a question or an issue. One reason he could do this no doubt was because of a faculty Commissioner Bartley referred to in his concluding sentence:

> Renowned as a great Speaker, one key to his success is that he was a great listener.

Acceptance Remarks of Robert T. Bartley, Nephew of the Late Sam Rayburn and a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, March 18, 1966

It is my happy privilege to accept this medal on behalf of the family of Sam Rayburn and to serve as the conduit to its permanent home, the Sam Rayburn Library.

I would like to emphasize one point made by Secretary Bob Wallace. You will recall he said: "Here in Bonham, Sam Rayburn continually sought opinions of people in all walks of life to help guide his thought and direct his actions."

Sam Rayburn had his own Gallup poll before anybody ever heard of Gallup. When the word got out that "Mr. Sam will be home this weekend," relatives and friends from all over the Fourth District dropped whatever other plans they had and would drop by and say "hello."

Those of us in Washington fortunate enough to be close to him could sometimes anticipate when he might simply say "Get me a reservation." We could, as he would have said "Feel a trip coming on." No one ever thought—or would have dared to ask "to where?" All knew, that if by train, it was Denison, or if by air, Love Field.

The clues to these sometimes apparent sudden trips had a familiar pattern.

As an important issue began to stir—as more and more leaders in Government or in industry and commerce just had to see Mr. Sam or the Speaker for a few minutes—as these pressures began to build and as the issues began to sharpen and the time for decision grew nearer and if one could catch a fleeting wistful look in his eyes, we would start listening for those welcome words "Get me a reservation."

I say they were welcome words because we knew that when he returned to Washington, he would return with his decision and would be ready, willing, and able to assume the leadership. And when he started to lead, the pressure let up and the people he wanted to see started showing up and things began to move.

What caused this wonderful thing that happened to him—and to the country—on these brief visits to Bonham?

In his words: "Down home they'll give it to you with the bark off." When he'd come back he'd say "My people think this is the right thing to do." He was looking for what they thought was best for our country. By the time he got off the train or plane in Washington, he had his decision. That is the wonderful thing that happened on those visit back home with his folks.

Renowned as a great Speaker, one key to his success is that he was a great listener.

Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this month Americans of Greek origin and Greek people throughout the world are celebrating the 145th anniversary of Greek independence from the brutal domination of the Ottoman Empire.

Ancient Greece might well be termed the cradle of American liberty. Western concepts of representative government and the rule of law were originated by the ancient Greeks. It was in classical Greece that the great political theories antagonistic to tyranny which undergird so much of the political change of our own time were first formulated. Apostles of freedom everywhere still look to ancient Greece for inspiration and knowledge.

Modern Greece has fought communism longer than any other member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. When the Germans were forced out of Greece in World War II Communist bands began moving in. But with U.S. help the tide was turned against the Communists, and Greece has become a bulwark of the NATO alliance.

It is a privilege for me to join with all of our Americans of Hellenic descent and indeed all citizens of the free world in celebrating the 145th anniversary of Greek independence.

Don't Muzzle the Watchdog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office has been an effective arm of Congress for over 40 years.

Frequently this agency is referred to as the "Watchdog of the Treasury". Without question, the GAO has perhaps made mistakes, but by and large, this agency has served the Congress well. Efforts are being made to "disarm" this Federal agency and, therefore, the editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News yesterday, March 28, will be of interest to Members.

The editorial follows:

SAVE THE GAO

For 45 years the General Accounting Office (headed by the Comptroller General of the United States) has been one of the best friends the taxpayers ever had.

This office is responsible only to Congress. It has broad power to investigate and audit agencies of the Federal Government. It has issued thousands of reports and saved or recovered many millions of taxpayer dollars. Its very presence is a guard against waste.

Now suddenly the House Government Operations Committee is out to cripple GAO's usefulness to the taxpayers.

This committee already has pressured the former Acting Comptroller into agreeing to restrictions in his reports of overspending, especially in the Defense Department. It accomplished this before the new Comptroller General, Elmer B. Staats, could take office.

The committee objects to "critical words or phases" in GAO reports, to identifying contractors, to making public its reports before Government officials or contractors have seen them, to making so many reports.

In short, the committee has buckled to complaints of the very people Congress created the GAO to investigate. It proposes to put shackles on the GAO.

Fortunately, not every Congressman agrees to this brazen program which would diminish GAO's effectiveness and cover up information the public has a right to know.

Republican members of the Government Operations Committee filed bristling dissents and Senator John J. Williams, of Delaware, a one-man investigating agency himself, is up in arms.

In its report, the House Committee begins by calling the GAO the "watchdog for Congress," agrees it is an "indispensable" source of information for Congress, says it has done an "outstanding" job, and so on. But the net of the report is to quiet the bark of the "watchdog," reduce its "indispensable" role and hamper its ability to do an "outstanding" job.

We hope the outcry from other Members of Congress—and from the taxpayers—will rattle the Capitol dome, and force the House Government Operations Committee into red-faced, hightailed retreat.

Proposed Constitutional Amendment to Restore Prayer, on a Voluntary Basis, to the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], has introduced on behalf of himself and other Members of the Senate, including myself, a constitutional amendment to restore prayer, on a voluntary basis, to the public schools. When he announced his intentions of doing so, previous to the introduction of the amendment, there was an immediate and overwhelming favorable public response. His efforts are welcomed by those across the country who share the opinion that the Supreme Court's rulings in this field infringe upon the guaranty of religious freedom contained in the first amendment and who are concerned about the moral atmosphere in our country.

As one evidence of the public response, the Greenville, S.C., News for Sunday, March 27, 1966, contains an editorial entitled "Greatest Good of Greatest Number." This editorial endorses the efforts of Senator Dirksen and the proponents of this amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GREATEST GOOD OF GREATEST NUMBER

Senator Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, has started that all-out fight he promised in a recent letter to the editor to restore prayer, on a voluntary basis, to the public schools.

As he said then, it is ridiculous for the House and Senate to start each legislative day with a prayer to Almighty God for his guidance and protection and to forbid children to pray in the same manner in school.

He has introduced legislation in the Senate which would nullify the Supreme Court decision by means of a constitutional amendment. It really amounts to a reasonable compromise between the forbidden, State-prescribed prayers and the right of the nonbelieving minority not to be subjected to what was to them objectionable.

If his amendment prevails in Congress and is ratified by three-fourths of the States, devotionals and prayer in the public schools will be a matter of community and individual choice.

And why not, if that's the way the majority wants it? The far-reaching and celebrated case was brought by a family of atheists who have been pretty well discredited by now.

The Supreme Court protected the rights of atheists to be free from public prayer by denying the right of the majority to engage in public prayer.

In most instances, the prayers were acceptable to any religious sect, to any person believing in God, be he Roman Catholic, Protestant, Jew, or almost anyone other than an atheist.

And how many genuine atheists are there? And how many of these in good conscience really want to interfere with the practice of religion by the believers?

Sometimes we think the atheists and the agnostics are, secretly, a bit envious of those who can accept on faith what the atheist or agnostic claims to reject on intellectual grounds. We often detect a hint of bitter plaintiveness, something almost pitiable in their protestations.

In both the legal and moral sense, Senator Dirksen and those who stand with him are doing nothing more nor less than seeking to grant to the majority the same kind of right that the Supreme Court by its decree granted to the minority.

The "rights of man" that the radical and violent revolutionaries proclaim, wherein the individual is supreme and absolute, is a detached and unattainable ideal. Efforts to attain it, with the French Revolution which followed our own and went on to excesses as a classic example, lead to anarchy and chaos in which no man is truly free.

To be free, a society must discipline itself for the same reasons that the undisciplined individual is not truly free. This requires not conformity, but reasonable compromise to adjust the rights of the individual to accommodate the collective rights of society.

Senator Dirksen's amendment is reasonable and justifiable of itself. The principal on which it is based is even more far reaching and important.

It is the essence of democracy in that it, in fact if not entirely in the narrowest legal sense, seeks to establish equality in the broadest possible terms.

City May Employ "Eye in the Sky"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable ingenious new police technique is under study by the city of Lakewood, Calif. It is the use of helicopters in place of radio cars for routine police patrol of the community.

This is the same city which, in 1954, pioneered what has become known as the Lakewood plan. Under this plan, rather than a city setting up its own police department, fire department, and many other service functions together with all the expense and administrative overhead involved, it simply contracts for them with another governmental body. In Lakewood's case, these contracts are with the county of Los Angeles. A total of 26 communities in Los Angeles County now follow the Lakewood plan.

The new police technique under consideration also will be handled under contract with Los Angeles County, specifically with the sheriff's department, and is described in the following item which appeared in the March-April issue of Lakewood's Newsletter circulated for the information of its citizens:

CITY MAY EMPLOY "EYE IN THE SKY"

"This City Patrolled by Aircraft" may soon become a familiar sign for persons entering the Lakewood city limits. In a presentation made to the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance in Washington, D.C., Mayor Robert W. Baker, Vice Mayor George Nye, Jr., and Sheriff Peter Pitchess requested $184,620 in Federal funds to test a revolutionary concept in law enforcement patrol. The new program utilizes helicopters in place of radio cars for routine patrol, and would provide a fast, new striking force for crime patrol in Lakewood.

A joint effort of the city of Lakewood, sheriff's department and the Aircraft Division of Hughes Tool Co., the program would keep a helicopter, piloted by Sheriff's personnel, flying over the city 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. In addition to the airborne helicopter, two additional helicopters will be available on a standby basis. Advanced design techniques now make the use of helicopters feasible for aerial patrol and will greatly improve emergency response capabilities.

If this unique law enforcement proposal is adopted, the total cost of the 1-year experiment will be approximately $340,611. The city of Lakewood will contribute $7,500 of this amount for various markings to assist the aircraft; and the sheriff's department will provide the personnel for the project at an estimated cost of $73,000.

Helicopters will be furnished by the Hughes Tool Co., at an estimated expense of $74,880. The balance of $184,620 represents the Federal grant which has been requested.

After extensive experimentation and cost analysis, tests will be conducted to determine how standards of service might be affected if the number of radio cars augmenting the air patrol were reduced.

The elimination of one patrol unit would offset a major portion of the helicopter cost and greatly increase effective coverage.

Real Economic Wealth Is Not Easily Achieved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, there appeared in the March 3, 1966, edition of the Casper, Wyo., Star-Tribune, an article by William D. Pardridge, whose works have appeared in newspapers of several States.

Mr. Pardridge is a writer of economics. He has undertaken the ambitious project of writing at least one article for the press of each of the 50 States. His long-range plan is to have these articles published in book form as a graphic reminder of what economic inequities—the name of his series of articles—are all about.

In his Wyoming article, Mr. Pardridge opines:

> Whoever says the United States today is rich enough to be a perpetual Santa Claus at home and at the same time be sheriff to the rest of the world, is either a dilettante, a dreamer, or a plain fool.

With that comment I can hardly disagree nor can I disagree with the substance of Mr. Pardridge's comments on economics as they were carried in the Casper, Wyo., Tribune.

I ask, Mr. President, that the article to which I have alluded be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REAL ECONOMIC WEALTH IS NOT EASILY ACHIEVED

(Editor's Note.—The author of the following article is a former editor of a Washington magazine, Air Affairs. He is a Chicago University graduate student working on a Ph. D. It is one of 50 articles Pardridge has written which will be published in book form after inclusion in the Congressional Record.

(The article published here today is carried as an interesting approach to governmental financial problems. The economic theories presented do not necessarily and in their entirety have the endorsement of this newspaper.)

(By William D. Pardridge)

Money is the root of all economic evil. Believe it.

It can easily be legislated into existence. But real economic wealth, which all money represents, must be earned the hard way—by working.

Yet people, especially politicians, think it is OK to appropriate a hundred million here and a billion dollars there to pay for a worthy project. Just like that.

Money is simply a highly efficient, measurable system to distribute the goods and services we produce with our factories and our hands and minds.

Things would be far different in our economy if people, especially grassroots folk, were to think in terms of governments appropriating not so many paper dollars but appropriating so much of our goods and services to pay for that worthy project.

Instead of Congress passing a law authorizing the President to spend $60 billion for Vietnam, the moon race, and general defense, have Congress enact a law appropriating 9 percent of our gross national product—or standard of living—for the military chiefs.

That wouldn't sit so well back home—particularly where the retail sales tax already takes 3, 4, and 5 percent of a worker's take-home pay.

Sure the worker spends all his wages—for prices had to rise to make the total amount of goods and services produced equal the total amount of money put on the counter to buy those very goods and services.

If more and more people are producing services—both needed and not needed—and fewer and fewer people are producing goods, as is now the case, then goods prices must must rise bcause there is more money around to buy a smaller total amount of goods produced.

Increased industrial productivity merely slows down the process of imbalance between goods produced and the artificially expanded consumer money and credit available to buy those goods. It does not necessarily make the two equal.

Uneconomic price rises caused this way bring on general inflation because there is constantly more money and consumer credit—available almost for the asking—to buy a diminishing amount of goods.

Per capita goods go down, and per capita money income goes up. In such a situation—and we're in it today—prices have got to rise.

No amount of big Government mumbo jumbo can prevent this upward snowballing of more money buying fewer goods.

But big Government regimentation can order a freezing of wages and prices. Down this road lies the political ruin not of the bosses but of the people.

And the sleepy cohesive big business community also will have had it. That's for sure.

Important know-it-alls every day say, "We're rich enough to have both the welfare state at home and enough guns and men overseas to fight all of Asia."

In dollars and deficits we are easily led to believe this. But in terms of economic wealth—actual goods and services—we can today afford neither.

When the bloated GNP is reduced to real per capita income—which slippery economists won't do outside their own smoke-filled rooms—then it becomes obvious that the American economy is suffering from severe malnutrition.

Whoever says the United States today is rich enough to be a perpetual Santa Claus at home and at the same time be sheriff to the rest of the world, is either a dilettante, a dreamer, or a plain fool.

Mister, which one are you?

The Population Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a concise presentation of the world population and food problem has been issued by the Chase Manhattan Bank in its Public Affairs Bulletin of February 18, 1966. The study discusses the many factors involved in world population growth and what it portends for the future. As the article points out, it is a mathematical certainty that a catastrophe will happen if immediate and effective action is not taken. We as a nation must fact the challenge and join with other nations in seeking a solution.

I have introduced a resolution, along with other Members of the House, proposing that a World Food Study and Coordinating Commission be established to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting the world food and agricultural needs and to evaluate the future role of the United States in meeting the problem. One of the major concerns is the coordination of our efforts with those of other nations, and I am hopeful that the Committee on Agriculture will give consideration to this aspect of the problem.

The Chase Manhattan Bank article follows:

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION

By the time you finish reading this bulletin, 1,000 babies will have been born into the world. In the same period, less than half that many people will die.

Every 24 hours world population is increasing by about 170,000, each year by nearly 65 million. Every 3 years, in other words, world population is growing by the equivalent of the entire population of the United States.

This is the population explosion—the greatest storm ever to sweep over the human race.

It is a rush toward potential disaster because population growth is outrunning food production. The chairman of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation said recently: "The catastrophe is not something that may happen; on the contrary it is a mathematical certainly that it will happen (unless action) is immediately forthcoming." Says James Reston of the New York Times: "Never in history has so obvious and significant a fact been so widely evaded."

It took man all of recorded time until the 1840's to reach a world population of 1 billion. It took less than a century to add the second billion, 30 years to add the third. At the present growth rate, another 3.5 billion people will be added in the remaining 34 years of this century, bringing the total to about 7 billion. World population, in short, will double by the year 2000 and will double every 35 years thereafter if the current growth rate remains constant. But the rate is increasing.

THE PARADOX OF PROGRESS

What accounts for this sudden population explosion? There is tragic irony in the answer. The population explosion, which threatens every aspect of life as we know it, and perhaps our survival itself, is the result of progress.

Throughout most of man's precarious existence, the number of births did not significantly exceed the number of deaths. But, especially in the last few decades, the balance between births and deaths has been drastically altered by a drop in the death rate. The population equilibrium has been shattered.

Three factors, more or less in historical sequence, contributed to the drop in death rates.

1. Higher living standards through technological advances and increased productivity. This was accompanied by the development of relatively powerful and stable central governments that made for longer periods of peace.

2. Progress in sanitation, personal hygiene, and the purification of food and water, resulting in the virtual elimination of a number of parasitic, infectious, and contagious diseases.

3. Recent great strides by medicine and science in the development of antibiotics, vaccines, disinfectants, and insecticides.

Initially these developments had their greatest impact in the more advanced countries. But population growth did not reach truly explosive proportions until recent years when the advances of medicine and science were made available in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

While death rates were plummeting, the birth rate in these areas has remained constant at about 40 per 1,000 persons (compared with between 17 and 23 per 1,000 in the more economically advanced areas). Thus by the year 2000, India may have 1 billion people; China perhaps 1.5 billion; Latin America more than 600 million.

THE PERIL IN THE YEARS AHEAD

Even in the United States, the most advanced country on earth, the prospect of 300 million people by the year 2000—100 million more than now—threatens serious strains on housing. transportation and other facilities, and on educational, medical and recreational resources.

How much greater is the problem for countries with a fraction of our wealth and productive capacity, with far greater population density already, and with populations growing at perhaps double the rate of our own?

Economic growth rates in such countries, often superficially impressive, are meaningless when measured against population increases. In some countries of Latin America, currently the area of most rapid population expansion, economic growth turns out actually to be a decline in per capita terms. India has managed to expand its gross national product, but with its population increasing by 10 million annually, the process may soon go into reverse.

With world population increasing about 2 percent annually, world food production is increasing only 1 percent. While life expectancy is increasing, nutrition levels in many areas are actually declining. The National Council of Churches of Christ recently estimated that 2 billion people (two-thirds of the world's population) now live in areas of nutritional deficiency and that half of these people "suffer daily or recurrent crippling hunger."

The problem, minimally, is to redress the current imbalance in world population growth and food production rates. Short of deliberately permitting the death rate to go up again—hardly a "solution" that would recommend itself to any civilized person—there are only two possible approaches:

1. A marked decrease in the birth rate.
2. A major increase in food production.

POPULATION CONTROL

It is impossible to discuss population control without acknowledging that the issue is controversial. The Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, and Mormon churches, and some Orthodox Jewish and fundamentalist Protestant leaders have all expressed reservations or outright opposition to certain forms of birth control. Other groups in many lands and cultures have proscriptions and taboos—moral, religious, tribal—on the subject. Yet it should be borne in mind that most of them do not exclude any and all attempts to limit family size.

The late Pope Pius XII said, "We affirm the legitimacy and, at the same time, the limits—in truth very wide—of a regulation of offspring which * * * is compatible with the law of God. One may even hope that science will succeed in providing this licit method with a sufficiently secure basis." The church accepts the "rhythm" method in marital relations that takes advantage of naturally recurring sterile periods. During the recent ecumenical council, Pope Paul VI charged a special commission to make a study, "as wide and profound as possible," of the "extremely grave" world population problem.

Moreover, religious and moral scruples are only one of the factors—and by no means the main one—that complicate the problem of population control. More important is the low level of education, or complete illiteracy, and the abysmal living standards in areas where the population problem is most acute.

Among the many ironies of the population problem is that birth rates tend to drop as the level of education and standard of living rise. The greater value and possibilities of life seem to strengthen the motivation for limiting offspring.

In the underdeveloped nations, such motivation is weak or nonexistent among much of the population. One specific problem, for example, is that the peoples in those areas have long been accustomed to bringing large numbers of children into the world because the high death rate meant only one or two might survive to contribute to the family welfare. Many cling to the same belief today. They recognize neither the fact of the sharp decline in death rate nor its consequences: namely, that additional children, far from representing economic security, may well guarantee destitution.

But even where the desire to limit family size presumably exists, and birth control information and devices have been made available, results often have been discouraging. There is usually too little understanding of the reproductive process, and living conditions are too primitive, for consistent and effective adoption of the prescribed measures.

Nevertheless, many persons are convinced that birth control programs—including intensive research into possible new and simpler methods that do not require repetitive procedures—offer the only real hope of averting a world population catastrophe. The attitude of the U.S. Government, in fact, has undergone a change on this question. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower said recently:

"There is no real progress or security to a nation which, with outside help, raises its productive capacity by 2 percent a year while the population rises 3 percent. When I was President, I opposed the use of Federal funds to provide birth control information to countries we were aiding. * * * I still believe we should not make birth control programs a condition of our foreign aid but we should tell receiving nations how population growth threatens them and what can be done about it."

A similar view apparently led President Johnson to ask the United Nations last summer to "act on the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth $100 invested in economic growth," and to call in his last two state of the Union messages for cooperation with nations seeking to check population growth.

In a special message last week, the President asked Congress to authorize a food-for-freedom program and to finance it with a $3.3 billion appropriation in each of the next 5 fiscal years. Under the program, food aid to needy nations would be stepped up and U.S. farm production increased to wage "a worldwide war on hunger."

Theoretically there are enough known and exploitable food resources on earth today to provide adequate diets for the $7 billion or so persons forecast for the year 2000. Improved agricultural techniques, intensive use of fertilizers, and the introduction of machinery in areas where agricultural practices are still primitive could greatly increase the yield of acreage already under cultivation. While the amount of potentially arable land has been constantly diminishing, there are still stretches of jungle, forest and even desert throughout the world that could be brought under cultivation.

FOOD SUPPLY PROSPECTS

Moreover, there are untapped food resources in the sea. Recently for example, U.S. Government scientists disclosed that they had developed a palatable and nutritious "fish flour" from parts and species of fish heretofore regarded as inedible. Studies indicate that if only the unharvested fish in U.S. coastal waters were transformed into flour it would provide the normal protein requirements for 1 billion persons for 300 days at a base production cost of half a cent a person a day.

But potential is one thing, realization another. Effective exploitation of the world's food resources to meet the needs in the years ahead will require huge investments of capital. Capital is produced only by economies in which savings and surplus are possible. In much of the world, as we have seen, population growth is undermining economic progress to the point where little or no disposable capital is available.

The conclusion is plain. There will have to be large infusions of capital in the underdeveloped areas from the developed nations. Whether in the form of private investment, government funds, or a combination of both, the infusion will be essential to prime the pump—in this case a "pump" on which millions of lives literally depend.

The challenge is not simply a humanitarian one. Long before the current imbalance between population growth and food supply reaches the point of mass starvation, social upheaval and cataclysm on a scale hitherto unimagined are inevitable. The population explosion packs far more potentially destructive power than anything the nuclear physicists are ever likely to devise.

The reward for meeting the test may be new vistas for mankind. In the words of the late Adlai E. Stevenson:

"Perhaps the necessity of confronting the population dilemma will finally usher in the brotherhood of man."

National Future Homemakers of America Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I join with over 600,000 members of the Future Homemakers of America in celebrating National FHA Week, March 27 through April 2.

Clearly, this is an age of youth, and it is comforting to know that the Future Homemakers of America is leading young women in wholesome, constructive pursuits which allows them the opportunity of seriously preparing themselves for responsible adult citizenship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fact sheet concerning National Future Homemakers of America Week.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA

National FHA Week, March 27 through April 2, will be observed by more than 600,000 high school youth across the Nation who are members of the Future Homemakers of America.

In this age of constant change and challenge, in this era of too much disregard for tradition and precedent, in this environment of population explosion and increased pressures, the need for new patterns in home life is widely accepted.

The Future Homemakers of America in 11,000 chapters in secondary schools scattered around the United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and in American Army post schools, are serious minded, community spirited, fun loving youngsters who are concerned about the responsiblities of the future and are conscientiously doing something about it. These are the future mothers, wives, teachers, jobholders, voters' and opinion molders of this great land of ours.

The success stories of former future homemakers who are now adult community leaders of this country attest to the strong impact the FHA experiences have had on the development of their own families, their effectiveness as homemakers, and their responsibility as good citizens.

This national youth organization of home economics students in junior and senior high schools provides opportunities for developing individual and group initiative in planning and carrying out activities related to today's complicated science of homemaking. As part of a large national organization of teenagers concerned with good home and family life each girl grows through new experiences, new views, and new friends.

National FHA Week this year will find the 11,000 local chapters spotlighting activities and projects concerned with a 4-year national program of work. This program of work which guides them is an ambitious one. Its objectives are to help each member recognize her abilities, strive for their full development, and participate actively in family, community, and world improvement projects.

To further these objectives the elected youth officers of FHA developed nine projects which stress individual development; emphasize mental and physical health; encourage serious consideration in choosing and training for useful careers; develop codes of ethics, morals, and manners; further understanding of people of all heritages, customs and beliefs; promote appreciation of all family members and their abilities and problems; teach selective spending; inculcate citizenship responsibilities; and encourage using leisure time for activities benefical to the individual and society.

The Future Homemakers of America was founded in 1945 as an incorporated, nonprofit organization, supported by membership dues. It was the outgrowth of various State and local clubs of high school home economics students which were known by different names and had no unified program. By the end of that first year the national organization had a membership of just under 100,000 in some 2,500 chapters. By the end of the second year, membership had almost doubled, and now as the Future Homemakers of America begin their 21st year they count well over 600,000 members in more than 11,000 chapters.

Twelve national you officers, elected yearly by the FHA members, direct the national program of wrok and plan and preside over the annual national meetings. Home economics teachers in the high schools serve as local chapter advisers. Members of the State supervisory staff for home economics education serve as State FHA advisers.

The Future Homemakers of America is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association. National headquarters are located in the Office of Education.

Statement of Mr. Francis H. Gleason on Behalf of the Shoe Manufacturing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent statement in part of Mr. Francis H. Gleason, president, J. F. McElwain Co., Nashua, N.H., before the House Agriculture Subcommittee concerning the acute shortage of hides in this country. I think it is clear to anyone reading this testimony that the Department of Commerce took appropriate action in limiting exports of hides to assure an adequate supply of such a scarce commodity for the domestic shoe manufacturing industry and to stabilize an inflationary situation. Failure to have done this would have surely cost the American consumer added dollars in the purchase of shoes.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS H. GLEASON ON BEHALF OF THE SHOE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY BEFORE THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK, MARCH 21, 1966

My name is Francis H. Gleason. I am president of the J. F. McElwain Co., Nashua, N.H., and the Blue Ridge Shoe Co., Wilkesboro, N.C.—manufacturing divisions of the Melville Shoe Corp., New York, N.Y., which operate 1,275 retail outlets as Thom McAn, Miles & Meldisco. I am appearing on behalf of the National Affairs Committee of the National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., and the New England Shoe & Leather Association. This committee represents over 80 percent of the leather and leather type footwear manufactured in the United States. We have asked to appear before this subcommittee in support of regulation No. 929 dated March 7, 1966, issued by the Department of Commerce to control the export of cattle hides, calf and kipskins, and bovine leathers.

STRUCTURE OF THE SHOE INDUSTRY

The leather shoe industry is made up of over 800 companies operating 1,300 factories in 38 States. These factories are located for the most part in small towns and are the primary source of employment in many of these towns. The bulk of footwear is produced in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, Maine, New Hampshire, Missouri, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio, and New Jersey. The industry employs over 200,000 workers, and turns out products valued at over $2½ billion annually at wholesale. In 1965 it produced 630 million pairs of leather and leather-type footwear. There is little concentration in the industry. The largest company does around 7 percent of the total volume, and the first four largest, around 23 percent. Over 800 companies produce the remaining 77 percent of the leather footwear.

Only about a dozen companies are publicly owned. The typical company is relatively small, is family owned, and of moderate size. The typical factory employs 200 workers.

Entry in and exit from the shoe manufacturing industry is relatively easy. All machinery may be rented, as well as buildings. As a result, 20 or more companies may start footwear manufacturing each year while 20 or more suffer financial failure.

BACKGROUND AND REASONS FOR HIDE PROBLEM

In the middle of last year, we became seriously concerned at the rate of hide exportation in the light of what appeared to be a long struggle in Vietnam and booming domestic economy. Everything pointed to a shortage of hides and skins in the year ahead. Exports were running at an annual rate of 13½ million or 2 million greater than the record high of 1964. This increase was substantially greater than the gain expected in domestic hide supplies in 1965. Reflecting this, hide prices in the middle of last year were up as much as 40 to 50 percent over 1964.

The reasons for the tremendous increase in exports in U.S. hides are well known and may be summarized very briefly, here. Argentina is the second largest supplier of hides to world buyers. The United States and Argentina together now supply approximately 20 million hides to a dozen or more countries short of this material. In 1962–63, Argentina suffered a severe drought which forced heavy cattle slaughter and higher hide exports in those years. This reduced cattle herds and drastically curtailed Argentine hide exports in 1964 and 1965. In the years 1957 and 1958, for example, Argentine exports averaged 10.6 million hides per year; in 1965, her hide exports fell to 6.8 million. This threw the bulk of world demand on the American market. Hides constitute only 5 to 7 percent of the value of the animal. Increases in hide supply depend on demand for beef. It takes 2 years to mature cattle. The supply of hides is increasing from Argentina but is not expected to return to normal for at least 2 years. Argentina maintains export controls on hides continuously as a means of regulating exchange and providing local tanners and manufacturers with adequate supplies of hides and leather.

DRAIN ON HIDE SUPPLY

The question might well be asked how can foreign buyers continue to pay higher and higher prices for our hides. Countries behind the Iron Curtain want American dollars badly. Work shoes made in Czechoslovakia, for example, sell in the United States at less than the cost of materials here. These foreign-made shoes cannot be bought by people in the country of manufacture, but their sale here produces needed dollars for the Iron Curtain bloc. In other words we supply hides to Communist-bloc countries which return them in the form of low-cost footwear.

The United States, a major industrial Nation, is an exporter of the raw materials for manufacturing shoes abroad which are then imported here. Total footwear imports accounted for 16 percent of our output in 1965, as against 1.2 percent in 1955.

If exports were to continue at the 1965 rate of 13 million net and with a domestic demand of 24 to 25 million hides, total demand would be 37 to 38 million hides against prospective supply of around 34 million. This would leave a shortage of 3 to 4 million. The rate of purchase for exports, as we have pointed out, is running for the first 2 months of this year well above the 1965 rate. These were the facts which caused us to again request a mild temporary limitation of hide exports.

RESPONSIBLE EXPORTS SHOULD BE MAINTAINED

We recognize that we must always export hides. We did not believe that a request for a modest 13-percent reduction in the all-time high export figure would cause concern or be harmful to anyone. In fact, many people in our industry regarded our request as too mild. We did not want to upset any market. Our sole concern was to prevent a situation where with military demands for Vietnam growing and the domestic economy booming we would find ourselves so short of hides that we could not properly take care of military and domestic needs without serious restrictions.

COST OF HIDES

Leather is the largest element in the cost of manufacture of our product. Though the percent of cost attributable to leather varies by type and grade of shoe, broadly speaking the range is in the area of 33 to 50 percent of the cost of production. Changes in prices in raw hides and skins are almost immediately reflected in the price of leather as tanners sell largely on a replacement basis.

The rapidly rising price of hides in the summer of 1965 alone increased the cost of medium-priced men's dress shoes by 20 to 30 cents per pair as compared to a few months earlier. When hide and skin prices rose again in November and increased at an accelerating rate it was impossible to keep up with the increasing cost of a whole line of shoes on a replacement basis. On February 15, upper leather for medium-priced men's dress shoes was up 10 to 20 cents per pair over the level of October; leather linings were up 5 cents per pair; and leather outersoles were up 10 cents per pair. Two weeks later the increases had become 20 to 40 cents on the upper, 8 cents on the lining, and 13 cents per pair on the outersole, with no sign of any cessation of this escalation. This second round of hide and leather increases resulted in additional increased cost at the shoe manufacturing level of 35 to 60 cents per pair on medium-priced men's dress shoes, depending upon the particular style and specifications.

CONCLUSION

The action of the hide and skin market in the last 2 weeks in our opinion is clear proof that the present plan is working.

We believe when the dust has settled all parties will agree that this licensing provides a flexible tool for insuring military and domestic supplies in a situation where further demand cannot possibly be foreseen but in view of present conditions can only increase. Licensing can be modified quickly to take into account unexpected changes in supply and demand and eliminated when pressure subsides.

We support the program of the Department of Commerce—

1. To assure an adequate supply of hides for the military and civilian manufacture of shoes;

2. To reduce chaotic inflationary pressures; and

3. To save money for the Government and the American family in the purchase of shoes.

Resolution Expressing Disapproval of Demonstrations Protesting U.S. Policy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of District 10 of the Polish Army Veterans Association of America I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted at the association's district 10 convention held last autumn in Trenton, N.J.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE POLISH ARMY VETERANS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

We the delegates of District 10 of the Polish Army Veterans Association of America, and the ladies auxiliary, being citizens of these United States, and of Polish origin, and participating in this convention we state:

That recent lawless demonstrations on the free soil of the United States by known and unknown groups against our policy in Vietnam, which policy is to defend and protect the freedom and independence of the Vietnamese people against the aggressions of international communism, are an affront to the brave servicemen who have given their lives in defense of such freedom and independence, and therefore deserve and have our greatest contempt.

We further state that the policy of the President of the United States has our firm and unyielding support, and that we stand ready to offer our services in life and blood in these rightful and just efforts in behalf of the freedom of the entire world.

And further we also declare without equivocation, that the time has come to stop the sneaky and backdoor expansion of international communism, without regard to ideological differences, and which expansion we believe to be on a collision course with the ideals of freedom and democracy the world over.

And since the demonstrations are, without a doubt, inspired and controlled by international communism, it is important therefore, that we take decisive action not only against the demonstrators, who may possibly be sincere but misguided, but also against the demagogs who infect them to so act for entirely different motives, and who set themselves up as the conscience of the world, and which demagogs also conspire against the existing laws of these United States of America.

And we the delegates of the Polish Army Veterans Association of District 10 also respectfully demand from the President of the United States further vigilance in the matter of our one-time Polish fatherland by assuring to her citizens a future of true freedom and independence, by reestablishing a free and democratic Polish state, and the return of her eastern borders, and the continuance of the existing western boundaries by certifying that they are truly and historically Polish borders.

Long live the United States of America.

Long live Poland and her people who have for 20 long years battled for the return of her freedom and independence.

KAZIMIERZ BURAWSKI,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.
JOHN MACH,
Commander.
B. GAWEL,
Secretary.

U.S. Grant to Home for Mentally Retarded of Hamilton County, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare approved a grant of $70,000 to the Resident Home for the Mentally Retarded of Hamilton County in Ohio. There is an interesting story behind this grant, which is just one of thousands under Public Law 88-164.

As we all know, there are many gradations or degrees of mental retardation. It is best described as a "reduced capacity for learning." Most mentally retarded children, while having this reduced capacity for learning, have all the normal needs for love, comfort, a sense of belonging, as well as an increased need for achievement and recognition. Most mentally retarded persons, despite their basic intellectual limitations, can be taught to be at least partially self-sufficient and others with training can become fully productive members of society.

Mental retardation can be due to a hundred different causes and can strike any family. It is a cruel accident of life and, while great strides have been made in treating mental illness and other diseases, relatively little progress has been made in the field of mental retardation, largely because of public ignorance of the matter.

It is estimated that about 3 percent of the population are retarded, or twice as many as are affected by blindness, polio, and rheumatic heart diseases combined—according to statistics based on the late President Kennedy's Panel on Mental Retardation. In Hamilton County, where my district is located, this means that there are approximately 27,000 mentally retarded individuals. Nationally, there are over 5,400,000 so afflicted. Almost every one of us knows someone with a mentally retarded child, grandchild, or other relative.

In Hamilton County, about 1,000 of these mentally retarded children are currently committed to State institutions, the nearest of which is approximately 100 miles away from Cincinnati. About 4,000 are enrolled in special tax-supported classes. However, thousands of others are receiving no special training at all.

Present conditions for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded in Ohio draw heavily on obsolete theories of the past. At one time, mental retardation was considered hopeless and shameful. In the name of protecting society and preserving the rest of the family, the general practice arose of isolating these children in distant, large institutions. Parents were told to resign themselves to this because "there is nothing you can do for Johnny."

Today, it has been proven that the mentally retarded can be helped with love, individual attention, and training. Many become fully productive, others partially self-sufficient, and almost all achieve degrees of self-care that were undreamed of 50 years ago. Yet, there has been almost no change in the institutional system of providing residential care for the mentally retarded in Ohio. Distressed parents who have no other source of assistance must still resort to committing their child to distant State institutions.

These institutions destroy the natural bond between parent and child, are 35 percent overcrowded, are understaffed, are unable to provide significant programs of training, substitute rigid rules and regimentation instead of individual attention and emphasize conformity and submission to authority instead of self-sufficiency.

Not quite 3 years ago, a handful of parents of mentally retarded children in Cincinnati, started an organization to provide a better answer to the problem of the mentally retarded.

Their objective was to build a permanent resident home-regional center for the mentally retarded of all ages and handicaps in Hamilton County so that these afflicted persons might attain the highest possible degree of self-sufficiency.

Many hours have been spent and many bitter frustrations have been experienced to realize this goal. But this small group of dedicated people had know the pain and torment of having a mentally retarded child. They also knew the futility of trying to finds help when there was no help. Instead of accepting the problem as insoluble, they had the determination and the zeal to succeed, not only for the sake of thier own children but for all the unfortunate mentally handicapped children.

Today this organization owns 32 acres of land; has several hundred members; has renovated a building on this land and is now conducting activity programs for mentally retarded children in it; has hired a full-time professional executive director; has raised over $100,000 in the community; has had its request for a $70,000 Federal construction grant approved and is ready to break ground on the first phase of its building program. The group was chartered as a non-profit Ohio corporation in June 1963 under the name of the Resident Home for the Mentally Retarded of Hamilton County, Inc. It is a tax-exempt, chartiable organization.

The corporation's bylaws require that 75 percent of its board of trustees be the parents of mentally retarded individuals. This was done to assure motivation and continuity of effort and to avoid any deviation from the primary objective.

The proposed residential center for the mentally retarded of Hamilton County closely follows the recommendations of "National Action to Combat Mental Retardation," the report of President Kennedy's panel, dated October 1962. This report strongly recommends that facilities for the mentally retarded be provided within their own communities. Facilities, it says, should include residential and nonresidential services and modern day care, recreation training, and vocational rehabilitation services. A residential population of 300 is considered highly desirable for optimum effectiveness.

Located within the boundaries of Cincinnati, easily accessible to all in the community, the residential center being planned will have the advantage of being able to offer the child professional services heretofore not available in the community, individual attention and loving care that he needs, while maintaining continuity of contact with parents while they live. Primary emphasis will be placed on encouraging earliest possible return to the home and the community and training to permit the mentally retarded to live their lives as close to normal as possible.

Located close to the community, the residential center will be able to draw on specialized educational, medical, and recreational facilities already in existence; utilize the personal services of the community's many dedicated service organizations who will want to become a part of this community project and donate their time as volunteers; and enrich the community by providing a training and research center for students of nursing, medicine, psychology, and so forth. This endeavor would also contribute experience to the inadequate fund of knowledge which is a worldwide handicap in combating and alleviating the problems of mental retardation.

The full-scale project will be undertaken just as soon as possible depending upon the availability of public assistance from county, State, and Federal sources. This will be a $3 to $4 million project, with funds from the private sector totaling $750,000 to $1 million.

When capacity is reached, according to the above concept, the development of another such center on the eastern side of the county will be considered.

Actually, then, the Federal Government has two objectives in helping to construct the first phase of this project: First, to contribute to the alleviation of at least some suffering caused by mental retardation in Hamilton County, and second, to help encourage the development of and concept of "partnership" of both private and public sectors of society in the solution of mental retardation problems so that others throughout the Nation can learn from this experience.

The $69,800 granted by Health, Education, and Welfare to the resident home probably would not buy the landing gear on one jet bomber but it represents some very important things to those who strove so hard to obtain it. It is 49 percent of the cost of the first residential structure; but, more important, it is the achievement of a first goal, the recognition of work well done, and the encouragement to finish what has been started.

Postmaster General Speaks in Indianapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on Saturday evening some 6,000 Hoosiers gathered in Indianapolis for the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. The honored guest and speaker of the occasion was a man well-known to all of us, a man of long and intense experience in politics, the Postmaster General of the United States, Lawrence F. O'Brien.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. O'Brien on that occasion may appear in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, MANUFACTURER'S BUILDING AT THE STATE FAIR GROUNDS, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MARCH 26, 1966, 7 P.M.

It's good to be back in Indiana for a number of reasons.

I recall many visits in 1959 and 1960 traveling across this State meeting and working with many of you.

During that time I soon recognized that your State Democratic Committee was not one of those unfortunately all too common organizations that relies more on good intentions than hard work, on hopefulness rather than organization.

I rapidly learned that Indiana had a State committee of professionals—men and women who knew the business of politics—who knew that aspiration is not enough, that inspiration is not enough, and even perspiration is not enough—without the kind of organization which insures that everyone works together effectively and with purpose.

That's the kind of State committee you have here, and I think you should be proud of it. It's the kind of party that produces Governors of the caliber of Matt Welsh, who was a candidate during my early visits, and Roger Branigan, whose record as Governor is a solid list of achievements.

It is the kind of party that has given this State one of the finest congressional delegations in the country. In your two Senators, Birch Bayh and Vance Hartke, both of whom I have been pleased to know for many years, you have young effective Senators who are not letting their colleagues forget for a minute that Indiana is the "crossroads of America," and I'm sure the people of Indiana recognize their effectiveness on behalf of this State. And, for the first time in far too long, Indiana is being served as it deserves to be served in the House of Representatives: John Brademas, Winfield Denton, Lee Hamilton, Andrew Jacobs, Ray Madden, and J. Edward Roush. You just can't beat a list like that. Effective hard-working Congressmen, whose ability is widely respected in Washington. But now that I think of it, there is one way that you can beat that list; 6 out of 11 is good—but you should have an even higher batting average, which would be better for this State and better for the country.

And believe me, under my old friends Gordon St. Angelo and Dick Stoner, along with Agnes Woolery and Dorothy Elmore, you have the organizational leadership that can do it.

I treasure the memories of campaigning in Indiana for a young Senator from Massachusetts who came here and asked you for your help.

I remember those midnight motorcades, and how the Hoosier crowds responded to him.

There are still echoes of his voice as he spoke at the coliseum in October 1960.

Many of you were present and I remember your enjoyment when he said, "Mr. Nixon in Boston the other day said that I was another Truman, and I returned the compliment and said he was another Dewey. And he has not said I was another Truman since."

And I can hear him reciting Robert Sherwood's poem that hailed the coming of F.D.R.'s administration—you remember:

> "Plodding feet, tramp, tramp,
> The Grand Old Party's breaking camp,
> Blare the bugles, din, din,
> The New Deal is moving in."

And then that November the plodding feet were again on their way out, and the blaring bugles sounded the beginning of the New Frontier.

Those were great, exciting days.

Today we rightly take pride in the fact that we have carried out the promises of the New Frontier. That is the greatest monument to President Kennedy. Today we are working together to help President Johnson build a Great Society in which all our people can find opportunity to share in our abundance, and in which the quality of our lives can begin to match the abundance of our resources.

For half a decade the opposition, the army of plodding feet, has been in disarray, their cohorts milling about, torn between those who would move toward the past quickly by jet and those who would merely go slowly by covered wagon. It's almost—almost—sad to see their banners wilt.

Their tired old slogans have bowed before democratic programs, that we were told over, and over, and over again, would lead us to national catastrophe, but which have instead brought unprecedented prosperity—year after year after year. Last year, alone, just the increase in our gross national product was more than the total—the total—gross national product of all but 7 of the 130 nations of the world. Some catastrophe.

Of course, it is a catastrophe for those who have little faith in America. It is a catastrophe for the professional criers of doom and gloom. It is a catastrophe for those who feel that the government is best which does least.

But it is certainly anything but a catastrophe for the American people.

Since 1961, we have enjoyed 61 months of uninterrupted economic growth, the longest period in our history. The cycle of recessions after every 2 or 3 years of prosperity has been halted.

The Democratic Party belives that we have to work to keep America prosperous. It doesn't come about automatically. The party of Jefferson and Jackson is a party that recognizes problems, believes they can be solved, and actively seeks solutions.

And today we can clearly recognize a number of basic problems.

Some of these problems are domestic; others are international.

Some are close, and simple as the conversation I read about between two little girls walking aimlessly along a trash-littered alley, returning from a school that is unable to teach them, to a home that is no home.

One turns and shouts, "Just nothin'. I don't want to be nothin' when I grow up." And the playmate's reply full of withering truth, "You're already nothin'."

Other problems are as distant and complicated as the movement of hostile troops, saboteurs, and terrorists into a neighbor's land.

Some problems deal with the fact that large numbers of our fellow citizens, large areas of our national life, are not participating in our general affluence.

Solutions to all of these problems involve a common element—a search for social justice.

That search must be rooted in an understanding that as our gross national income soars far above $700 billion a year, as we produce nearly 10 million automobiles, as we add an annex to the horn of plenty, we cannot, we must not, forget those who are being ground down by the iron heel of poverty and deprivation.

That search lies at the heart of the President's call for a war on poverty and his crusade to assure that every American child gets as much education as he can absorb—first-class education, befitting a first-class country.

And let me digress here and say that when generations yet unborn read in their history books about the United States in the middle of this century—I am convinced we will be hailed not for our production of material wealth, but as the generation which, under President Johnson's leadership, created opportunity in education through such landmark legislation as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

This legislation dealt with problems that had baffled and frustrated sincere effort for many years. It removed in one clean, masterful effort conflicts and suspicions that had for too long held back the broad diffusion of general knowledge.

It struck a heavy, hopeful blow to the door of opportunity. And that door is opening, opening to millions for whom it would otherwise have been closed.

The President's leadership in this area has produced programs designed to give people a chance who now have no chance. It will provide ways for them to discover, develop, and employ their abilities and capacities. It will assure that all Americans have the same access to opportunity that we ourselves enjoy.

One of the finest of such programs is Project Headstart. Though modest in scope, it is enormous in its potential and its goal—which is no less than to reach poverty's youngest children before the scar tissue produced by the grimness of their lives has constricted their ability to learn and to grow.

But in a world of 15,000-mile-an-hour ballistic missiles that nation which concentrates on its own problems alone is pursuing a shortsighted, dangerous, and potentially disastrous policy.

In a world shrunk by the speed of jet and rocket, that nation which aims to secure social justice at home, while ignoring the destruction of social justice abroad, is abdicating leadership and only postponing the ultimate reckoning.

In this, the time of the "long twilight struggle, year in and year out" the erosion of freedom anywhere in the world weakens freedom here at home.

We hear much these days about the complexities of the struggle in Vietnam.

The air is full of falling feathers from hawk and dove.

The papers tell us of conflicts between New Left and Old Right.

There is, indeed, so much discussion of the war, that sometimes the essential facts are like the soil around active volcanoes—covered over with layer after layer of fine ash.

But I will say here, that President Johnson hasn't lost sight of the basic issue. And I have heard him say again and again: "The basic issue in Vietnam is whether we are going to stand idly by and watch a slowly budding freedom being crushed by superior force."

All this talk of hawks and doves, all of the arguments about escalation and de-escalation, all this controversy between left and right, are secondary to the question of what is right and what is wrong.

Just a month ago a young mother and her three children entered the President's office in the White House. They met there for a sad and solemn cremony: the posthumous presentation of the Medal of Honor Award to S. Sgt. Larry S. Pierce, a young American who had fallen on the field of battle in Vietnam. Sergeant Pierce had thrown himself on an exploding mine and thereby saved many lives at the cost of his own.

The President addressed himself to the same questions that trouble all of us when violence snuffs out the brightness of a brave, young life.

Why should this sacrifice have been necessary?

"Why," the President asked, "was this brave American called upon to give up the promise of his youth? Why are his comrades still called upon to fight on after him?"

"The answers," he said, "are to be found in Hanoi and Peking where greed and ambition reach out to strangle peaceful nations.

"And they are to be found woven in the very fabric of American tradition where freedom—any man's freedom—is prized above life itself.

"From Saratoga to the Marne to Okinawa and now Vietnam—the Sergeant Pierces have come in legions to light the darkness and drive out tyranny and war. They do so today * * *. They will defend the idea and pursue the dream forever."

And then the President added, "We at home must be worthy of their sacrifice. We must be united in our purpose to create a world where terror will not go unchallenged—where aggression and violence will shatter on the rock of our courage and our conviction.

"We must be committed as individuals to a common pledge: Freemen shall not stand alone against the enemy that menaces all freemen."

This elemental fact was understood in the time of Jefferson and Jackson. That is why freedom survives and flourishes today.

Now that we are the most powerful nation in the world, should we hold freedom more cheaply than we did as a weak nation in the days of Jefferson and Jackson?

If there is one single sentence that sums up our position in Vietnam, it the President's statement: "We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else."

Yes, my friends, it is not easy to wear the mantle of responsibility during troubled times.

But if we do not stand firm, who will?

If we cannot support freedom in Vietnam, who will?

If we cannot keep our commitment to that embattled nation which has suffered heavy casualties—civilian and military—day after day, year after year, rather than bend the knee to communism, where then will we keep it?

If we do not keep our trust with those who trust us now—who will trust us or rely on us in the future?

If we turn our eyes away from the harsh, unpleasant, but real facts of international life, will the appetite of communism decrease—or will it grow?

Do you, incidentally, think for a moment that Indonesia, the sixth largest nation in the world, would have the courage to rise up and throw out communism if it weren't for our example of standing firm in Vietnam?

These are the hard questions, the kind of questions I saw John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson grapple with.

My friends, I do not for one moment believe that the line of American courage and clearheadedness that runs through our history ends in this generation.

There was no more peace-loving man than Thomas Jefferson, but let us not forget that he was the author of a declaration which signaled the beginning of the real conflict with England; and he was President when we refused to pay tribute to north African pirates.

America honors these great figures of her past because their leadership gave to us our heritage of freedom. Their deeds made it possible for a Statue of Liberty to be at home here.

That heritage means something. That statue means something.

They do not mean that because the assassination, and kidnaping, and torture, and sabotage occur in a small country, far away, to a people about whom we know little, we should wash our hands of concern, and stand aside and let the aggressors do their worst.

That is not the policy of the America of Jefferson and Jackson.

And so my friends, when we defend justice in Vietnam as we advance it at home, when our President tells us that our commitment to building the Great Society at home must include protection of the basic rights of man which lie at the foundation of any great society, we are only doing what we, as concerned Americans, should do.

At the basis of building a Great Society here at home and protecting freedom abroad there is that same brilliantly burning, everlasting idea, that flowed from the pen of Thomas Jefferson, and that has guided our party through its long history: "that men are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These are Jefferson's words. They tell us why we are building a Great Society * * * and why we are in Vietnam.

Certainly defending freedom is our historic position—it is our position now, and I hope it always will be. Every American who believes in our form of government—its accomplishments and its future—will, I am sure, give our President his loyalty, his support, and his prayers—as the President pursues his awesome task: the preservation of our democracy.

Dedication of St. Joseph's Church in Hazleton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to have attended the dedication ceremonies of the new St. Joseph's Church in Hazleton on Sunday, March 20, 1966, and to have addressed the banquet gathering. Monsignor Gavenda, the pastor, and his parishioners, deserve the highest praise in the tremendous rebuilding project which they undertook following the terrible fire that destroyed the former church.

My interest in this parish goes back to my childhood because I was born just two blocks from the church. Many of my closest and dearest friends are members of this parish and it was indeed a warm feeling to have been among them on the day of the dedication of the new edifice. In recognition of that occasion, the Hazelton Standard-Speaker ran a lengthy and detailed narrative of the dedication ceremony in its edition of Monday, March 21, and as part of my remarks today I would like to include this news story.

The article follows:

DEDICATION CEREMONIES ATTRACT THOUSANDS TO ST. JOSEPH CHURCH

Ceremonies surrounding the dedication of the new St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church attracted thousands of persons over the weekend.

Beginning Saturday and ending yesterday, the ceremonies included dedication of the church and two of its altars, an open-house program and a banquet.

Participating in the ceremonies were local, area and regional priests, officials of the Roman Catholic diocese of Scranton, and government leaders.

The dedication ceremonies climaxed an extensive rebuilding campaign inaugurated after a fire destroyed the former church March 1, 1963.

The fire caused more than a million dollars damage and forced members of the Western Hemipshere's oldest Slovak Catholic parish to worship in the church school's auditorium for more than 3 years.

The new building was blessed by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph J. Gavenda, S.T.D., J.C.D., V.F., St. Joseph's pastor, at a solemn high Mass of thanksgiving yesterday morning.

The new North Laurel Street church, which holds about 900 persons, was filled to capacity for the Mass.

Two of the church's three altars were consecrated in rites conducted by Monsignor Gavenda Saturday, the Feast of St. Joseph. The morning ceremony filled the church to capacity.

Under Roman Catholic law, the remaining altar will be consecrated when the church is consecrated. No date has been set for the church consecration.

The church was open to visitors for 4 hours Saturday afternoon and night. Monsignor Gavenda said a constant flow of persons, including large numbers of nonparishioners, brought thousands to the open-house program.

Following yesterday's church dedication, 980 persons gathered in the parish school's auditorium for a banquet.

Assisting Monsignor Gavenda at yesterday's mass were Rev. Anthony W. Drogowski, pastor of St. Stanislaus Roman Catholic Church, who served as deacon, and Rev. Francis S. Mussari, S.T.L., pastor of Our Lady of Grace Church, the subdeacon.

Rev. Andrew Rentko, S.V.D., a missionary in Mexico who came here for the dedication, delivered the sermon.

Reverend Rentko, a city native and the first vocation from St. Joseph's during Monsignor Gavenda's pastorate, described the history of the parish and lauded the faith and the sacrifices of the parishioners in building the new church.

Chanters were Rev. Joseph J. Super, pastor of St. John the Baptist Church, Pittston, and

Rev. Leo M. Gardzalla, assistant pastor of Holy Trinity Slovak Church.

Revs. Stephen G. Medwick and Cyril J. Rable, assistant pastors, were masters of ceremonies.

Two parish vocations, Rev. Leo Dusheck, S.V.D., and Thomas J. Dzurenda, S.P., were thurifers. Serving as acolytes were two parish seminarians, Gerald V. Brienza and Gerald J. Washko.

Rev. John S. Marinko, assistant pastor, commentated the Mass on radio.

Music for the mass was sung by the parish school's girl choir, directed by the Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius. Mrs. Francis J. Guydish was organist.

At the altar consecration Saturday, deacon and subdeacon were Rev. Cassian Yuhas, C.P., and Rev. Andrew A. Chupela, Starford, both parish vocations.

Reverends Super and Gardzalla were chanters; Reverends Medwick and Rable, masters of ceremonies; and Reverends Dusheck and Dzurenda, thurifers.

At yesterday's banquet, the audience was addressed by John P. Senko, on behalf of the parishioners, and by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph A. Madden, diocesan chancellor, on behalf of the diocese.

Both spoke of the parish's history and future, and of the parishioners' spirit as evidenced in the rebuilding campaign.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, a surprise visitor, also addressed the banquet gathering. Mayor Joseph B. Conahan brought greetings from the city.

Invocation was offered by Rev. Joseph S. Tomicek, of St. John the Baptist Church, Throop. Benediction was delivered by Rev. Michael J. Holly, of St. Mary's Church, McAdoo.

Toastmaster was Rev. Stephen J. Yaneka, pastor of St. Anthony's R. C. Church, Larksville, and a former assistant pastor of St. Joseph's.

Music selections were presented by the parish men's choir, directed by Mrs. Guydish, John Tomsho, Jr., was accompanist.

Dinner music was provided by Phil Cusick, organist.

The U.S. Commitment in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many voices have been raised in recent days to question and deprecate the validity and essentially of our commitment in southeast Asia. A very direct and cogent answer appears in an editorial in the Ukrainian Bulletin for the period March 1 to March 15, 1966. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Vietnam: Symbol of U.S. Guardianship of Freedom," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM: SYMBOL OF U.S. GUARDIANSHIP OF FREEDOM

The U.S. military involvement in Vietnam is a subject of worldwide interest and a bone of contention for a small segment of the American people who fail to see clearly what our vital stakes are in the struggle against the Communists in that remote southeast Asian country.

While our soldiers, ordered into battle by their Commander in Chief, President Johnson, are dying day and night, in America there are individuals and groups who viciously denounce the Johnson administration. In doing so, they are actually helping the enemy, the North Vietnamese Communists and their allies, wherever they may be, in Peking or Moscow.

Among the most vociferous critics are some old hands and supposed "experts" on communism. One of them is George F. Kennan, our former Ambassador to Moscow and Belgrade, who, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, counseled "withdrawal," but not "a disorderly withdrawal."

PROPHET OF DOOM AND SURRENDER

It is to be recalled that Mr. Kennan has so often been wrong on great international issues that no other U.S. diplomat can ever hope to match him in the number of his consistenly erroneous prophesies and predictions.

It was Mr. Kennan who in 1947 came up with the brilliant idea of containment, holding that communism and Russian totalitarian imperialism should not be combated but contained. This concept merely failed to take into account the dynamic nature of communism which—for better or for worse—cannot be contained, but must progress and expand in order to conceal the emptiness and shallowness of its ideology.

It was Mr. Kennan who, on the eve of the Polish and Hungarian uprisings in 1956, wrote about the finality of enslavement of Central and Eastern European nations behind the Iron Curtain. His sonorous prophesies fell to pieces when the Hungarian freedom fighters, in a matter of days, destroyed the despicable regime imposed upon Hungary by Moscow. Thanks to the shameful panic of the United Nations and the blunt refusal of the free world to support the Hungarian patriots, a bloody Soviet Russian enslavement became a fact again. It was the same Mr. Kennan who invested in his writings the historical canard that Ukraine is as much a part of Russia as Pennsylvania is a part of the United States.

This completely illogical and untrue statement has helped strengthen the Communist ideological thesis that the U.S.S.R. is synonymous with Russia, although the Russian Communist leaders still feel compelled to maintain the illusion of a federation. Even the Kremlin, despite its totalitarian rule, its oppression of the captive non-Russian nations, and its wholesale rewriting of history, cannot go as far as Mr. Kennan in asserting that Ukraine is not an entity of its own.

In testifying on Vietnam before the Fulbright committee, Mr. Kennan pronounced such typically wise counsel as: "I would submit there is more respect to be won in the opinion of the world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than in the most stubborn pursuits of extravagant or uncompromising objectives."

Thus, in plainer language, a retreat before the enemy will win us more friends than trying to defeat him.

Have Mr. Kennan, General Gavin, and Senators FULBRIGHT, GRUENING, and MORSE learned nothing from the great lessons of World War II and its origins? Obviously not, if they persist in advocating withdrawal of the United States from Vietnam—which would mean a literal surrender of southeast Asia to the Communist camp. This should also refer to the latest "me too" voice of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY who ill advisedly counsels a partnership with the murderous Vietcong.

It is unfortunate that while the U.S. Government is trying to force the enemy to come to the conference table that a group of U.S. legislators should have deemed it appropriate and helpful to stage special hearings and have a Mr. Kennan air views which at best have the effect of making Hanoi hold on a little longer, in the hope we'll get tired and go away.

For the Communist puppets in Hanoi have had ample opportunity to open up peace talks. During the suspension of U.S. bombings of North Vietnam the U.S. Government explored every accessible avenue to encourage negotiations for the purpose of terminating the war in Vietnam. But these efforts came to naught. Somehow these legislators have overlooked this key fact.

Perhaps most of the present critics of President Johnson's policies would not be so concerned about "peace" in Vietnam had there been a Salazar or a Franco confronting us there—we may then have heard a loud clamor for an open war in defense of human freedom against the forces of totalitarianism. But the enemy happens to be communism, and somehow resolution and belief in the rightness of our cause seem to fade away.

A COMMUNIST PATTERN OF CONQUEST

The critics of our involvement in Vietnam are fond of maintaining that there is no aggression from the north and that the Vietcong and its political arm, the National Liberation Front, are as much Vietnamese as are the South Vietnamese.

Some 40 years ago an almost identical situation existed in Ukraine. When the Ukrainian Central Rada proclaimed the independence of Ukraine with the overwhelming support of the Ukrainian people, the Russian Communists promptly organized in Russia, north of Ukraine, a puppet Ukrainian Communist government, and sent several thousand Russian Communist troops to sustain these puppets in power. When the Ukrainian delegates at the peace conference in Brest Litovsk signed a treaty with the central powers, the Bolsheviks clamored that their regime, brought in from the north on the blades of their bayonets, was the true Ukrainian Government.

It is evident that without an armed intervention by the regular military formations of North Vietnam the Peking-supported Vietcong could not have operated over a vast territory in the south as it has.

The U.S. legislators may also be interested to learn that the Chinese Communists recently sponsored the establishment in Peking of a Malayan National Liberation Front, a clandestine organization similar to the South Vietnam Liberation Front, dedicated to the overthrow of the governments in Singapore and Kuala Lumpur. Last year saw the forming in Peking of the Thailand Patriotic Front. When and if warfare breaks out in these countries will they be civil wars, too?

COST OF WITHDRAWAL

It would be sheer folly for the United States to make any move in Vietnam which would indicate weakening or a lack of will power on our part to uphold our commitment.

But the stakes in Vietnam are much higher than the prestige of the United States alone. What would be the repercussions in the neighboring countries, and then further, in Australia, the Philippines, and New Zealand, if we heeded the ill-advised and defeatist counsels of Mr. Kennan and his kind? The psychological shock waves would undoubtedly undermine the entire American position in the Far East.

And what would the West Germans say and the Berliners in particular, whose very existence depends on our determination and our power to resist the Communist enemy?

The Communists are counting heavily on our internal dissension and opposition. In their view, democracies are weak and irresolute. They believe that the campus protests and U.S. Senate teach-ins are signs that the U.S. Government is ready to capitulate.

Critics like MORSE and FULBRIGHT serve their function in the free discussions which characterize our democracy. The war in Vietnam is unpopular; war as such is repugnant to the Americans. But we believe that the American people, maturing rapidly since World War II thrust the mantle of world leadership on their shoulders, will not shirk the cause of freedom. To remain free Americans we must be the world guardians of freedom.

Submarine Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the week of April 11 to 17 is Submarine Week. I know that those who are familiar with our Nation's history are aware of the vital role the submarine played in World War II, and what a major part of this Nation's defenses our submarine comprises today.

The saga of the submarine is one of overcoming tremendous technical problems.

It began on April 11, 1900, when the U.S. Navy purchased a 54-foot "steel submarine torpedo boat" for $150,000.

The story of the first U.S. submarine began in the village of Liscannor, County Clare, Ireland, where a young schoolteacher named John Philip Holland spent most of his spare time sketching plans for a submersible vessel.

In 1872, Holland emigrated to the United States and began teaching in Paterson, N.J. He also began building submarines, financing them through savings from his salary and personally testing them in the Passaic River.

Between 1872 and 1895, Holland built a variety of submarines with varying degrees of success. One of his major problems was underwater propulsion, since he was forced to use an air-consuming, highly dangerous gasoline engine.

In 1895, he began work on a craft named the *Holland* in which he solved the propulsion problem by employing electric storage batteries for submerged operation. The *Holland* was 54 feet long, displaced 75 tons and was armed with one torpedo tube and a pneumatic dynamite gun.

After a series of exhaustive tests which lasted more than 2 years, the Navy purchased the *Holland* and ordered six which were similar to it.

When the United States entered World War I, the Navy had a fleet of 59 submarines, most of them representing improved designs. In 1912, it had acquired the U.S.S. *Skipjack*, first of the E class submarines and first to use diesel engines for surface propulsion.

The diesel, inherently safer than the gasoline engine, gave the submarine greater cruising range and the *Skipjack* became the first U.S. submarine to cross the Atlantic.

An accelerated building program during World War I brought forth the O and S class submarines which were slated to be the workhorses of the undersea fleet for nearly a quarter of a century. Their durability is attested by the fact that during World War II, 10 "S" boats, which comprised but a small part of our submarine forces, alone sank 14 Japanese naval and merchant ships.

In the years following World War I, the United States, adhering to the Naval Limitations Treaty, restricted its submarine building program and new vessels were largely of the S class. However, durable as they were, technological advances were making them obsolete.

On November 21, 1933, an entirely new type submarine was launched at Groton, Conn. Named *Cuttlefish*, it was the forerunner of the fleet type of World War II fame. Larger than the S class, it had two distinctly new features—a partial double hull was partially welded rather than completely riveted—both of which enabled the submarine to dive deeper than its predecessors. A deck gun and 10 torpedo tubes made *Cuttlefish* a formidable fighting ship.

Following the *Cuttlefish* came the *Shark*, the first all-welded submarine and the development of the fleet-type submarine had begun. By World War II submarines were fairly standard, averaging 310 feet in length and displacing 1,500 tons. They were armed with either one or two 3-inch deck guns and had 10 torpedo tubes, 6 in the bow and 4 in the stern.

In the early days after Pearl Harbor the submarine became the Nation's primary sea weapon. The undersea Navy began offensive operations against the Japanese immediately after war was declared and by V-J Day had sunk more enemy shipping than the combined efforts of the surface fleet and the air forces. Comprising 1.6 percent of the Navy's wartime personnel, submarines accounted for 55 percent of all enemy shipping destroyed.

Following the war, extensive modifications were made in submarines. In an effort to increase underwater speed, superstructures and conning towers were streamlined; deck guns and other protruberances which created underwater drag were eliminated; the snorkel was introduced; and high alloy steels allowed the vessels to operate at greater depths.

Despite technological advances and design improvements of a half century, the submarine was basically the same craft developed by John P. Holland—a surface ship that could operate under water for a limited period of time. For example: at a speed of between 1 and 2 knots, an absolute minimum, a submarine could remain submerged for a maximum of about 48 hours. At its top underwater speed of about 8 knots, a submarine could operate submerged for no more than 1 hour.

Power limitations had long concerned submarine designers. In fact, John P. Holland had written in 1900:

> Larger (more than 200 feet long) boats will never be feasible, unless we discover some better system of storing electricity than exists today—a contingency which is exceedingly doubtful.

Holland failed to foresee the ingenuity of American industry, however, and eventually, storage batteries were developed which enabled submarines to go faster than ever and remain longer under water than before.

But it was nuclear power that finally turned the submersible surface ship into a true submarine capable of almost indefinite operation and no longer bound to the earth's atmosphere.

The first nuclear-powered submarine, *Nautilus*, far exceeded the hopes of her most optimistic supporters. During her first 2 years of operation, *Nautilus* steamed over 82,000 miles without refueling and established new speed and endurance records. On a second atomic core *Nautilus* went even further, pointing the way toward the Navy and Atomic Energy Commission goal of a nuclear core which would last at least 5 years.

Nautilus vividly demonstrated the new versatility of submarine in August 1958, when the submarine traveled from the Pacific to the Atlantic via the North Pole during a 4-day, 1,830-mile voyage.

Other nuclear submarines—*Sea Wolf*, *Skate*, and *Sargo*—pioneered new areas of submarine operation. *Sea Wolf* remained submerged for 60 days completely independent of the earth's atmosphere, proving that extended submerged patrols are feasible from both mechanical and human standpoints.

Skate made two trips under the arctic ice, one during the northern summer and the second during its winter. On the first trip, *Skate* surfaced nine times in lakelike openings in the ice. On the second, it surfaced by pushing its way through the ice and on March 17, 1959, surfaced at the geographic North Pole.

More recently, the *Sargo* spent 31 days under the arctic ice on an exploratory mission, and duplicated the *Skate's* feat of surfacing at the Pole.

These achievements proved that the Arctic Ocean is not only accessible to nuclear submarines but is actually an operational area, open to nuclear submarines regardless of the season.

The "Guppy" conversion, a streamlining of the hull configuration, began after World War II, and marked a major step in increasing underwater speeds. The name Guppy itself is an acronym for "greater underwater propulsion." Again, however, it was nuclear power that enabled a second revolutionary development—this one in the field of design. Naval architects had long known that a whale-shaped hull was ideally suited for subsurface operations. Holland, in fact, had designed his submarines along this line. However, power limitations made the surface craft design—sharp bow, superstructure deck and conning—the most practical for the prenuclear era.

With the new power source at their disposal, designers developed a radically new type of submarine—one with a whale-shaped hull and nuclear powerplant. First, however, it was necessary to test the feasibility of such a hull so the conventionally powered U.S.S. *Albacore* was built as a research submarine. Its success gave rise to the nuclear-powered *Skipjack*, a great stride in the submarine's history. With its whale-shaped hull, its sail with diving planes mounted on it, and its single screw propeller, the *Skipjack* became the world's fastest and most maneuverable submarine.

A third advance came with the fleet ballistic missile submarine, a nuclear-powered submarine armed with the Polaris intermediate range ballistic missile. These submarines were designed to launch missiles with nuclear warheads from beneath the surface, and because of their mobility are vital weapons in this Nation's deterrent arsenal.

The first Polaris-firing nuclear submarine, U.S.S. *George Washington*, was launched June 9, 1959, by General Dynamics and commissioned by the U.S. Navy the following December 30.

More Effective Handling of Problems Accompanying Cybernation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, recently Sam Zagoria, a member of the National Labor Relations Board and formerly my able administrative assistant, addressed a dinner meeting of the Prince Georges County Council for the Social Studies held at the University of Maryland.

In a lively style, he pointed out how some of the problems accompanying cybernation can be handled more effectively. I think, too, that most of us would agree that we all need to be better informed about developments in this field and their relationship to collective bargaining. I therefore request, Mr. President, that the text of his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Collective Bargaining: How To Take the Frustration Out of Cybernation

(Remarks of Sam Zagoria, member, National Labor Relations Board, at a dinner meeting of the Prince Georges County Council for the Social Studies, Adult Education Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Md., March 3, 1966)

I am grateful for the invitation to speak to all of you. You have an important responsibility and a great opportunity, for it is through your eyes, through your interest and enthusiasm, that the youngsters of this county, including my own, will learn about the institutions of our land, as well as those of other countries.

Finding a topic that would be appropriate and useful posed no problem except that I am still learning the P's and Q's of a new job. The P's remind me not to talk about pending legislation, pending cases, or politics. This rather limits the field, but let me try.

As we sit here tonight thinking that we should have skipped the dessert or at least skipped out before the speaker, it is hard to turn our thoughts to how social sicence teachers of the next century will talk about this one. Much wiser heads than mine, the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, last month contributed their view:

"Future historians will probably describe our time as an age of conscious social change. The change we are witnessing includes the rapid growth of population, the massive flow of peoples from rural areas to the cities, the steady growth of national wealth and income, the rise of oppressed and submerged peoples, the spread of mass education, the extension of leisure, the venture into space and the frightening increase in the destructiveness of military weapons."

These thoughts are no strangers, I know, to this audience, but they have some implications for the field in which I work which I should like to share with you. Let me start with a recent statement by Secretary of Labor Wirtz, "Today's youthful members of the work force can anticipate changing jobs three to four times over the course of a career. * * * Modern technology and the new skill demands it has brought about have introduced on the American work scene an unprecedented era of change."

Indeed, some of your young charges are likely to find that in their working career they will prepare for one field of work, change to another and wind up in a third. Also, these changes are likely to be compressed into a shorter work career, for the trend is toward more years in school and college and toward earlier and earlier retirement. In between are the working years and not the kind your father and grandfather knew, where they learned a trade, craft or profession, practiced it well, and encouraged their offspring—and occasionally a son-in-law, too—to carry on the family's good name in the same field.

The world in which we live—the world you are introducing your students to—is changing. It always has, but a new ingredient—cybernation—I suggest, will affect the broad trends of which the Automation Commission spoke, and bring about substantial change in the employment picture of which Secretary Wirtz spoke. Let us take a quick look at it.

Automation has been with us for many years, but now we have added to it a fantastic piece of equipment—the computer—which has the facility to store thousands and thousands of facts, to make calculations and give directions based on them, to accept new facts during the process and revise directions. It can match wanted facts against stored facts in speeds hard to comprehend, and it can do these things 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, even at locations thousands of miles from the man asking the questions.

Let me describe one example: The Sara Lee bakery located outside Chicago. It produces fresh-frozen cakes, breads, and rolls—about 75 million a year for customers all over the Nation. A central computer about the size of a bread truck does all these things: It follows sales figures, orders the appropriate amounts of fresh milk, whole eggs, butter, flour, and other ingredients; meters them out precisely; directs the mixing machine, baking, wrapping, and freezing, and accepts signals from quality control instruments all along the route (is the batter too thick? Too thin? And every 15 seconds it asks if the oven is too hot, too cold), and then when the goodies are stored, it records the precise location of each item.

When an order comes in, it commands a mechanized warehouse to assemble an exact order from among the 24 varieties and do so in the time a truck is driven from the front gate to the back door. In its spare time, it prepares bills, cost figures, sales trend charts, the company payroll, and anything else the button pressers can think up.

Let me point out, too, that this plant is located almost 30 miles outside Chicago, in a suburb where land values permit a horizontal operation rather than the more expensive vertical one; where shipping trucks do not have to double and triple park in narrow downtown streets with drivers' pay ticking away at $4 and $5 an hour; where workers are given parking space free instead of nibbling away at their weekly pay to plunk out a dollar a day in parking fees.

Let me blend in one more factor. In a manual operation, growth in business means the owner has to expand his plant and his labor force. In a highly mechanized operation such as Sara Lee, the company can triple its current production without adding to its 500,000-square-foot bakery and you may be sure its labor costs will not be tripled.

Some observers have pooh-poohed cybernation, declaring such plants as Sara Lee are an isolated example. True, for now, but what do you think will happen when competing bakery A, faced with an obsolete plant and constant traffic jams, ponders what to do next? What do you think competing bakery B, when faced with a need for expansion in a high-rent district downtown will do? These rugged individualists, no less than high school sophomores, are copycats, particularly when their earnings picture can be brightened by change.

Another factor on which some rely in downgrading the impact of cybernation is that the computer industry itself will bring about a great demand for people to make computers and to service them. Ironically, much of the computer making is being accomplished by automated—indeed computer-directed—processing, and when a part of the computer goes on the blink, the remaining units can help track down down the erring unit. Frequently all that is involved is that the old unit is removed, a new one screwed into place, and, voila, all's well again.

But lest you think cybernation affects only blue-collar workers and not those of us who have to wear ties to work, perish the thought. Wherever men and women are working, whatever the field, new technology can help. In teaching, we have already made use of teaching machines, programed instruction in various ways, teaching by television and now even in color. In Mexico City, color TV is being used to teach reading and writing successfully to illiterates such as a 77-year-old laborer. Almost 500 persons received diplomas after 60 hours of classes—65 percent of the entering class (that's better than the University of Maryland in the days when I taught here).

Computers are in use in hospitals to take inventories of stocks, order drugs, add up bills, check insurance payments, regulate diets, record medical histories, read cardiograms and analyze brain malfunctions. Computers are helping lawyers find precedents from among thousands of law decisions. In banks and insurance companies they have become commonplace.

The potential is endless. Recently a lecturer at the University of Maryland pointed out that computers are being taught to solve jigsaw puzzles, which is not as frivolous as it sounds. The computers can then figure out how to pack the highest possible number of cars into a parking lot or how to best plot out a land development project.

Clearly, we are entering a period of great change. But teachers thrive on change. You get plenty of it—a new crop of challenges every year, each one different. Coming back to cybernation, must it necessarily involve large economic dislocations, much personal hardship? The answer depends in good measure on what we do today and on a relatively new institution, which has weathered good and bad days, collective bargaining.

The Magna Carta for collective bargaining was the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, a year when many of us here were trying to outguess our high school teachers. The Wagner Act, as it became known, included this sentence: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstruction to the free flow of commerce * * * by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing."

The act goes on to say that employees have the right to form, join, or assist labor organizations or to refrain from such activities. Through the years, the act has been amended, but these basic rights have not been diminished. Senator Robert A. Taft, in urging his amendments, said, "We have drafted this bill and it is based upon the theory of the Wagner Act, if you please. It is based on the theory that the solution of the labor problem in the United States is free collective bargaining—a contract between one employer and all of his men acting as one man. * * * No employer can beat down a union; no employer can discriminate; no employer can refuse to deal with the union which is duly certified to him."

The freedom of choice available to a worker is important. In an NLRB election he has a chance to vote for a union, sometimes to choose among unions, or to vote for none. Each year the Board runs some 8,000 elections for this purpose and our people are justifiably proud that we achieve a 90-percent participation—much higher than political elections—and we run them without permitting threats, coercion or unlawful promises of benefit. Few candidates in political life can make the same claim. Recently the Board made it possible for union and management to bring their views to the attention of all affected employees through them mails before elections. We believe in education, too.

Through the past three decades, the act has helped workers and employers avert problems, such as oncoming automation, and resolve other sore spots as they developed. Thousands upon thousands of voluntary bargaining sessions with results spelled out in contracts have helped smooth labor-management relationships. These are the companies and unions we never see at the NLRB. Their success can be likened to the international bodies which have contributed to world peace by negotiating differences and incorporating agreements into treaties. At any level, communication can lead to understanding and agreement, providing an undergirding for stable relations. Cybernation—the combination of the computer and automation—is a fruitful area for collective bargaining—before during and after its introduction.

Collective bargaining has already helped some of the Nation's biggest companies make the transition without incident. A reader of the financial pages can report that these and cost industrial giants never were so strong nor had it so good. A reader of labor periodicals can tell you that most—if not all—of these giants are unionized, from sweepers all the way up to the supervisory jobs.

Why then is collective bargaining on the hot seat from time to time? The answer, I venture, consists of many things. One is that we who have taught have given inadequate attention to it; the textbooks I have seen cover the subject in lines, not pages.

The result is that the knowledge of most viewers is limited to information obtained in less formal places of education—the newspapers, magazines, and television. The media have little interest in the field when things are flowing smoothly. Interest commences when relationships break down, and some unions strike or some managements lock out. Then most reports concentrate on the effects, on the inconvenience and hardship in the local community. Rarely will you find mature discussion of the issues which led to the dispute. This is not too surprising, for the number of experienced labor reporters in communications media around the country would hardly crowd even a small University of Maryland classroom. We need more good reporters to give us penetrating detail and thorough coverage, to bring some perspective to the situation, some idea of how wage proposals compare with rates in similar cities, in similar fields, with productivity gains, with company income. Then we would have some insight on the causes as well as the effects. As things are, in most cities the only thing the public really is adequately informed on in a dispute is the hardship of the innocent bystanders. Important as this is, it is not enough. It helps ignore the successes and emphasize the failures without analyzing the reasons.

Collective bargaining has not been helped by some individuals and membership organizations who operate on the premise that every knock at a union is a boost to their own income. Since they make little pretext of being fair or complete in their commentaries, there is little to do about them except to recognize their existence.

Of course, I am not here to sell you the advantages of collective bargaining. This is not my role, but I do believe that there have been some unfair labels hung on labor groups. They are natural developments, created to meet the need for better communication, better understanding, among people working in a common enterprise. People who believe in unions find in their structure assurance of individual dignity and economic security. There are arrogant labor leaders and arrogant managements who place themselves above the law, but, fortunately, neither is typical of the hundreds of thousands who sit down at the bargaining table and work out fair contracts covering wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act to protect the right of working men and women to avail themselves of collective bargaining, and I am privileged to take part in this effort.

Carry on your good works and don't hold against any younger Zagorias, who come your way, either their father's ignorance or his long-windedness. When I was a reporter I harkened well the words of a favorite editor who used to plead, "Take a little longer and write it a little shorter." Now that I am talking rather than recording, the advice still seems good—for reporters.

Watershed Projects Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget has taken another swipe at rural America in its deplorable action which limits the number of new watershed conservation projects which can be started by the Soil Conservation Service in 1967.

The Budget Bureau has also stripped $500,000 in regular funds from the watershed program of the Soil Conservation Service in order to cover a special grant to Appalachia, an area which has already received more than $1 billion in aid in the last year alone. Consequently, countless projects and new obligations in South Dakota and the other States of the Midwest are being curtailed while one region of the country gets preferential treatment.

These planning limitations are unfair, both to the SCS and more importantly to the local people who are awaiting approval of watershed planning requests. It is imperative that the Budget Bureau remove this outrageous limitation policy. The projects which can be approved both for watershed planning and construction next year have been limited to 50, far under the present permitted level of 100.

If the planning limitations for fiscal years 1966 remain in effect, it will be very unfair to those local organizations who have spent countless hours of effort in preparing their plans to the SCS for approval and are awaiting decisions on them.

In fairness to those who have invested so much time and effort in these matters, the Bureau of the Budget should lift its planning limitations for the current fiscal year and for 1967. Congress must refuse to put this additional $500,000 frosting on the Appalachian giveaway package and restore the economy to the Soil Conservation Service funds which help all areas of the country which need to have their projects initiated.

J. Bryan Bradbury Honored as Top Citizen of Abilene, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, J. Bryan Bradbury is an outstanding attorney, civic leader, and prime mover of many community projects in Abilene, Tex. Recently he was given the highest civic award of Abilene by being named "Outstanding Citizen of the Year of Abilene, Tex."

This man is without a doubt one of the most civic-minded citizens of my home State of Texas, having been a civic leader for three decades in many projects too numerous to mention. He is a self-made man, having endured tremendous financial handicaps to complete his legal education. He is a past State legislator for Taylor County and has held numerous positions in his local and State bar associations.

As a tribute to his many accomplishments, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Bradbury Chosen City's Top Citizen," published in the Abilene Reporter-News of Saturday, March 12, 1966, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article ws ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bradbury Chosen City's Top Citizen

(By Katharyn Duff)

Thanks for three decades of civic labors were wrapped up in award which Abilenians, through the Abilene Chamber of Commerce bestowed Friday night on Attorney J. Bryan Bradbury.

The announcement that Bradbury, a tall bald, erudite lawyer, had been singled out for this highest Abilene civic honor was made as climax to the annual chamber of commerce banquet.

C. E. "Sonny" Bentley, who was named "Outstanding Citizen" last year, made the presentation, always a closely guarded secret.

The award was a tribute to Bradbury's recent service in many local fields, including his work for the new medical foundation which is seeking a school of medicine for Abilene and his labor in behalf of Business-AID, the organization formed to urge financial support of local colleges.

BIG TASKS

It was a special tribute, also, to the success of two vast and complex assignments Bradbury recently carried out for the community—

His chairmanship of the cross-section commission which wrote Abilene's new city charter, a backbreaking task which took many months of detailed—and unsalaried—work.

And his chairmanship of another cross-section group, the one called on to plan and promote the $7.9 million city capital improvements bond program which produced, among other things, Abilene's newly occupied city hall and the new Abilene Zoo, to be opened July 2.

Bradbury, 53, a native of the Zephyr community in Brown County, has been a resident of Abilene since 1928 when his father, the late R. E. Bradbury, came here to go into business in Standard Printing Co.

Bryan is the eldest of three Bradbury children. His brother Robert E., lives in Big Spring; his sister, Mrs. Frank Gibson, in Abilene.

DEPRESSION

Bradbury did the last portion of his public school work here, graduating from Abilene High in 1929—just in time for the depression. Higher education in his collegiate generation, did not come easy. Bradbury got his a very hard way, juggling jobs and classwork for a dozen years.

Out of high school he went to work as a printer in his father's shop and began studying law on the side, taking classwork at McMurry as he could work it into his schedule.

At age 21 he plunged into politics, a field in which he is still active as adviser and consultant. He ran that year for the Texas Legislature and won in the election which was held a few weeks after his 22d birthday. That same year, 1934, he passed the bar exams for which he had been studying at night.

LEGISLATIVE YEARS

Bradbury served Taylor County in the legislature for 6 years. His was active service. Among other legislative chores he was a leader in the fight against legalized horserace betting and helped spearhead the fight against W. L. O'Daniel's sales tax proposal.

Since the legislative office was then part time, with only token pay, Bryan padded out his income, between sessions, with his budding law practice. For a time, he worked in the legal department of the liquor control board and, when the legislature was not meeting, got off some college work. He put in one semester with an early morning class at the University of Texas, night classes at St. Edward's University and a full day's work with the liquor control board in between.

In 1943, Bradbury volunteered for military duty as an apprentice seaman. He spent his entire Navy hitch, oddly enough, on duty in Texas. He was assigned to the Corpus Christi Naval Station.

Out of service in 1945, Bradbury joined the large field of candidates anounced for Congress. He lost in the campaign which sent OMAR BURLESON to the Congress in 1946. And with that defeat Bradbury settled down to law practice in partnership with the late Ben L. Cox.

In 1947 and 1948, Bradbury became a part-time professor, teaching classes at McMurry College. And all the time, he was still trying to earn for himself a college degree. He continued earning college credits as he could—he has them from four schools, H-SU and McMurry, UT and St. Ed. He finally received his Bachelor of Science from McMurry in 1948.

Bradbury was married in Abilene on Christmas Day 1938 to Helen Walter, member of a longtime prominent Abilene family. They have one daughter, Mrs. Shannon Young of Lubbock, and one grandson, Bryan David Young, age 1½.

Through the years Bradbury has been active in almost every worthwhile undertaking in the community, serving on the board of such groups as the Salvation Army and Red Cross, in such clubs as Optimist, Lions, Pythians.

Professionally, he has held many positions in the local and State bar associations, serving as a director of the State organization of lawyers.

He has been outstanding in work for his faith, Baptist. He is a deacon and Sunday School teacher at South Side Baptist, chairmanned the building committee for that church's new sanctuary, served through the years in many other church posts. He has served two local church institutions, as a trustee of Hendrick Memorial Hospital, as a member of the board of development for Hardin-Simmons University.

Bradbury is active in Democratic Party affairs, taking a quiet, behind-the-scenes role in many successful partisan campaigns. He has been called on, however, to head up many nonpartisan and bipartisan civic undertakings, such as the city charter project and the massive capital improvements city bond issue.

More impressive than his headline activities, however, to those who knew it, has been the quiet life Bradbury has lived outside the limelight in Abilene these years.

Bradbury, who was aptly enough a prime mover in the project to get Abilene modern library facilities, is a learned man, a student and a scholar. He is a "reader and a writer."

He has continued his studies through travel, including a lengthy trip through Russia a year or so ago, through correspondence course and short courses, particularly at the University of Chicago and Harvard. His advanced fields of study are law and philosophy.

His writing is in related fields, particularly the philosophy of law. He has finished one book—he wrote it for himself but it was good enough to be considered for publication—on the origin of law. He has lately been writing in the field of the "adversary system" of American jurisprudence.

The 1966 GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the most significant piece of legislation to be passed by this session of the 89th Congress is the so-called cold war GI bill.

This bill received overwhelming support from both Houses of the Congress and from our constituents, and I am pleased to say that I can be numbered among those who gave this bill their full support.

Recently, an editorial, relative to this bill, appeared in the Kingsport Times-News of Kingsport, Tenn., and I include it at this point in the RECORD, for it is always good to know that our actions are considered as a job well done.

THE GI BILL

It is nice to have someone do something for you. However, it is even nicer when you have an opportunity to repay the favor. Veterans of World War II and the Korean conflicts will have that opportunity.

The case at point is the new "cold war GI bill" which passed unanimously in both House of Congress and involves the outlay of a big chunk of money—some $2.8 billion over the next 6 years before it tapers off.

This is about twice as much as the administration asked for in its original request. But it is one of those things that cannot be categorized as inflationary or noninflationary, that eludes analysis in columns of profit and loss.

The fact is that a substantial share of the billions the program will cost will come from the incomes of citizens in the prime of their working lives who themselves received benefits—college educations, vocational training, home loans, etc.—under previous GI bills.

There were 8.4 million who participated in the first bill after World War II. Another 2.5 million were beneficiaries of the Korean GI bill.

How much more they have earned, how much more they have contributed to the Nation than they otherwise might have, is impossible to say. The monetary returns on these investments might perhaps be estimated: in any other terms it is incalculable.

While the heavy hand the veterans' lobbies exercise over Congress is open to question on some matters, the new GI bill is one fruit of their labors everyone can applaud.

Theoretically, it could be of immediate benefit to some 3.5 million veterans who were discharged from the services after January 31, 1955, when the Korean bill expired.

While the veterans of the big war and the police action are having their opportunity to repay their share of the debt to the new generation in the armed services, the rest of us are also benefiting.

Despite the share that many citizens have contributed with their tax dollars to both GI bills, only a few can be found grumbling over the assessment.

While they didn't receive college educations, vocational training and the like from the measures, they do enjoy living in a free country which was made possible by these fighting men.

Had not American GI's fought our battles overseas, we might not now be in the position of helping these veterans to better themselves.

A prayer is in the hearts of all Americans that the time will come when it will no longer be necessary for our men to be called to arms in order to defend our rights and freedoms.

Speech by Robert Vaughn, "The Man From U.N.C.L.E."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Last week, Mr. President, I had the pleasure of meeting with

Mr. Robert Vaughn, the well-known television actor, in my office. Mr. Vaughn is not only a charming gentleman and a highly competent member of his profession, but he is also a man with a deep concern for public questions.

This is very clear from an address which he recently delivered at a dinner of the Marion County, Ind., Young Democrats in Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that this speech, which stresses the moral aspects of political leadership on the international scene, may appear in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech Delivered by Robert Vaughn, to the Marion County Young Democrats, Annual F.D.R.–J.F.K. Memorial Dinner, January 29, 1966, Indianapolis, Ind.

Thank you Mr. Secretary, Lieutenant Governor Rock, Mayor Barton, Attorney General Dillon, Congressman Jacobs, Governor Welsh, ladies and gentlemen.

I am pleased and honored that Mike Riley so graciously extended an invitation to be present this evening at your annual F.D.R.–J.F.K. memorial dinner. As a devoted admirer of President Kennedy and President Roosevelt, my appreciation for the opportunity to address this gathering is bounteous in the extreme. My sincere thanks.

This is my first visit to Indianapolis, although as a child I traveled many times through your State enroute from my home in Minneapolis to New York. My memories of the Hoosier State are the real images of basketball backboards as far as the eye could see and the make-believe Hollywood images of "Home in Indiana." As a boy it was my favorite picture and, regardless of how many times I saw it, I was always thrilled by the beauty of new mown hay, lush trees, thoroughbred horses, and Jeanne Crain. Not necessarily in that order.

Although my home State of Minnesota prides itself as sire of the current Vice President, Indiana, with such men as Thomas Hendricks, Charles Fairbanks and Thomas Marshall is often referred to as the "cradle" of Vice Presidents.

And Indiana has contributed many show-business greats also.

Cole Porter, Anne Baxter, Phil Harris, Forrest Tucker, Harry Von Zell, Clifton Webb, Red Skelton; and the gifted songwriter, Hoagy Carmichael, who has immortalized his Indiana birthplace with such songs "Baltimore Oriole," "Memphis in June," and "Georgia on My Mind."

In going over your list of previous speakers I found the name of Senator Birch Bayh, whose example of independent and creative action has made it possible to wrest control of the Democratic Party in Marion County from—as Mike Riley described them in a letter to me—"conservatives wearing the label of Democrats."

I found the names of Senator Hartke, Senator Tydings, of Maryland, and Governor Breathitt of Kentucky. Men whose leadership in the Democratic Party offer daily proof to John F. Kennedy's declaration that "the torch" has been passed to a new generation of Americans.

And it is to that new generation that I address myself this evening.

On August 6, 1945, a new world was born. It was named the atomic age. And with that first fleeting heartbeat in the new babe, all the ages that came before were rendered unmeangingful.

At this moment of birth, all systems of man's solutions to dispute were made obsolete.

War, as it had been known before this date, was suddenly no longer a method for effecting social change. Man's inhumanity to man had reached the final insanity. Scientific sophistication had succeeded in producing the means for man to eliminate his species from the earth.

Adolph Hitler's "final solution" of genocide was no longer limited to ethnic extinction. On that summer day, a little more than a score of years ago, forces were unleashed that would finally enable man to exterminate the entirety of his race, but even then he was not satisfied. In a race to build bigger and more expedient means of hastening the genocide, those first bombs were made immediately obsolescent. And by 1954, at Bikini Atoll, a nuclear detonation occurred that was greater than all of the combined explosives of the Second World War. That was greater, moreover, than all of the explosives, in all of the wars, since the dawn of mankind, and still he was not satisfied. The stockpiles of hydrogen horror continue to grow. The potential overkill today taxes the most lucid and imaginative of human minds, and still man is not satisfied.

Still he continues to settle dispute in the old ways, disregarding the blatantly apparent fact that war, of any kind, anywhere, can lead to the end of our planet in minutes.

Yet, this day, we are at war and if that war is allowed to continue and expand, it will surely and eventually conclude with man's final solution for man; death of the human race.

It may not be this year, it may not be next year, but as long as we choose to settle dispute by destruction it will most certainly be in that "new generation" that carries John F. Kennedy's torch.

By definition, governments are immoral, because they must work in a selfish way for one group of people against another group of people. But men are moral.

If there is a salvation for mankind it must come from the shouts of the moral men that make up the greatest deliberative body in the world, the Congress of the United States of America.

I submit the following quote on the rationalization of men to make war.

"The loud little handful will shout for war. The puppet will wearily and cautiously protest at first. The great mass of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes and will try to make out why there should be a war. And they will earnestly and indignantly say is it unjust and dishonorable and there is no need for war. Then the few will shout even louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen and at first will get a hearing and be applauded. But it will not last long. The few who want war will outshout those who want peace. And presently the antiwar audience will thin out and peace will become unpopular. Before long you will see a curious thing. Antiwar speakers will be stoned from the platforms and free speech will be strangled by hordes of furious men, who still agree with the speakers, but dare not admit it.

"The whole nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry and shout itself hoarse and will mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth for peace. Then such shut mouths will cease to open. Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame on the nation that is to be attacked and each man will be glad of these lies, and will study them, because they sooth his conscience. And thus he will, by and by, convince himself that the war is just and he will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys by his self-deception."

The author of these remarks was Mark Twain and they are applicable to all nations, in all ages, because they expose the rationalizations that are involved in the use of violence to achieve peace.

But no longer is justification necessary for war, because war, is no longer justifiable. Still, men continue to commit acts of atrocious and inhuman violence to their fellow man. The war in Vietnam cannot be rationalized by moral men.

In a Christmas issue of a New York paper I encountered a drawing which, although not captioned, I think clearly reflected the major irony of the war in southeast Asia.

It was a drawing of the lion lying down with the lamb. There was only one problem—there were two lions.

Already, they were baring their teeth at one another, each violently demanding his exclusive right to lie down peacefully with the lamb.

And, with the great claws of two separate lions pulling his head in opposite directions, the lamb sat numbly between them and waited for that helpless head to be ripped off so that the victorious lion might lie down peacefully with the gutted remains.

Let us examine the lions.

From 3 divergent sources I quote the following:

Item 1. From a Paris Match interview with Father Currien, formerly curé of some 10 villages in Vietnam:

"No one was in the village except for some women, children, and old people whom neither the Vietcong nor the regular troops thought to pick up to serve as coolies. I heard some planes. The first bomb fell at 6:05 on my church. There was nothing left of it. We passed the entire night while those accursed planes hammered with rockets and bombs at my village. There were no longer any Vietcong around. They had fled into the forest long before.

"Today, nothing remains of all that region. All is razed. As for the poor mountain people whose villages and rice granaries have been destroyed, they can live only as wild boars in the forest. Before the bombardment, the loud speakers in the planes above them told them not to go into the fields, and to stay in their huts. They stayed in their huts and the huts were bombarded anyway. Or, again, the Vietcong obliged them to come out * * * and machinegunned them in the fields. I have seen my faithful burned up in napalm. I have seen the bodies of women and children blown to bits. I have seen all my villages razed. By God, it's not possible."

The lions would lie with the lamb.

Item 2. From a New York Times dispatch following the first bombing of dams in North Vietnam:

"The bombing * * * raised the question whether there was any consideration of attacking one of North Vietnam's most vulnerable points, the complex of dikes in the Red River Delta. Some observers believe widespread destruction of dikes could devastate the most populous part of North Vietnam and cause serious famine."

The lion would lie down with the lamb—by starving him, if necessary.

Item 3. From a Senate speech by South Dakota's Senator George McGovern:

"I urge that we stop the bombing attacks in both North and South Vietnam. Bombing is largely ineffective in a guerrilla war and more often than not kills the wrong people. We should also stop the jungle skirmishes that subject our soldiers to ambush. The guerrillas control most of the rural and village areas. To dislodge them would be to destroy in the process thousands of the innocent civilians we are trying to save * * * human life—the lives of our soldiers and the Vietnamese people."

And so we are reminded that not all men are "lions" or "hawks," as we now call them. Senator McGovern is not a "lion." Senator Wayne Morse, Senator William Fulbright, Senator Ernest Gruening—and a daily growing list of Senators and Congressmen—are not "lions."

Senator Hartke said that of some 500 letters received from Indiana supporting the peace offensive. "72 percent reflect dissatisfaction with U.S. involvement, with at least half of these urging withdrawal of our troops, if peace efforts fail." The people of Indiana are not "lions."

America, in point of fact, is not a nation of "lions"—and yet we have come to appear so.

We have come to appear as a great, vain, jealous—perhaps even frightened—vindictive lion in the eyes of much of the world, even to many of our allies.

And—most important of all—we have taken on that appearance with a small, but I'm afraid, mounting number of those who should be most important to us, those who must know and reflect the very essence of almost 200 years of democracy.

We have taken on some part of that appearance to much of our own youth. The vibrant, involved youth, still perhaps not old enough to vote, but desperately demanding that our Government in action, show them what they have been taught in theory, and that our Government earn the right to that vote.

We are all nourished from childhood on the importance of the vote, the significance of the secret ballot as the very backbone of our heritage. And yet many, many Americans remember devoting themselves tirelessly in 1964 to assure the defeat of a presidential candidate they feared because of his warlike threats and promises.

They defeated that candidate, and yet they see some of those same policies they fought in effect today.

And so cynicism appears in old as well as young and, in a tradition which dates back to the first rumblings of freedom in this Nation, the disenchanted turn to the streets.

The "lions" among us would exorcise this disquieting image, particularly, the legion of young America, the students, suddenly finding it necessary to remind their teachers what the Constitution means, what the American tradition of peace and morality means, these "lions" point immediately to the misguided illegality of burning draft cards or, in truly tragic cases—the burning of self—and fail to understand the reasons behind these protests, and shout these acts down as those of Communists and cowards.

But they cannot shout down the thousands who burn nothing, but march in silent anguish to protest burning.

At the end of a year's escalation of the war in Vietnam, the administration looked out on the front porch of Government and found its uneasy chairs uncomfortably crowded with people bearing signs: signs calling for an end to the war. Signs calling for peace talks. Signs calling for immediate withdrawal.

If they looked very closely they could find an occasional Communist.

But mostly they found students. They found mothers of small children, and veterans of one or even two wars of the last three decades, ministers, priests, rabbis, veterans of Vietnam, scientists, doctors, writers, teachers, they found Nobel Peace Prize winners.

They found Members of the Senate, of the House, local party leaders, and respected political commentators in the national press.

All applauding efforts toward a Great Society, but mournfully predicting its impending atrophy under the grinding weight of a continuing—and perhaps pointless—war.

I have never doubted, I do not think that any but the most irrational radical has ever doubted, that President Johnson does indeed want to lie down with the lamb, in peace and mutual respect. And I'm sure it seems to him that escalation has grown step by inexorable step in spite of his most sincere efforts to arrest that growth.

And, on a practical basis, once escalation had begun, I'm not sure what else could have been done.

One of the Presidents we pay respect to this evening inherited the legacy of the Vietnam problem.

I quote his biographer, aid, and friend, Ted Sorensen: "He neither permitted the war's escalation into a general war nor bargained away Vietnam's security at the conference table, despite being pressed along both lines by those impatient to win or withdraw."

Two months before his assassination in September 1963, President Kennedy said in a television interview:

"They (the South Vietnamese)—are the ones who have to win or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment. We can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam."

No; I do not know what a living President John F. Kennedy would have done. But I believe what he said during his lifetime.

I believe what John Kennedy said. And I believe, and support, his insistence that South Vietnam's security cannot be bargained away at the conference table.

I believe the concept that we cannot abandon Asia to communism is false, because by inference it implies that Asia is ours to abandon.

I believe that the concept of this great Nation losing face in the eyes of the world by retiring from an untenable situation is false. Our older brothers, Britain and France, retired from untenable situations and gained the gratitude of the world.

And I believe that if the face of this great Republic was lost a thousand times, that loss is of no consequence, if it ends the slaughter in southeast Asia.

I believe that the killing must stop.

And when that cessation is made, we then sit at the conference table with the representatives of the South Vietnam revolution, and of Hanoi and Saigon and assure the free elections that the Vietnamese were promised at Geneva in 1954, and have never experienced.

And I think we must assure the freedom of those elections, not assure our own victory, for that would be a denial of all our Constitution stands for. I believe we must take that gamble, steadied by the knowledge that no Communist government ever has come into power through elections.

And if we gamble and lose, if South Vietnam should prove to be the first freely elected Communist government in the world, then we must learn to live with that government, as we have learned to live with Communist Russia, racist South Africa, and Fascist Spain. We cannot prevent the spread of communism by sacrificing the principles of democracy.

The nations of the world must learn to live with us, the most powerful nation on earth; we cannot choose to do less in return.

I have spoken only briefly tonight of the other giant we gather to honor, but I think we might well leave on the note he carved deeply and eternally into every American consciousness, even to those yet unborn.

More than 30 years ago, in time of domestic chaos President Roosevelt said: "So first of all let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Today, in time of international chaos we live by fear. We are all told to fear the Red menace abroad and creeping socialism at home. To fear a tiny island 90 miles off our shores and to fear a revolutionary army fighting on its own ground in southeast Asia, thousands of miles from our shores; to fear the student protest marches who might be encouraging the enemy; to fear the handful of aging Marxists who seek their lost and futile youth in the student protests of today; to fear the moral breakdown of the new generation; that generation born after Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That generation that reached the age of reason only to find their fathers had lost the capacity to reason. That generation, that understands only that those who preceded them have made it possible for their generation to be the last.

To you ladies and gentlemen, and to the distinguished Senators from Indiana and to their colleagues in the world's greatest Congress of freemen I respectfully submit these thoughts.

Concluding only: Let us fear not. Or the lions may die with the lamb.

Thank you.

"Maritime Lecture at Tulane University"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following lecture by Commission George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, before the Institute on Foreign Transportation and Port Operations, sponsored by Tulane University, School of Business Administration, New Orleans, La., on March 23, 1966.

The reason for, and the history of events leading up to the enactment of the Shipping Act of 1916, and amendments thereto, is not only informative but this practical discourse concerning the need for regulation due to the difference in the philosophies between the United States and that of our European commercial friends in treating concerted efforts and monopolistic business practices is important for all to note. This treatise goes far in explaining the intent of Congress concerning ocean shipping regulations in today's business world.

LECTURE BY MR. HEARN

Ocean shipping, because of its unique role in international commercial intercourse, has always been a subject of grave concern for trading nations. Historically, for some nations a merchant fleet has been the source of national pride and wealth and to those nations, their concern with ocean shipping has been an end in and of itself. For other countries, a merchant fleet has been a vehicle for the exchange of goods and their concern with ocean shipping has been with a means to an end. In our country a merchant fleet has served a twofold purpose at one and the same time. It has been a tool for the flow of our commerce and a most necessary adjunct to our National Defense Establishment and I might add to the defense establishment of the entire free world. That dual concern has presented us with many problems.

But since the advent of Reorganization Plan No. 7 in 1961 the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce has had, as you know, the responsibility of promoting the American-flag merchant fleet while the Federal Maritime Commission has had the responsibility of administering the economic aspects of ocean shipping with respect to all common carriers, terminal operators, and freight forwarders for the freer and unencumbered flow of the foreign commerce of the United States.

I believe that none will quarrel with the wisdom of the separation of these diverse functions.

Perhaps a brief review of the history of economic aspects of ocean shipping might be in order. In the late 19th century, the industry, worldwide, was honeycombed with deferred rebates, discriminatory treatment of competing shippers, fighting ships and other devices, sophisticated and crude, inimical to the free flow of commerce. Ocean shipping, under the banner of extranational laissez faire, had taken on the aspects of jungle survival. Not the least vexing of problems besetting international waterborne commerce is found in the sometimes conflicting legal systems and philosophies of the community of nations.

While much has been accomplished in recent years respecting tariff barriers much remains to be done, particularly in the area of ocean shipping. I know that many nations find our Shipping Act unpalatable. Nevertheless, the Congress, in enacting that legislation, did give meaningful fiat to the traditional philosophy extolled by the conference system which is counter to our own business philosophy.

We cannot demand that all nations recognize our Shipping Act as best for their own national purposes, but we do ask them to respect the judgment of our Congress that it is desirable for us as a commercial nation, and that when their vessels engage in our trade, that they do so on the explicit condition of the existence of the Shipping Act.

In the early 1900's, two important maritime nations examined the impact of shipping practices on their economies. The first important inquiry was that conducted by Great Britian. That nation's select investigation commission, which included ship owners, was called the Royal Commission on Shipping Rings, of 1906, it was brought together for the purpose of inquiring into the operation of conferences and to "report whether such operations have caused, or are likely to cause, injury to British or colonial trade." That report stands, even today, as a beacon of integrity and thoroughness, and lessons taught by it are applicable after almost 60 years.

In general, the Royal Commission found that the good emanating from the conference system counterbalanced its evils, and gave within limits, the royal seal of approval to the conference system.

Its principal recommendation was the encouragement of shippers to unite in opposing conferences wherever abuses occurred. A few years later, our own Government brought ocean shipping under its scrutiny, through the efforts of a committee of the Congress, headed by Congressman Alexander, in 1912, extensively drew upon the Royal Commission's hearings and report and, in general, came to the same conclusion. That is, in broad terms, steamship conferences should be sanctioned but deferred rebates and other practices odious to our national policy should be outlawed. But our Alexander report, in a material sense, went beyond the Rings Commission:

It recommended legislation which had a foundation in fairness; fairness among carriers and, more importantly, fairness to similarly situated shippers. An historical note which I think should be injected here is that, at the time of these two mammoth investigations, Great Britain was the world's leading maritime nation, as well as the world's leading trader.

The United States, on the other hand, represented a potential trading house, a marketplace of unheard of proportions, and yet possessed a most inferior merchant marine. Another historical footnote in the comparison of the two inquiries is that the United States had a national antitrust philosophy already embodied in the Sherman Act, a statute which even the minority report of the Royal Commission was not ready to adopt.

It wrote: "We are not satisfied that any * * * legislation as has been proposed by witnesses, short of legislation on the lines of the Sherman Act, would be effective; and we are not prepared * * * to recommend so great a change." Here, gentlemen, the difference in philosophies is pinpointed. The minority report of the Rings Commission was not ready to accept an antitrust attitude in regard to ocean shipping, in contrast to our own already established national policy of antimonopoly.

The result of all this has been that the United States, cognizant of the benefits which accrue from conferences and at the same time fearful, as a comparatively nonmaritime nation, of the dangers to an economy based upon free competition which conferences, particularly foreign-flag dominated conferences, could pose to a viable, evermushrooming international trade, attempted to fashion legislation which sanctioned the conference system and recognized our national policy of free competition.

More simply expressed, Congress was aware of both the benefits and perils of the conference system and was most certainly influenced by a recently codified national policy of free competition. Hence, Congress granted antitrust immunity to steamship conferences, and at the same time counterbalanced this license with a plan for regulation.

The result of our Alexander investigation was, of course, the Shipping Act of 1916. There is no need, before this institute, to spell out the provisions of the act. Suffice it to say, the Shipping Act is fairly unique among the community of maritime nations.

I believe history bears out the claim that the United States, under law, welcomes the services offered by vessels of all flags to participate in our foreign commerce, that under the Shipping Act the Federal Maritime Commission does not favor or prejudice the vessels of any flag, and that every common carrier by water can receive fair and impartial treatment before the Federal Maritime Commission. I am sure, also, that it is not necessary to recite by chapter and verse, the cases where protection, under the act, has been afforded to non-American-flag carriers.

The more recent history of ocean shipping in this country is embodied in the recent investigation of the House Antitrust Subcommittee under the leadership of Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of my hometown of Brooklyn, and the revered dean of the House. Significantly, the report of that committee, after weighing the alternative of outlawing the conference system, concluded "that it would be best * * * not to recommend withdrawal of antitrust exemptions for steamship conferences," and one of the grounds relied upon was that such action might create "substantial rate instability presently undesired by American shippers."

Hence, after a thorough investigation revealing the malpractices and shortcomings of conference conduct, Congress nevertheless was willing to endorse the system, even though it did so "grudgingly." It was an endorsement, which demands a strict overseeing of conference activities by the Federal Maritime Commission. It should be apparent, therefore, that immunity and regulation must go hand in hand.

At almost the same time, the Shipping Act was undergoing substantial changes that resulted in the Bonner Act of 1961. It gives the Commission increased powers as a guardian of our foreign commerce, particularly with respect to freight rates, permitted the carriers the tying device of dual rate contracts and provided shippers meaningful protections in dual rate contract systems.

So, after 50 years of the Shipping Act, what is the posture of our foreign commerce? It takes no expertise to read the score of yesterday's ball game, as Judge Lumbard so aptly put it. Unhappily, liner movements, both by volume and by value, are trending toward our imports over our exports. Imports have been growing more rapidly than exports for the past 19 years. Indeed since 1960 imports have increased almost 40 percent while our exports have advanced less than 30 percent. Moreover, in two of our most important trades, imports have exceeded exports, particularly in dollar value.

A significant barometer is that measured in terms of per capita contribution to our gross national product. Since the end of World War II, our per capita contribution to the gross national product has steadily and dramatically increased, from 400 to better than 800 based on the 1957–59 dollar. During the same period, our per capita contribution to exports, using the same dollar standard, has fluctuated between 250 and 277.

Now, we have often heard of the fact that less than 9 percent of our exports carried by liners is moved on U.S.-flag bottoms. This figure has been used time and time again to portray the terribly weak posture of our American merchant marine. Well, I too, am concerned with this figure but, as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission, for an entirely different reason. Our concern for the free flow of our commerce, both export and import, dictates that it is entirely reasonable to insure that our exporters and importers will not be prejudiced or discriminated against in their endeavors in world marketplaces by carriers or groups of carriers which have no relationship to them other than profits.

In short, we cannot permit our international commerce, which emanates from four coasts, to hang entirely by the thin thread of total dependence upon merchant marines not necessarily allied with us in our commercial aims without the existence of countervailing tools to insure that our exporters and importers receive the same treatment as their foreign competitors.

The foreign commerce of the United States is far too important to be left, unregulated and unaudited, in the hands of others. Therefore, is it any wonder that in the light of such a fact the Commission exists to insure that our foreign commerce is not disadvantaged when we are so dependent upon others and do not supply the needed merchant service ourselves, since there has been a history of abuses in the ocean shipping field.

With the awareness that our commerical exports are not keeping apace, that our balance of payments has not reached the level which we deem satisfactory and in view of the congressional mandate contained in 18(b)(5) of the Shipping Act, that rates so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to our commerce must be disapproved, this 90-percent figure raises, in my mind, rather grave concern as to whether our American exporters will continue to be charged reasonable rates.

Now we know that our rate authority over freight rates in our foreign trades is not what it is in our offshore domestic trades. We know that Congress has endorsed, with safeguards, the Conference system that it approved in 1916. And we know of the concern of the administration and the Congress with our level of participation in international trade. Moreover, the Congress, in 1961, bestowed upon the Federal Maritime Commission not only the power to disapprove after hearing, unreasonable rates that are detrimental to our commerce in the foreign trade, and power to disapprove concerted action agreements when they offend our public interest, but as well as a general rulemaking grant "to carry out the provisions of this act."

This leads me to the Commission's recent experiences under section 18(b) of the act. An investigation of rates in the North Atlantic-United Kingdom trade, both inward and outward, has been instituted.

It is no secret that I dissented from the decision to institute the United Kingdom investigation. I was compelled to say that at the time the investigation was instituted, the available evidence did not warrant that type of investigation embodied in Docket No. 65–45. But I had then, and still have a serious doubt that section 18(b)(5) can be applied in an ad hoc fashion where there are no clearly defined standards of reasonableness, or unreasonableness. Clearly, if a freight rate is "unreasonably high," it must be "unreasonably high" in terms of the carrier's operations, and not in relation to the shipper's business experience.

In my opinion, we presently lack standards for determining the "reasonableness" or "unreasonableness" of rates in our foreign trades. We do not, however, lack the tools for establishing such standards. I believe that general rulemaking is indicated, that we have ample authority to undertake such an approach and that the first step should involve the promulgation of a uniform system of accounts applicable to carriers in our foreign commerce. I note that such a requirement has had a salutary effect in our domestic trades and that the affected carriers recognize its benefits.

It is also my opinion that section 43 of the Shipping Act authorizes the formation of such a tool for measuring "reasonableness" and that the well-known disparate rate situations dictate its need. Without such a requirement, I fear that it would be virtually impossible to conclude that a rate, let alone an entire rate structure, is "unreasonable." Unless and until meaningful tools are adopted for testing reasonableness, I fear that our endeavors in rate disparity cases are preordained to become meaningless but expensive exercises.

I have alluded, earlier, to the fact that all carriers are welcome to participate in our foreign trade. The United States, because it has set up statutory protections for the flow of our commerce, economic regulation, to be more precise has been subjected to rather loud criticism throughout the world. Particularly, since the Federal Maritime Commission has shown a determination to carry out the mandates of Congress as emboded in the Shipping Act. So a few words on this seems appropriate.

Now it is true that the United States, by the Shipping Act, comprehensively regulates, in the economic sphere, ocean shipping to the extent that it is undertaken by common carriers. But none can doubt that this economic regulation is designed to, or effectuated in a manner which is calculated to, favor or prejudice the vessel of any flag. Other nations legislate as to ocean shipping. Not all of their regulations are nondiscriminatory, as are those under our Shipping Act. Brazil's SUMOC decree 181 clearly favors its own vessels with respect to commercial movements of cargo to that country.

Article 22 of Chilean Law 12041 similarly favors that nation's flag vessels with respect to commercial cargoes. A surcharge amounting to about 20 percent of the c.i.f. value of cargo is subject to an assessment on goods imported into Uruguay, by that government, on vessels which do not fly its flag. Colombia, too, has measures designed to favor its own vessels in the commercial field. Peru's Government may establish the percentage of its export and import trade to be reserved for its own flag ships by article 26 of Peruvian Law 13836 of January 1962. In Indonesia a national freight board is authorized to give priority to its own vessels and efforts are now underway to reserve 40 percent of that nation's commercial waterborne trade with Europe to Indonesian-flag vessels. In France, the government requires non-French-flag vessels to employ government licensed "Courtiers Maritimes" for the entrance and clearance of vessels. These are examples in my opinion, of economic regulation of ocean shipping, discriminatory in nature, which breed inefficiency, high costs and stifle or impede the free flow of commerce.

The Republic of South Africa can hardly be said to be unconcerned with the economic regulation of ocean shipping. While it is true that it does not have a comprehensive statutory plan in the matter, its Post Office Act prohibits mail contracts with lines which grant tying rebates. Its Shipping Board, moreover, is authorized to investigate rates to and from South Africa and to obtain information on rates and carrier agreements. With respect to the liner trade between South Africa and Europe, the government has entered into an agreement with the European Conference whereby its goods are shipped via conference vessels, and the agreement even provides a formula governing the profits of shipping companies.

In a manner quite similar to our own, the Government of Japan comprehensively regulates the economic aspects of ocean shipping, and the Government of India recently brought some pressure to bear on a surcharge proposed by carriers on cargo shipped to Bombay.

In yet another vein, Australia and New Zealand give governmental support to shipper-carrier associations which concern themselves with freight rates. In Australia, in the Australia-Europe trade, voyage results are actually audited and reported to both shipper and carrier interests.

I can agree with the recent remarks of the Minister of Communications of a European maritime nation, that a serious threat to freeworld shipping is posed by protectionist measures involving flag discriminations. But it is precisely here that I part with the gentleman's philosophy since in this same recent speech he noted his country's objection to its flag carriers filing information and documentation with the Federal Maritime Commission pursuant to the 1961 amendments to the Shipping Act.

I would say to the gentleman that the Commission seeks nothing from his nation's common carriers that it doesn't seek from every other common carrier in our foreign trade, and if the Shipping Act is to be administered with fairness to all in the furtherance of our import and export foreign commerce, statutory enactments by others calculated to thwart the ground rules which Congress has laid down for all who accept our open invitation to participate in our trade would themselves, constitute a discrimination. That type of restraining legislation is not qualitatively different than the protective discriminatory legislation which he finds so odious in the developing nations.

The developing nations, incidentally, have vast potentials of goods, as opposed to services, to place in the channels of international commerce. Such legislation calculated to frustrate the orderly administration of the Shipping Act, moreover, is quite unusual. Many nations, ours included, have long enforced statutes relating to pilotage rules, quarantine requirements, health standards, immigration, and contraband, without raising the hue and cry which is now witnessed with respect to economic safeguards.

The recent appearance of shippers councils in Europe is an indication of an awareness of shippers problems and an effort by the carriers to attempt to settle them. This subject is too detailed to go into today, however, their role is satisfied in our commerce by promulgations of the Commission, especially the requirement that conferences maintain procedures for the fair handling of shippers requests and complaints. I believe that our own regulations provide for that continuing dialog between diverse interests on matters common and vital to both carriers and shippers which establish a climate favorable for business growth.

Finally, I want to say that I recognize that ocean shipping and international trade are beset with great problems, today. We at the Federal Maritime Commission are wrestling with them daily. And no one need doubt that our efforts are directed primarily toward securing a maximum flow of import and export commerce for this Nation.

Watts II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Charleston, S.C., Evening Post, for Thursday, March 17, 1966, published an editorial entitled "Watts II" which deserves much wider attention and consideration by the Members of the Congress and the public generally. This editorial contains pointed observations concerning causes, both ostensible and real, of the two outbreaks of lawlessness and rioting which have occurred in that Los Angeles suburb.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Watts II

The seething hatred of Watts has erupted into the open again, and one can almost feel the apologists easing into high gear. How will they explain this one? The United States Weather Bureau reports that the temperature in Los Angeles never rose above 66° all day Tuesday. That would seem to eliminate the heat. What's left?

Have no fear. Something will occur to the fertile imagination. In a pinch, it is always possible to pretend that Tuesday's violence didn't happen, or that it was an "isolated incident," or that only a few hoodlums were involved. Then off to bed to dream sweet dreams of the Great Society where all men are brothers, the South excepted.

The all-important question will still remain: What is there about Watts and Harlem and other trouble spots outside the South that makes them prone to this kind of savage violence? It is not a simple question. But through the smoke of Watts II it is possible to glimpse a tentative answer, perhaps.

Some of the cause almost certainly lies in the attitude of the public. After last summer's bloodletting, a great deal of sympathy was expended in behald of the poor, oppressed residents of Watts. Commentators were quick to point out that, though Watts was not a slum in the normal sense, its palm-trimmed neighborhoods did something wretched to the spirit. Many of the rioters were on relief. Oh, the tragedy of it. Who could blame them for shooting at the cops?

Other things besides sympathy were expended, too. The Federal Government rushed in several million dollars to alleviate the suffering. Antipoverty offices sprang up overnight. Committees were formed, and bureaucrats dashed about dispensing the good things of life. A reporter for the Los Angeles Times was chatting with some of the poverty chieftains when word arrived at the neighborhood adult participation project that all hell was breaking loose down the street. "There goes one now," someone shouted as he ambled toward the scene. "Get out of here, whitey," advised another oppressed citizen, heaving a Coke bottle in his direction.

Last summer a blue-ribbon commission was appointed to probe the causes of the earlier uprising. The commission walked down all the old familiar paths of sociology and unemployment, examined with care every tender leaf and vine and came out, thoroughly confused, in the heart of the forest. Nothing in its report, which called for massive infusions of cash, put the blame where it properly belongs—surely a necessary first step toward teaching the hoodlum community that society will not accept poverty as a defense for assault.

It is tough being poor. Sometimes, no doubt, it is tough being black. But these are not reasons. These are excuses, and it is past time for the Nation to stop sentimentalizing over the noble bum. The world is full of people who are poor and black, but who have too much decency and self-respect about them to mob a fellow human because he is helpless and white. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that what a great many Watts residents need much more than commiseration is a good boot, judiciously directed.

And what the Nation desperately requires is a political leader with enough honesty to say so. There is no excuse for what has taken place in Los Angeles twice since last spring, and those responsible deserve nothing from the Nation but contempt. This they will not get. Instead they will get probed and bribed and psychoanalyzed, and their political godfathers will get votes and the Nation, rest assured, will get, somewhere, another Watts.

Des Moines Sunday Register Poll Shows 81 Percent of Iowa Farmers Favor Banning Large-Scale Packer Feeding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, on January 18 I introduced a bill, H.R. 12115, to prohibit large-scale feeding of livestock by meatpacking firms and retail chain stores engaged in meatpacking operations.

Very frankly, I have been pleasantly surprised by the large amount of support expressed thus far for this legislation. Judging by the mail which I have received, a good many people across the country are concerned about the economic implications of packer-feeding operations.

In any case, I feel certain that a majority of the people from my home State of Iowa, which is the Nation's second largest cattle-producing State, are worried about packer feeding.

In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members the results of the Iowa poll, published in the Des Moines, Iowa, Sunday Register, of March 27, 1965.

According to the poll, 81 percent of the Iowa farmers and 65 percent of all Iowans are in favor of the bill I introduced to prohibit large-scale packer-feeding operations.

The basic purpose of H.R. 12115 is to help assure farmers of a livestock market which is open and competitive, and which is based on the free enterprise principle of supply and demand.

The bill, which would amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, contains these major provisions:

First, it would prohibit livestock feeding by meatpacking firms with more than $1 million in annual gross sales. The same provision would apply to retail chain stores operating as meatpackers.

Second, it would bar any officer or director of firms covered by the bill, or any owner of more than 5 percent of stock in such a firm, from engaging in the livestock feeding business.

Third, it would prohibit these firms from purchasing livestock for slaughter through feeding contracts with individual farmers.

The Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the House Committee on Agriculture will hold hearings in the Midwest, at a date and place to be announced shortly, sometime this spring. I am hopeful that these field hearings, as well as the hearings to be held in Washington, D.C., before the subcommittee, will provide useful information on packer feeding.

These will be the first congressional hearings on packer feeding, and I feel that the concern expressed by Iowans and persons elsewhere in the Nation clearly shows the need for a careful inquiry into this subject.

The results of the Iowa Poll, to which I referred earlier, are as follows:

POLL SHOWS IOWANS OPPOSED TO PACKER FEED LOTS

Iowans living in cities and towns join farmers in favoring a Federal law which would prevent meatpacking companies from operating their own cattle feed lots, the Iowa poll reports.

About 6 out of 10 in cities and towns and 8 out of 10 farmers support such a law. About 2 out of 10 urban people and 1 out of 10 farmers oppose the law.

THEIR OWN FEED LOTS

In recent months, some meatpacking companies have indicated an interest in operating their own feed lots to supply livestock for their meat processing operations.

Farmers and farm groups have advocated a Federal law which would prevent meatpackers from operating feed lots.

Most of those favoring the law feel that the farmer would be hurt by lower prices or by unfair competition.

Those opposing the law feel it would infringe on the free enterprise system. Others opposing think the farmer needs competition or that packer feed lots might result in lower retail meat prices and more balanced livestock production.

WHAT THEY WERE ASKED

Iowans were asked the following:

"Some meatpacking companies have announced plans to operate their own beef cattle feedlots to supply some cattle for their packing plants. This might result in more competition for the livestock farmer. Therefore, it has been suggested that Federal laws be passed to stop meatpacking plants from operating their own cattle feeding lots. Would you favor or oppose such laws?

[Percent]

	All Iowans	*Farmers only*
Favor law preventing packer feedlots	65	81
Oppose law	19	11
No opinion	16	8

Those favoring the law gave the following reasons:

[Percent]

	All Iowans	*Farmers only*
Packers should process only, farmers feed	27	30
Farmers would be hurt	25	19
Unfair competition to farmers	25	28
Farm prices go down	20	18
Higher retail prices	2	0
Indefinite, miscellaneous	9	12

Those opposing a Federal law preventing meatpackers from owning feedlots gave the the following reasons:

[Percent]

	All Iowans	*Farmers only*
Against free enterprise	44	40
Too much Government control	25	26
Farmers need competition	6	0
Better balance of production	5	7
Lower retail meat prices	5	0
Indefinite, miscellaneous	20	27

Carl T. Rowan on China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished columnist, Carl T. Rowan, made some cogent comments on the question of our policy toward China. Mr. Rowan, former director of the U.S. Information Agency, speaks of the way our judgment has been affected by "the paralysis of fear." This atmosphere, as he notes, is being presently dispelled by the very helpful probings of our relationships to China, and the facts surrounding our China policy, through the efforts of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rowan's article, which appeared in the Indianapolis Star for Sunday, March 20, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Mar. 20, 1966]

FEAR, SILENCE HURT U.S. POLICY ON RED CHINA

(By Carl T. Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—Looking back over 15 grim years of U.S. policy toward China, one cannot help but note the role played by the paralysis of fear.

We have pursued a policy that was the product more of emotion than reason—and for the simple fact that the public discussions so essential to decisionmaking in a democracy were not taking place.

In the early 1950's, public emotions ran high over the American lives lost in Korea.

Many Americans felt that to express anything but public contempt for and hostility toward the Chinese would be interpreted as betrayal of our dead GI's.

Then the purges and inquisitions of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy had an even more stifling effect on public debate that might have brought some wise moderation in our approach to the most populous Nation in the world. It is conceivable that no wiser policy was available to us but we could hardly know, when the American public had no free exchanges of ideas about a country that is being pictured more and more as the major threat to U.S. security.

Thanks to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the era of fear-inspired silence may be at an end. Scholars like Doak Barnett of Columbia and John K. Fairbanks of Harvard are talking again—and saying some very controversial things.

They point out—rightly, I think—that there is a vast difference between "containing" China and ostracizing it. Fairbanks sees an urgent need to "bring China into greater contact with the outside world."

These hearings ought to be welcomed by Government officials who have grappled with the China riddle these last few years in the deep-down knowledge that some kind of change in policy was essential to the long-term requirements of peace.

The administration has made some nervous gestures toward increasing China's contact with the American people. Today any American journalist, doctor, scientist in the fields of medicine or public health, scholar—or even churchworker planning to report on China to a religious body—can get his passport validated to travel to mainland China.

Yet, Peking has been and remains the major obstacle to wider contact with the outside world. In Warsaw talks, the Chinese have told our envoy over and over that "smaller issues" cannot be resolved until the question of Peking's claim to Formosa is settled. So they keep our journalists and scholars out.

Last September 29, Communist China threw down new conditions on its entry into the U.N. It demanded that the General Assembly withdraw the 1950 resolution declaring China an aggressor in Korea; that a new resolution be voted branding the United States as the aggressor; that Nationalist China we expelled that all other "imperialists' puppets" be ousted and that the U.N. be reorganized.

In 1955, en route to the Bandung Conference, the late Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, told me that he considered the isolation of China extremely dangerous—that nations, like men, do insane things if they are cut off from contacts with the rest of society.

Whether China's present arrogance and belligerence flow out of her isolation is debatable—just as is the theory that through wider contacts we can "gradually manipulate Peking into acceptance of the international world as an alternative to trying to subvert it," as Fairbank suggests.

But what isn't debatable, in my view, is the value and wisdom of having Americans speak frankly about the problem of living with the giant dragon of the East.

The Navy Wife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Navy wife and the wives of other servicemen, often seem to be the forgotten people of our land. Fortunately, they have a good protector in the chairman of our House Armed Service Committee, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers. They also have a good friend in Columnist George Robeson of the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram. On March 3 he wrote of them as follows:

HEY, HERE'S SOME MORE POOR PEOPLE

(By George Robeson)

It was a hard-fought election, but the better people won. If anybody won. You remember the election Tuesday, don't you? The poor people—those who earn less than $4,000 a year—were to vote for representatives on the Economic and Youth Opportunities Board, a war-on-poverty agency.

Twelve people voted in Long Beach. In the huge voting district including Long Beach and 8 or 10 other cities, 58 votes was a plurality that elected a board representative.

The probable reasons for the absurdly low turnout of voters were lack of information on the election, lack of issues, and lack of interest in the whole thing. There were no issues, actually. All the candidates had the same qualification and stated it forthrightly: They were poor, therefore they knew the problems of the poor and perhaps there was something the new board could do about poverty. Maybe.

There would have been a much bigger turnout in Long Beach had one Great Society of paupers not been ignored: The Navy dependents.

Some of the Navy wives are pretty sore about being shunted aside in their Government's grandiose plans for helping the poor. I interviewed some Navy wives Wednesday (who will remain anonymous, if they know what's good for them), and this is what they said:

"Poor people? We're poor people. The poor are those who made less than $4,000 last year, correct? Well, my husband made $3,028 last year. We have two children. I rent an apartment in town because no Navy housing is available. I pay for dental care. Navy medicare is fine if you don't mind waiting 2 or 3 hours to get an APC capsule for a child who's running a high fever.

"You civilians think that the Navy takes care of everything for us. Well, it doesn't quite work out that way."

That was from a 22-year-old wife who gets a $200-a-month allotment. Then there's a 21-year-old Navy wife with one child. She figures that her husband, on duty in the South China Sea, works for 49 cents an hour. He keeps about $25 a month, she says, and she gets $300. But she has a job. She'll tell you about it:

"I had to find work. You can't live on my husband's Navy pay. You know how a lot of Navy families exist? We get what you could call CARE packages from our parents.

"I had a difficult time finding work, even though I'm an experienced key-punch operator, and they're in demand. But private industry doesn't like to hire Navy wives, because we could move out at any time if our husbands are shipped elsewhere. I was lucky enough to get a civil service job. Immediately, I was making more money than my husband. Is that the way it should be? I don't think so."

Well, that's a fine turn of affairs, I must say. Here the Government is trying its best to find poor people who will vote for their own Representatives and the greatest number of them are right there in the Government's own family. "Millions for tribute, but not one dollar for defense," that's the spirit.

A serviceman is steadily employed. In fact, no one is more steadily employed. It's so steady it'll drive you nuts. So how come they're so poor?

It's a shame the Navy wives didn't get to the polls, although I'm not sure what good it would do to vote for a poor civilian to represent them. They meet all the voter qualifications I've heard. Even noncitizens could vote.

But perhaps Uncle Sugar, while helping the poor in all the rooms of his house, may yet notice that his kitchen staff isn't eating too well, either.

Address of ICC Chairman Bush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, John W. Bush, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, on March 8, gave an address to the 18th annual meeting of the Common Carrier Conference in Miami, Fla.

Among his comments made to the trucking organization were some observations about the Transportation Department bill and the response of the Interstate Commerce Commission to that proposal. Another section deals strongly with the need for highway safety, which is a particular concern I share with Mr. Bush.

I ask unanimous consent that Chairman Bush's address may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF JOHN W. BUSH, CHAIRMAN, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Article I, section 8, of our U.S. Constitution, provides that Congress—not the States—shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States with the Indian tribes. Pursuant to this constitutional grant, Congress has created a Commission with authority to regulate this commerce and transportation. "It shall be known as the Interstate Commerce Commission, which shall be composed of 11 Commissioners appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The reference to the Indian tribes causes me to reflect with honest amazement upon the tremendous growth of our country since the birth of the ICC—less than 80 years ago—a mere drop in the bucket of time as we think of it in connection with the total development of all civilization and of the old countries of Europe and Asia. I reflect particularly upon the thought that the Interstate Commerce Commission was actually created while we were still in the process of just winning—not even yet really developing—the vast West. In fact, the famous battle (called Custer's Last Stand) was fought between our soldiers and the Indians only a few years before the ICC was created. And in our recent national bereavement, someone pointed out that President Kennedy's grandmother was living at the time of his assassination, and that she was also living when President Lincoln was assassinated. We truly are a young country.

Of course, the main key to this rapid development of our great country is the fact that transportation facilities were developed—not just as fast as, but faster than any other phase of our development. No industrial or economic development of any country can ever move forward any faster than the development of its transportation system. Time after time after time this elementary fact has been proven. The oldest cases in point would probably be the well known, historically recorded, story of the development of trade between Europe and the Far East via the routes of the sailing vessels. The newest cases in point would be the almost unbelievable development of trade and travel in the past 30 years in the United States over the exploding highway system, and via the airlines and pipelines—and even those staid old methods of transportation, the railroads and the inland waterways.

Don't ever count out that old transportation warrior—the railroads—for they are still the backbone of our national transportation system; they have a "new breed" running them in the keen, "new look," management teams; and they just may jerk the rug out from under you—at any time—in any area of transportation operation. The truckers "did it" to them in automobile hauling, etc., but they only licked their wounds for a little while before they came up with piggyback and fishyback and unit trains and computerization of old, wornout methods, etc. Anyone who doesn't think the railroads are back in the transportation ball game in the United States needs only to consult the smart investors—the mutual funds, the pension funds, and even the sophisticated individual investors.

So much for the railroads and other modes of transportation. I haven't forgotten that I am speaking to one of the best groups in the transportation industry—the truckers we know as the Irregular Route Carriers of the Common Carrier Conference—ATA.

It is an interesting observation that of about 11,500 motor common carriers of property holding permanent authority from the Commission about 8,400 conduct solely irregular route operations, and of the remaining 3,000 plus, over a half conduct some regular and some irregular route operations. As one of my good friends right here in this room said, "You should treat us especially well for we are one of your biggest customers."

One factor to which the Commission is devoting special and very considerable time and thought—and to which I am sure you are doing the same—is the factor of restrictions in motor carrier authorities.

Overall, it appears that the majority of all the outstanding grants of authority, common and contract, are free of restrictions—perhaps 65 percent are unrestricted. Furthermore, it appears from a 1964 midyear summary that on a relative basis more regular than irregular route grants are free of restrictions.

The irregular route carriers have about 69 percent of all common carrier authorities. However, the regular route common carriers have more authorities per carrier and fewer restrictions per authority than you do.

As you know, the policy of the Commission in recent years has moved away from the inclusion of restrictions in the issuance of authorities. The big problem now is what to do about the restrictions in the approximately 35 percent of the authorities which do have them. One example of our effort to try to "do something constructive" in this area is Ex Parte No. MC-68, which was instituted earlier this year to determine if all "truckload lot" restrictions should be removed from existing authorities.

In a recent speech to another segment of the trucking industry I mentioned another major factor in which both the industry and the Commission have a mutual and vital interest. That is the problem of how to handle the ever-increasing number of motor carrier applications. In the year I became a Commissioner we received less than 4,000 applications and last year—just 4 years later—the number received was almost twice as large. Furthermore, the rate of increase is mounting even faster, so that if the present trend continues we could have 15,000 for the year 1970. Long before that—we would find it impossible to process, by our present procedures, the number we would be receiving. Therefore the industry—the Commission—the Congress—and the administration all have a vital interest. This problem may well be the greatest problem facing the Commission and the trucking industry—for some unadvised (quote) "quick solution" seekers simply say—free entry. The words have been said aloud—and really with conviction—enough times—that "free entry" in the motor carrier field must be considered now, or soon, as an issue to be met, solved, and disposed of one way or another by all of us who are involved in the issue, and particularly by all of us who realize that that "solution" is no solution at all.

THE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT BILL

By now I am sure most of you are familiar with the bill proposing to create a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation.

When discussion of the probability of such a bill first started, administration spokesmen indicated that the economic regulatory functions of the ICC would not be included in the Department. We were asked if we felt the highway safety and the railroad safety and car service functions, which sections of the Commission now perform, could be transferred into the new Department. Both former Chairman Webb and I said they could be, and we, personally, thought they should be transferred to the new Department if it became a reality. The Commission subsequently voted to support this position and voted its approval of the proposal to create the Department. We will undoubtedly be called to testify before the congressional committees holding hearings on the bill.

As far as the ICC is concerned, all the economic regulatory functions will remain unchanged. Our highway safety section and the section of railway safety and car service would be transferred to the new Department. The Department would then be the intervenor or supplier of safety fitness information in cases where safety fitness was a factor in motor carrier applications. I do not yet know the mechanics of how this would work.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Although no one single factor could be considered the most cohesive factor around which the idea of developing a coordinated Department of Transportation centered—if one could be pointed to it could well be the factor of highway safety.

Probably in no area has a more complete summary been made, nor have more comprehensive sugestions and planning been subimtted to President Johnson than in the area of, or on the subject of, highway safety. This is true because at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue deep concern has jelled into a determination to substantially reduce current traffic fatality and accident injury rates, and the resulting economic and social loss, to acceptable levels—within the years immediately ahead of us. And, of course, this concern and determination is shared by—and the resulting action will be joined by—State and local government units and by all of the responsible segments of industry that are interested in and affected by the subject of highway safety.

Secondly, this is a huge, tangible area in which results can actually be brought about—and measured or charted—but which will be brought about in any substantial degree only after coordinated effort is a reality. Governmental highway safety programs are widely dispersed with Federal, State, and local efforts proceeding separately under little or no coordination. At the Federal level, there is no clearly assigned focus of responsibility for marshaling the vast resources available to the Nation for dealing with this problem. In a Department of Transportation—and probably only within such a framework—a Federal leadership role can be developed, with the necessary financial resources support for effective corrective actions.

It is still very clear that the Federal role in highway safety must continue to complement and support the activities of State, local and private groups. I also believe that whatever their origin, highway safety preventive measures must be operative at the State and local level if they are to have maximum effect.

The full scope—and the full potential—of coordinating highway safety into the proposed new Department of Transportation infers to me—as just a few of the major areas—great possibilities for:

1. Enlarged research efforts,
2. Better traffic supervision, licensing, and inspection programs—without making such corrective measures so radical as to drastically impede the highway transportation system which generates these safety problems.
3. Realistic, central direction of the Federal highway safety plans and programs.
4. The building of corrective safety features into new and existing highways.
5. Developing curriculum and qualified teachers for a driver education and training program.
6. The greatest possible cooperation from our 15 to 20 million truckdrivers and busdrivers—the men who are, generally speaking, the best drivers in the world.
7. There are many other areas, but perhaps, really, the most important one of all is in the development of a national consensus in support of corrective programs. This means finding the catalyst to create—on the part of individuals—a sense of personal responsibility for improving our terrible highway accident record.

I believe this catalyst must be motivated in the homes and in the schools—and among the above-mentioned truckdrivers.

The people of our country have the kind of universal feeling against war that we must try to develop against our own highway slaughter—for the number of Americans killed or wounded in all of our wars together is less than the total number killed and injured in highway accidents. For example, in 1945 while 1,724 Americans were killed in Vietnam, about 50,000 were killed at home in highway accidents. And while in 1965 about 6,000 Americans were injured in Vietnam, about 3½ million were injured at home in highway accidents.

It is difficult to find a subject, or speech material, that is not too light for the men of such an important segment of the ATA as is this one—and yet not too heavy to be of interest to the wives at this luncheon. That is why I have treated in some depth the subject of highway safety. The deaths of nearly 50,000 people each year by highway accidents, and the 3½ million injuries (with annual monetary losses of over eight thousand million dollars) fills all of us with deep fear and concern. The saddest statement in this speech is that the highway traffic accident is the top killer among the youth of our Nation. For this reason, on this subject, I am speaking to you not just as members of the trucking industry—but, individually, as mothers, fathers, American citizens. Highway accidents since the automobile came on the scene have caused the death of more than 1½ million of our citizens, and in the past decade alone more than 20 million persons have been injured in motor vehicle accidents. No measurement can be placed upon the accumulated grief and tragedy.

And so, I repeat again, probably the most important area to be worked on is the development of a national consensus in support of corrective programs.

The ICC, with limited resources and manpower, has done a yeoman's job in the area of highway safety work with regulated and private motor carriers. I believe that our highway safety section, if moved into the highway safety section of the proposed new Department, would make a tremendous and invaluable contribution of dedication and technical know-how to the new Department.

In closing—may I add a few remarks—beamed as much to our lovely—and usually very patient wives—as to my official hosts?

In a light vein, I would say that that kind of closing statement, especially at this kind of a delightful luncheon, would be so patent that it would almost be suspect. However, it really only prefaces a few final, serious remarks.

Probably no one in transportation hears more of "the inside story"—more of the headaches and the heartaches—more of the real problems, and sometimes the real triumphs—than the wives of the men in transportation. And yet—even in that intimacy and the need for a quiet listener—a sympathetic audience—I doubt that even our wise and wonderful wives really have a very complete concept of the importance of transportation in the total economy of our country. I believe that possibly no one thing in our individual budgets tops the factor of transportation. When we think of our personal and family budgets we think of food, clothing, rent, medical expenses, taxes, etc. But we really don't fully consider the fact that nothing moves into our homes or out of them without a price for transportation being included.

I once used as an example the little spot on the world map—Manhattan Island. Just thing, that every bit of sand and gravel for building—at least some part, or all, of every piece of clothing sold in New York—some part, or all, of every bite of food consumed there—that for every one of the hundreds of thousands of commuters who arrives and leaves there every day—and for every businessman, visitor, tourist—for everyone and everything, in fact, that moves onto or off off the island, we must figure in—include in—the factor of transportation. And it is the same whether you live in New York, in Richmond, in Peoria, or Carmel-by-the-Sea in California.

Finally, the main point, and purpose, of my speech here—and of all my talks—is to stress the tremendous importance of transportation in the progress of our country. Therefore, you lovely ladies are married to some of the most important men in the world today.

And if that isn't a good place to stop, I don't think I'll ever find one.

In Support of National School Safety Patrol Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, I had the pleasure of joining with many of my colleagues in introducing a resolution, providing that the second week in May be designated as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

I have received a wonderful letter from Phillip Leinart, of Knoxville, Tenn., which supports this resolution, and I insert it at this point in the RECORD.

KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
March 22, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I give you my full support in making the second week in May, Safety Patrol Week. One reason is that there are a lot of boys and girls that stand out in rain and snow to help children across the road (or street). Another reason is that patrols need some publicity to remind drivers that children are out walking or riding bicycles this time of year.

Yours truly,

PHILLIP LEINART,
Captain of Ridgedales Safety Patrols.

H.R. 9339

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 18, 1966, the Select Subcommittee on Education held public hearings in New York City on H.R. 9339, a bill which I introduced in Congress. H.R. 9339 would establish a summer lunch program similar to the current program during the regular school year under the National Lunch Act of 1946.

The Honorable Herman Badillo, president of the Borough of the Bronx, submitted a brilliant statement outlined in scholarly and logical fashion, the clear need for passage of H.R. 9339, which I know my colleagues will find interesting and informative.

His statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF HERMAN BADILLO, BOROUGH PRESIDENT OF THE BRONX, BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 9339, A BILL TO ESTABLISH A SPECIAL SUMMER LUNCH PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN

Congressman SCHEUER, members of the committee, I want to take this opportunity to thank you for permitting me to testify before the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Commitee on Education and Labor, on behalf of the H.R. 9339, a bill to establish a special summer lunch program for children.

I shall try to be brief and to the point. In New York City, where so many children come from homes that are at, or below, the poverty level, we have found that the lunch meal served under the National School Lunch Act, operated under Public Law 346, is usually the single most important meal that these unfortunate children have during the entire day. Important in that it is usually the most nutritious meal they eat all day and important in that it is oftentimes the only hot meal of the day. Type A lunches, which are served in most of the elementary, junior high schools and high schools of New York, provides from one-third to one-half of a child's daily nutritive requirements based upon recommended allowances of the National Academy of Science-National Research Council. The National School Lunch Act which became effective June 4, 1946, provided a permanent basis in law for annual Federal appropriations for the school lunch program.

I think it important to recall that this act, in its declaration of policy, states that "it is the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of food and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation and expansion of nonprofit school lunch programs." This declaration of policy was not intended to apply only during the school year. Obviously, the need for such a program is year round.

More than 500,000 children in over 1,000 schools in the 5 boroughs of New York participate in this program, as do the children attending nearly 200 nonprofit, nonpublic schools. Many of these children, especially in the Negro and Puerto Rican areas of our city, come from homes where the mother of the home or both parents are out working and are not home during the day to prepare proper meals for their children. In far too many cases, when the mother or other relative is in the home, they cannot afford to provide the kind of meals required by schoolage children. There is ample evidence that lack of adequate or nutritiously balanced meals is an important factor in the learning progress of schoolchildren.

Experience indicates that children who receive lunches under this program, compared with those who do not, generally show more rapid gains in weight and height, better attendance records, improvement in scholastic standing, better deportment and a higher resistance to colds and other illnesses. I'd like to make clear that this does not only apply to Negro and Puerto Rican children who may come from more deprived homes than their classmates, this experience pattern applies to all of the children who participate in the program. Its great value is not limited to Negro and Puerto Rican children, but to all of our children because it aids them in developing proper and nutritiously beneficial food habits which, hopefully, carry over into later life. It is astonishing how many children come from well-to-do homes, where there is a great lack of proper knowledge about proper nutrition and diet.

The important point that I want to make is that there is very clear evidence of the need and importance of the school lunch program and that this need does not automatically stop in the summertime when children have school vacation. Many thousands of these children will be attending recreation centers, day camps, summer camps, community centers, and other activity centers designed to keep our children off the streets and creatively occupied.

Unless this Special Summer Lunch Program for Children Act is passed, 500,000 children will be denied the opportunity to continue receiving a proper lunchtime meal. It would be an act of extreme cruelty to cut these children off from such a vitally needed aid, and it will invoke a terrible hardship and financial burden on many thousands of families that are already living in a state of privation. In many cases it will necessitate requesting assistance from the welfare department and public and private social agencies, and can only increase the burdens the city of New York is now experiencing.

I cannot begin to tell you how disastrous the failure to approve this legislation will be to my own Borough of the Bronx. Perhaps the dimension of the problems can better be understood by pointing out that while the unemployment rate in New York City as a whole hovers around 5 percent of the work force, the Borough of the Bronx suffers from a 9.9-percent unemployment rate. And I might add that a large percentage of these people are either unemployable or have only marginal employment prospects.

Additionally, employment prospects during the summer months tend to decline. To add to the problems of these families is unconscionable. I want to add that I am deeply distressed to learn that the 1966-67 Federal budget calls for a cut of $82 million for the special milk program from $103 million to $21 million. This reduction of almost 80 percent will reduce New York's allocation to an estimated $8.6 million and will necessitate an increase by children now paying 2 or 3 cents per half pint of milk to 6 or 7 cents.

This action, coupled with the failure to pass the summer lunch legislation, can only have a devastating impact on the well being of our children. The health and welfare of our Nation's schoolchildren is an investment in the future which we cannot afford to scrimp on. To do so would be completely contrary to the purpose and intent of our poverty programs. We are presently engaged in a race to see if we can rescue our children from being foredoomed to the life of poverty and degradation many of their parents live under. If we fail to pass this bill we will be helping to destroy the very base on which we hope to build the Great Society. I cannot believe that you gentlemen will fail in this obligation. I urge this committee to recommend passage of the special summer lunch program.

Byelorussian Independence Day 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

For almost half a century now Byelorussia has suffered under the rule of Soviet Russia. And prior to domination by the Soviets, the Byelorussians suffered for over a century under the rule of czarist Russia. Because of the history of Russian colonial domination during the last two and a half centuries, some people have made the mistake of identifying the Byelorussians with the people of great Russia. Actually, the history of the Byelorussian people developed quite independently of that of the Russians until they were forced together at the end of the 18th century. In fact, for over five centuries, from the beginning of the 13th to the end of the 18th, the history of Byelorussia represents a long and courageous fight on the part of this valiant nation to preserve its independence against almost unbelievable odds.

At the end of the 18th century the Grand Duchy was finally incorporated into the Russian Empire, but even then the Russians were to find that the Byelorussians had never completely given up the fight. The czarist regime was forced to put down three major uprisings and fight several small border wars before the Russian Revolution of 1917.

The fall of the czarist regime in 1917 and Lenin's initial proclamation of independence for the nationalities filled the Byelorussians with renewed hope for complete freedom and independence. On December 18, 1917, the first Byelorussian National Congress was convened at Minsk and attended by 1,872 deputies from throughout the nation.

But once the Bolsheviks began to consolidate their power within Russia their policy toward the nationalities was immediately reversed. Bolshevik troops were sent to Minsk; the congress building was surrounded; the delegates were dispersed, and several leaders were arrested. For the long-suffering Byelorussians, this new form of Russian domination was the last straw. On February 20, 1918, the city of Minsk erupted in a general revolt that drove the surprised Russian troops over 50 miles from the city. The Byelorussians quickly formed a new democratic republic. On March 25, 1918, they officially announced their independence from Soviet Russia.

Unfortunately, the Byelorussians were not able to enjoy their independence for long. The brutal force of the Red army eventually subdued the proud citizens of Byelorussia into a determined passive resistance which continues to this day.

Today, 48 years later, it is easy for us to forget the plight of the Byelorussians and the other captive nations of the Soviet Empire. They seem so far away, and their problems are easily lost in the endless crises that appear on the international horizon. But forgetting would be a mistake. For as long as other nations, nations who value their freedom no less dearly than we do ours, remain the captives of foreign rule our freedom cannot be secure. As long as our friends and the relatives of our neighbors remain enslaved, we cannot be entirely free.

That is why we commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence, each year on March 25. We set aside this day to remind ourselves of their plight, and to renew our pledge of support to the cause of freedom and independence for Byelorussia.

Precinct Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, responsible politics should be the goal of every good citizen. Often, however, we do not carry through our good intentions. We allow someone else to shoulder the mundane chores and then complain and carp when opinions develop that differ from our own. Because of the tendency of most of us to do this, it is extremely gratifying to read in the Carroll, Iowa, Daily Times Herald of participation of a responsible political leader who is endeavoring to make the political system function properly.

As long as we have leaders of this quality, we are going to have a sound political system. I am pleased to place this account in the RECORD so that my colleagues may have the benefit of sharing it:

PRECINCT POLICIES

As chairman of the Carroll County Democratic Central Committee, Lou Galetich has done a good job. An example of his commendable service was noted in Monday's issue of the Daily Times Herald in an announcement of Democratic precinct caucuses to be held March 28. The efficient party chairman has seen to it that meeting places have been arranged for the holding of a caucus in every voting precinct of the county and widespread publicity has been given the call for the several caucuses along with detailed instructions as to when and where they will be held.

The precinct caucus, of course, is about the lowest form of official political activity in our system of government. But it is nonetheless vitally important in the scheme of representative government rule. For at the precinct caucus any citizen can participate and have his or her say. And from the several precincts go delegates and alternates elected to transact business at subsequent conventions, on the county, district, and State levels. In presidential election years, the process continues to the national convention where a candidate for the highest office in the land is selected. At the precinct caucus, too, a committeeman and committeewoman are named who assume responsibility for carrying on important political party duties at the grassroots level, as well as participate in the official activities and deliberation of the county central committee of which they become members.

In view of the fact a shamefully small percentage of eligible voters ever take the time to go to the polls on election day, it can hardly be expected that a precinct caucus should attract a capacity crowd. But our laws provide for the holding of party caucuses, essential to orderly representative government, and a citizen can no more be denied the right to participate in the precinct caucus of the political party with which he affiliates than he can be denied the right to vote on election day. The clamor would be loud if either right were abridged.

Chairman Galetich has undoubtedly been extended considerable cooperation from the various township committeemen and committeewomen serving under him in completing arrangements for the Democratic precinct caucuses next Monday. This speaks well not only for the Democratic Party and its officials in Carroll County, but stands as a significant and noteworthy contribution to good government generally.

The Late John Baldwin

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Congressman JOHN BALDWIN has left a deep void in the House of Representatives. I feel sure I speak for all my colleagues when I reflect upon the distinguished public career which JOHN BALDWIN rightfully enjoyed. As a Member of the House since 1954, his concern and care for the welfare of his district and the country were unflagging.

Congressman BALDWIN as 2d ranking minority member of the House Committee on Public Works, was diligent in promoting wise and progressive legislation for the building of a better America. Especially notable was his singular contribution to the drafting and passage of the Federal Interstate Highway Act, the nationwide highway safety program, and the highway beautification program.

These achievements were so recognized last year when Speaker McCormack appointed Representative Baldwin to every conference committee on public works legislation. For this outstanding committee service, he was cited three times by the Council of California Congressional Recognition Plan, a nonpartisan organization.

Where he felt that his leadership could be vital, John Baldwin was always ready to give. Formerly a president of a 4-H Club, he won a 4-H Club award in 1965 for his continuing service to the youth of our Nation. And, just this past January, he was acclaimed for his contribution to athletics and scholarship by the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

To Representative Baldwin, the opportunity to serve in the Congress was a privilege and a trust. In over 10 years, until falling ill, he never missed voting on a recorded rollcall vote, a record achieved by no other California Congressman in history. Now, when the two bells are sounded, we can only grieve that he is no longer with us.

Goodnight—Not Goodby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, these are the words of the former President of the National Farmers Union, James G. Patton:

> In a road to peace it must be the job of mankind in the future to close the gap of poverty—of poverty made up of disease, of hunger, of ignorance, of lack of opportunity and communication.

In almost a quarter of a century, James G. Patton has proven himself to be a great American and Coloradan. I would like to take this opportunity to insert his valedictory address and an editorial from the Denver Post entitled "Jim Patton Gives a Moving Goodby." I consider these articles worthy to be read by my colleagues.

GOODNIGHT—NOT GOODBY

(An address by James G. Patton, President, National Farmers Union, to the Annual Convention, National Farmers Union, Denver, Colo., March 14, 1966)

It is not easy to come before you this evening.

I am reminded of a quotation from William Hazlitt: "The only true retirement is that of the heart; the only true leisure is the repose of the passions. To such persons it makes little difference whether they are young or old; and they die as they have lived, with graceful resignation."

So, as you will hear tonight, I am not really retiring.

As I depart from the presidency of this great organization, I want to thank all, individually and collectively, who have helped to build the Farmers Union during this past quarter century.

These past 25 years have been momentous ones and it takes the perspective of time to appreciate the extent and nature of the amazing changes that they have brought in our organization, in our society, and in the world.

Twenty-five years ago the Farmers Union was a struggling, virtually bankrupt organization of only 80,681 families in 30 States. In some States we had two or three different organizations claiming to be the official Farmers Union. In Washington, D.C., we had as many as three different so-called official spokesmen. Today, despite an 89-percent decline in the number of American farmers, Farmers Union has a membership of 250,000 families in 40 States.

We now operate a thriving life, accident, and health insurance business with $193 million of life insurance business in force. Our National Farmers Union Property & Casualty had a premium income for 1965 of $13,532,000.

Farmers Union members have built great cooperative organizations which include our own oil wells, pipelines, a refinery, fertilizer plants, large regional grain marketing cooperatives, hundreds of local marketing supply and dairy processing cooperatives.

We have placed in operation a major potash development and own one-half of a $35 million potash mine and processing plant.

Farmers Union stands at a peak in prestige. Our voice is listened to and respected in Washington and in capitals throughout the world.

We are entitled to feel pride in our progress.

I claim no undue credit for having done this. It has been a team job. It has been the members, basically—it has been the coops—it has been the wonderful colleagues I have had as State presidents.

It has been the wonderful relationship that I have had with one man—Glenn J. Talbott, the vice president of this organization.

And, of course, I have had a wonderful group of associates—Tony Dechant, C. E. Huff, Charles Brannan, and our executive committee members.

But, in the main, we could have done nothing if it were not for the loyalty of the members and the growth and understanding that they have had.

The America of 1940 and the America of March 1966 are related, of course, but the resemblance is somewhat distant. We now have 65 million more people. Individual dollar income has doubled. We have two large new States—Alaska and Hawaii. The rural-urban ratio has shifted from 1 to 4 to 1 to 5. The 60 million American jobs which Henry Wallace and I predicted have proven a dream only in understatement. Equal opportunity for all Americans and an end to discriminatory practices are almost upon us. The release of atomic energy and the development of the computer—both only glints in a few eyes in 1940—have long since become a reality. Atomic energy and the computer are transforming our society at a far more rapid pace than at any time for any society in history.

Man is marrying outer space, just as Jules Verne and the "Amazing Stories" of Hugo Gernsback foresaw to the indulgent amusement of previous generations. The Moon and Mars, once barely visible provinces of vague textbooks and huge telescopes, are now, in truth, just over the horizon. Today, it is not just a small world we live in, but a rapidly shrinking universe.

And yet human beings on Earth still kill each other, and some people starve while others worry about what to do with "surplus" food—enough food, through science, to feed everybody, every place.

Some people have too much of everything and most people have not enough of anything.

We have the human and material resources to do almost anything we ever dreamed about in 1940—and yet we apparently haven't the social ingenuity and moral impetus to do what must be done to realize our potential.

Paradox and frustration surround us as we speed virtually uncomplaining and voiceless toward self-destruction. We are not satisfied with the capacity to blow each other up—we insist on the capacity to do it not once, but 10 times over. Yet human beings do not have nine lives as cats are supposed to have.

Farmers Union, I will state candidly, has had the good sense to be a progressive, foresighted organization throughout its history.

We have been for those proposals which are good for all people, such as medicare, social security for all; a society of abundance, not one of scarcity. Since 1940, as an illustration, Farmers Union has pioneered service to family farmers.

In 1941 and 1942, Farmers Union supported 90 to 100 percent price floors on basics and other commodities.

In 1943, Farmers Union proposed that the school lunch program be placed on a permanent basis.

In 1944, Farmers Union urged establishment of the Rural Telephone program (established in 1949) as part of REA and sought the creation of Missouri Valley Authority. In that same year, I began proposing peacetime economic planning for full employment. This was accomplished when the Employment Act of 1946 was adopted.

In 1945, Farmers Union supported legislation establishing REA loan terms permanently at 2 percent interest over a 35-year repayment period. We asked inclusion of farmers under social security (adopted 1954) and participated in a conference founding the United Nations.

In 1948, Farmers Union supported 2-year extension of 90-percent supports.

In 1949, as a long-range program, Farmers Union urged the adoption of production payments (so-called Brannan Plan) which form the basis of the support concept of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

It was Farmers Union which first proposed a nationwide system of food cooperatives with REA-type financing—2 percent, 50-year loans with a $5 per family membership.

In 1949, Farmers Union supported development of the first International Wheat Agreement.

In 1952, the 2-year extension of 90 percent supports was urged by Farmers Union and was approved.

In 1954, Farmers Union backed the enactment of the National Wool Act, using direct payments.

In 1954, the Special School Milk Act, supported by Farmers Union, was adopted and the Agricultural Trade and Development Act, Public Law 480, was adopted, a partial beginning toward the food-for-peace idea.

In 1955, Farmers Union sought refund of Federal gas tax on agricultural nonhighway uses (adopted 1956).

In 1961, Farmers Union pioneered development of emergency feed grain and other support program improvements, resulting in 10-percent farm income gain. That same year the Agricultural Act, supported by Farmers Union, extended marketing order provisions to additional commodities.

In 1961-63, rural housing laws were improved. Broad expansion of food for peace, school lunch, Farmers Home Administration, crop insurance, soil conservation, small watershed and rural development programs were enacted with National Farmers Union vision and support.

In 1964, the emergency feed grain program was extended. The antipoverty war was enacted.

In 1965, we reached a truly remarkable year of progress with Congress enacting the greatest social revolution which has ever occurred in the country.

Through all of this—some years thick, some years thin—Farmers Union has had the good sense to join with organized labor and the people of good will to create a people's movement in America.

And this wasn't only the Farmers Union. This wasn't organized labor, it wasn't the American Civil Liberties Union and it wasn't the Negro movement—it was a total movement. It was a movement of people in a consensus of conscience, which is the only thing I believe in. It was church leaders, it was Negro leaders, it was liberal farm leaders, it was labor leaders, it was the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, and all the wonderful people who have served in the past and created in America a climate which made these things possible—John F. Kennedy and his memory; Franklin Delano Roosevelt; Harry S. Truman, and many others.

America is in the early beginning of a great social revolution—not at the end of a social revolution. It's about this social revolution that I wish to talk tonight in my closing message to you. I do not care to further reminisce about the past—I want to talk about a future of peace and abundance in America and in the world.

I want to start by saying that America cannot live as an island of plenty—a big white house on the hill with all the poor people around living in the malaria-ridden mud huts in the valley, or the poor people will rise in America and elsewhere and destroy the big white house on the hill.

The issue then—the No. 1 job of mankind—is peace.

I say we must begin to spend one-half as much for peace as we do to kill or prepare to kill people. We must reduce our military budget by $5 to $10 billion annually a year to start. We must show the others we truly want peace by our deeds and actions—not talk here and escalate there.

Our actions must be geared to a new prospective, to turn hate to love, prejudice to sympathy. We must grant freedom to others as we seek it for ourselves.

We must seek a psychological change for our planet earth. It has been based on power and force—military and armaments. Instead we should turn our hearts to religious leaders and all men of good will and compassion.

If peace is to be won, it will be won on a psychological basis, not power. An empty belly, a diseased body, an ignorant brain knows no politics.

Again, we get to the fundamental question of what kind of America we want. Do we want a highly literate, politically alert and active people's government, functioning as an alert leader in building world government under law and order? Or do we choose to let things drift into an Orwellian dual corporate—military class—fascist society?

In a road to peace it must be the job of mankind in the future to close the gap of poverty—of poverty made up of disease, of hunger, of ignorance, of lack of opportunity and communication; of poverty made up of prejudice of the white man against the colored man and the colored man against the white man—a poverty which arose out of colonial materialism in the world. These are the things which we have to work toward.

And what are our tools? Our tools are the tools of democracy, the tools of the cooperative movement, the tools of the building and strengthening of institutions that have such high goals and high vistas in the Farmers Union, in the labor movement, in the people's movement, in the rural movement—not a farmers' movement, but a rural movement.

In our own sector, this means the revitalization, recapitalization, repopulation, rebirth, if you please, of rural America—cast not in farmers' terms alone, based solely on his income which is deteriorating, with rural America becoming unpopulated with no churches, no school and no institutions, not even doctors and lawyers or even undertakers—but rather a rural America which is rich in culture. A place where the people who live in the cities like to come to spend their vacations.

A place where more and more people from the crowded cities will move; a place where one day we will have at least 250 new cities built to new specifications—specifications we cannot even dream of now.

Brandnew cities, mind you, located in rural America with all its resources and blessings.

Cities with populations of 100,000 to 150,000 people free to enjoy these bounties and blessings. These new cities—and we now have them on the drawing board—are nearly self-sufficient. We will construct them on three levels. The bottom level, completely underground, will contain tunnels for high speed, 150-to-200-mile-an-hour interconnecting trains. It will contain airstrips for jet aircraft to taxi underground right into the heart of the city. It will be where heavy vehicles do their loading and unloading.

On our second level, still underground as we know it, but with filtered clean air and light, will be the passenger cars and whatever other kind of vehicles we use in the future to transport us from place to place.

The living level will have no streets, but greenery with tricycle and bicycle paths and places for the people to wheel their baby carriages, sit in parks and enjoy life.

A place where each city has, either underground or in its area, light industry; where the pollution of the air and of the streams is eliminated; where leisure time can be fully enjoyed.

To do this we must separate work from reward, in the ordinary sense, and redefine work. Define it to include getting an education—pay people to get an education, pay them to get an M.D. or Ph. D., pay them to become nurses, pay them to become skilled folks to help people. We must take a new look at leisure and redefine leisure not as the art of a pool hall or some bawdy movie, but as the art of enjoying good music, good literature, or just sitting and thinking for a change—having time to sit and think and reflect.

We must place our emphasis on the quality of people.

My basic point is this. In my lifetime, in the span of my life, we have escalated from the hearing of too little—the dividing, in other words, of scarcity—to the place where we can meet all human needs. We no longer have to decide who gets enough and who gets too little. We now have the capital, the technical knowhow, the human and natural resources, to permit all Americans to live in comfort and dignity. We must learn to live with abundance and like it. We cannot resist abundance any longer.

To me this means that there shouldn't be a single school child, a single American, who doesn't have all the education that he or she can, and wants, to take. It means to me that there shouldn't be anywhere in America a hungry person or one who is malnourished because he does not have sufficient income. It means that we should wipe out the slums of America and rebuild and decentralize the cities of America where so much hate and ill will is created.

It means to me, most of all, that there just simply isn't any excuse whatsoever for the American farmer to be a second-class economic citizen. I mean this, just exactly this, that if it takes $3 wheat to maintain the American farmer's position as a family farmer, then let's pay him $3 for the wheat. Let's not pay the great big guy who gets a $165,000 or $170,000 Government payment, that $170,000. But if it takes $3 to keep the family on the farm and to secure that farm, then I am for taxing income wherever income is to help maintain that farm and that family on the farm.

I am for getting back, for example, some of the subsidies that the farmer has sent to the cities, so that we can recapitalize and rebuild rural America. I am absolutely opposed to the whole concept that we have to use the numbers game in agriculture and move 2 million farmers off the land because we don't think we can spend enough money.

I believe that we have enough wealth and enough income in this great country so that every single American can have a floor below which he doesn't need to go, but above which he can most surely rise. America can do anything America wants to do.

So much of the legislation of the 89th Congress has dealt with this very issue. The education acts, the medicare bill and social security concept, housing measures with rent supplementation, are all examples of using payments or grants of supplements to people who, for the most part, are in a difficult position for no fault of their own.

So what we need to do in America are a few big things—a few big changes in our concepts. One is to see that everyone has a good education; two, that everyone has food enough to eat; three, to see that everyone has good housing; and four, that they have enough income for leisure.

That means a guaranteed income and I am for guaranteed income. Such a guaranteed income should start at a level which will provide a fully adequate standard of living—health, education, housing and clothing, entertainment and other living amenities—and should move up automatically as prices of goods and services rise and, particularly, as the gross national product and the cost of killing the world's population decreases (as it surely must), and the standard of living of people elsewhere rises.

Then, on the world scene, we have to recognize what I think is one fundamental truth—that we can never hope to survive as a human race if we proliferate nuclear warfare; if we insist on drawing the color lines; if we insist that everybody has to believe as we believe; if we insist that a man doesn't have a right to be a Communist, or a Socialist, or a Buddhist, or a Hindu, or a Christian, or a Jew, or a Catholic, or whatever he is.

We must recognize that man, the individual, is the basic element toward which we are struggling and that any form of government is only a means or a device by which people can live under law and order instead of the spear, the sword, the atom bomb, or the gun.

The basic aim of the Farmers Union and the people of the world must be to go out and constitute institutions, such as the United States, where people can live under law and order. And our contribution to it must be not less than 4 percent of the gross national product—4 percent of our bountiful production, placed in a World Development Corporation for the capitalization of the underdeveloped areas of the world. A World Development Corporation for the purpose of closing the hunger and ignorance and health and poverty gaps which exist in the world.

We have the technical skills, we have the knowledge of so many things, but so far as social order, so far as culture is concerned, we are among the younger cultures of the world.

All of these things have to arise and can only arise out of a world society governed by law rather than by force and, as we drop our force and discontinue the use of $150 billion worth of our production as we are now using—we, Russia, China, and all the rest—for the destruction of mankind, we can raise the sntadard of living of mankind. This is the ultimate and it won't happen in my generation and it won't happen in my son's generation; but, as President Kennedy said, "A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step."

Most of my visions for the future will occupy my time—and I have pledged to myself to follow this course—in the years ahead.

Although I am 2 years away from the "retirement age" of 65, I firmly believe that 25 years is long enough and now is the best opportunity by all standards for a change in Farmers Union leadership.

But I intend to continue the fight.

And if the Farmers Union continues its past general philosophical pattern, they will find me as an individual, wherever I may be, supporting the philosophy which they have supported in the past, which has, as its essence, placing the values on people and on the individual and not on things, and not on commodities and not on selfish gains for the individual.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Mar. 16, 1960]

JIM PATTON GIVES A MOVING GOODBY

Jim Patton's valedictory address as president of the National Farmers Union was a moving performance. His words were to the point and they were typical of the visionary spirit which has established this former Colorado farmer as one of America's great farm leaders.

Speaking to delegates to the annual NFU convention Monday night, Patton lookd beyond the immediate problems of agriculture—and beyond the immediate problems of this Nation—as he sought keys to the well-being of the world.

"We must," he said, "seek a psychological change for our planet. It has been based on power and force. An empty belly, a diseased body, and an ignorant brain know no politics."

This was Jim Patton at his finest—out in front, leading, and searching for paths which will benefit both his own generation and those to come.

Today, many of the things which Jim Patton anticipated during his quarter-century career as NFU president either have become reality or are waiting in the wings. He foresaw the need for a program to alleviate world hunger. He fought for the dignity of farm people. He correctly predicted the course of farm programs in Washington.

A master of timing, Jim Patton could not have picked a better moment for his retirement, at the age of 63, to a less strenuous job than the NFU presidency. The present time seems to be the occasion of momentous shifts in the directions of U.S. agriculture. For the most part, these are trends Jim Patton either foresaw or helped shape.

Crop and livestock production is moving steadily into a situation of scarcity rather than surplus in many commondity areas. Surplus has been a way of life—with a few exceptions—for this Nation for many years. We canot, thus, see clearly the depth of the alterations which lie ahead.

For example, this Nation's growing concern with feeding the world cannot be accomplished without a revolution in world thinking as to the emphasis to be placed upon intensive food production and population control. Our leadership in the campaign is going to require tremendous wisdom.

We suspect that, regardless of Jim Patton's decision to step down, there will be occasions ahead when many people, including the Nation's highest leaders, will be seeking his advice. Almost certainly, they will get it. It it not in Jim Patton's character to dodge a problem or avoid a responsibility—especially when it comes to the welfare of people.

Snow Survey for Water Forecasts Beneficial to West and Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, each winter in the high mountain places of the Northwest, there unfolds a kind of silent drama, familiar to few people in most of the Nation, but significant to millions in the West.

This little-known activity is the annual cooperative snow survey coordinated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service.

Snow surveyors go into the mountains periodically from January to May, traveling over permanently designated snow courses, to measure the snow depth and to determine how much water is in it. From these findings come data for water supply forecasting that enable users to plan for and cope with adequate and inadequate water supply during long dry summers, or controlled and uncontrolled runoff during spring thaw.

A year ago, key snow courses throughout my State of Idaho indicated the heaviest snow pack ever recorded. Many courses had more snow-water as of January 1 than occurs for an entire season.

This discovery stimulated special snow surveys near the middle of each succeeding month to determine if the storm patterns were continuing throughout the winter season and to caution the people on impending consequences. The mounting snow data indicated a snow melt that would cause the heaviest volume flows ever recorded on the Salmon, The Big and Little Lost, and the Boise Rivers. The forecasts proved correct and the greatest peak flows ever recorded in 70 years resulted in the rivers.

Forewarned, the private, State and Federal water-using organizations had lowered the water levels in their reservoirs and thereby averted tremendous flood damages in areas below the reservoirs that otherwise might have been inundated.

These annual snow surveys are carried out by specially trained people who travel set schedules over remote areas, using over-snow machines, skies, snowshoes, helicopters, and airplanes.

For this extraordinary work the entire expenditure of money for all purposes by private, State, and Federal sources in Idaho is less than $90,000 a year; yet in Boise, Idaho, alone, it helped to avert $3,513,000 damages last spring.

SCS conservationists and technicians working with them on forecasting problems feel that additional work and instrumentation is necessary to keep up with the increased demands and needs for accurate forecasts of water supply each year.

This is a unique service. It is a needed program. It is appreciated and depended upon by farmers and ranchers of Idaho and the great Northwest, and it is of actual benefit and potential interest to the Nation at large.

I take this means to salute the efforts and achievements of the people in this program who help our western farmers and other water users to cope with their water problems.

Report to the 29th District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have requested unanimous permission to insert hereinafter in the Appendix the report which I plan to send to my constituents in the 29th District of California within the next few days. The report is as follows:

A REPORT TO THE 29TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BILLS INTRODUCED

Food for peace

I introduced a bill early this year that would, if passed, expand the food-for-peace program by establishing a national policy designed to deliberately produce more food on our farms that can be used to help erase worldwide hunger and malnutrition. We cannot, however, feed the world and would not want to try to do this if we could. Other nations might become too dependent on our food supplies and would not make sufficient efforts to increase their own food production.

This plan would also place a great deal of emphasis on stimulating and helping underdeveloped nations to increase their own agricultural industry. The food we would furnish would only be a temporary stopgap measure to prevent starvation right now. Within a few years our own population will have continued to increase so that we will need to divert this increased productive capacity to our own use.

Gun laws

I have received some criticism from hunters, gun collectors, and others for introducing this proposal to curb mail-order sales of guns by prohibiting interstate shipment of arms except by licensed dealers. The bill would also prohibit sale of any gun to persons under 18, and would require a dealer to determine the identity and place of residence of a purchaser before making a sale.

I do not believe that most of those persons who oppose this legislation understand it too well. They have been misled by false claims. It would not prevent legitimate hunters or collectors from purchasing guns. Juveniles and criminals, who can now easily obtain a gun through the mail-order business, would have a much harder time obtaining a gun.

The law would not wipe out crime, but would be a step in the right direction. President Johnson, the American Bar Association, practically all law enforcement groups, and hundreds of other organizations are supporting this type of action.

Humane treatment of animals

I also introduced a proposal to regulate the sale, transportation and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for research or experimentation. The theft of family pets and inhumane methods of handling by some dealers the primary targets of this proposal.

It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish standards for humane care by dealers, who would have to be licensed, wait 5 days between acquisition and sale of an animal, identify each animal individually, keep records for at least 2 years, and would not be able to ship sick, injured, unweaned or pregnant animals. Proper housing, feeding, watering, sanitation and shelter would be required and enforced by means of a regular inspection program.

Traffic safety

I introduced two bills recently aimed at helping to reduce the toll of death and injury on the Nation's highways. One of these bills would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to establish minimum standards for highway traffic safety. It would initiate research and development into safety standards and would then apply the results of this research by improving minimum standards on such things as driver training, traffic laws, traffic control devices, highways, motor vehicle inspection, and automobiles themselves. A National Highway Traffic Safety Center would be established to coordinate the programs, and State grants for inspection programs and driver education would be authorized.

The second bill would be known as the Tire Safety Act and would establish safety standards for tires, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a research and development program on tires, prescribe maximum loads for different tires, and develop a uniform grading system for tires. Currently, there is not even a standard meaning for the ratings given different tires from different companies and no requirements to tell us whether a tire of a certain grade or rating is actually safe for the job it is doing.

Space age techniques for national problems

A Federal application of a California-pioneered approach is embodied in a bill which I introduced that would utilize our scientific and engineering manpower to employ systems analysis and systems engineering to help solve national problems.

About a year ago, Governor Brown contracted with four California space firms to do feasibility studies, using scientific research and computer capabilities on crime, pollution, transportation, and information control. The results were most promising.

The proposal I have introduced would authorize the Federal Government to make grants to States or groups of States that would, in turn, use the grants to contract with universities, or other private, public or nonprofit organizations, for this type of study. The studies could include, but would not be limited to, problems in the area of education, unemployment, welfare, crime, juvenile delinquency, air pollution, housing, transportation and waste disposal.

Before making the grant the Secretary of Labor would have to be satisfied that the knowledge gained would have to be applicable to other States and the information would have to be made readily available to the Federal Government and to other States.

COLLEGE EDUCATION FOR VETERANS

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I was most pleased to have an opportunity to work on the development of the cold war GI bill, providing educational assistance for veterans who have served since early 1955. Previously I had introduced a bill similar to that which the committee recommended favorably and which was, later, signed into law by President Johnson.

The bill is not as generous as the World War II educational benefits—or the Korean GI bill. It is, however, a permanent plan and will apply to all servicement from now on. It is also retroactive to January 31, 1955, as I mentioned above, and will allow all of these veterans to receive $100 per month in educational assistance as long as they are bona fide full-time students. If they have one dependent, they receive $125 per month, and $150 with two or more dependents. Lower benefits are provided if schooling is half time or three-quarter time.

Schooling that is covered includes college or high school education, and the same assistance may be obtained during training in trade, vocational, and technical schools. A veteran is eligible for 1 month's assistance for each month he has spent on active duty—up to a maximum of 36 months. This would cover up to the normal four 9-month school years necessary to obtain a college degree.

Included in the same law, farm and home loan benefits are also made available to this group of veterans, as well as non-service-connected medical care for those unable to pay for private care. They will also be eligible for civil service preference, and job counseling and placement.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Revisions in the excise and withholding tax laws were passed less than 2 months after the President presented his plan to Congress. Its major provisions establish a new system of graduated withholding on individual income taxes, using a scale geared to your income, plus the suspension of the reductions in automobile and telephone excise taxes which we adopted last year. The new law also provides for accelerated payment of corporate taxes and of social security contributions from self-employed individuals.

An amendment added later in the Senate authorizes a $35 payment under the social security program for any person over 72 years of age who is not eligible for social security benefits on any other basis.

The new graduated withholding rate for income tax eliminated the present flat 14-percent withholding rate and substituted a system of six graduated rates, running from 14 percent to 30 percent, designed to more accurately withhold the proper amount of tax from individuals. This will not only serve the purpose of bringing money into the Federal Treasury sooner, which is the President's desire because of the cost of the Vietnam efforts, but should correct the situation in which so many persons have found themselves this year of still owing a rather substantial sum on their tax when filing time comes around.

More controversial was the section that would suspend the excise tax reductions on automobiles and telephone rates. I opposed this plan, and voted against it, as I feel that needed funds can be obtained in more equitable ways than replacing what amounts to practically a sales tax on two necessities which will be paid by rich and poor alike, without regard to ability to pay. Telephone excise taxes had dropped to 3 percent on January 1, 1966, and will now go back to 10 percent, where they will remain until April 1, 1968, when present law calls for a cut to 1 percent. Automobile excise taxes had dropped to 6 percent and will now go back to 7 percent. Instead of dropping to 4 percent on January 1, 1967 and to 2 percent a year later, they will remain at 7 percent until dropping to 2 percent on April 1, 1968.

SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS COMMITTEE

Several days of hearings and executive sessions have been held in the Committee on Science and Astronautics concerning America's space program. These have been for the purpose of reviewing the budget proposals for fiscal 1966–67. A total authorization slightly more than $5 billion appears imminent—slightly lower than last year because of the pressures caused by the cost of the Vietnam war.

My work on this committee has also involved a great deal of time spent considering the role and functions of the National Science Foundation. In preliminary subcommittee discussions we have developed a proposal, which I have introduced in the form of a bill, that would make needed changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation. Hearings will begin soon on this proposal in order to perfect it.

The National Science Foundation is the nucleus of much of the Federal Government's activities in scientific research and education in the fields of mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering and social sciences.

VIETNAM SITUATION CONTINUES

The war in Vietnam continues but there seems to be a lull in the debate that was raging in Washington a few weeks ago. There is not a lull in the fighting in Vietnam, however, and I see no signs at this moment of further developments in the attempts to negotiate.

The hearings held by Chairman FULBRIGHT and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, receiving nationwide television coverage, were most welcomed and, I feel, very valuable. I have been advocating wide discussion of our goals and our policies in southeast Asia. This certainly fulfilled that desire—at least temporarily.

The reason the debate flared up was because of supplemental appropriations requests from the administration—one for additional foreign aid funds (including $275 million for Vietnam), and one to authorize an additional $4.8 billion for military supplies, followed by an appropriation of $13 billion from the Treasury, mainly to support U.S. operations in Vietnam.

Since these funds ostensibly are just for the purpose of finishing out the 1966 fiscal year (up to July 1, 1966), there is obviously a second round coming up when the regular fiscal 1967 money bills come up.

I believe that you can expect to hear a good deal more of the pros and cons on this matter during the next few months.

Personally, I voted against the bills listed above because of my conviction that we must make every effort to extricate ourselves from this war through a reasonable, negotiated solution and bring our troops home as soon as possible. I supported the President's efforts to negotiate and applauded our attempts to bring the whole matter before the Security Council of the United Nations. I am in favor of more concentrated efforts in this direction and it appears that we have alowed these attempts to find peace at the moment.

OFFICER CANDIDATE HALL OF FAME

I was surprised and pleased to receive a letter and certificate from Gen. George I. Forsythe, assistant commandant of the U.S. Army Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga., advising me that my name had been placed on the honor roll of the Officer Candidate Hall of Fame at Fort Benning. This hall of fame is intended to honor those graduates of the Infantry Officer Candidate School who have distinguished themselves in either military or civilian pursuits.

I was graduated from Fort Benning's Infantry Officer Candidate School during World War II (April 1945) and, as an alumnus of the school who has since been elected to an office of national prominence, I received this honor. It is also given to graduates who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor or who have attained the grade of full colonel while serving on active duty.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

We have just completed work in the House attempting to bring more uniformity into daylight saving time. This bill would require every State to adopt daylight saving time—starting next year—unless the State legislature of a State voted to keep the entire State on standard time. The bill also requires all areas to begin and end daylight saving time on the same dates—from the last Sunday in April until the last Sunday in October.

MEDICARE

Exhaustive efforts were made during March to make certain that all elderly persons had had the opportunity to sign up for the voluntary part of the medicare program before the March 31 deadline passed. The Social Security Administration, local, State, and Federal officials, the antipoverty program, and many private organizations all stressed the importance of signing up before the deadline. It was not necessary to sign up for the portion that covers hospital bills, but the $3 per month plan covering doctor bills and other medical costs was not automatic.

An assessment of the number who have not signed up will have to be made and it is very possible that there will be efforts to extend the deadline. Otherwise, a person who was 65 by January 1, 1966, will have to wait until the next general enrollment period during the last 3 months of 1967. Persons who reach age 65 in the future have a 7-month period in which to sign up—the 3 months before the month in which their birthday falls through the 3 months after.

Benefits for those now eligible will begin on July 1, 1966.

JOB TRAINING PROGRAM

It has been wisely observed that the quickest way to wipe out poverty is through jobs. I would only add that they must be good jobs. With the minimum wage still at $1.25 (meaning an annual income of $2,600 for a 40-hour week) it is still possible to be working full time and be classed as having a poverty-level income—usually set at $3,000.

With this in mind, I was very pleased to see approval of a substantial job training program for unemployed workers in the east Los Angeles area by the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare recently. Funded for about $1.5 million, training should be made available to 350 men and women under this project, which is scheduled to begin very soon. Large projects were approved for the south central Los Angeles (Watts) area and the Pacoima area, as well. It will be operated through the facilities of the California State Employment Service and free training plus training allowances for unemployed persons who qualify will be available in such occupational skills as auto mechanics, clerk-typist, hospital orderly, nurses' aid, welder, vocational nurse and machine operator.

Another project to give prejob counseling, tutoring, and work-orientation services to about 300 young persons from 16 to 21 who are both out of school, and out of work, costing $200,000, was also approved recently and will serve both east Los Angeles and south-central Los Angeles.

If we find the solution to high youth unemployment rates, I am sure we will also find the solution to many of the problems caused by high juvenile delinquency and youth crime rates.

President Lyndon B. Johnson presented me with one of the pens used in the signing ceremony at the White House to sign the cold war GI bill into law.

Because of the expanded workload for social security offices to administer the new medicare program, a new local office was opened in Monterey Park at 118 North Garfield Avenue. I was pleased to participate in the grand opening ceremonies with David Orozco, district manager. The new office will serve the East Los Angeles, Montebello, South San Gabriel, and Monterey Park areas.

I was able to visit with my son, Dale, during my last trip to California. Dale recently was graduated from boot camp in San Diego and is now training with the Seabees at Port Hueneme. There is a very good chance that he will see duty in Vietnam in the near future.

Water for the West a Cooperative Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging and exciting stories in American history is now unfolding as our Western States, in close coordination with the Federal Government, begin the task of organizing themselves and their tremendous water resources in a great regional development effort to assure a sound economic future for this, the Nation's fastest growing section.

On this vital subject, both the Los Angeles Times and the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner have recently published excellent editorials outlining some of the challenges and opportunities in this exciting venture.

Because of the national, and indeed, international, interest in successful efforts to promote regional cooperation in resource development, I include both of these fine editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I also insert in the RECORD a most progressive and forward-looking editorial entitled, "Water and Need," which appeared in a recent edition of the Newberg, Oreg., Graphic.

The highly commendable sentiments expressed in the Oregon editorial certainly reflect a most cooperative attitude toward a regional approach to solving problems that affect us all.

I was particularly impressed by the Oregon editorial's statement, made in reference to various proposals for regional development and utilization of the West's precious water resources, that:

> This is one country, and all parts are interdependent on each other * * * so let's get on with the biggest water project the world has ever known.

The editorials follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 23, 1966]

MEETING WESTERN WATER NEEDS

Bold action to meet the water needs of the future is a "national necessity," declared President Johnson as he urged Congress to approve a greatly expanded research program.

The President acted on the report of a special study committee which called for the spending of nearly $200 million per year on water research by 1971. Committee members warned that although the United States as a whole has enough water, "in arid and semiarid regions of the country we are approaching full utilization."

That hardly comes as news to the Pacific Southwest where water scarcity has always been a problem. White House and congressional awareness, however, should lead to new answers to the old problem.

Although desalinization, pollution control, and conservation hold some promise, the surest solution of the Southwest water shortage lies in utilization of the vast surpluses of the Pacific Northwest.

A total of 150 million acre-feet—10 times the entire flow of the Colorado River—is wasted into the sea each year from the Columbia River. A small fraction of that huge excess would meet the future needs of of the seven States dependent upon the Colorado.

Washington's Gov. Daniel J. Evans, in a letter published in the Times, said transportation of water from the Columbia River Basin should not be undertaken until a "comprehensive study" is made of regional water resources and needs.

The Times agrees wholeheartedly. To that end we strongly support the legislative proposal of the Colorado River Basin States for such an inventory of water surplus and scarcity.

The Southwest would never consider drawing any water needed now or in the future by the States served by the Columbia. But as a farsighted Oregon newspaper editorializes elsewhere on this page, Columbia River water flowing south "could be a tremendous boon to the arid eastern Oregon country as well."

Congress should approve the water study this session as the first step in developing a regional plan that will benefit the entire West.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Mar. 24, 1966]

FRIENDS IN OREGON

With bills in Congress promising a Federal survey of all of the water needs of the Pacific Southwest, including the semiarid States of California and Arizona, it is refreshing to note a friendly hand reaching toward this area from Oregon.

The need for more water in the Southwest States is not immediate, but planning is necessary for possible needs of the future. The Columbia River wastes far more than 150 million acre-feet annually into the Pacific Ocean. Less than 10 million acre-feet of the wasted water from this mighty river would satisfy the needs of the entire Pacific Southwest, no matter how fast the population grows.

Here in part is what the Newberg, Oreg., Graphic newspaper says in an editorial:

"It has been estimated that a waterflow approximate to the Willamette's at Salem would give California and Arizona all the water they would need. Considering the Columbia's volume * * * this much water would hardly be missed.

"Biggest danger seems to be to fish life, and if this could be solved, we think it would be a wonderful scheme to transport some of our surplus water to the arid southwestern regions.

"After all, the U.S. Constitution forbids States to set up barriers against each other.

"Columbia River water flowing south to California and Arizona would be a tremendous boon to the arid eastern Oregon country as well.

"The water situation isn't going to get any better * * * it will get progressively worse. We hate to see any area deprived of water simply because a few politicians (Democrats and Republicans alike) want to make an issue of it."

Our thanks to the fairminded sentiments expressed in the Newberg Graphic. The Pacific Southwest will require only a small fraction of the Columbia River's mighty wasted flow to make its deserts bloom and its cities grow. All this area asks is a small fraction of surplus water now going to waste.

[From the Newberg (Oreg.) Graphic]

WATER AND NEED

With the Columbia River carrying more water than practically any river in the world, California and Arizona Congressmen are turning envious eyes toward the Northwest.

It has been estimated that a waterflow approximate to the Willamette's at Salem, would give California and Arizona all the water they would need. Considering the Columbia's volume (which has a more even flow month in and month out than most other rivers) this much water would hardly be missed.

Biggest danger seems to be to fish life and if this could be solved we think it would be a wonderful scheme to transport some of our surplus water to the arid southwestern regions. After all, the U.S. Constitution forbids States to set up barriers against each other. This is one country and all parts are independent on each other.

Columbia River water, flowing south to California and Arizona, would be a tremendous boon to the arid eastern Oregon country as well. The water situation isn't going to get any better * * * it will get progressively worse. We hate to see any area deprived of water simply because a few politicians (Democrats and Republicans alike) want to make an issue out of it. If the Columbia River fishery is not endangered, let's get on with the biggest water project the world has ever known.

"Alvin" Is Making History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, we have been following closely the search for the hydrogen bomb in the coastal waters off Spain. A small research submersible Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution finally located the bomb and is now assisting in recovery operations. The vehicle, *Alvin*, is named for Allyn Vine, the Woods Hole engineer who played a key role in developing the submersible.

As one who has long advocated that investment in our oceanographic program would be highly profitable for the United States, I am pleased that this research vessel is of so much assistance to the Navy in a matter of critical importance to our national security. This incident will perhaps point up some of the potential value of developments in oceanography as well as give some indication of the need for us to possess adequate technology to explore the seas.

The Cape Cod Standard-Times recently published an editorial which, in my view, sums up the situation very well. It praises the *Alvin*'s capabilities, pointing out that those involved in its design and manning have helped to make history. Yet the article makes the point as well that we must recognize that the *Alvin* is only the beginning of a new era in ocean technology.

THE "ALVIN"

There could have been those who eyed askance the submarine *Alvin* when it first arrived in Woods Hole waters.

It was such a small craft—and there were so many things being said about what it could do in the matter of deep sea diving and research.

The *Alvin* underwent its tests and performed successfully. Yet—

Whatever doubts there might have remained about the usefulness of the *Alvin* were dispelled when the deep submergence research vessel last week located a hydrogen bomb missing off the coast of Spain following an air mishap involving U.S. planes.

Attention around the globe had been focused on the search.

Down went the *Alvin*—and it scored another success.

Men have been deeper than 2,500 feet below the surface—the depth at which the hydrogen bomb was discovered. The *Alvin*, in fact, has been down more than double that depth while manned.

The *Alvin* is maneuverable; it can move up and down, forward and backward and hover at great depths. That combination was not possible too long ago.

Let it be said that the *Alvin* has done itself proud off Spain. Let it be said that those who manned the craft in its dives and tests and created its design and equipment have helped make history.

There will be others coming along like the *Alvin*, which represents a new generation of underwater vessels. Science, and man's inventiveness, in the days to come, doubtless will make the *Alvin* obsolete.

But, for now, the *Alvin* deserves the admiration being heaped upon its tiny self.

Representative Charles S. Gubser Supports Public Law 874

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, today I testified before the General Subcommittee on Education in opposition to a proposal by President Johnson which would seriously curtail the benefits to education of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, which have worked so effectively since 1950.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES S. GUBSER, IN SUPPORT OF PUBLIC LAW 874, BEFORE THE EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE, MARCH 29, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as President Johnson has stated in the past few months, "the education of our people is a national investment. There is no greater challenge than that of providing our children and youth with the opportunity to develop fully their talents and interests. Education is vital to the achievement of a Great Society and is our major weapon in the war on poverty."

It is difficult to reconcile these admirable and well-accepted views with the current proposal to amend Public Law 874 and Public Law 815.

William Carey, Executive Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget stated in a recent letter that "the reduction in the impacted area program is * * * a reflection of the hard choices which are necessary to meet critical domestic needs in a time of extraordinary requirements for our international commitments."

Yet President Johnson does not find it difficult to dim his enthusiasm for education—and logic—to the point where he will sacrifice $190 million in funds for a well-proven, successful program at the same time that he requests about nine times as much—$1.75 billion—to finance his poverty program which all too often has turned into an administrative tangle embroiled in local feuds and is, as Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL commented on March 8, "mired in the swamp of mediocrity."

Furthermore, it is simply not true that new educational assistance programs will make up for the loss in Public Law 874 funds.

Money under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 goes to districts with large numbers of low-income families and must be spent in a specific way for additional programs superimposed on the educational program already being sustained. Public Law 874 funds generally go to entirely different districts—those that have more students than normal due to tax-exempt Federal Government activities in the area. It is one of the few programs which assist the local taxpayer in meeting day-to-day operating costs of the regular school program. Any loss here will mean reductions in basic school programs.

It is significant that Federal control under Public Law 874 and Public Law 816 has been kept to a minimum, a goal which this Committee and the Congress has often stated. No other form of Federal assistance has produced so little erosion of local control.

My district is strongly opposed to any change in Federal aid to impacted school districts. As one person put it, "The caliber of people brought here by Federal aerospace and electronic activities demands a high level curriculum taught in good schools. We have been making giant strides, and thus far we have been able to provide this curriculum. Loss of Public Law 874 funds would present an enormous crisis to our district. Our taxpayers are already heavily burdened to keep up our schools. We would prefer that less money be spent on the programs of the Great Society and antipoverty programs as a means of economizing."

There is great justification for upgrading the level of education of the disadvantaged who live in areas of poverty. Such an improvement is unquestionably an addition to our national assets.

But we all agree that the objective of education must go beyond bringing the disadvantaged up to a norm. It must also concentrate on the very fertile minds of those whose backgrounds have blessed them with special aptitudes. Here is our source of scientists, technologists, and intellectuals who will be leaders of tomorrow and whose skills can build a better life for all—rich and poor alike.

It is a fact of life that students with these aptitudes are often concentrated in areas of Federal impaction. We cannot afford in this crucial time of technological and ideological competition with the Communist world to cut back on the accelerated educational programs which we now offer talented and superior students. Yet this would be the inevitable result of the President's recommendations regarding Public Law 874.

Eighteen school districts in my congressional district will receive approximately $1,485,450 this year under the terms of Public Law 874. Under pending administration proposals, only nine districts will receive $207,766 for a net loss of $1,277,684.

Under California law, the State will automatically assume from the State school fund an average of 25 percent of the Federal cutback. The State fund, however, is already showing a deficit for this year. As a result these make-up funds may not be available, and the current budget crisis which the California legislature is facing increases this likelihood. This deficit and the loss caused by the Federal cut will result in reduced State equalization which is paid to most school districts in the State—not just to those receiving Federal funds.

In addition, the districts receiving Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 funds are not rich in terms of local tax dollars. Most of them are at the maximum tax rate allowed by law and are bonded to their legal capacity. In almost every case the districts will have to turn to the State for adiditional help beyond the amount they will receive automatically. If this help is to be forthcoming it will require special action of the legislature and will be an additional burden on the State taxpayer.

Dollarwise, local schools will take a drubbing if Public Law 874 is not continued as it is.

It cannot be said that the loss of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 aid will be offset by application of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Since this is a law with nationwide application, its benefits and provisions are now available to all school districts and its application should be nondiscriminatory. But if, because of this newest law some school districts are forced to surrender the payments they have received for a Federal impact which has narrowed the local tax base, then those districts are the victims of discrimination. They are prevented from taxing a Federal installation which contributes children who must be educated at partially local expense and they receive no more, probably less, Federal aid. In the sense that local citizens are asked to shoulder what is properly a Federal responsibility, they are the victims of discrimination.

I strongly support continuing Public Laws 874 and 815 as they are presently written because the programs have been successful and have involved a minimum of Federal regulation, because of the bonafide need the programs are designed to meet, and because their maintenance will prevent discrimination between school districts.

One hundred and ninety million dollars is such a small commitment to the education of tomorrow's leaders.

Child Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the conferees on H.R. 10304 to provide mandatory reporting of child abuse in the District of Columbia will meet soon to work out differences between the Senate and House bills. The Congress, hopefully, therefore, will take final action this year in dealing with the child abuse problem here in our capital city.

This is, of course, a nationwide problem but it is a problem with which local authorities in the various States must deal. Since the Congress has not yet given up its responsibilities as "City Council" for the city of Washington, I think it is imperative that we do enact this legislation for the District of Columbia this year.

The distinguished medical writer for the New York Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, on March 27 wrote an excellent survey article entitled "The Battered Child." His article points out, among other things, the important research and demonstration projects carried out in this field by the Children's Bureau under the direction of its very able chief, Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Rusk's article at this point in the RECORD.

THE BATTERED CHILD: PARENTAL ABUSE OF YOUNGSTERS IS THE FOCUS OF FOUR FEDERAL RESEARCH PROJECTS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

In the last few years a terrifying and ugly new phrase has entered the medical lexicon—the "battered child syndrome."

It is understandable that professional concern for the plight of children who are mistreated physically by their parents has increased in recent years. However, it is not known whether the prevalence of such incidents is actually increasing.

Physical punishment of children by parents has been accepted through the ages. When a parent inflicts injury in reprimanding a child, it then is termed abuse. Determination of what is abuse is decided by the courts.

Because a physician is frequently the only person outside of the parent who sees the abused child, he must be suspicious if certain symptoms are evident. Among them are indications of neglect, evidence of broken bones, internal injuries, including brain damage, and soft tissue injuries.

The diagnostic role of the radiologist is often a key one. It is the radiologist who may first find fractures or obscure internal injuries. This evidence of trauma alerts the physician to investigate the cause, which may be criminal abuse.

The radiologist may also be the key to disposition of the case, because if he can build up the necessary evidence while the child is in the hospital, the parents may be called in and may, faced with that evidence, acknowledge responsibility for the injuries.

The physician must not only feel free but also feel a moral responsibility to report any cases of child abuse he suspects. This should be done promptly because parents who abuse their children often shift physicians when second injuries occur.

The physician, as a result, is often reluctant to report child abuse cases because of the possibility of misinterpretation when having examined the child only once.

The physician also often hesitates to report such cases because of the right of privileged communication in this instance is a disclosure of a conversation between physician and parent and is protected by law.

The attorney general of Kansas, however, has suggested that the right of privileged communication does not extend to parents if a physician is called to testify. He argues that the child is the actual patient.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Timothy Murphy has pointed out it is much better for authorities to work informally with parents and to get them to accept whatever help social and psychiatric agencies may be able to offer than to prefer charges. Mr. Murphy handles such problems in the District of Columbia.

He points out that the vast majority of children are ultimately going to end up back home with the same set of parents. He also stresses that it is difficult to get a conviction and that indicting without convicting is no deterrent to further abuse.

Conviction cannot be based on the evidence of a child alone, as the testimony of children under 7 years old is not held competent by the courts, nor can be husband and wife be compelled to testify against each other.

In cases analyzed, mothers appear to be the abusers in the majority of instances. Psychiatrists say that this confirms the knowledge that emotional disturbances are often triggered in the postpartum period, the time immediately after the birth of a child, when the mother often suffers from despondency and anxiety.

These mothers have not fully grasped the experience of childhood or motherhood and are, therefore, often unable to assume parental responsibilities.

Physical abuse of children may also be an expression of the parent's failure to distinguish between their own childhood suffering and their reaction to other children. In one case, a parent told of his alcoholic father who had beaten and tyrannized him during childhood. The man's parents separated and he never saw his father again. This man saw his son in the same light as his childhood relationship with his father.

A sergeant in the military police spoke of his 9-month-old son, whom he had beaten:

"He thinks he's boss—all the time trying to run things—but I showed him who's in charge here."

Studies have shown that physical abuse of children is no more evident in one ethnic, social, or economic group than in another. In only a few instances did gross poverty or ignorance appear.

The only common denominator seems to be that the child beater is determined to take out personal frustrations on one or more of his children because of the lack of emotional maturity to deal with his own conflicts.

Currently, the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is supporting four research and demonstration projects aimed at finding out why parents abuse their children.

Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, Chief of the Children's Bureau, comments:

"Each of these projects represents a different approach to a very complex problem—ranging from a project to collect nationwide data on the incidence of child abuse to an analysis of how protective services of child welfare agencies are used in cases of neglect and abuse."

The projects are at Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.; the Juvenile Protective Association, Chicago; the University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work, Philadelphia, and the School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Whereas, 5 years ago only one State had child-abuse statutes, the reporting of physically abused children has now become almost nationwide. Laws existed at the start of this year in all States except Hawaii, Mississippi, and Virginia.

Most of the legislation is patterned on recommendations developed by the Children's Bureau in 1963.

The philosophy of treating the battered child as a health problem calls for rehabilitation rather than punishment of the parent. These parents are sick people. However, they must first want to receive treatment and get well.

Unless we recognize the emotional health of the parent as the key factor and orient the legal solutions of that issue, the problem of child abuse will never be solved satisfactorily.

Popper Goes North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, where "there's a will, there's a way"—and our VISTA volunteers have a fund of both. Two of these OEO employees in Noorvik, Alaska, decided to provide a popcorn popping machine for the village, and the enclosed article, "Popper Goes North," which appeared in the Washington Daily News of March 24, 1966, reveals how they achieved their goal:

POPPER GOES NORTH

Employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity here have chipped in to provide an Eskimo village in Alaska with a popcorn popping machine.

The story began when two VISTA volunteers, Judy Ames, of Altadena, Calif., and Harold Bruce, of Wheaton, Minn., in the village of Noorvik (population 384) wrote OEO Director Sargent Shriver.

They said popcorn sold like hotcakes in the Noorvik theater, and the proceeds went to charity. But the profit was low because prepopped popcorn had to be flown in.

Mr. Shriver assigned the problem to Mike Sher, who ordinarily works on congressional relations, and a popping machine was finally located in San Francisco and its owner, Arthur Unger, agreed to sell it at half its regular price of $150.

Jacques Rion, a San Francisco theater operator who had helped locate the machine, offered to pay $37.50, if OEO provided the rest. He also pledged a year's supply of popcorn.

Since the OEO has no budget for popping machines, Mr. Sher passed the hat in the office here, and the machine was on its way.

Strong Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the Houston Chronicle's editorial opinion on "the overwhelming support both Houses of Congress gave the $6 billion tax increase."

The Chronicle is of the opinion that the strong support the measure received indicates:

> Most Congressmen stand with the President—Republicans as well as Democrats.

The paper believes:

> No one yet has come up with a better course of action than that which President Johnson is pursuing.

Since many may want to see the editorial in its entirety, with permission of my colleagues I include it in the RECORD.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Mar. 19, 1966]

A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

The overwhelming support both Houses of Congress gave the $6 billion tax increase was to some degree a vote of confidence in President Johnson's conduct of the war in Vietnam. The vote was 288 to 102 in the House and 72 to 5 in the Senate. The increase will provide funds to carry on the war.

The strong support the measure received indicates that, despite the worst Mr. Johnson's critics could do, most Congressmen stand with the President—Republicans as well as Democrats. This does not mean, of course, that many Americans aren't deeply disturbed at the possibility of a greatly enlarged war or even of eventual war with Red China. But it does indicate that no one yet has come up with a better course of action than that which President Johnson is pursuing.

At the signing of the bill, Mr. Johnson made a few observations about our mission in Vietnam. He recalled that Congress, on the eve of World War II, created a false impression in the world when it extended the draft by a slim one-vote margin in the House, then refused to fortify the island of Guam.

He added: "The overwhelming vote of this [tax increase] measure * * * testified that we may have learned something from recent history. It is a lesson which we should have learned long ago for it was really one of our Founding Fathers, John Jay, who warned us: 'It is too true, however disgraceful it may be to human nature, that nations in general will make war whenever they have a prospect of getting anything by it.' "

Most nations have since learned the final futility of war, Mr. Johnson said. A few remain who do not desire peace, "So to those who ask what our present struggle in Vietnam means, let me say: Our purpose is to demonstrate to the remaining advocates of violence that there is more human profit to be had from peace than there is from war."

Strength in Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the last several weeks we have been hearing the cry of General de Gaulle that it was his intention to do everything he could to weaken or dismantle the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I do not subscribe to the theory of General de Gaulle in this action and hope that this plan will drop by the wayside and that this great Organization will continue its existence, yes, even expand.

The Newark Evening News of Thursday March 24, 1966, states that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization must be preserved.

The paper declares:

> NATO has brought confidence where there was uncertainty; progress where there was decay; partnership where there was isolation.

It adds:

> If accommodations to new conditions are possible there is no reason they cannot be made by extending, and not disintegrating, the Atlantic Alliance.

Since this matter concerns us all at this time, I would like my distinguished colleagues in the House to have the full text of the editorial as it appeared in the Newark Evening News.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial on the subject in the RECORD because of its timeliness and excellent appraisal of the problem.

The editorial follows:

PRESERVING NATO

President Johnson has responded obliquely but nonetheless forcefully to General de Gaulle's plan to dismantle NATO. Europe's choice, as the President sees it, either is to extend and strengthen the unity under which it has prospered in peace for the last 20 years or to risk a return to the rivalries that produced two world wars within a generation.

These are, of course, easy generalities. Avoided was any direct reply to De Gaulle's threat to clear France of all NATO troops and bases that are not turned over to French command. Practicality, as well as diplomacy, counseled this approach.

More time is needed for a fuller appreciation of what the general's proposals would mean, not only to France's European allies but to France itself. NATO headquarters is an industry in itself, and one that contributes importantly to the French economy. So do its various installations throughout the country. Obviously, Mr. Johnson is content to let the French ponder what their losses would be.

Overriding these mundane pecuniary considerations is the fact that NATO has brought confidence where there was uncertainty; progress where there was decay; partnership where there was isolation. An aggressor is likely to be deterred if he is confronted by a common defense, emergency plans prepared in advance, and integrated commands to carry them out. And that is what NATO has provided to date.

If accommodations to new conditions are possible there is no reason they cannot be made by extending, and not disintegrating, the Atlantic alliance. Its purpose, as Mr. Johnson noted, is not to make war but to assure peace. No more than assurance of peaceful intent should be needed to gain admission.

These are some of the thoughts Mr. Johnson has left with France and any others who may be tempted by General de Gaulle's ideas of trying once again to go it alone. Fortunately, as matters now stand, General de Gaulle's is still a lonely voice crying out more from frustration than any position of real leadership.

South Vietnam Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials from my hometown newspaper, the Leesburg Daily Commercial, on the situation in South Vietnam that I think are well worth reading. The arguments that they present are cogent and I commend them to the membership of the Congress:

[From the Leesburg (Fla.) Daily Commercial, Mar. 17, 1966]

AN INVITATION TO DISASTER

There are at least two gaping holes in Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's plan for a Sino-American detente in southeast Asia.

The Arkansas Democrat, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, would like to see the United States and Red China reach an agreement for the neutralization of that part of the world, with both sides withdrawing their military power from the region.

To bring this about, says the Senator, we must make the prospect of permanent American military bases on the periphery of China a credible threat. And to do this, we should confine ourselves to "easily defensible bases somewhat like Guantanamo or Gibraltar."

Our present strategy in the war in Vietnam is not a credible threat to China, he maintains, because the Chinese are convinced we have neither the strength nor the will to keep on spending "more and more lives and more and more money in an ever-widening but inconclusive war."

The most glaring defect in the Senator's argument, even if such an agreement could be made with China, is that China has no bases to dismantle in southeast Asia, no combat troops to remove from Vietnam.

By the same logic, we might also offer to recall the 7th Fleet from the Pacific if the Chinese would drydock their nonexistent navy.

As for the Senator's other recommendation, not only would a withdrawal into little "fortress Americas" be a retreat, undoing all that has been accomplished with such sacrifice on the battlefield in the past months, but it would give the Communists the greatest incentive they could have for continuing the war.

According to one military analyst, Hanson W. Baldwin, such a policy would lead nowhere. It would mean the abandonment of all hope of clearing the Vietcong from their strongholds in the south and deteriorate South Vietnamese morale. It would mean conceding the strategic initiative to the enemy and exposing U.S. forces to the constant drain of casualties without bringing increased pressure on Hanoi. "It would mean indefinite stalemate, deferred defeat, defeat on the installment plan."

In his Senate speech, Fulbright quoted a Canadian correspondent's report that it is a matter of faith with the Chinese that the United States can never win a land war in Asia, that with all our awesome power we cannot fight several revolutionary wars at the same time and that we will eventually be engulfed without direct Chinese intervention.

The Chinese, fortunately, are not infallible. It was an article of faith with them in the last century that, despite the technological superiority of the Europeans who were carving out spheres of influence on Chinese territory, China was superior to all of them in culture and could not possibly be defeated—that with one great shrug its vast population would someday cast the barbarians back into the sea.

The present masters of China are no less out of touch with reality, no less prisoners of their own propaganda. If we ever hope to achieve lasting peace in southeast Asia, the worst thing we could do—and the worst disservice we could render not only to ourselves but to the Chinese—would be to join them in their dream world and adapt our policies to their fantasies.

[From the Leesburg (Fla.) Daily Commercial, Mar. 18, 1966]

WHO ARE THE VIETCONG?

One of the easiest and safest ways to acquire a reputation for statesmanship and sagacity at the present time is to come out in favor of negotiating with the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

As spokesman for this view, the name of Senator Robert Kennedy leaps to mind first—an automatic reaction every politician would like to inculcate, though not necessarily in this particular connection.

The New York Times is another influential voice. In a recent 1,300-word editorial outlining suggested modifications in the administration's present Vietnamese policy, it opined that "direct talks with the Vietcong are essential."

Such advice is easy, because few wars have provided a better field day for armchair strategists. When even the experts take turns putting their feet in their mouths, as they have consistently done for the past decade, no one else can be blamed for thinking he can do better.

And it is safe, because no sensible person wants the war in Vietnam to go on and on as it has, exacting an increasing toll in lives and resources from all concerned with nothing that can be called victory in sight.

Certainly the President would like the mess to end, and has gone on record pledging himself to the principle of a negotiated peace.

The only difficulty is, how do you hold "direct talks" with something that is not a political entity but more like an elemental force of nature, that seems to be led by no one man, which has no headquarters, no acknowledged hierarchy of command?

In other words, who is the man or group of men in the Vietcong with whom we are supposed to negotiate?

According to some, the Vietcong is a patriotic, indigenous South Vietnamese faction—aided, perhaps, but not directed by North Vietnam. But if so, where is the Ho Chi Minh of South Vietnam whom we are to offer a post in a coalition government?

The facts are that there is only one Ho Chi Minh, the one in the north; that here its only one headquarters for the Vietcong, the one in Hanoi; that the only leaders with whom we can negotiate are the ones in North Vietnam.

These are the only assumptions this country can reasonably base its policy on, and until other evidence is forthcoming, the facile advice that we "talk to the Vietcong" merely adds unneeded nettles to what is one of the thorniest entanglements America has ever gotten itself into.

Basic Protection for the Traffic Victim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the contributions that scholars at Harvard and other universities have made in the public interest on a wide variety of emergent problems. I am pleased now to commend to the attention of my colleagues another such service—a proposed new form of insurance plan which would do away in large measure with the flood of negligence actions that are plaguing our courts. The plan and the text of a proposed model statute to place it into effect at the State level are set forth in a book entitled "Basic Protection for the Traffic Victim," published by Little, Brown & Co. It was written by Prof. Robert E. Keeton, of Harvard Law School, and Prof. Jeffrey O'Connell, of the University of Illinois, College of Law. The study out of which their proposal emerged was conducted at Harvard Law School. Throughout the study the authors had the advice of a distinguished panel of experts on insurance and related law. This panel includes Profs. Frederick M. Hart and James M. Smith, of Boston College Law School; William J. Curran, director of the Boston University Law-Medicine Research Institute; Prof. Daniel G. MacLeod, of Boston University Law School; Profs. Harold J. Berman, Louis L. Jaffe, and John H. Mansfield, of Harvard Law School, and Profs. Alvan Brody and David J. Sargent, of Suffolk University Law School.

In essence, the plan proposes a basic protection insurance which would reimburse a person for his financial loss arising from an automobile accident without, in most cases, raising the question of blame. The injured person would be reimbursed the doctor bills, hospital bills, and lost wages month by month as the losses occur, rather, than as at present, receive a lump sum as and when the inured party settles with the insurance company or receives judgment as the result of litigation.

This new form of insurance would be coupled with a State statute that would waive claims based on negligence unless the damages for pain and suffering are likely to exceed $5,000 or recovery for all other causes—medical expenses, loss of wages, et cetera—would exceed $10,000.

The authors of the proposal contend that their plan would sharply reduce the overhead of our present insurance system which, according to reliable figures, delivers less than 50 cents of the premium dollar to the victims. The authors also believe their plan would cut insurance costs and remove the inducement for fraudulent claims. I am advised that legislation to implement this new plan has already been introduced in Michigan and is being given consideration in other States. I think we can all agree that the time has arrived for some sort of reform in automobile negligence actions. The proposal by Professors Keeton and O'Connell is worth serious consideration.

Air Pollution Elimination by Mayor John B. Nicosia, of East Chicago, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Mayor John B. Nicosia, of East Chicago, Ind., has accomplished more progress in fighting air pollution in his city than any mayor in the United States.

The following article by Sarah Boyden in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 13, 1966, reveals facts and procedures that should be followed by mayors of all cities which are scourged with industrial, auto, and all forms of air pollution:

ONE MAN'S BATTLE FOR A GULP OF FRESH AIR

The air you breath costs you at least $35 a year. That pays for cleaning your clothes and house furnishings. Add walls that must be repainted, trees and shrubs which are blighted or killed, carpets that wear out quicker, a dozen other similar items caused by airborne contaminants, and the bill is more than doubled.

But those results of dirty air are only nuisances. What one man saw in X-ray pictures of the lungs of his fellow citizens caused him to give up an established medical practice, run for mayor of East Chicago, Ind., and get elected.

"I couldn't stand it," says Mayor (Dr.) John B. Nicosia in his sparkling clean office in the city hall, on Indianapolis Boulevard. Its windows overlooked a stretch of lawn partly covered by gray snow, under a sky so gray the buildings across the street looked dim.

"I came here from New York in 1937 as a young doctor. I married a girl who had been born and brought up here, and here we have lived and brought up our children." (One son, Dr. Jon F. Nicosia, is an intern at Cook County Hospital.)

In the course of his practice of medicine, Dr. Nicosia looked at thousands of chest X-rays, mostly of residents of the area. What he saw stirred him to action. "You get not only this constant irritation, and worse, of bronchial tubes and lungs," he says, "but you get heart complications from chronic respiratory trouble—the heart has to work harder to pump bad air through injured tissues. This is especially true of younger people.

"Hundreds die prematurely from atmospheric poisons, directly. The TB rate runs higher in areas with air pollution. No one has yet proved how much it contributes to the rising rate of emphysema. We really don't know what ills air pollution causes. We do know that the sulfur dioxide concentration which resulted in 4,000 deaths in London in 1952 was 1.2 parts per million for about 8 hours." In South Chicago, in 1963, the sulfur dioxide concentration was 1.6 for 1 hour—until a strong wind providentially blew it away.

"It's up to us, what goes into our air," says Mayor Nicosia. "We don't have to turn the sky into a sewer."

Since he took office in 1963, the mayor has been busy clearing the air. First thing he did was to take various governmental officials for helicopter rides over his city. They couldn't see much, on account of the smoke. Since all the city files on air pollution control were missing, he set up new ones. He bought, built, and borrowed equipment to set up five sampling stations throughout the area to furnish the data required by the Federal Government before its assistance is made available. Now the city also has a roving laboratory in a van, which will analyze air samples on the spot and report the results.

At first, he says, people thought he was just joking. East Chicago is surrounded by steel mills, cement mills, oil refineries, asphalt plants, gypsum plants, aluminum and lead smelters, carbide plants, and chemical manufacturing. Some of these are located right in the town, as well as around it. Residents were used to foul air. In one locality—Markstown—the air was so bad that people kept their windows sealed tightly shut winter and summer. Even then, everything inside was covered with grime and soot, and in the hot weather, before air conditioning, conditions were miserable.

There were days when vehicular traffic could not move faster than 5 miles an hour because of low visibility on the streets. Of course, the vehicles were also heavily contributing to the airborne sludge.

The only escape from this mess was to move away.

"You can't work by yourself on this problem because air has no boundaries," says Nicosia. "Furthermore, East Chicago is not the only locality to have such trouble—it's all over the country, all over the world. It doesn't get much attention because we don't realize the potential danger we face every day."

INDUSTRY COOPERATES

One of his first acts to combat the menace was to call a conference of local industrial representatives and citizens. After several starts and fits, an agreement was reached. Improvement is already noticeable, but the program is long range, specifying full control of all air emissions from open hearth furnaces and sintering plants by 1973—and the way the plants are going at it, this goal may be reached a couple of years early.

No sooner had this step been taken than a minor setback occurred in the East Chicago garbage dump. This dump at present is overloaded to the point of frequently breaking out in spontaneous fires, adding further to the smoke in the city air. A new incinerator with proper controls, built in a favorable location, is now under debate. "Would you think anyone would so much as question the necessity for this?" inquires the mayor indignantly, after a heated committee meeting.

One plant, the U.S. Reduction Co., paid no attention to several warnings from the city office as to its offending emissions. Finally the police force moved in and arrested its responsible officers, the mayor reports. "It was quite a surprise to them," the mayor said. The case is now pending in court.

Basically, East Chicago loves industries. In fact, it lives upon them. Its plants produce more steel than any other city in the world, and its output of other vital materials furnishes a steady, well-paid livelihood to its citizens, plus considerable in taxes. This move to help industry help itself comes from the conviction that such action is everywhere inevitable, and why shouldn't East Chicago, as a leader in results, take the lead in reforming the process of getting them, too?

PLANT DESTRUCTION

Growing plants are affected by smog and pollution even more quickly than are animals and humans. "Oxygen is not a permanent feature in the air," states the Air Conservation Commission of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. "It is a renewable resource dependent on plants for its production, and on animals, fire, and minerals for its removal," the statement continues. "If enough green plants are destroyed, oxygen production could be decreased." This is speculative and long range, say the experts, but not to be discounted, especially in a period when people are multiplying and trees being destroyed.

So the ambient air isn't free—nor is it guaranteed to last forever.

What should we do? Spend our money to protect and preserve it? Or on repairs, as and if possible?

"Nobody has been able to grow evergreens around here for years," answers Mayor Nicosia of East Chicago. "All those blue spruces—they die the first winter, when they can't be washed down every day by hosing. But we are going to get things so we can grow evergreens. When we do, we'll be glad to give advice on how we did it. People are as important as evergreens."

Authorizing an Official Residence for the Vice President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, in analyzing S. 2394 now before the House, I have tried to determine whether the people of the United States should provide an official residence for all future Vice Presidents because of the nature of the office in relation to its importance to the Nation and not whether the present Vice President should have an official residence.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the decision to provide a home for our second most important Government official should not be motivated by the personality of Mr. HUMPHREY, his wants or his desires, but motivated only to further the dignity of the office, itself.

Furthermore, for security reasons, I believe the house should be located in an environment adaptable to the maximum amount of protection available for the Vice President and his family. The Naval Observatory on Massachusetts Avenue is such a site and thoroughly approve of the committee's choice in this connection.

It would appear that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have you believe that construction of a house for the Vice President would begin next week or within the next 6 months. This is impossible. The fact is the appropriation will not be considerered by us today at all; only an authorization for an amount not to exceed $750,000.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] has indicated that only a $45,000 appropriation for architectural planning and designing will be requested at this time. This is the main reason, Mr. Speaker, that I shall vote for the bill.

An unusual feature that captured my imagination, Mr. Speaker, is the provision enabling foundations and the public to make gifts thereby reducing the overall cost of this project. If this bill becomes law, I propose to ask the chambers of commerce in my district to organize committees to collect funds for this worthwhile endeavor.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if we can furnish homes for our generals, colonels, other military personnel, and ambassadors, I feel we can afford, even during war, to spend $45,000 for the planning of an official residence for the Nation's second highest official.

Sad Condition of the U.S. Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. merchant marine has been on the decline for the last 10 years and aside from some hand wringing and discouraging speeches on the subject, not very much has been done to remedy the situation. The several administrations during that period have not been very helpful either, in fact, each year the budget requests for this purpose are smaller than the previous year.

In this connection I would like to bring to the attention of the Members two articles in the Baltimore Sun by the very able maritime editor, Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, as worthy of their careful perusal:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 24, 1966]

AROUND THE WATERFRONT: MERCHANT MARINE ENTERS ERA OF BLOC OBSOLESCENCE

(By, Helen Delich Bentley)

BAL HARBOUR, FLA., February 24.—The oft-promised, long-threatened bloc obsolescence of the American merchant marine is here.

No more warnings have to be issued about it—nor must this country be altered that this is something that it must guard against.

The shipowners—and more important, the shippers—became acutely aware of it last week when the British underwriters announced an increase in insurance rates on cargoes moving aboard war-built vessels and those over 20 years of age.

Seventy-one percent of the Nation's berth-line ships were destined to lose their cargoes if the rate increase, as it was originally announced, became effective March 1.

But only 7 to 10 percent of the foreign-flag berth liners serving for United States fall into the rate-increase class.

What a sad State for the richest Nation in the world—that 71 percent of its ships carrying its essential cargo on its essential trade routes are so old that they literally are considered decrepit in insurance circles, while those of even the new energing African countries are more modern.

An even more critical aspect is that a substantial portion of the 29 percent of newer ships will fall into this same obsolete category within the next 5 years.

The real note of irony is that many of the foreign countries—Japan, Italy, Germany, Ghana—have modern ships because of American generosity over the years. This country gave them the money with which to build new, modern shipyards—shipyards with the most efficient facilities to build vessels in the most economical way and thus undercut America's shipbuilders. This country also provided funds for them to build up their merchant marines.

When a new country emerges, the State Department philosophy seems to be that the United States must help them build up a merchant marine (modern, of course) because this is so important to the stature of these have-not, new nations.

As one steamship official puts it, if the United States "is to get the full value from those countries, they must have ships equal to ours." Yet, at the same time, those same State Department officials downgrade the U.S.'s own merchant marine.

Washington has given these other countries the money to build up what this country was initially founded on—seapower—but nothing is done to maintain the U.S.'s own position along these lines.

As a result of American generosity, these countries today can take away all the high-priced cargoes from American-flag bottoms because this country's officials have failed to adhere to the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and to provide this country with a modern fleet.

Warnings about bloc obsolescence of the Amercan merchant marine have been issued since 1955 when Sinclair Weeks was Secretary of Commerce. He said then that the United States should begin replacing its war-built ships on such a large scale that the bulk of its fleet would not rot at one time.

Since then there has been repeated warnings, but nothing concrete or productive was ever really done to avoid what this country must realize today: That 71 percent of the "cream" of the merchant marine is obsolete—has deteriorated—is old and expensive to run.

The reserve fleet that officials keep talking so much about is in even worse condition—all of those ships are war-built, which means they are at least 21 years old.

And instead of making any efforts to improve this situation and cut down on the 71-percent figure, the Johnson administration has reduced the amount of appropriations for new construction to the lowest number yet since the ship replacement program got in full swing in 1958.

The $85 million it allots will provide for only seven new vessels. If the Maritime Administration is lucky, it will get 13 ships in the 1967 fiscal budget, provided Congress permits funds to be switched from another account.

Even at that, the program is from 6 to 9 ships short for 1967, aggravating the already high figure of 90 ships behind in the replacement program.

This tragedy continues to unfold in sad fashion while the richest nation in the world has to watch the rest of that world pass it by with modern ships, with the import cargoes—because this country has not lived up to its responsibilities.

Bloc obsolescence has finally overwhelmed the American merchant marine. Is anyone going to do anything about it?

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 25, 1966]

AROUND THE WATERFRONT: MARITIME INDUSTRY SEEN NEEDING A COMMON VOICE

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

NEW ORLEANS, March 24.—The current threat of a coal strike for the first time in a number of years takes us back to 1958 when the National Coal Policy Conference was formed.

The statement by John L. Lewis which resulted in the formation of that conference could certainly apply to the maritime industry today.

"COMMON VOICE" NEEDED

In an address before the American Mining Congress March 5, 1958, the head of the United Mine Workers—considered one of the greatest labor leaders of all time—stated:

"This industry now needs a common voice, recognized as such to bring its problems to the attention of the Government itself, the Congress if need must be, and the American people in addition. It needs the best talents and the best organization. Our industry and its leadership is capable of furnishing both.

"Who speaks for the cold industry now? All of our great leaders are only able to speak for segments of the industry, and the influence of those words upon their auditors (audience) are minimized by the fact that they are speaking for a group in the industry."

AGENCY PROPOSED

"We should have an agency, a national agency meeting at appropriate times, the leaders of which could speak—perhaps quarterly—voicing the requirements of all those attached to the industry. This agency would be the voice not only of the investors of the industry and the management, but also the manpower of the industry."

The rationale of the National Coal Policy Conference today, behind Lewis' statement, is that the coal industry had been studded with bitter conflicts after World War II, with each segment fighting the other persistently and hotly. However, a few far-sighted leaders in the coal industry took it upon themselves to stop this erosion and sought to strengthen the industry, to preserve the benefits of coal for the Nation, and to revise the growing public misconceptions of coal as an industry which progress had bypassed and which was losing, or had lost, its social and economic influence.

Certainly in the maritime world today the same situation exists—and all one would have to do is remove the word "coal" and substitute "shipping," because there certainly is a need to stop the erosion in the maritime field, to strengthen the industry, to preserve the benefits of shipping for the Nation, and to revise the growing public misconceptions of shipping as an industry which progress is bypassing and which has lost its social and economic influence.

So, out of John L. Lewis' three paragraphs the National Coal Policy Conference was founded. When it speaks, it is recognized as representing a whole industry—not a strip coal mine, not a major coal producer, not a union, not a coal carrier, or machinery manufacturer.

FULL REPRESENTATION

Its members are labor, all coal mine owners, all manufacturers of machinery for coal mines, public utilities that use coal, and the railroads that carry the coal.

It is the coal industry.

A comparable conference for the maritime industry would not represent a subsidized segment, the tankers, the unsubsidized liners, the tramps, the labor unions, the shipyards, or the manufacturers.

A solid front should speak for the industry.

A solid front would be better received than are the individual groups as they appear on Capitol Hill today because it is recognized beforehand—"well, he's going to talk to protect his subsidy." Or "he's going to oppose compulsory arbitration" or "he's going to plead for the tramps."

LITTLE PROGRESS MADE

Although there has been a tendency toward cementing the groups in the past 7 months, that is where it stands—a tendency. The cement has not been given the opportunity to harden. Management still remains fractionalized and so does labor.

A solid front would certainly help ward off the industry's enemies in Washington circles, who seek to destroy rather than buoy up this industry so vital to the industrial might as well as the defense of the United States.

Is management and labor sufficiently devoted to the overall welfare of the shipping industry and broad enough in their thinking to truly strive toward this end, or are they going to remain obstinate and separate while their industry literally rusts away?

William C. Welch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, effective Monday, March 28, Mr. William C. Welch, Director of the Veterans' Administration Congressional Liaison Service, departed for an assignment to the Special Advisory Committee to the Administrator.

Bill has been on the Capitol Hill scene for a great number of years, and I know will be missed by his many friends. He has an enviable record of service to his country beginning with his military service in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1941 to 1945. Upon separation from the service, he furthered his education at Furman University and the University of Wisconsin, the latter under a Rockefeller scholarship. He did graduate teaching in history and political science from 1951 to 1953 at which time he joined the Central Intelligence Agency in liaison work.

Bill's service on Capitol Hill began in 1954 when he joined the staff of the late Henderson Lanham, of Georgia, and was with him until his tragic death in 1958. He became administrative assistant to Erwin Mitchell who was a member of my Committee on Veterans' Affairs from

1958 to 1961 at which time he assumed his duties of Director of the Veterans' Administration's Liaison Office.

I know all of his friends wish him well in his new assignment and know that he will perform most capably as he did in his previous assignment.

Mr. Earl E. Johnson Elected President of the National Association of Supervisors, Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Supervisors, Department of Defense, held their 28th national convention in Washington, D.C., from February 28, through March 2, 1966.

I was most pleased that, during these meetings, the association reelected Mr. Earl E. Johnson, of Brockton, Mass., as their national president. Earl, an outstanding citizen of my 11th Congressional District, is respected and admired by all of his many friends.

He and his wife, the former Arlene Hayward, of Brockton, resides at 11 Cushing Avenue with their three sons who are all attending Brockton schools. Earl is a member of the South Congregational Church, and has in the past served his community with distinction as president of the Men's Club, and the Huntington School PTA.

A veteran of World War II, Mr. Johnson has been employed since 1940 by the Boston Naval Shipyard where he presently holds the position of supervisory production shop planner.

The national association of which Mr. Johnson is president was organized in Washington, D.C., in 1913 with a nucleus of seven locals—all Navy. It enjoyed progress until 1922 at which time, due to the large reduction of employees in naval establishments, it was disbanded. It was reactivated in 1933, and the first annual convention was held in 1939. By 1944, there were 11 locals, and there has been steady growth since. In 1950, as a result of the Unification Act of the Armed Forces, the association was expanded to the National Association of Supervisors, Department of Defense, with 33 locals. There are currently 54 active chapters with a membership of in excess of 8,000 members working for Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

This organization is the bargaining agent for all civilian supervisors in the Department of Defense, and has been responsible for solving many problems that could not have been satisfactorily resolved at a lower level. The national is officially recognized by the Department of Defense as representing civilian supervisors; it also enjoys "formal recognition" with the Navy Department under Executive Order No. 10988.

C. W. Shaffer—A Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have lived in a small community, Russell, Kans. This community has been blessed with an abundance of outstanding people. Without question, one of the greatest was the late C. W. Shaffer, who departed this life at the age of 86 on March 1, 1966.

The late Mr. Shaffer was a self-made man whose influence was not only strongly felt in our community, but throughout Kansas and the Midwest. It would be difficult to determine just how many people have succeeded because of the advice and assistance received from Mr. Shaffer, but the number is large. He was a symbol of success, in the true American spirit, because he believed in hard work and was convinced to the very end that those who were willing to work, willing to conserve, willing to endure hardships when necessary, and willing to give of their time and money to worthwhile causes, would be successful.

He was a man who worked and lived for tomorrow—his, yours, and the tomorrow of future generations. Every community has its great men, and certainly my community was fortunate in having felt the influence of "Uncle Charlie" for so many years.

In the March 3, 1966, issue of the Russell Record, an editorial by Russell T. Townsley, publisher and editor of the Russell Record and the Russell Daily News, pays tribute to this outstanding man:

[From the Russell Record, Mar. 3, 1966]

C. W. SHAFFER

The death of C. W. Shaffer, 86-year-old prominent Russell banker, marked the end of an era in central Kansas. The last member of the "Lucky Seven," Mr. Shaffer was identified with the discovery of oil in mid-Kansas and the meteoric rise of the industry which, even today, has a significant place in the economy. He was respected for his financial ability, his dedication to his family, civic and community life. Pages of the book bearing his name are filled with entries of the sort that few men achieve.

His belief in a solid community can be seen in the schools built during his 43 years on the board, the church, constructed, both spiritually and physically during his lifelong membership, his home which is warm and filled with memories of a son and daughter and their circles of friends who shared in its glow. His bank, as modern and efficient as can be found today, was expanded and improved in the closing years of his life span. He was planning for the future at the time in life when others were content to contemplate the past.

The story of C. W. Shaffer, however, can't be fairly told in the recital of his achievements. It is as warm and down-to-earth as a tale by O'Henry, Mark Twain, or Tarkington. Hundreds of brides over a half century or more, have started in housekeeping with the pinning of currency on their wedding dress at the traditional wedding dance. It would be hard to count the number of homes in the community today which are here because Mr. Shaffer at the bank could see truth, honesty, and industry—where others saw hard luck and hard times. Vast farm holdings, solid stores, service firms, and industries are good today because "Uncle Charlie" could measure men. He was as conversant with the tools of his trade, the financial statements, bonds and stock reports, debentures and discounts as he was with the skills of Babe Ruth, Walt Johnson, Casey Stengel, and Stan "The Man" Musial. His love for the national pastime gave the fullness to his life that few people knew. His devotion and love for his wife, Catherine, who died in 1964, and his love for young people proved the full life which was often screened by long hours at his desk in the bank.

The lessons he taught as a young schoolteacher remained to teach him. Not expecting perfection, he held, nevertheless, that all should face life squarely, as he had, and plan soundly for the future. He tolerated those who failed to meet his standards and encouraged those who made passing grades in life's classes for he was firmly convinced their marks were the keys to their own success and happiness.

In his nearly 87 years, he had the satisfaction of finding his principles to be sound and basic, perhaps the most rewarding of all the things that can come to a man.

Hopes for the Atom Smasher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal recently published a provocative editorial, "Hopes for the Atom Smasher," which well depicts the hopes of Wisconsin—and the Midwest—for this new facility.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I commend this editorial to my colleagues and request that it be printed in the RECORD:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Mar. 23, 1966]

HOPES FOR THE ATOM SMASHER

Midwest hopes were justifiably raised Tuesday when the National Academy of Sciences recommended seven sites—four in the Midwest—for the proposed 200 billion electron volt atom smasher. This $375 million tool for high-energy physicists would be an economic boon to whatever location is finally chosen, but selection of a Midwest site would be wise for other reasons, too.

Physicists from across the country would use this facility. The biggest concentrations of high-energy physicists now are at the University of California at Berkeley and at Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, N.Y. The Midwest would be a logical and convenient central location for the largest and most complex nuclear research device in the world.

The Wisconsin site recommended, near Stoughton and a short way from the University of Wisconsin at Madison has been strongly supported as scientifically and culturally outstanding. The distinguished scientists who recognized that in their recommendations apparently objected only to Wisconsin's winters. This hardly seems a drawback, however, since our winters have not kept the University of Wisconsin from drawing many of the top scholars in the country to its faculty.

Both the Midwest and the Wisconsin site can be strongly backed without pushing the decision into the political arena. If it does become a matter of politics, however, Wisconsin's Washington delegation can be counted on to do an effective job, since its members have already pledged to work together on this project.

There is no certainty that President Johnson will agree to put beginning construction money in his budget at a time when the Vietnam war is already jeopardizing domestic programs. But this atom smasher would be an important national tool for probing deeper into the mysteries of the atomic age, and should eventually be funded.

The Drive Is On for Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported that some in Government favor wartime censorship of news from Vietnam.

The following editorial from the March 21, 1966, edition of the Chicago Tribune discusses this question:

The Drive Is On for Censorship

A Democratic spokesman, Representative Richard Ichord, of Missouri, has initiated preliminary moves in behalf of the Johnson administration for wartime censorship of news from Vietnam. He said that the country simply cannot afford distorted, biased, inaccurate, incomplete, or irresponsible war news coverage.

He suggested that the Government might tighten policy on accrediting correspondents, limit access to battle zones, and "scrutinize" reports filed for transmission to American newspapers.

Representative Ichord complained about the adequacy and objectivity of the reporting of the war, which, he said, denied the American people a complete and fair account of how the war is going. He added that there is too much destructive criticism of our efforts, both military and civilian, in Vietnam.

There have been many complaints from correspondents reporting the war about clumsy, but at times smothering, efforts by military information officers to hamper them in their work. The usual motive of censorship is not to rectify inaccuracies but to cover up blunders.

Again, the American people might have a clearer understanding of the war if the political leaders in Washington had a coherent idea of what they are out to accomplish and how they intend to defeat Communist aggression. The sniping at the war and its goals comes mostly from members of President Johnson's own party, as the activities of Senators Fulbright, Morse, and others have demonstrated.

An administration which operates on the precepts that news is part of the arsenal of weaponry available to the President, that a policy of managing the news is justified, and that a government can lie to save itself is hardly one to set itself up as a judge of purity and truth in dispatches by professional observers from Vietnam. The threat of censorship is an attempted diversion to place the blame, not on an administration which practices deceit, but on the newspaper writers who are trying to penetrate the paper curtain.

Water Resources Challenges in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the need for a truly comprehensive attack on the water resources problems of the Northeast, including the Potomac basin and all of Maryland, should be clear to us all. This year the flow of the Potomac at Washington reached an alltime January low. Communities in central Maryland have found their municipal water supplies dangerously depleted. Agricultural losses for the State from 1962 through 1965 have been estimated at over $7,000,000. With no end to the severe 5-year drought in sight, the warning signs are numerous.

It is essential that we accelerate our efforts to develop additional sources of water, to improve water distribution systems, and to make usable all the water we have through an energetic assault upon pollution. Although many Federal, State and local agencies are working toward these goals, intensified efforts should be financed and encouraged without further delay.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress today an editorial, "Fifth Year of Drought," from the Washington Evening Star, March 26, 1966, and Mr. John Dorsey's extremely interesting and informative article on the drought and its impact on Maryland, "Northeast United States Has Its Greatest Drought in History," from the Baltimore Sunday Sun of March 27.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 26, 1966]

Fifth Year of Drought

Some of us may have assumed that this winter's heavy snows have headed off the prospect of another year of drought in the Northeast. Alas, not so. The National Water Resources Council reports that not only is the drought likely to continue; it is likely to extend eastward and southward to include Delaware, Maryland, half of Virginia, and northeastern West Virginia.

Another dry year could result in a serious situation, the council warns, and affected areas are advised to begin conserving water and improving supply systems at once, taking maximum advantage of existing Federal loan and grant programs.

The Potomac basin, now for the first time officially included in the drought area, saw its river reach an alltime low at Washington in January. Melting snow swelled the river temporarily, but by the end of February the water had receded below average levels.

Coming at a time when a major effort is underway to make the Potomac basin a model for the Nation, the report drives home, or should drive home, the fact that our attitude toward natural resources, particularly water, has been cavalier, to say the least. If continued drought convinces us that the time for a national conservation effort is at hand, it will have served a useful purpose.

To most of us, the quiet dying of landscape and wildlife, the imperceptible loss of soil and the slow fouling of lakes and streams have an unreal quality. These things take place so gradually, we feel no sense of shock. But when we cannot shave or take a bath, cannot water the flower bed and even have difficulty getting a glass of water in a restaurant, the importance of natural resources begins to strike home.

There is no room for complacency where water is concerned, the council warns. And this is a warning that applies to our total environment. We must read the handwriting on the wall and act before it is too late.

[From the Baltimore Sunday Sun, Mar. 27, 1966]

Northeast United States Has Its Greatest Drought in History

(By John Dorsey)

The present drought in the Northeastern United States is of longer duration and of greater intensity than any drought ever before recorded. There is little comfort in the fact that the law of averages decrees only one such drought every 200 years.

Maryland has not suffered as much as New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, but the State nevertheless has experienced a drought more extended and almost as severe as that of the early thirties. The State has now had over three and a half years of extreme drought. Other areas of the Northeast have 4 to 5 years of extreme drought.

Precipitation in the first 3 months of 1966 has alleviated the situation temporarily, but much more rain must fall before conditions approach normal.

For instance, R. J. Kratzschmar, city water engineer, estimates that in an area where normally about 3 inches of rain can be expected to fall a month, we must have at least 5 inches a month for the next 6 months for the reservoirs which feed Baltimore to approach normal levels.

TOLL OF DROUGHT

No one can tell how long the drought will last, but everywhere there are indications of the toll it has taken:

Cumberland began restricting water use last September.

In Emmittsburg, two schools were forced to close early for Christmas vacation because they were draining too much of the town's depleted water supply.

In Brunswick, at the other end of Frederick County from Emmittsburg, one school was closed temporarily in January and a teachers' conference was called off because of the water shortage. Despite emergency measures, the situation in that town is still critical.

Reports for the years 1962 to 1965 show that the State's crop losses due to the drought amounted to nearly $7 million a year.

The Palmer Drought Index, a new method of measuring drought severity, uses a scale on which areas of near normal rainfall show a reading about zero. A reading of minus 1.50 indicates a mild drought, of minus 2.50 indicates a moderate drought, and any reading of minus 4.0 indicates an "extreme" drought.

W. J. Moyer, the Weather Bureau's State Climatologist, reports that of Maryland's eight recording areas, all show readings below minus 4.0, and four show readings below minus 5.0. The north central region, which includes Baltimore, shows a reading of minus 5.6. Those are January readings.

RAINFALL DEFICIENCY

Recently calculated total rainfall figures for the Baltimore area show that over the 8-year period from 1958 to 1965 a total deficiency of more than 56 inches of rain has been recorded.

The Washington Metropolitan area, which takes its water directly from the Potomac, has watched that river's flow decrease to dangerous levels. The District of Columbia proper is served by the Washington Aqueduct Division of the Corps of Engineers. The suburban area, including parts of Montgomery and Prince Georges County, is served by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission.

On an average summer day the Washington area uses about 250 million gallons of water, only about 3 percent of the river's normal flow of 7,500 million gallons a day. But one day last September, the river's flow was less than one-tenth its average, and the Washington area required 46 percent of the flow. In February of this year the Potomac's flow was below 700 million gallons a day, the lowest ever recorded.

Were it not for the foresight of Baltimore's planners in installing a pipeline from the Susquehanna River to give the city a huge potential supply of water in addition to that available from its three reservoirs, restrictions on the use of water would have been required in the city this winter.

In general, the Northeastern drought has been caused, according to Jerome Namias, chief of the U.S. Weather Bureau's long-range weather forecast division, by a shift in planetary wind systems which have diverted storms from the south that might have produced precipitation in the northeast out over the Atlantic.

The same plentary wind patterns have also driven storms from the west farther north than normal. Thus both southern and western storms have been driven away from the drought area.

The early, cold months of each of the past 3 years have brought heavy precipitation, but each year this period has been followed by a long dry spell in the warmer months. So every year the drought has become more severe.

WATER RESOURCES

Maryland's water resources are watched over by local agencies such as the Baltimore Water Department and in a more general way by the U.S. Geological Survey's Water Resources Division, with offices at Towson, the Maryland Geological Survey, with offices at the Johns Hopkins University, the State health department and the Maryland Department of Water Resources.

The U.S.G.S. Water Resources Division and the Maryland Geological survey work closely together. The former is headed by John Wark, the latter by Kenneth N. Weaver. These bodies take readings of ground and surface water levels at 200 points in the State. *Records that have been kept since* 1947 show that during the past year water levels in Washington and many Maryland communities, notably Frostburg, Hancock, Thurmont, have been lower that at any other time on record.

The State health department's water supply division, directed by Thomas D. McKewen, *helps solve community water problems*, including the problem of how a drought-plagued community can get clean water from previously untapped sources in emergency situations.

The department of water resources, headed by Paul W. McKee, seeks ways to solve the State's long-range water problems.

Officials of all those bodies emphasize that despite the extent and severity of the drought, Maryland has, potentially, enough usable water not only for its immediate needs but for all its needs in the foreseeable future—even taking into account the estimate that the population of Maryland in less than 50 years may triple to over 9 million.

Maryland's problem, the water experts point out, is how to make that water available to the people of each area, through better methods of collection, purification, if necessary, and distribution.

OWN PROBLEMS

Each area of the State draws on different water supplies and has different problems with respect to water supply. Some areas draw water from wells in the ground. Usually, wells for one-family use are shallow, and contain water from rain that has recently fallen. Most wells that serve communities are much deeper—perhaps 200 or more feet deep. These wells contain water from aquafers, layers of sand or fissured rock that contain large quantities of water deposited over long periods. In dry periods shallow wells go dry sooner, but recover faster, than aquafers.

The other source of water, of course, is surface water, from rivers, streams and springs. These are frequently dammed, to produce reservoirs for large communities. Baltimore has three reservoirs created by Loch Raven and Prettyboy Dams on the Gunpowder River and Liberty Dam on the Patuxent River. Some large communities, however, such as Washington, take their water from the flow of the surface source without damming.

The Eastern Shore, where crops have been hard hit, has had few water supply problems. Since the area is so flat, the terrain is not conducive to effective use of reservoirs and most water comes from wells. Some shallow wells on the Shore have dried up, but with one exception communities have had no problems.

The exception is Cambridge, where it is suspected that salt water has seeped into the aquafer that feeds two of the city's eight wells. Health officials have still to determine whether there is seepage and if so how serious it is. But a relatively small amount of salt water can contaminate all the water in a well, or in an aquafer, for many years.

Such seepage can be related to a drought, for it is when too much fresh water is drawn out of an aquafer and there is not enough coming in to replace it that salt from nearby salt water areas such as the bay seeps in to fill the gap.

IN NORTH CENTRAL AREA

The north central section of the State—Baltimore City and Baltimore, Cecil, Harford, Carroll, Frederick, and Montgomery Counties—has experienced a steadily decreasing water supply since 1960. Last year the rainfall was more than 13 inches below the normal total of 43.88 inches.

Excluding urban Montgomery County, which should be discussed in relation to Washington, and the area served by the Baltimore Water Department, the north central area has perhaps been hardest hit by the drought.

Shallow wells have gone dry in both Harford and Baltimore Counties and the plight of Emmittsburg and Brunswick has already been mentioned.

Both of those communities depend on surface water. Emmittsburg was able to supplement its normal supply with water from nearby Tom's Creek during the emergency and Brunswick took water from the Potomac. Both towns are now studying ways to increase their permanent sources of supply.

The area served by the Baltimore Water Department, which includes the city and parts of Baltimore County, has been more fortunate than any other area of the State.

When the Susquehanna pipeline, planned for 10 years, was opened on January 28, Baltimore's three dams were less than half full. Pumps from the Susquehanna immediately began pumping 110 million gallons of water a day into the Baltimore system, about half of Baltimore's daily requirement. Now the reservoirs are filling up again, due both to the increased rainfall of the past 2 months and to the decreased demand on their resources made possible by the pipeline.

The three presently operating Susquehanna pumps have a capacity to divert 150 million gallons of water a day from the river to Baltimore, and whenever they are needed two additional pumps will be added to bring the total diversion capacity to 250 million gallons. That is more water than the city now uses daily. It is anticipated that Baltimore will have no water problems until sometime after the year 2000.

Though they probably haven't noticed it, Baltimoreans are getting used water for the first time. Water from the Patuxent and Gunpowder Rivers is never used before it comes to Baltimore. But communities in New York and Pennsylvania use Susquehanna water and then turn it back to the river as treated waste. By the time it reaches Baltimore faucets it may have been used several times. Every drop is cleaned at the Montebello filtration plant before being pumped into the water system.

Such reuse of water, though new to Baltimore, is not uncommon. Several communities up the Potomac draw water from that river and redeposit it before Washington draws its supply. In some places on the Ohio River water is used four or five times.

According to Mr. McKee, the uses of the Susquehanna, particularly the tapping of its fresh water, should be a matter of some concern for Marylanders, since the Chesapeake Bay could be seriously affected.

"Baltimore's diversion of water is not really significant," he says, "for even if the city should take a full 250 million gallons a day from the river this would be only about 1 percent of the average flow of 23,500 million gallons a day. But other communities in New York and Pennsylvania are also thinking of diverting water which also would not be put back into the river.

DIVERSION PLAN

"The Chester, Pa., diversion plan, for instance, would take water from the Susquehanna and when used return it to the Delaware River. The significance of this is that the Chesapeake Bay gets 51 percent of all its fresh water from the Susquehanna. If water diversion should significantly reduce the amount of flow of the Susquehanna, the balance between fresh and salt water in the bay would be altered, and that in turn could disturb marine life in the bay.

"For one thing, it could mean the end of the oyster industry. The 'oyster drill,' the deadly parasite that has destroyed Virginia's oyster industry, can only live in water of a certain salt level. In recent years, because of the drought, the salt level line has been creeping up the bay and the oyster drill has been coming with it. It is now up as far as Crisfield. A significant diversion of fresh water from the Susquehanna could raise the salt level in the upper bay to the point where the oyster drill might kill the whole oyster population of Maryland.

"That is why Maryland's Legislature has passed a resolution asking the Governors of New York and Pennsylvania not to approve any *Susquehanna diversion plans in their* States until the compact worked out by the Interstate Advisory Commission on the Susquehanna can be acted on by the three States."

That advisory commission, including members from all three States, has drawn up a long-range compact for the best use of the Susquehanna. *It is hoped that the proposed* compact, the terms of which have not yet been made public, will be approved by the Legislatures of New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland next year.

Turning to western Maryland, the only serious water supply problem has been faced by Cumberland. Its two reservoirs—Lake Koon and Lake Gordon, both in Pennsylvania—at one time in the fall contained only 80 days' supply of water instead of the 280 days' supply they hold at capacity.

The ban on private use of hoses, in effect from September 20 to March 4, has alleviated the shortage, and recent rains have raised water levels in the reservoirs.

Southern Maryland's problems are largely restricted to Anne Arundel County, where water shortages are not tied solely to the current drought. Anne Arundel is the one place in the State where growing population may soon present serious water supply problems.

Part of the county takes water from the Patuxent River, but the bulk of the county's water comes from the Magothy formation, a great aquafer that stretches across the county.

There is danger of salt water entering the formation, so the water resources department has introduced a bill to the legislature which would restrict the amount of water that could be taken from portions of the formation near the bay.

If the county's population continues to increase at the projected rate, Anne Arundel County will soon face serious water problems for which, Mr. McKee says, no permanent solution has yet been found.

FLOW OF THE POTOMAC

Recent precipitation has increased the flow of the Potomac River, which has benefited the Washington area. But in the near future, officials of the city and suburban water systems acknowledge, Washington must have reservoirs on the Potomac.

In February 1963, a report of the District Engineer proposed a development plan that called for 12 dam and reservoir projects on the Potomac. The principal dam in that plan would be built near Seneca in Montgomery County. This plan has been violently opposed by residents of the area, who wish to keep the river as it is, and Congress has so far taken no action on the matter.

Despite all protests, Mr. McKee feels that "eventually the Seneca project or something like it will have to go through."

The added problem of pollution complicates the water resources picture everywhere. Most rivers, including the Potomac, are polluted to some degree. But up to a point their waters can still be cleaned and used. Beyond that point, however, pollution becomes so bad it prevents use of the water altogether.

Until recently, nothing could be done about industries dumping untreated industrial wastes and communities dumping raw sewage into rivers and streams. State and local laws were often ineffective since most rivers pass through several States with differing laws.

POLLUTION CONTROL UNIT

But last year, under President Johnson's urging, the Water Pollution Control Administration was set up as a branch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Briefly, it had power to help areas along river basins with their pollution problems and prosecute those who did not live up to pollution laws.

This year the President seeks to transfer that body to the Interior Department and make it even stronger. Under the President's proposals, States lying along a river basin will be encouraged to draw up compacts outlining water pollution and resource plans. If the compacts meet certain Federal criteria, the Federal Government will pay a third of the cost of abolishing pollution in the river.

Presumably, the compact drawn up for the Susquehanna, when enacted by State legislatures, will allow the States to get Federal aid. So, hopefully, will any compact drawn up for the Potomac by the newly created Advisory Commission on the Potomac. That body, which includes representatives from Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and Washington, has just begun to work out the respective States separate and mutual problems.

When—or if—in the future fresh water supplies are exhausted, there are methods of converting sea water to fresh water for human use. But so far they are three to four times as expensive as present methods of tapping fresh water supplies.

If Maryland's various areas can learn to take maximum advantage of their ample fresh water supplies, even a more severe drought than the present one should pose no impossible problems.

Unwise Budget Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposed spending reductions for fiscal year 1967 in the area of agricultural research and extension activities, was received with shock by many Members of Congress and leaders in agriculture.

A leading farmer in my congressional district, Mr. George Meeker, of Garden City, Kans., presented his views on the proposed cuts to the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on March 24, 1966, and his statement merits the attention of everyone.

Mr. Meeker, a member of the Kansas House of Representatives, is not only a successful farmer, but has long been associated with organizations identified with agricultural progress. He is presently vice president of the National Association of Wheat Growers, and president of the Kansas Association of Wheatgrowers. Obviously, he is well qualified to speak on this subject:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE MEEKER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS, BEFORE THE AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, MARCH 24, 1966

Mr. Chairman, my name is George Meeker. I am a wheat farmer and live at Garden City, Kans. I am vice president of the National Association of Wheat Growers, and president of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers. My associations appreciate this opoprtunity for me to appear before this committee in opposition to the proposed budget reductions in our agricultural research programs.

WHAT ARE THE REDUCTIONS PROPOSED?

It is our understanding that total agricultural research funds allocated for 1966 amount to $131,343,000 and reductions recommended for the 1967 budget amount to $4,610,000. This represents a reduction of just a little over 3 percent and would appear to be very modest until we dig a little deeper into the budget recommendations. As we dig deeper, we find the proposals in the 1967 budget recommend a reduction of more than $20 million in instruction and research funds going to the 68 land-grant institutions, and for a shift of $10 million in support of cooperative extension programs with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, from institutional allocation by formula to Federal allocation.

The proposed reduction of $6.5 million in research funds for our agricultural experiment stations in our land-grant colleges, coupled with substantial reductions in USDA research funds, represents a crippling blow to agricultural research, and means that many of our basic research programs must either be eliminated or severely curtailed. These recommendations come at a time when our surpluses of agricultural commodities are almost gone and we are facing possible shortages in some commodities, and stepping up our food-for-freedom programs.

The National Association of Wheat Growers does not believe it is in the longtime interest of either producers or consumers to reduce our basic agricultural research funds. We believe our investments in agricultural research have paid handsome dividends in the past and will continue to do so in the future. We urge the Appropriations Committee to disallow these proposed research reductions.

May we direct your attention to the proposed budget reductions for wheat. The decrease includes $410,700 which would be effected by terminating or curtailing wheat production, breeding, quality, and disease research at 13 locations. This includes closing the wheat quality laboratory at Pullman, Wash. It is proposed to terminate research on insects attacking wheat at five locations amounting to $178,500. Research work on industrial uses of wheat will be reduced by $629,400. Proposed reductions for wheat research alone amount to over $1,200,000. This means that wheat reductions equal about 25 percent of total proposed research reductions. Most of these reductions will seriously affect the utilization and production of wheat.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the ability of American agriculture to produce in abundance is the envy of the world. The United States is one of a very few countries in the world that has the ability to produce more food and fiber than we use at home and still provide sizable quantities for export and donation to food short countries. Why is this true? One of the big reasons is that 75 to 100 years ago the United States established land-grant colleges and provided money for basic research to increase production of food and fiber. We are able now to make two stalks of wheat grow where only one grew about 20 years ago. This is true of most of our commodities. This modern miracle can largely be attributed to our basic research programs over the years.

Research to develop higher yielding and better quality wheats, research to develop disease resistant varieties, research to develop varieties that are resistant to smut and rust, and research to control noxious weeds—these are the types of programs that have made a major contribution toward making our agricultural plant the envy of the world. And these fundamental research programs are now to be drastically curtailed and in many instances eliminated. The National Association of Wheatgrowers believes such a proposal is shortsighted and ill advised and urges your committe to maintain our basic agricultural research programs and fund them properly.

We know that even at this moment many nations in the world are rapidly losing the ability to feed themselves. We know this problem is going to get worse before it improves. India is experiencing her worst drought in this century. Authorities all agree that developing nations must learn to increase their production of food and fiber if worldwide hunger and starvation are to avoided. Many experts have testified in recent weeks before our Agricultural Committes that this must be done. The first step—the most fundamental recommendation made; one they all agree on—is that the developing nations greatly increase their basic research programs. How do they propose to do this? By establishing agricultural colleges similar to our land-grant colleges and staffing them with properly trained scientists and technicians. We understand that India is now in the process of building several agricultural colleges to greatly enlarge her basic research programs.

Secretary Freeman said recently in an address, "a successful war against hunger and want has its troops in research and education. Unless our food supports research and education aimed at making the agricultures of developing nations grow and support the total economic development, history will rule it wasted." We agree, and this is another reason why we must not curtail and eliminate many of our research programs. Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Wheatgrowers believes that if there was ever a time in history when we must do everything possible to increase production of food and fiber both at home and abroad—to avoid mass starvation and hunger—that time is now. We should be increasing our funds for agricultural research rather than curtailing them.

We would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that food is cheap in America. The average family in the United States spends only 18.5 percent of their disposable income for food. This alone represents a modern miracle. Never before in history have the people of any nation been able to buy their food for less than 20 percent of their income. In other areas of the world, the people spend from 25 to 70 percent of their income for food. It is almost axiomatic that in countries where limited resources were devoted to basic agricultural research, production is low and a higher percentage of net income is required to purchase food and fiber. Basic agricultural research benefits all Americans. This has been proved time after time—our investments in research have shown themselves to be sound investments in our country's future. To curtail or eliminate them is a step backward—a step in the wrong direction.

Basic research is not like a water hydrant. Turn it on when you need water—turn it off and wait a year or two—then turn it on again and expect to get the water as needed. Basic research programs must be on a continuing basis. Many wheat varieties that are resistant to smut, rust, and disease, after a few years lose this resistance, and our research people must be ready with new varieties. Basic research is like an insurance policy. You must pay for it when it seems the need is minimal in order to have it when the need is great. For example, in the late 1950's and the early 1960's, when our agricultural plant was producing more food and fiber than we could use at home, export, and dispose of through special concessional programs—there were those who suggested the way to solve this problem was to curtail and reduce our research programs.

This, too, was shortsighted, and this committee did not listen to such proposals. Even now farm income averages only about 60 percent of other segments of our economy, but without our basic research programs to increase yields and produce better quality products, net farm income would have been much lower. The only real opportunity farmers have to lower their production costs is through our research programs.

Mr. Chairman, we would like to point out that the wheat States of Kansas, North Dakota, Washington, and Montana will receive research reductions of between $200,000 and $300,000. This represents a real blow to our land grant colleges.

Other wheat States are adversely affected in proportion. These recommended reductions come at a time when all agree that our basic research programs will have to be expanded if we are to meet our objectives of the food-for-freedom program.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, may we point out that the commodity of wheat has played a major role during the past 11 years in combating hunger and disease throughout the world. Wheat has been used to fight for peace, to fight for freedom, to combat the spread of communism. In the past 11 years more wheat has been shipped to foreign countries to combat hunger and disease than all other commodities combined. As the threat of hunger and starvation intensifies in many countries of the world and becomes even more real and dangerous, we expect wheat to continue to play a major role in this battle. Without the emphasis this committee and our Nation has placed on research in the past, these commodities would not have been available to strike a blow for freedom. The need is greater today than ever before. It makes little sense to increase our research outlays in times of surpluses and seriously curtail them just as most of our agricultural surpluses are disappearing.

The National Association of Wheat Growers respectfully urges the Appropriations Committee to maintain our basic agricultural research programs and provide adequate finances for them. We appreciate this opportunity to present our views pertaining to reductions in agricultural research.

Inflation Is Made, Not Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader in the Senate, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, suggested recently that—

> The press and the Republicans are doing an awfully good job of talking ourselves into inflation.

I suggest that Senator MANSFIELD's shot missed the mark.

Inflation does not result from talk. Inflation is encouraged by a Federal Government which is either unwilling or unable to practice fiscal responsibility.

The following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of March 23, 1966, very well points up the inaccuracy of Mr. MANSFIELD's comments:

Inflation Is Made, Not Born

MIKE MANSFIELD, the U.S. Senate majority leader, says that "the press and the Republicans are doing an awfully good job" of "talking ourselves into inflation." The gentleman from Montana is talking through his political hat.

Inflation, as MANSFIELD well knows, does not stem in the first place from talk. It results from too much money reaching out for too few goods and services, and having some of its intrinsic value shaved off in the process.

The Federal Government, with its vast power to tax and to spend, holds strong reins in its hands. It does not always use those reins with economic wisdom.

President Johnson's earlier wage and price policies, for example, were inflationary by definition, holding down prices while putting more money in labor's pockets.

His initial tax reductions represented a gamble that productivity would be spurred sufficiently to offset the increase in spendable income, and this proved to be the case for some time. But increased military and domestic welfare spending have served to distort the balance once more, so that unless some drastic steps are now taken (in addition to the current tax increases) to drain off some of the excess of spending power, inflation is a certainty.

The fact that the Republicans are threatening to make significant gains in November's congressional elections is causing Mr. Johnson to think twice about imposing still another tax boost.

But the decision is clearly not up to the Republicans, who control neither the White House nor Congress, nor to the press. The decision is Mr. Johnson's, and his first lieutenant in the Senate cannot separate the President from the responsibility for his actions or his inaction.

Triumph of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, by any measure Gemini 8 was "an historic scientific experiment," the Detroit News said in a recent editorial.

The paper believes the hazards and complexities of space exploration have never been more evident. Nor has the capability of man to plan for the unexpected and handle it if it occurs.

This analysis on the price one pays in the cause of wider knowledge was of much interest to me and I therefore am making the editorial available for the RECORD.

Gemini 8 Astronauts Cheat Death: A Triumph for Man

The hazards and complexities of space exploration have never been more evident. Nor has the capability of man to plan for the unexpected and handle it if it occurs.

First reports, yet to be fully explained, suggest Gemini 8 came within a whisker of disaster. It is uncertain whether the technicians will ever know what made one of 16 maneuvering thruster rockets go haywire. That part of the rocket was detached before reentry and burned up as it entered our atmosphere.

Had Majs. David R. Scott and Neil A. Armstrong not called upon deep reservoirs of training and judgment, they, too, would have been burned to vaporous ash. Yet America had better get used to that possibility. The more daring our experiments and the more intricate our equipment, the closer we come to that first, inevitable fatality.

The scientific achievements of the flight were substantial. The location of the Agena satellite was accomplished by radar; the docking maneuver was perfect; some flight was made in the connected position. By any measure it was an historic scientific experiment.

It is probably because Gemini 8 flight's troubles were so well reported, but this time the degree to which accidents had been prepared for appeared most impressive.

Not only the presence of one, or even two, backup systems for important operations, but the swiftness with which essential information could be sent from Houston to a point 184 miles above the other side of the world, were a great credit to the mission directors.

That these emergency capabilities were used to their utmost limits is further evidence, also, of the need for the most deliberate planning, and the most orderly administration by the thousands of human beings whose human errors must be avoided.

There is nothing new about risking death in the cause of wider knowledge. It is just that the incredible character of the space frontier, the fantastic cost of its exploration and the presence of so many millions of spectators give it a remarkable impact.

Had Scott and Armstrong not returned, dying in orbit or on reentry, their contribution would have been no less important. But would it have been worth the price? No man is wise enough to say with certainty. Scott and Armstrong thought it was and they are the best judges.

Commerce OK's Russia Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, even though we do have an Export Control Act, apparently it is not too effective according to the Allen-Scott report published in the Northern Virginia Sun of March 26. The report, which enumerates the various items for which export licenses have been issued by the Commerce Department, follows:

COMMERCE OK'S RUSSIA EXPORTS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

There is good reason the Johnson administration is pussyfooting on excoriating that shocking Paris-Bonn deal to build a $150-million steel complex for Red China.

The administration is doing pretty much the same sort of thing.

This column has obtained lists of scores of unannounced export licenses issued by the Commerce Department from October 1, 1965, to March 3, 1966, authorizing the sale to Russia and Poland of a wide range of machinery, equipment, materials, supplies, and technical data—with distinct strategic potentialities.

Graphically illustrative are the following:

Boron isotopes, a vital element in the production of heat-resistance metals for supersonic planes and spacecraft; airborne communications and navigation equipment and parts for Aeroflot, the Soviet's rapidly expanding global airline; technical data for the design and operation of a sulphuric acid plant; numerous unnamed chemical compounds; nylon and rayon tire cord.

Commerce Department officials maintain these exports do not fall directly in a strategic category. Also that the sums involved are not high.

This is whitewashing rationalization.

Most of the items on these export lists have definite military import. Virtually everything the Communists buy abroad has a military connotation. That's the primary motivation behind these purchases. They are to strengthen and expand the Red economy, whose basic purpose is waging war.

Also, while the overall value of these sales is not huge, some of the items run into millions of dollars and a number into hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Both strategically and financially, this trade is not a minor moment.

Following are significant items on these backstage lists of U.S. exports to the Communists:

Sales to Poland: Industrial instruments for use in laboratory analyses for production of plastics; technical data for phosphoric acid evaporators; signal generators and parts; navigational equipmnt for airport; rotary drill and parts; technical data for the design, erection, and operation of electrostatic precipitator; rubber antiozonant.

Technical data for the production of automobile and truck bodies; synthetic resins; technical data for the design and erection of butadiene plants; wire mill rolls; industrial chemicals for manufacture of synthetic resins; precision test receiving system and parts; technical data for construction and operation of ethylene oxide glycol plant; testing instruments for tension of compression; electrical testing instruments.

To Russia: Synthetic rubber for manufacture of rubber products; unspecified chemical compound; photographic equipment; industrial chemicals for manufacture of solvents for use in textiles and leather industries; chemical woodpulp for manufacture of tire cord; temperature control instruments and parts for use in sugar plant; pulverizing machinery parts; technical data for production of soduim cyanide; technical data for the erection, operation and maintenance of a coil buildup line for hot rolled steel strip.

Beet harvester; field cultivators; double action disk harrows, row crop tractors; industrial instruments for scientific research, hydraulic fluid power pumps; technical data on method of applying glass lubricant to steel bars prior to hot extrusion; filtering machines for liquids, air, and gases; technical data for erection and operation of amonium sulfate crystallizer; transmitters and receivers for facsimile transmission; plain cylindrical grinding machine for metal working plant; technical data for synthetic resin plant; transformers; technical data for waste gas disposal units; tungsten carbide rock bits for geological drilling.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, chairman of the Foreign Aid Expenditures Subcommittee, is still waiting for a reply to his demand on Defense Secretary McNamara for an immediate worldwide freeze on the disposal of surplus military property urgently needed in the Vietnam fighting.

Since calling on McNamara for such action several weeks ago, GRUENING has received an advertisement in a San Francisco newspaper announcing a public auction of "military aircraft components, parts, and accessories."

Among the listed items are engines, communications equipment, prop shafts, a wide variety of aircraft instruments, trucks and trailers.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the brave citizens of Byelorussian origin living in this country on the anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic on March 25, 1918.

In past centuries Byelorussia was an independent nation. It was conquered by Russians in 1795. Several attempts were made by the Byelorussians to regain independence, culminating with the 1918 proclamation.

The new nation was overrun by the Russian Communists in August of 1920, before it had been able to rebuild its strength against a strong foe. Following World War II another attempt to regain freedom was made but again Russia overpowered this determined people. Byelorussia today, including only part of its original territory, is completely subordinate to Moscow and has suffered national persecution and severe exploitation and oppression.

The captivity of this valiant nation is a reminder to us that freedom is in constant danger. As long as the forces of communism press for world domination we must continue to be vigilant. We join the Byelorussians in celebrating their independence day and renew our efforts to hasten the day when freedom will return to the nation of Byelorussia.

Statement of Gladstone Mxolisi Ntlabati

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF GLADSTONE MXOLISI NTLABATI, MEMBER OF THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MARCH 30, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to thank you for the privilege of appearing before you today. My name is Gladstone Mxolisi Ntlabati, an ordained minister of the Methodist Church of South Africa and a member of the banned African National Congress of South Africa. I am a South African citizen, at present a candidate for the Ph. D. degree at Harvard University Divinity School.

South Africa is the only country in the world where denial of human rights and discrimination in every walk of life—based on color—is enshrined in the constitution of the land. In South Africa oppression is legal. The South African policy of apartheid has been attacked by nearly every nation in the world and in almost every session of the United Nations since 1946. In all this time, there has been no response from the South African Government except defiance and an increase in repressive, authoritarian measures reminiscent of Hitler's Nazi Germany.

The South African Government claims that its policy of apartheid or separate development is not a political system of simple exploitation by whites of the nonwhite people of South Africa. The policy of separate development is supposed to further the well-being of every racial group in South Africa, and to prepare the nonwhites for independence in the Bantustans.

My experience has been that the policy of apartheid is a systematic legal structure based on the 300-year-old racial prejudices of white South Africans designed to perpetuate and exacerbate those prejudices and to make them the justification of pitiless economic and political tyranny. As expressed in the words of Dr. Verwoerd in Parliament on January 25, 1963, the aim of this tyranny is "to keep South Africa white. Keeping it white can mean only one thing; namely, white domination, not leadership, not guidance, but control, supremacy."

Those who are born nonwhite in South Africa are, in the interests of this racialist ideal, subjected to humiliation and exploitation from birth to death, and even beyond, and are not allowed to make any movement of resistance or protest their fate.

Nonwhites in South Africa live in extreme poverty. Three hundred to four hundred African babies in every thousand die before they are 1 month old; the main cause of death is starvation. The majority of those who survive continue to suffer from kwashiokor, gastroenteritis, tuberculosis, trachoma, pellagra, and scurvy bring death and destruction of health. According to the medical officer of health for Pretoria, tuberculosis kills 40 people a day (almost all Africans), and in 1961 there were 58,491 new cases reported. These diseases not only destroy the vital organs of the body, but they result in retarded mental conditions and lack of initiative, and reduce powers of concentration. The secondary results of such conditions affect the whole community and the standard of work performed by African laborers.

The complaint of Africans, however, is not only that they are poor and whites are rich, but that the laws which are made by the whites are designed to preserve this situation. There are two ways to break out of poverty. The first is by formal education, and the second is by the worker acquiring a greater skill at his work and thus higher wages. As far as Africans are concerned, both these avenues of advancement are deliberately curtailed by legislation.

The quality of education is also different. According to the Bantu Education Journal, only 5,660 African children in the whole of South Africa passed their junior high examinations in 1962, and in that year only 362 passed high school. This is presumably consistent with the policy of Bantu education about which the present Prime Minister, Dr. Verwoerd said, during the debate on the Bantu education bill in 1953:

"When I have control of native education I will reform it so that natives will be taught from childhood to realize that equality with Europeans is not for them. * * * People who believe in it are not desirable teachers for natives. When my Department controls native education, it will know for what class of higher education a native is fitted, and whether he will have a chance in life to use his knowledge."

It would be difficult enough for Africans to try to improve their social and economic situation if their attempts were not strangled by job reservation, by laws prohibiting Africans from owning property in white areas, by the migrant labor system, by laws making strikes illegal and forbidding free trade unions, by the Bantu education system which is designed to keep Africans in ignorance and subjection, by the passed laws which are meant to regulate the labor supply, and by the all-pervasive attitude of white South Africans who resent and fear nonwhites who are not servants and underlings.

Economic and political freedom are intimately connected. Nonwhites are not allowed any political voice in South Africa. In certain areas, like the Transkei, we are supposed to be free except in what concerns our security, our livelihood, our international relations and movements, our dignity, and our representation in our own Parliament. What an African experiences in the Transkei is not very different from what he experiences in the rest of his own country. The self-governing Transkei has been governed under emergency regulations promulgated by the Minister of Justice of South Africa since 1960. In the so-called white areas where the greatest number of nonwhites live and work political freedom is nonexistent.

The African National Congress and the Pan African Congress were banned in 1960. Leaders and members of these organizations, including the Liberal Party led by Alan Paton, have been banned, arrested without trial, forbidden to punish or attend gatherings. Trade Union leaders have been similarly harassed by the Suppression of Communism Act, the Riotous Laws Amendment Act, the Sabotage Act, and the personal intervention of the Minister of Justice to suppress whatever opposition these acts have not intimidated or suppressed.

Censorship, police brutality, the economic impotence of nonwhites and the social disorganization which is caused by the pass laws, the destruction of family life, and the migrant labor system also play their role in keeping South Africa white. I have myself experienced something of the weight with which South Africa crushes the spirit of those who resist. I was imprisoned without trail and kept in solitary confinement. I was interrogated. I was assaulted. I was more fortunate than some because I am a clergyman and the South African Government claims to be defending Christianity and Western civilization. Other have been found dead in mysterious circumstances, or have committed suicide, have had to receive psychiatric treatment, have accused their white guardians of torturing them (as if solitary confinement were not torture enough).

I was also more fortunate than those who are never allowed out of prison. For under the No Trial Act the Minister of Justice can simply ignore acquittal and imprison the accused from the courtroom to the grave. For example, Robetr Sobukwe, the president of the banned Pan Africa Congress, who should have been freed 3 years ago—whose sentence for organizing peaceful demonstrations ran its course and expired in 1963, is still today being held prisoner on Robben Island. There, according to the Minister of Justice, he will continue to be held, until "this side of eternity."

But it is not only political prisoners who have to fear the police. Africans can be arrested at any time, even in their own homes, even in the middle of the night under the pass laws. They can be sent to work for white employers, especially farmers. It is well known that at this work they are usually starved, beaten (some to death), tortured for the amusement of their supervisors, or merely overworked without pay.

The lack of human dignity experienced by Africans is the direct result of the policy of white supremacy. White supremacy implies black inferiority. Legislation designed to preserve white supremacy entrenches this notion. Menial tasks in South Africa are invariably performed by Africans. When anything has to be carried or cleaned the white man will look around for an African to do it for him, whether the African is employed by him or not. Because of this sort of attitude, whites tend to regard Africans as a separate breed. They do not look upon them as people with families of their own; they do not realize that they have emotions—that they fall in love like white people do; that they want to be with their wives and children like white people want to be with theirs; that they want to earn enough money to support their families properly, to feed and clothe them and send them to school. And what house boy or garden boy or laborer can ever hope to do this?

Pass Laws, which to the Africans are among the most hated bits of legislation in South Africa, render any African liable to police surveillance at any time. I doubt whether there is a single African male in South Africa who has not at some stage had a brush with the police over his pass. Hundreds and thousands of Africans are thrown into jail each year under pass laws. Even worst than this is the fact that pass laws keep husband and wife apart and lead to the breakdown of family life.

Poverty and the breakdown of family life have secondary effects. Children wander about the streets of the townships because they have no schools to go to, or no money to enable them to go to school, or no parents at home to see that they go to school, because both parents (if there be two) have to work to keep the family alive. This leads to a breakdown in moral standards, to an alarming rise in illegitimacy and to growing violence which erupts, not only politically, but everywhere. Life in the townships is dangerous. There is not a day that goes by without somebody being stabbed or assaulted. And violence is carried out of the townships in the white living areas. People are afraid to walk alone in the streets after dark. Housebreakings and robberies are increasing, despite the fact that the death sentence can now be imposed for such offences. Death sentences cannot cure the festering sore.

The Government often answers its critics by saying that Africans in South Africa are economically better off than the inhabitants of the other countries in Africa. I do not know whether this statement is true and doubt whether any comparison can be made without having regard to the cost-of-living index in such countries. But even if it is true, as far as the African people are concerned, it is irrelevant. We do not want to be compared with Africans in other countries. We want to be compared with other South Africans. Our complaint is not that we are poor by comparison with people in other countries, but that we are poor by comparison with the white people in our own country, and that we are prevented by legislation from altering this imbalance.

In the words of the African National Congress leader Nelson Mandela, now perpetually confined to Robben Island, South Africa's Alcatraz, "Africans want to be paid a living wage, Africans want to perform work which they are capable of doing, and not work which the Government declares them to be capable of. Africans want to be allowed to live where they obtain work, and not be endorsed out of an area because they were not born there.

Africans want to be allowed to own land in places where they work, and not be obliged to live in rented houses which they can never call their own. Africans want to be part of the general population, and not confined to living in their own ghettos. African men want to have their wives and children to live with them where they work, and not be forced into an unnatural existence in men's hostels. African women want to be with their menfolk and not be left permanently widowed in the reserves. Africans want to be allowed out after 11 o'clock at night and not to be confined to their rooms like little children.

Africans want to be allowed to travel in their own country and to seek work where they want to and not where the Labor Bureau tells them to. Africans want a just share in the whole of South Africa; they want security and a stake in society."

For the above aspirations, Africans have struggled through peaceful protests and demonstrations. Mahatma Ghandi influenced our nonwhite political organizations as early as the twenties and demonstrated to us the way of nonviolence. For over 50 years the nonwhite people have been dedicated to the principle of nonviolence. For over 50 years the role of white government in South Africa has been a role of nonviolence. In every instance the nonviolent actions of the Africans majority have been brutally and violently suppressed. Thousands of Africans have died at the behest of the god of white racialism. I could quote many instances where peacefully protesting Africans have been brutally massacred, but in the interests of brevity, I shall confine by remarks to just one; the Sharpeville massacre.

On the 21st of March, 1961, 20,000 unarmed African men, women, and children marched to the police station at Sharpeville to protest against the arrest of African leadership a few days before a national strike was called. The police and army shot through the crowd and killed 69 people and wounded hundreds.

This massacre clearly showed the Africans that nonviolence was a failure and that it only worked in a situation where the opposition has a conscience. It pointed clearly to the inevitable growth among Africans of the belief that violence was the only way out. It showed that a government that uses force to maintain its rule teaches the oppressed to use force to oppose it. Since even peaceful organization is not only illegal, but is met with blood and iron, Africans feel that there is no hope that white South Africans will undergo such a change of heart that they will stop practicing apartheid of their own free will.

In our struggle for freedom and human dignity we have looked for allies in our own country and in the rest of the world. Our cause has been recognized in the honor accorded the president of the African National Congress. Our leader is Chief Albert Luthuli, Nobel Peace Prize winner, who, in South Africa, far from being honored, may not even be heard and is confined to an isolated rural area so that he may not spread dangerous notions derived from the gospels and democratic principles. Among the whites of our own country we have found less and less understanding and tolerance of our aspirations.

Even now today an election is being conducted in South Africa which excludes four fifths of the population, an election in which Helen Suzman, the one white person who still speaks for the nonwhites in South Africa's Parliament, is probably losing her place in that parliament. If Helen Suzman is not returned to Parliament there will be no one to ask how many prisoners have died in South Africa's jails, how many arrested without charges or trials, how many starve to death, how many are endorsed without appeal out of the towns where they work.

Even if Helen Suzman is returned she can do little more than continue to be the conscience of white South Africa and ask such questions. South Africa does not care to hear either question nor answer. The issues have already been decided. The measures accepted. The protests of the victims of apartheid ignored. The Liberal Party of South Africa which asks for a colorblind franchise has no representatives in South Africa's Parliament, provincial councils, or municipalities.

In the Transkei its candidates for election were forbidden to hold meetings and even banned. There are still some whites in South Africa who believe in democracy and have some idea of what justice would call for in the political and economic life of South Africa. They are harassed and threatened and smeared with the label of Communist. We Africans have experienced that Communists almost alone of white South Africans have been willing to dedicate themselves completely to our struggle for dignity. But to say that we have willingly accepted Communists as our allies when we have had few other allies is not to say that we are ourselves Communists or that it is a Communist privilege alone to fight against injustice as blatant, cruel, and unyielding as that of South Africa.

Even if Africans were to become Communists it would be understandable for in South Africa the government teaches us to admire Communists. Everyone who identifies himself with our suffering, who struggles for the freedom and human dignity of our people, stands for a truly democratic South Africa is a Communist. On the contrary the South African Government does all that it does to preserve Christianity and Western civilization.

The South African Information Service describes South Africa's brutal and racial tyranny, and I quote "as the last bastiañ of Western democracy in Africa." South Africa is also described as a stable and prosperous land, a reliable anti-Communist Western country in Africa with a promise of a bright future. Let us never forget that this reliable Western country is dominated by two convinced Nazis: the Minister of Justice, Mr. Vorster, was interned from September 1942 until January 1944 and was then placed under house arrest in Robertson on the cape until the end of the war for supporting Hitler.

The Prime Minister, Dr. Verwoerd, who according to the judgment of Justice Millin, on July 13, 1943 "furthered Nazi propaganda in his newspaper Die Transvaaler. Let us also never forget that the International Commission of Jurists said in 1963, and I quote: "South Africa in its laws and procedures is copying some of the worst features of the Stalinist regime." Is this how South Africa fights communism?

Because our situation is urgent and our sufferings intolerable and because at present we are weak and without a voice in our own country, we also look to the rest of the world for understanding and assistance. Again if the Communists offer to be our allies we are in no position to refuse. When the United States engaged in a struggle against the racist ideology which was then and now remains the creed of South Africa's rulers, the United States and Britain similarly found it possible to act with Communist allies.

But by tradition, our own tradition in tribal society and our adopted traditions of Christianity and Western civilization, we have preferred and the majority still prefer to find our allies in Britain and the United States and the rest of the Western world.

But over and over again we have been disappointed. As long ago as 1919 we found our representatives at Versailles ignored. The great American ideal of representation for even minorities and small nations was not extended as far as South Africa. Repeatedly since then we have found the defenders of democracy more reluctant to help us than Communist countries. At the United Nations Communist countries have voted to condemn and act against South Africa for her policy of apartheid.

Only more recently have Britain and the United States condemned South Africa. They have both banned the sale of arms to South Africa but Africans cannot help noticing that they did this when South Africa was already virtually self-sufficient in the production of arms and had already developed the strongest army on the African Continent. And what are we to think of an arms embargo which allows an American firm to build an atoms-for-peace plant in South Africa when South African Cabinet ministers grandiosely proclaim that they might themselves join the nuclear club at will.

We are sure that if the American people realized how gravely and unjustly my people suffer, how perverted and irresistible the injustice of their rulers, how inevitably our country slips nearer to civil and racial anarchy because more peaceful means have proved too weak, if the American people realized more fully how urgently and deeply all nonwhite people feel our cause they would not want to remain indifferent.

However, the South African Government and certain economic interests in the United States and other Western countries have been at pains to keep the world ignorant of the full meaning of apartheid to pretend that because some South Africans have money, have wealth, because South Africa's economy is advanced and extremely profitable because of exploiting African labor, that apartheid is not a crime against humanity. They advertise the beauties of South Africa in which they include such fascinating fauna as ignorant Africans, whom it is their policy to keep forever ignorant, forever quaint, forever subhuman. I am sure that this committee is not deceived by such propaganda or by the surrogate independence which will one day be attained in the Bantustans.

The importance of American opinion is far greater in South Africa than can be readily imagined. If the inquiries of this committee provoke indignant repudiation by Verwoerd's newspaper of the right of Americans to inquire into the nature of countries with which they have dealings, because South Africa considers murder a domestic problem, the inquiries of this committee equally attract the hopes of nonwhites that American ignorance about South Africa, and apparent indifferences to sufferings of the majority of her people, will be diminished, and that the United States will, in time, respond to the African invitation to participate in the struggle for freedom and human dignity which has already changed the face of most of the continent.

But whatever the American people might feel, what we Africans see is that American economic interests bolster the white totalitarian, racist regime by which we are tortured and destroyed and that the American Government seems more concerned to placate white South Africa than to defend American ideals even on American property. The U.S. diplomatic missions have all-white staffs which have in recent years held interracial parties but the only black man employed in their offices is the man who makes tea and sweeps. Is the United States afraid of Verwoerd, is the United States afraid of democracy in South Africa? U.S. investors derive opulent profits from cheap black labor in a country when they are encouraged to flout the fair employment practices of their own country. If multiracial parties and verbal condemnation without action is the best that we can expect of the United States I am sorry to admit that we will find it too little.

The appeasement of the South African reich may yet lead to an end as cruel and destructive as the appeasement of its German model did. However passionately Britain or any other state may desire it, South Africa cannot go a lonely way, its human erosions sealed off at its frontiers—the very existence of white supremacy.is an insult and an incitement to the peoples of the nonwhite world. Another racial massacre in South Africa—and who, since Sharpeville, does not expect one?—or a clash between the white forces of South Africa and the black forces of other African States may set off a color conflict throughout the world. Doubtless, the Munich mind dismisses the prospect as unprofitable. Is the world to be so wrong and so stupid again?

President Johnson Proposes an Indo-American Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the versatility of Public Law 480 is a tribute to the many people in Congress and in the executive branch who down through the years have labored to improve this marvelous piece of legislative machinery and put it to work for human betterment.

The latest evidence on this point is the proposal by President Johnson to use the grant authority in the act to endow a binational foundation jointly administered by Indian and American leaders to strengthen the country of India and ease some of the economic problems that plague it.

The foundation would receive its initial capital in the form of an endowment of Indian rupees under the grant authority contained in section 104(e) of Public Law 480.

Through the years, that authority has been used to finance valuable economic development projects. Grants have been made for agricultural development, for industry and mining, for transportation, for health and sanitation, for school construction, for rural community electrification and water supply, and other creative projects that provide employment and fight poverty over the world—from Brazil to Burma, from Pakistan to Peru.

Under the President's proposal, a private foundation, operating in close alliance with governments, might be expected to open up new horizons for the grant authority contained in Public Law 480.

I am happy to endorse this creative and imaginative use of a sound and farsighted piece of legislation.

The Rent Supplement Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 29, the day on which the House of Representatives approved the appropriations measure authorizing $12 million for rent supplements, the Atlantic City Press, the largest daily newspaper in New Jersey's Second District, which I have the honor to represent, supported the rent supplement plan in an editorial entitled "The Rent Supplement Plan."

Although the appropriation for rent supplements was reduced from the $30 million requested by President Johnson, the program as approved will provide much-needed assistance to those Americans who need it most and will fulfill the principal objectives for which it was intended, as outlined in the Press' editorial.

I should like to insert the Atlantic City Press editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since the funds for rent supplements which I supported and which was approved by the House on Tuesday will help alleviate serious conditions in the three economically depressed New Jersey counties—Atlantic, Cape May, and Cumberland—which this fine newspaper covers.

The editorial reads as follows:

The Rent Supplement Plan

The head of a sponsoring group for a proposed senior citizens housing project here has expressed interest in a rent supplement plan under consideration in Washington.

This is the rent supplement plan which was authorized by the Housing Act of 1965, though no appropriation was made to activate it.

Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the new U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has promised to step up Federal programs for improving the housing of the poor when the funds become available.

Under the rent supplement plan, the Government would pay part of the rent charged low-income tenants by private landlords for housing that meets Government standards of adequacy. The tenant would pay 25 percent of the family income toward the rent; the remainder would be covered by Government subsidy.

The plan differs markedly from standard public housing procedure in that tenants would not be required to move out when their income rose above a certain level. If the tenant's income should rise to a figure four times the amount of the rental charge, the subsidy would simply cease and the tenant would begin paying the rent in full.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development had received preliminary proposals from sponsors to construct nearly 70,000 low-income units as soon as the rent supplement funds became available. The proposals were for 424 projects in 265 localities in 43 States.

Failure of Congress to appropriate funds for rent supplementation reflected suspicion on the part of many Members that the benefits would accrue to families with incomes well above the poverty level. This suspicion has largely subsided. The National Association of Real Estate Boards informed the President on February 1 that it had dropped its opposition to the plan when regulations issued by the new housing agency made it clear that only the poorest families would be helped. Association officials said they actually preferred rent supplementation to public housing and promised to do what they could to promote the plan around the country.

The President has asked Congress to vote a supplemental appropriation of $30 million to get the program underway in what remains of the fiscal year 1966. This would allow approximately 50,000 rental units to become available to families otherwise unable to afford them. In addition the administration's budget for fiscal 1967 calls for the full maximum annual authorization of $35 million which would allow for 58,000 units.

The rent supplement plan is in line with current efforts to break up concentrations of poverty-level, dependent individuals, and families in either slum ghettos or institutionlike projects operated by public housing authorities.

Are We Succumbing to "Brake Fever"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, each week brings to our attention new voices crying for curbs on our expanding economy. Certainly, I, with other concerned citizens, have recognized the need to supply balance to an economy that faces the danger of rapid inflation. However, balance is not repression, and I am afraid that there may be a mounting "brake fever" mentality that could seriously negate the effects of those of us trying to apply reasoned restraint.

We are faced with the problem of controlling undesirable elements, such as inflation, from playing havoc while guaranteeing that our real growth rate is substantial and indicative of a healthy economy. We must certainly be vigilant and apply reasoned restraint on the economy in order to prevent inflation and overheating. Yesterday, I indicated some steps that should be taken in order to stem inflationary spirals. I believe these steps will appropriately apply the needed restraint necessary to prevent further serious inflation.

However, I am concerned that "inflation psychology" may be repressive. We seem to approach the present boom with a feeling of mixed emotion. It is difficult for me to be afraid of our rapidly growing economy. Rather, I am encouraged, for I believe as pointed out in the 1966 joint economic report that with proper fiscal management, inflationary pressure can be controlled. All the manipulative forces at our command can and should be used to keep a balanced economic expansion.

Because our first attempt to place restraints on the economy was essentially a monetary je ne sais quoi, nothing of substance resulted, with the possible exception of a tightening of the money market in the area that can least afford it—the home construction industry. Otherwise, we have seen a greater demand for money with only the major banks benefiting from the raise in interest rates.

The failure of the Federal Reserve to adequately prove its monetary theories has caused many to take a jaundiced look at the boom. Many feel, in light of the Fed's failure vis-a-vis inflation, we are in the middle of an expansion run amuck, and economists are tripping over each other to propose every type of conceivable restriction.

It is this attitude that frightens me. Certainly we must be aware and can ill afford to be apathetic toward signs of inflation. But neither can we afford to create a negative climate toward boom. Properly balanced, flexible and well-managed fiscal, and, where needed, monetary policies can and will support balanced growth.

As evidence to the present feelings of mixed and frenzied reaction to the present state of the economy, I would ask that Jack Nelson's article appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Post be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

U.S. Boom Is Upsetting Predictions—Ross Reveals GNP May Hit $735 Billion for a Rate Record

(By Jack Nelson)

ATLANTA, March 23.—The Nation's economic boom has accelerated so rapidly so far this year that Government economists now expect the gross national product to total $735 billion in 1966, U.S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics Arthur Ross disclosed here today.

That would be an increase of almost 8.9 percent—or the largest annual statistical growth rate in history.

It would be $13 billion higher than the President's Council of Economic Advisers forecast earlier and it would exceed the 1965 gross national product by $60 billion.

FORECASTS BEING REVISED

Ross said that because of unanticipated increases in production and prices both the Council and the Bureau of Labor Statistics are revising their earlier predictions.

He said that the Bureau earlier had estimated the 1966 figure would be $728 billion. However, his statement today about revising the estimates was the first time a Government official had publicly mentioned a predicted figure higher than the $722 billion estimate of the Council.

In Washington, a Government economist expressed surprise that Ross had announced the $735 billion figure. He acknowledged that the Council of Economic Advisers is revising the $722 billion estimate it gave to Congress in January, but said such revisions usually are for internal purposes only.

MAY BREAK PRECEDENT

The Council, whose January estimates usually have been fairly accurate, is considering breaking precedent and making the revised prediction public, the economist said.

Economists point out that some of the growth rate will be attributable to inflation, but even so the projected figure represents a tremendous acceleration of an already booming economy.

Last year the statistical growth rate was about 7.5 percent. Actual growth, after substracting 2 percent for increased prices, was about 5.5 percent.

Government economists predicted earlier that prices would go up another 2 percent this year, but they now say they may go a little higher so that the actual growth rate in 1966 probably will be between 6 and 7 percent.

Ross, who was appointed Labor Statistics Commissioner last October, made his comments on the economy in a speech before the Atlanta Press Club.

He said both the war in Vietnam and the capital boom—investments in new buildings, plants, and other fixed assets—have helped push the economy beyond the earlier estimates.

Ross said it was "hard to answer" whether prices are "out of hand" and the danger of inflation is increasing. But he warned there is "not much margin of safety."

As a Transportee, He Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, in the March 5 issue of the Kansas City Star, there appeared an interesting and humorous article that should be of interest to every Member. The article was written by Bill Vaughan, noted associate editor of the Star. Before long, the guessing game of "Who will it be?" will begin, and the inside information contained in this piece might provide some helpful clues.

As a Transportee, He Volunteers

You and I are strongly behind the President's suggestion that we have a Cabinet-level Secretary of Transportation. The trouble is that they probably wont pick you or I (me) to be in charge of the new department.

Hey, the big hangup will be over transportation for the Secretary of Transportation. He'll get a Lincoln, or a Pontiac, chauffeur-driven to ride around in. There will be telephones and a reading lamp in the rear seat, which, is the extreme status symbol in Washington, and while he is gliding about he can be studying reports on how tough it is for everybody to get around in this country.

I would be great for this job and I volunteer, even without knowing what it pays. You probably would be, too, but we'll eliminate you just to keep the count simple. You can always drop by with suggestions.

They will probably pick a lawyer. They always do. Lawyers know nothing about transportation. Whatever traveling they do is on an expense account.

However, instead of a lawyer, there is the chance that they will pick a real person, which is where we come in.

Or rather, where I come in. Because I am a transportee. I am very good at it. I can hold onto a strap with one hand, and fold a newspaper with the other, reading it while rolling and lighting a cigarette (all the time ignoring the "No Smoking" sign).

I can imagine the congressional committee's inquisition of the guy they pick to be Secretary of Transportation. They'll ask him what experience he has had being vice president of a railroad, traffic expert for a bus line, or consulting expediter for an airplane company. If he shows all the blue-chip qualifications at the executive level he will be approved.

I know these people. They have their secretary call the secretary of their travel agent to call the secretary of the president of the line to get a ticket.

They have never been bumped off a flight at Nowhere, N. Dak. at 2 o'clock in the morning. They have never been a salesman who arrives on the early train at Ong's Hat, N.J., only to find that his sample case went to Bug Tussle, Tex.

In fact, I will bow out of the race for secretary and let them put a traveling salesman in the job. These are the boys who know transportation, the agony and the ecstasy of the same, far beyond my powers of comprehension.

We are very much aware these days of the need to have the poor on the board of the poverty program and the stupid on the faculty of the university. Let's have some harassed traveling man as Secretary of Transportation.

It will never happen. They will pick somebody who says that he has commuted in New York and understands the problems. If he's such a big shot he probably commutes in the off-hours.

The man we need is one of us who has stood in line at train gates, who has alighted from a bus at the wrong station and watched the lights disappear in the distance while trying to figure out how to heft the suitcase 2 miles to the nearest inhabited spot, who has been stuck on the thruway without a telephone in the car.

As I have said, you and I agree that a Secretary of Transportation is a good idea.

All that possibly you, and certainly I, can hope for is that they put a man in there who realizes that the task of getting from one place to another in this country gets increasingly more unpleasant.

But they won't. They'll pick a man who wants to make it more efficient.

And you and I will be left eating a candy bar in a bus depot, train station, or airport, in a town we never heard of, wondering where we're going to go next, and asking ourselves why somebody doesn't do something about it.

Of course, somebody will. There will be a Secretary of Transportation, going over the reports.

President's Consumer Proposals Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News asserts that the aims of the "truth in lending" and "truth in packaging" bills are "perfectly simple and perfectly honest."

The paper believes the evidence strongly suggests the need for such bills, adding:

> Most of us have had some experience with misleading labels or trick packaging. Almost no longterm buyer has any idea of how much interest he pays.

Because this interpretation makes some very good points, I will have the editorial in its entirety included in the RECORD.

Just the Truth, That's All

Once again President Johnson has urged Congress to pass the so-called truth in lending and truth in packaging bills.

The aims of these bills are perfectly simple, and perfectly honest:

To require, by law, that consumers buying on the installment plan be told at the outset how much interest and "carrying charge" they are paying over and above the cost of whatever they buy.

To require, by law, that packaged goods carry labels clearly indicating the nature and quantity of the contents.

There is nothing in either of these objectives from which honest business can demur. We just assume that these are common practices among reputable producers.

Opponents of this legislation, pending in Congress several years, say it isn't necessary, or it would disrupt competition, or it is a matter for the States, or it would invite the Government's big nose into everybody's business, or it would raise prices.

It is true there is a risk in Government regulation of anything. Bureaucrats tend to overdo.

But the evidence strongly suggests the need. Most of us have had some experience with misleading labels or trick packaging. Almost no long-term buyer has any idea of how much interest he pays.

As for competition, if it is based on guile it is not competition at all, even though it attracts some suckers.

The States rights argument is a cliche. And if, indeed, any of this legislation would raise prices, the consumer, at least, would know what he is getting for his money.

The Niagara Frontier: Deep-Sea Diving Capital of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, with great pride and admiration, I hasten to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarkable achievements and leading research of outstanding scientists of the Niagara Frontier in ocean research.

The Niagara Frontier is fast becoming the deep-sea diving capital of the world. This is attributable to the combination of extremely talented research specialists pioneering in underwater physiology at the State University of New York at Buffalo and Union Carbide's Ocean Systems, Inc.

At a recent symposium on underwater physiology held here in Washington at the State Department, 5 of the 36 scientific papers were delivered by residents of the Niagara Frontier. This combined with successful deep-sea diving to heretofore unconquered ocean depths and international recognition of the accomplishments and research of this group illustrates only in part the full scope of their activities and future research plans to develop underocean potential.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert into the Record an article from the Buffalo Courier-Express, March 26, 1966, which portrays more fully the individual and group achievements in underwater research in the Niagara Frontier:

Clear Way to Deeper Dives: Linde, UB Experts Put Area in Fore of Ocean Research

(By Lucian C. Warren)

Washington.—The Niagara Frontier has a new claim to fame.

Notwithstanding its location several hundred miles inland, it is rapidly becoming known as the deep sea diving capital of the world.

This is because a combination of research specialists at the State University of New York at Buffalo and the Ocean Systems, Inc., branch of Tonawanda's Linde Division of Union Carbide Corp. are pioneering in the science of underwater physiology.

As a direct result of the work of these Niagara Frontier experts, the art of sending frogmen to hitherto unconquered ocean depths and getting them back alive and healthy has received a tremendous impetus.

ADVANCES DISCLOSED IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SYMPOSIUM

A tribute to the reputation of the Niagara Frontier in the underwater physiology field was contained in the program of a just concluded third symposium on underwater physiology. One of the six planners of the symposium was Dr. Herman Rahn, of the State University's School of Medicine at Buffalo. Dr. Rahn is regarded as one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on respiratory physiology.

Five of the 36 scientific papers were delivered by Niagara Frontier residents from the university or the Linde plant. No other area had such a large representation.

"As a matter of fact," says Dr. Heinz R. Schreiner, a biological research department supervisor at Linde, "I venture to suggest there is a greater concentration of underwater physiology experts per square mile in the Niagara Frontier than any other place in the world outside of Navy installations."

So great has the reputation of the area become in this field that foreign scientists are making a headlong rush to the Niagara Frontier to consult with the experts,. Some visitors from Sweden were at the Linde plant last week and, in the next week or so, scientists from Japan, the Netherlands and Denmark are scheduled to arrive.

Dr. Schreiner was one of the panelists at the symposium, held in the State Department auditorium for 3 days under sponsorship of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council, and the Office of Naval Research.

LABOR OF WEEKS REDUCED TO 20 MINUTES

Dr. Schreiner and Patrick L. Kelley at Linde were the coauthors of a paper on "Computation Methods for Decompression From Deep Dives."

Kelley is a brilliant young mathematician who, with Dr. Schreiner, has thrown away the slide rules and managed by the use of computers, to figure out in 20 minutes some of the mathematical problems in deep sea diving that used to take weeks by old fashioned methods.

One of the symposium's final papers was delivered late Friday by Dr. E. H. Lamphier, of the Department of Physiology at the UB School of Medicine. Dr. Lamphier suggested that, if unexpected factors do not intervent, man may be able to dive to a depth of at least 2,500 feet, using practically pure helium for breathing.

Helium has become the main breathing ingredient for the deep sea divers, replacing oxygen, which becomes poisonous in the ocean depths, and is preferred over hydrogen, the properties of which make it harder to handle.

Another Friday afternoon symposium lecturer was R. W. Hamilton, Jr., of the Linde plant, who told of his experiments with persons at rest and doing exercise in chambers simulating the pressures of various ocean depths.

The Niagara Frontier's contribution to the symposium was rounded out by earlier papers of Dr. H. D. Dan Liew of the UB Department of Physiology and Dr. Gerald Doebbler of the Linde plant.

Dr. Van Liew went into scientific detail about the cause and cure of what is popularly known as the "bends," resulting from a deep sea diver decompressing too quickly from the heavy pressures of ocean depth. The "bends" are technically known as tissue gas bubbles and Dr. Liew talked on the "Factors in the Resolution of Tissue Gas Bubbles."

Dr. Doebbler offered his observations on the influences of high pressures of inert gases (such as helium) upon cell activity.

Those participating in the symposium included Dr. Joseph B. MacInnis, an ocean systems scientist whose essay on "Living Under the Sea" is the lead article in the March issue of the Scientific American.

Schreiner and MacInnis are most emphatic in supporting an all-out U.S. effort in developing deep sea diving and exploration techniques.

"The submerged domain potentially available to man for firsthand investigation and, eventually, exploitation," says MacInnis in the Scientific American, "can be regarded as a new continent with an area of about 11.5 million square miles—the size of Africa."

Mineral and other riches are available for the nation which first successfully develops the art of deep sea exploration.

Schreiner points out that, according to international law, all ocean depths beyond the 3-mile offshore limit and below 656 feet below sea level can become the property of the nation that first explores such depths and develops facilities to occupy them.

He feels that in the race with Soviet Russia, the United States should be first to develop the underocean potential for its own uses.

Ocean Systems, Inc., has been working all year on tests in chambers simulating the pressures of 650 feet of ocean depth, which is virtually double the depth of actual ocean explorations to date.

Within a few weeks, Ocean Systems will send a team, including personnel from the Linde plant, to Miami for actual deep sea diving at the 650-foot depth.

With the aid of the sizable underwater diving research developed on the Niagara Frontier, the tests are expected to mark another milestone in man's efforts to conquer the ocean depths.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the March 1966 edition of Steel Labor, the paper of the United Steelworkers of America, carefully makes some pointed observations regarding the relationship between the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and Ku Klux Klan investigation undertaken by the committee and political extremism in America.

The United Steelworkers of America, as one of the leading unions of the labor movement in our country, has consistently gone on record defending our heritage as a heritage for all of us. Their concern has been and is today to preserve the right to dissent while resisting the hollow substitution of public exposure for meaningful, constitutional action and legislation to deal with the serious problem of extremism of the left and right. I commend this article and ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the Congressional Record.

Lights, Camera, Action—The Un-Americans Ride Again

Last January the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives got its biggest annual bundle in 27 years. The appropriation—passed over the growing opposition of a number of congressmen who have viewed with concern its activities—marked another year of life for what many Members consider their own "Congressional Follies."

Within a matter of weeks the committee was back at the familiar old stand of "investigating" beliefs, associations and ideas. The only difference was that for the first time in a quarter of a century of probing "un-Americanism," the spotlight was on a grassroots, 100-percent, native-spawned hate group—the Ku Klux Klan.

It is ironic, Representative Donald Edwards, Democrat, of California, recently wrote in the AFL–CIO Industrial Union Department magazine, Agenda, that if there is one institution that is peculiarly "American" it is the Klan. "We can't blame the Klan on the Soviet Union," he added.

Congressman Edwards, a leading House opponent of the committee (HUAC), pinpointed the haze which has clouded the history of this outmoded institution and which has given it a new lease on life more than a decade after McCarthyism was buried by the good sense of an informed American public.

Since 1957 the committee has spent $2.9 million of the taxpayer's money following the same "exposure for exposure's sake" prohibition of the famous Watkins decision of the Supreme Court. And while a southern moderate, Representative Charles L. Weltner, has injected some restraint into the committee, there are fears that the now-concluding Klan investigation will set the stage for a wholesale probe of the civil rights movement.

"It is easy," Edwards wrote in the IUD publication, "to ignore the inherent danger to our constitutional liberties and sense of fairplay as long as the targets are Communists, radical professors, students, and other disruptive members of our society.

"The fact is that the rights and liberties of all Americans are bound to the rights and liberties of each American, no matter how misguided or obnoxious his beliefs, associations, and preachments may be."

"HUAC" has become a familiar cry to student groups, academic circles and generally liberal organizations in recent years. Most of them have viewed it with a mixture of amusement and contempt, but the history of the committees and the people who have been its chairmen, steered its investigations, and made it the dirty linen of a dozen Congresses, suggest it is more than a bad joke.

In fact, had it not been for the judicial counterweight guaranteed by the wisdom of the Founding Fathers to meet such an unintended invasion by the legislative branch, HUAC might have run roughshod over the Bill of Rights in a fashion which would have made Senator McCarthy appear as a moderate.

The legislative box score of HUAC during its 20 years as a standing committee, according to the USWA Washington office, has been limited to three minor laws. To date, not a single conviction under the legislation it has formulated has been upheld in the Supreme Court.

The committee spends thousands of dollars every year in "showoff" hearings and keeping voluminous files of unverified information. Even the Klan hearings have demonstrated the questionable role of the committee and the attitudes of those doing the investigating and those investigated.

Most of the committee members, under the House seniority system, have been from the South. All but one of its chairmen since 1945 have been acknowledged segregationists who have always flunked any COPE or labor rollcall rating.

Those who have not been familiar with the reactionary, ultraconservative posture of HUAC over the years may have been confused when an ex-Alabama "Grand Dragon" of the Klan told committee members in February that the Kluxers top sheet, "Imperial Wizard" Robert Shelton "thinks highly of this committee."

But students of political extremism in the United States have long observed that Communists on the one hand and radical rightists on the other have thrived in different ways through its existence. Domestic Reds have enjoyed a martyr role and Birchites and their ilk have used it as an unending repository of official literature and testimony to buttress their conspiracy theory of a subverted America.

John Rankin, the ex-Mississippi Congressman who read anti-Semitic and racist speeches into the Congressional Record, was the "father" of the present standing committee. He declared in 1946 that the Klan was a "100-percent American" institution.

The granddaddy of the present HUAC, founded in 1938, was an Un-American Committee chaired by Martin Dies, who saw in labor's political action and in the CIO itself a Communist plot. Dies, like other committee members and staff, subsequently found good pickings on the radical right circuit, and is now a John Birch Society columnist.

HUAC's mandate from Congress to investigate "subversive and un-American progaganda" is an umbrella under which it has attacked labor in the past and the civil rights movement in more recent times. The committee's files have been used by so-called "little un-American" committees in Southern States to intimidate rights workers and voter registration.

Organized labor has not lost sight of the important of full protection under the first amendment when the committee has "come to town" for its side shows. In 1960, when students were clubbed and hosed down the steps of San Francisco's City Hall after protesting HUAC's fishing expedition into the colleges, the San Francisco Labor Council, AFL–CIO, joined in the attack on the committee.

Labor has cleaned its house of those antidemocratic forces who would have used it for other purposes, but through the years the USWA and other major AFL–CIO unions have taken the position that civil liberties are meaningless unless the rights of all are defended. The right to speak, to write, to propagate—misguided and even loathsome views, cannot be restricted without imperiling the liberties of all.

The right to dissent is far removed from overt acts by Klansmen, of Communists or domestic Nazi-acts which threaten the lives of other American citizens and which should come under the law. What is needed is not headlines and a waste of taxpayer money to lift the sheets of the Klan for public exposure—but new Federal laws to protect the civil rights guaranteed by the 1964 act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Hope for the long-overdue burial of HUAC is seen by Congressman Edwards and other House critics. "I am convinced that a substantial majority in the House are opposed to the existence of the committee," he says, "and would welcome the transfer to the Committee on the Judiciary of all matters affecting the internal security of our country. I hope that Congress will soon remove another outmoded institution which demeans and belittles the Congress, by abolishing HUAC."

A Bonus for Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the hysterical attempt to soften up the public into accepting the policy switch by the Johnson State Department and accede to the admission of Red China to the U.N. continues. Therefore, to counteract this devious propaganda, I insert in the Record a very effective editorial which appeared in this morning's Chicago Tribune:

A Bonus for Red China

Whatever its spokesmen may say to the contrary, the Democratic administration is trying to play footsy under the table with Red China. The sudden flood of propaganda that we must ignore or isolate Peking and that we had better resign ourselves to Red China's admission to the United Nations is not accidental but is inspired.

Not a day passes but we are exposed to dope stories forecasting a shift in policy toward China or hinting at an open door into U.N. A typical effort to justify Red China's intransigence is a column by James Reston of the New York Times asking why, when we would not tolerate Communist Chinese power in the south of Mexico, we should assume that Red China will tolerate our power in South Vietnam.

The answer to that, we think, is sufficiently apparent. We are in South Vietnam because Red China, through her auxiliary, Communist North Vietnam, has embarked on a war of conquest against a people who were given solemn international pledges that their independence and sovereignty would be respected. If Red China wants to get us to leave southeast Asia, all she has to do is call off the war she is fighting by proxy. She has done no such thing, and no one expects her to do so. She has yet to make a single gesture which would contribute to peace and the stability of the world.

In these circumstances, as former Representative Walter H. Judd said yesterday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to recognize Red China and cease opposition to her admission to the U.N. would be to confer "a smashing and wholly unnecessary victory" on the most bellicose country in the world.

Mr. Judd, whose long experience as a medical missionary in China qualifies him to speak with authority, was supported in his position by other witnesses, whose statements helped to redress the balance in the hearings Senator Fulbright, the committee chairman, has rigged up to make a case that we are being too beastly to the Chinese Communists.

Prof. George Taylor of the University of Washington pricked one of the most persistent of the fictions relating to Communist China—the contention that we are isolating her. He said that, contrary to the story that we should cease trying to isolate Peking, it is Peking that is trying to isolate us.

"The terms that she has announced for taking a seat in the U.N.," Professor Taylor said, "are so outrageous that they must have been designed to show her contempt for that organization."

One of these terms is that Nationalist China be expelled from the U.N. and from its security council. If we assented to such treatment of a loyal ally, it would be as raw a deal as when we helped sell out Poland to communism and betrayed General Mihailovitch and the Chetniks to Tito's tyranny in Yugoslavia.

The theory that Red China can be rendered amenable by treating her with kindness and showering favors on her is just as sensible as contending that Al Capone could have been reformed by inviting him to become a member of the police benevolent league. Communist China's whole record, and don't forget the Korean war for which she still stands under U.N. condemnation as an aggressor, is that of an international plugugly, and right now her principal business is to funnel weapons and supplies into Vietnam to kill Americans.

The 92d Street YM–YWHA Celebrates Its 92d Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 92d Street Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association (YM–YWHA) in New York City has compiled a distinguished history of services to the community and city during the 92 years of its existence. Famed for its strong tradition of cultural activities, the "Y" has, over the years, developed a comprehensive program for people of all ages, which includes athletic and social events as well. In addition, it has always welcomed interfaith and interreligious meetings.

The following article of the New York Times of Monday, March 21, 1966, written on the occasion of the "Y's" 92d anniversary, details the excellent work it is performing. I hope my colleagues will have an opportunity to read it:

Ninety-second Street "Y" Is Celebrating Its 92d Anniversary

(By Irving Spiegel)

The "Y" on 92d Street, where T. E. Eliot read his poetry, where the Marx Brothers played basketball and Agnes de Mille taught the dance celebrated its 92d birthday last night.

And in the celebration, the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association on Lexington Avenue showed it is carrying on its strong cultural tradition.

Last night—on the stage of its handsome Theresa L. Kaufmann Concert Hall, where

Dylan Thomas had intoned his lyric verse and the Budapest String Quartet had played—there was music, drama, dance, and poetry reading.

And, like long ago, the youngsters were still charging up staircases yesterday to the two gymnasiums and the swimming pool and adults were flocking to meeting rooms for lectures.

When the curtain parted at 8:30 p.m. every available place in the 850-seat auditorium and balcony was filled for the anniversary celebration program.

The program included the pianist Gary Graffman, the dancer, Paul Draper, Richard Kiley and Irving Jacobson, who did a scene from "Man of La Mancha"; Hermione Gingold, the English comedienne, and Mill Geer and John Randolph, who did excerpts from Robert Frost's poems.

PURPOSE UNCHANGED

Outside of the building, 73-year-old Jack Nadel, a member for the last 60 years, the "Y's" former executive director until his retirement in 1958, looked up at the inscribed Biblical injunction in the stone lintel above the entrances:

"Rejoice O young man in the youth—Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth."

"We grow and grow," Mr. Nadel said. "The rattle of the Lexington Avenue trolley is gone, so are the brownstones. But our goal has remained the same—to instill in our boys and girls, in every way we can, devotion and loyalty to our country to our faith, so that they may give better service to both."

The 13-story "Y," on that northeast corner of Lexington Avenue since 1900 and in different locations before that, loomed large beside the four old brownstones on 91st Street that are to be demolished. In their place will rise a new 11-story Henry Kaufmann Building, an 8-story residence for girls and a 3-story cultural center—an integral part of the "Y."

To date, $3 million has been raised toward the building fund of $3.4 million. The "Y" is a beneficiary of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, which supports and maintains 116 social welfare and medical institutions that serve more than 700,000 New Yorkers of all races and creeds.

More than 9,500 men, women, and children take part in its activities, and 1 million persons pass through its doors every year to attend the Kaufmann concert hall events.

For Jack Nadel and Carl Urbont, his successor, the opening section of the "Y's" bylaws is as meaningful today as it was in 1874 when it was first promulgated:

"The object of the association shall be the improvement of the mental, moral, spiritual, cultural, social, and physical condition of young men and young women and the fostering of Judaism."

The "Y's" ancient records disclose such members and benefactors as Jacob H. Schiff, Felix M. Warburg, Joseph Proskauer, Bernard Baruch, and his brother Rudolph, Ambassador to the Netherlands.

The "Y" has withstood shifting populations and physical changes of the neighborhood since the turn of the century, and today prides itself as "belonging to the city at large." People from the five boroughs pass through its doors. Its records tell of interfaith and interreligious programs.

The dusty file reveals an appeal issued on February 17, 1880:

"That the various Jewish congregations and societies be invited to cooperate in the work of securing subscriptions from the Israelites of this city in behalf of the starving people in Ireland."

It was one of the early leaders in the development of comprehensive social, educational, and recreational programs for teenagers. More than 2,000 children throng to the "Y" to enjoy its many offerings. It is an institution that echoes with the sounds of youngsters fiddling, strumming, and playing on many instruments.

For Jack Nadel, there was the memory of the late Billy Rose when he was a member, "Oh, yes, when the Marx brothers played basketball, sang."

"Yes, yes," he added, "the 92d 'Y' is something more than evenings of wonderful poetry reading, the listening to the music of Chopin, Bach, Beethoven—wonderful as that is—it is people of all ages finding fulfillment."

Best Idea in Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson requested in January that Congress create a new Department of Transportation, he took many of us by surprise; yet it was immediately apparent that the proposal had great merit.

I am happy to see that national support for the proposal is growing, and I am particularly gratified to call my colleagues' attention to some recent remarks of my good friend Hanson Ray Sisk, respected editor and publisher of the Nogales Daily Herald in Nogales, Ariz. Expressing his approval of the new department, Mr. Sisk referred to it as the "best idea in years." Mr. Speaker, without objection, I insert Mr. Sisk's column of March 3, 1966, in the Appendix at this point:

BEST IDEA IN YEARS

It appears that President Johnson is coming up with more ideas, more spending, more bureaus and departments than all the Chief Executives of the United States combined since Franklin D. Roosevelt inaugurated the so-called New Deal.

Yesterday he asked Congress to create a new department with a new Cabinet officer. It would be called the Department of Transportation, involving air, land, and sea. The President wants an appropriation of almost $1 billion for the new Department.

He wants inaugurated a highway safety program, which is very important and commendable, as it would set up Federal safety standards; a study for separate highways for trucks and passenger cars; promote safety at sea, and other functions involving all general forms of transportation used by people and goods.

Under the new Department would come almost 100,000 people and about $6 billion of Federal funds which are now devoted to transportation in various other departments.

Without question, with the rapid expansion of transportation in the past two decades, a department of this nature is sorely needed particularly to establish national standards for vehicular safety. It would also embrace railroads, planes, freight routes, and river transportation.

To pay the extra expense load the President suggests increased taxes on airplane fuel, airfreight, and inland waterway fuel, and perhaps other forms of travel taxes.

With millions of automobiles on the highways of the Nation, the air lanes filled with airplanes of all types including private planes, and more ships on the oceans and streams, it is plainly evident that controls be centered into a single department as now handle finance, commerce, postal, and other Federal services.

America will soon reach the 200 million population, and by the turn of the next century will be about 350 million. All forms of transportation will be doubled or tripled to serve this new growth.

Our Nation has need for this proposed new department to save lives, speed up shipments, and impose controls on the airways, railways, highways, and sea lanes.

Youth's Dream of Becoming Instructor for Boys' Clubs of America Ended by Enemy Bullet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, since this is National Boys' Club Week, the heroics of one particular member of the Boys' Clubs of America has been brought to my attention by its director, Robert J. Murrin.

This boy or I should say—young man—who lived in the 20th Congressional District, Michael Nemchick, has given his life for this Nation. He was not quite 19—but he was a paratrooper and wore his coveted wings with pride.

Mike was very active in the Boys' Club in McKeesport as he was growing. His ambition had been to continue his education upon his discharge from the service and join the staff of the Boys' Clubs of America.

During his service he wrote to the local chapter and kept the present members informed. He told of our Nation's part in the present conflict. He also advised the boys of the many advantages they received through the various programs conducted by the club.

One sometimes wonders why a sniper's bullet could find its mark and end a career before it actually started.

The answer can never be found—but Mike's sacrifice, along with others like him, will assure the continuation of organizations designed to help our youth mature and develop into good citizens.

Having participated in two wars, I fully realize the personal loss being experienced by the Nemchick family. Time alone will ease that pain. However, I do feel this world was better because of the defeat of our enemy those many years ago—and—it will improve even more when this conflict is successfully concluded.

Mr. Speaker, I felt it was only right to bring this young man's sacrifice to the attention of my colleagues. Michael Nemchick is typical of many, many young men in our Nation today and he, with those like him, should receive recognition for their willingness to serve in time of need.

The article from the McKeesport, Pa., Daily News for February 23, 1965, concerning Michael follows:

Local Soldier Killed by Sniper in Vietnam—Youth's Dreams of Becoming Instructor for Boys' Clubs of America Ended by Enemy Bullet

A young McKeesport man's dream of someday helping the boys of his community along the same path he followed died with him yesterday in Vietnam.

Michael J. Nemchick's life wasn't long. He would have been 19 next Monday if he had lived.

It wasn't really a distinguished life because he never had a chance to accomplish the things he hoped to do.

The only career he ever really got started on was the job of being a soldier. And a Vietcong sniper's bullet ended that career at a place called Bon Song in Vietnam.

DIED OF WOUNDS

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. Nemchick of 1511 Fifth avenue, got the word yesterday in a telegram. It said simply that their son had died of gunshot wounds of the abdomen inflicted by an enemy sniper.

It contained the usual words of sympathy and explained that they would be contacted personally in the near future to make arrangements to have their son's remains returned here for burial.

The telegram said nothing of Mike's dream of surviving the fighting in Vietnam, of going to college when he got out of the service and of learning the things he needed to know to become a professional guidance counselor and physical instructor for the Boys' Clubs of America.

He talked of these things in letters he wrote to Samuel R. LaRosa, executive director of the Boys' Club here in McKeesport. Mike was a Boys' Club graduate and he wrote in his letters of the lessons he learned, the values he received, and the guidance which kept him from straying to the wrong path.

Each year, the Boys' Club in McKeesport elects some of its members to serve as city officials for one day. In 1961, Mike was elected mayor. It was an honor he cherished.

He wrote a letter to the boys who belong to the club now, urging them to take advantage of the opportunities it afforded them.

He pointed out how much the physical training he received here had helped him in jump school where he won his coveted paratrooper wings.

Last November, he was assigned to the Airmobile forces of the First Cavalry. He said he was scared about going to Vietnam but he was also proud to go.

TOOK LETTER OF PROMISE

He took with him a letter from the regional director of the Boys' Clubs of America promising him whatever help was available in furthering his education and launching his career when he returned.

Mike will never have a chance to avail himself of those opportunities now.

But perhaps what he did in Vietnam will make it possible for his younger brothers, William, 16, and Gregory, 9, to turn their dreams and ambitions into reality someday.

Sir Stuart Mallinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, April 9 the unveiling of the new statue of Sir Winston Churchill at the British Embassy will bring a host of British dignitaries to Washington among whom will be a distinguished gentleman—Sir Stuart Mallinson, who has been an outstanding friend and benefactor to the Armed Forces assigned to England.

Members of the 20th Tactical Fighter Wing—which is one of the oldest fighter wings in the Air Force—through a committee headed by Col. Farley E. Peebles of San Antonio are planning to honor Sir Stuart while he is in our country. Therefore, I thought it would be fitting to call to the attention of my colleagues and to the American public through this media the numerous contributions which Sir Stuart has made to closer ties between Great Britain and the United States.

During World War II when he was high sheriff of Essex, Sir Stuart initiated and was responsible for the formation of the Essex Anglo-American Community Relations Committee when units of the U.S. Air Force returned to England in 1952 and has served as chairman since that time.

He has often personally planned and sponsored functions where Britons and Americans can meet and develop lasting friendships, and has been responsible for eliminating problems and resolving crises of varying magnitude between the bases and local individuals and organizations in his country. The diplomacy and tact by Sir Stuart in resolving these difficulties have precluded embarrassment to the United States and to Her Majesty's Government.

A case in point is the housing development at Weathersford, England, which has been used exclusively by U.S. servicemen and their families, and which owes its continued existence to Sir Stuart's efforts to prevent it from being closed.

The George Washington Ball, held on the Friday nearest the 22d of February each year, was initiated by Sir Stuart 9 years ago and has been held annually since then at a site alternating among the military bases and the local villages and towns.

Sir Stuart has sponsored a garden party for 8 years now at his home, which is known to many Americans as the White House of Woodford Green, Essex. On these occasions Sir Stuart has made possible a rare exchange between some of England's most noted statesmen and dignitaries and American servicemen with their wives. His guests in recent years have included Earl Clement Atlee and Field Marshal Sir B. L. Montgomery.

American Gen. Louis Norstaad, NATO commander, was presented by Sir Stuart to the English Speaking Union in a gesture of the close relationship between the British and American forces.

The list of good deeds of Sir Stuart could go on indefinitely. Other examples of his work include his being instrumental in dependent personnel of American servicemen being invited to participate in functions with their counterparts in British schools, and the presentation of Christmas trees to American forces for the last 8 years in England. Sir Stuart organized the original Anglo-American Thanksgiving service held each year in the Chemsford Cathedral. He also was the originator of the idea of establishing a memorial window at this Cathedral for Essex-based servicemen who lost their lives during World War II. He has given tickets for numerous international and national sporting events to our service personnel and on many occasions has taken servicemen to these events as his personal guests.

One of our commanders once said:

> Our base owes much to Sir Stuart whose aim has been to draw together in the bond of friendship the members of the Armed Forces and the people of the surrounding community. This he has done in a most outstanding manner.

Elbie Jay Meets His Equal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the satirist, Arthur Hoppe, has published another one of his Elbie Jay family articles. This article, which was published in the San Francisco Chronicle of March 25, follows:

Elbie Jay Meets His Equal

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? Time for another tee-vee visit with the rootin'-tootin' Jay family, starring ol' Elbie Jay—a humble fellow who believes in never lordin' it over his equals. If'n he ever should meet one.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today, he's a-settin' at his writin' desk, pen in hand, scratchin' his head and lookin' angry. That's his faithful sidekick, Robin (Texas Jack) Valenti, at his side.

Elbie. You know, I just can't figure that varmint out. I give him nothing but kindness. I treat him like an equal. I even mention his name once or twice in my public statements. And then he wants to go his own independent way.

Robin. Fulbright is an ungrateful rat.

Elbie. Him, too. But I'm talking about the sneaky polecat who really stabbed me in the back.

Robin. Bobby Kennedy is an ungrateful dirty rat.

Elbie. Him, too. But I mean old Chuck de Gaulle. Just think of him, wantin' to get out of NATO. You know what it all boils down to, Robin? He don't trust me.

Robin (shocked). No.

Elbie (nodding). Yep. It's hard to believe. After all, what's life without mutual trust? The sneaky polecat. But what am I going to say about a fellow like that in this here speech I'm writin'?

Robin. Well, here's a line I just read, sir: "No nation today can hope to pursue an isolated course. Without the full consultation, approval and material aid of her allies, she is bound to be defeated."

Elbie (happily). A decent, kindly, aboveboard statement, Robin, and a credit to my sense of fairplay. Where'd you get it?

Robin. I think it's what he said about your war in Vietnam.

Elbie (pounding his hand on the table). See what a sneaky polecat he is? How can you trust a fellow who'd say a thing like that? Worst of all, how can I outfox this varmint, if I can't figure out what makes him tick? What do I know about him?

Robin (reading from a file). Well, he's a big, tall man. Very vain about his personal appearance and photographs. Awfully petty about protocol. Hardly ever holds press conferences because he doesn't like to be questioned.

Elbie (ticking them off). Vain, petty, clever.

Robin. Plays off one faction against another domestically. Says what the voters want to hear. But his basic drive is to go down in history as the most wonderful leader his country ever had.

Elbie. Devious, demagogic, overweeningly ambitious (grudgingly). He must work mighty hard.

Robin (nodding). It's like he had extra glands. But to sum up, sir, he thinks he's the greatest man in the world.

Elbie (snapping his fingers). That's it, Robin. You've found the key. But, great balls of fire, how are we going to deal with a fellow who thinks he's me?

Robin (blanching). You're right, sir. Oh, I'll sleep each night a little worse just knowing a man like that is their President.

Well, tune in to our next episode, folks. And meantime, as you mosey on down the long trail of life, remember what Elbie's old granddaddy used to say: "There ain't nothin' more precious in life than trust. So get all you can."

Harold Harper of West Springfield, Mass., Honored as Newly Elected Governor for Massachusetts District, Order of AHEPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Harold Harper of West Springfield, Mass., newly elected governor of Massachusetts District 8 of the Order of AHEPA, was honored at a testimonial dinner held at the Kimball Towers in Springfield Saturday night.

More than 400 attended to pay tribute to Mr. Harper as he assumed an important position in the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, including Dr. Kimon Doukas, supreme president of AHEPA, Peter Bell, past supreme president of AHEPA, Charles Georgeson, chairman of the national advisory board of the Sons of Pericles, and Mrs. Bessie Langadinos, district governor of the Daughters of Penelope.

I had the pleasure of being the guest of Mr. Harper on March 14 for the 17th national banquet in honor of Members of the 89th Congress, sponsored by the Order of AHEPA, and held here in Washington.

I was not able to be present for the testimonial Saturday night in honor of Mr. Harper, but I sent this telegram which is to be printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, together with excerpts of a news story taken from the Springfield Sunday Republican of March 27:

March 26, 1965.

Charles S. Pappas,
Chairman, Altis Chapter 85 of AHEPA, Testimonial Dinner to Gov. Harold Harper, Springfield, Mass.:

Sincerely regret that I cannot join you personally in this fine tribute to Gov. Harold Harper. Altis chapter has a right to be proud of the honor of having Harold Harper in a key position of the great Order of AHEPA. He has the ability, the dedication and the personality to render great service in his honored position. I had the privilege of attending the great Washington AHEPA banquet and met and talked with AHEPA's national officials.

I congratulate President Kimon Doukas and AHEPA for its outstanding educational and progressive policy. I applaud Altis chapter 85 for what it has done and will continue to do for the Hellenic people of our community. Convey my best personal wishes and felicitations to Harold Harper and all of his assembled friends.

Edward P. Boland,
Member of Congress.

The Springfield Republican said:

Dr. Doukas went on to say, "Tonight, however, we are taking the occasion to assemble some of our past and present officials to show the growth and progress of our great order in disseminating and advocating the noblest attributes of Hellenism and the wonderful tenets and precepts of Americanism which is a living practitioner of the ancient Hellenic thought, the basis of Western civilization."

"Mr. Harper deserves the appreciation and gratitude of all AHEPA members," Dr. Doukas said, "for dedicating his life to the practices of democracy within his district."

ACHIEVEMENTS NOTED

Dr. Doukas said, "Our order comprises mostly Americans of Hellenic origin from one end of the country to another and proudly displays among its members some outstanding Government leaders, such as Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey and many Federal, State, and city officials."

Recalling recent achievements of the organization, Dr. Doukas noted the tribute paid by AHEPA to former President Harry S. Truman, by having a monument erected in his honor at a central square in Athens, Greece.

"We are currently engaged in advocating an educational program for our members whereby scholarships and other financial aid is granted to American students at universities and colleges in Greece," Dr. Doukas said.

GOOD-WILL AMBASSADORS

He mentioned that last year, "We held a convention in Athens where we transported by air 10,000 members and their families as official ambassadors of good will. They took the greetings of the American people and American Government to the people and the Government of Greece."

Among other distinguished guests were Basil S. Milonas, James A. Mzarakos, William P. Tesaffaras, and Peter Carellas, supreme trustees, Rev. Stephen Papadoulias of St. George Greek Orthodox Church, and Michael Vortsos, former supreme treasurer of Ahepa.

Since joining the organization in 1951, Mr. Harper has served as secretary, treasurer, and president of Altis Chapter 85 of this city. Mr. Harper and his wife, the former Claire Granger, live at 12 Sylvan Street with their five children.

Dr. Doukas was elected supreme president at the organization's supreme convention in Athens last August. He was awarded a degree of bachelor of science in economics, a master of arts in finance, and government and a doctorate of philosophy in public law and government degrees by Columbia University; and a doctor of jurisprudence degree by New York University.

He has authored several articles and professional reviews.

Members of the committee included: Nestor Cokkinias, secretary; Charles S. Pappas, ex-offico chairman; Menas Demetrion, treasurer; George George and Mairo Kacoyiannakis, tickets; Nicholas Hassiotis, entertainment; John Taloymis and Peter J. Alphas, arrangements; Mrs. Eva Hassiotis, and Miss Diamond Cokkinias, publicity; and George Klotsis, hall.

We Are Drifting Into a Government Controlled Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, across this Nation the alert observers of the American economy are noting with alarm the increasing role which big government is playing in controlling prices and wages.

More than one large industry in this country has been whipped into submission by a stern telephone call from the White House.

What has become of our free, competitive economy? What has become of the authority of this Congress to legislate concerning matters of price and wage regulation? If the present trend continues the Federal Government will become the great dictator of the Nation's marketplaces.

The Los Angeles, Calif., Times has taken editorial note of this trend, in the issue of March 24, 1966. I insert this editorial in the Record for the information of Members of Congress:

Perilous Drift to Controls

Inflation and the war in Vietnam notwithstanding, it is time to call a halt to the dangerous drift toward Government fixing of prices and wages before a permanent addiction takes hold.

Just the other day, President Walter Reuther, of the United Auto Workers, made a speech proposing creation of a price-wage review board.

Any corporation with 25 percent or more of the market in a given industry would have to give 60 days' notice of intent to raise prices, and justify the proposed boost before the board.

Fortunately, the idea is unlikely to get anywhere at present. President Johnson, for one, has shown no interest in creating a formalized wage-price machinery.

In any event, the review board proposed by Reuther would have no power, beyond that of stirring adverse public opinion, to head off unjustified price increases.

Still, the UAW chief's proposal is a disturbing sign of the times.

Instances of Federal interference in the marketplace are becoming too commonplace for the comfort of anyone who believes in the fundamentals of the system which has given America the most productive economy on earth.

Businessmen are required to restrict loans and investments abroad voluntarily.

Both business and labor are expected to heed guidelines under which prices should remain stable and wage increases should be held to 3.2 percent per year.

Again, compliance is voluntary. But, in recent months, the Nation has seen President Johnson bring White House prestige—and in some cases, the threat of dumping Government stockpiles on the market—to force abandonment of price increases in the steel, aluminum, and copper industries.

The administration has let it be known that Federal public works contracts will be parceled out with an eye toward which companies and unions have stayed within the wage-price guidelines.

Now, White House pressure has even been used to force a partial rollback in a cigarette price increase.

In the context of war-fed inflation and the U.S. gold crisis, it is hard to quarrel with Mr. Johnson's determined campaign of persuasion in behalf of wage-price stability. Some kind of restraints are unavoidable in times like these.

However, it should be remembered that the guidelines result in serious inequities to some unions and some companies—and, if long continued, such artificial restraints create economic distortions which can impair future prosperity.

Thus, use of the guidelines can be justified as an emergency expedient—nothing more.

Unfortunately, an air of permanence is beginning to settle around the idea of Federal interference with wages and prices, as evidenced by proposals to formalize the procedures.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, has introduced a bill similar to Reuther's proposal.

A measure authored by Representative HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, would empower Congress Joint Economic Committee to review proposed price increases. Company officials could be subpenaed to bring in their books, confidential correspondence, and other records.

The present emergency is not so great that price increases—often unavoidable—should be treated as quasi-criminal acts.

Challenge and Response in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the New York Times on March 28, entitled "Challenge and Response in Foreign Aid."

The author of this article is Dr. James A. Perkins, president of Cornell University a learned and respected member of the academic community. His suggestions and recommendations are certainly most worthwhile, and deserving of our close and careful consideration and attention. He echoes my own suggestion of a year ago that the only means of achieving a useful presence in such parts of the world lies in making a vast program of foreign aid the absolute basis of our overall policy.

Dr. Perkins' article follows:

CHALLENGE AND RESPONSE IN FOREIGN AID

(By James A. Perkins)

A cardinal principle of statecraft holds that a nation's response to a problem should be on the same scale as the problem itself. In law this maxim reads that the punishment should fit the crime. In the family budget, this rule suggests that the husband's deposits should equal the wife's withdrawals.

In national affairs, when the solution is not up to the problem, we despair; when the solution is grandiose, we are frightened; and when the solution seems appropriate, we are content. Finding a proper balance is perhaps the essence of statesmanship.

I would sugegst that we have failed to find such a balance in the case of our foreign assistance program, and I would suggest further that this failure may lie beneath the national malaise that seems to afflict this program. (Similarly, the uneasiness that many feel about our position in Vietnam may grow from the suspicion that the problem is not as large as the solution we are offering.)

THE WIDENING GAP

With regard to our foreign assistance effort, I suspect we feel there is a basic illogic between the decreasing size of this effort and the obviously widening gap between the rich and the poor nations. It would be ironic indeed if the continued reduction in the level of our aid and, therefore, in its effectiveness, were merely to result in increased opposition to the effort.

We can remember all too well other occasions in our national past when our responses to problems were seriously inadequate. The Hoover administration's response to the onset of the depression was grotesquely insufficient. So was our willingness to act for several years on the assumption that neutrality legislation was adequate to deal with the European inferno created by Adolf Hitler. In both cases, we succumbed to despair because the problems seemed larger than our capabilities—when in fact, it was the scope of our imagination and the magnitude of our effort that was wanting.

RECONSTRUCTING EUROPE

There have also been occasions when our responses were far larger than the problems required. We still flinch at the memory of Senator McCarthy's efforts to discover some Communists in the State Department. A more recent example was the episode in the Bay of Pigs which was a fiasco precisely because it was too large a commitment of our prestige for the actual level of the Castro threat, just as it was too small a military commitment to enable the operation to succeed.

But there are, fortunately, examples when proper balances have been struck between problems we have faced and the responses we have made to them. Whatever we may think of the utility of public power, the TVA stands as a classic example of a response at a level appropriate to the problem. This controversial but highly successful enterprise was conceived and operated on a scale large enough to bring the American South into the 20th century. In foreign affairs, the Marshall plan and the Common Market were ideas equal to the task of reconstructing Europe. It is a measure of the success of the resulting achievement that Charles de Gaulle has had so much difficulty in destroying the machinery of European and Atlantic unity.

We have surely proved that we are capable of the social inventiveness and the political willpower to conceive and to carry through large and sophisticated programs which are in balance with the problems they are designed to help solve. What must we do, then, to bring our foreign assistance effort up to scale?

First, we must recognize the magnitude of the human misery outside our borders. And we must really accept the fact that it will not just go away. We must also accept the fact that, as the world's most wealthy and powerful Nation, the problem is, in substantial measure, ours. The recognition that this misery represents a present danger is the necessary first step. As a nation, we have not yet taken that step.

Then we must recognize that the general level of these efforts is unquestionably far too low. We are now permitting ourselves to think that one-third of 1 percent of our gross national product, which is the level of our Federal foreign assistance program this year, is adequate. During the Marshall plan years our support represented 2 percent—proportionately six times our current effort. If we are serious about being effective with our foreign aid, we must commit to the task a minimum of 1 percent of our gross national product, or triple our current expenditures.

COPERNICAN REVOLUTION

In addition to recognizing the scale of the problem and the scale of our response, we must also enlarge the time scale of our thinking. A larger effort will have to operate over a longer time. We are not discussing a problem to be solved in a year or even a decade. We must consciously adopt a program that will last for the rest of the century—and perhaps into the next. The annual debate on the continuation of foreign assistance is both absurd and misleading. It only confuses our purposes, increases impatience, obscures the issues, and inhibits success. We might as well have an annual review of the wisdom of having a public school system.

And finally, we must undergo a Copernican revolution in our thinking and our strategy. We have to recognize that the postwar programs of foreign aid—involving the rebuilding of Europe and the initial appraisals of the situation of the underdeveloped world—are now part of the past. The future requires an unblinking recognition of enormous and considerably different problems.

We need to think and act on a scale equal to the problems faced by the desperate peoples of the developing countries. If we recognize this danger and its causes, we can respond at a level equal to the task.

The 48th Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the 48th anniversary of independence of the Byelorussian people was observed on March 25, 1966, but it was not a day of great rejoicing but one of hope that some day they will regain their freedom.

It was on March 25, 1918, that the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born but its independence was short-lived and within 3 years complete Russian domination of the new nation was reimposed.

Today the hopes of those who brought the Byelorussian Republic into existence are still alive but their subjugated country now bears the name of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and is wholly unrepresentative of some 18 million people.

So on this day of national commemoration we of the free world join in paying tribute to these courageous people who despite heart-rendering hardships over these many years have not given up their dreams of self-determination once again.

On Sunday, March 27, the Byelorussian-American Association, of which Nicholas Horoshko is national president, observed the 48th anniversary by presenting a commemorative program in the Biltmore Hotel in New York City.

The Byelorussians comprise one of the most important groups of Slavic people in Eastern Europe. Their historic country of 80,000 square miles borders Poland on the west, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia on the northwest, Russia on the north, and the Ukraine on the south.

Early in the 16th century Byelorussia became part of the Russian Empire and remained as such until the Bolshevik Revolution which overthrew the czarist empire in 1917.

Among the non-Russian groups which proclaimed their independence was the Byelorussians and on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian National Republic was established.

But before the Byelorussians, or White Russians as they are also known, had a chance to enjoy the benefits of their victory the Red army overran the country and made it part of the Soviet Union. Byelorussia had been swallowed up in less than 3 years.

So today let us continue our prayers that the day may not be distant when these long suffering people may once again experience the blessings of freedom in their historic homeland.

Support of the Indian-American Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, recently several of my Republican colleagues and I proposed a variety of suggestions as to the new directions which we believe our Nation's foreign aid programs must take if they are to contribute in an effective way to the changing world and the revolution of rising expectations which so characterizes the ferment of countries which have gained their independence in the past two decades as well as those which, like our neighbors in Latin America, have been independent for some time.

Social development and political education and development were prominent among the goals which we listed.

In some of these nations our country has on reserve large sums of local currency, generated by sales of Public Law 480 food, which should be put to use in achieving these goals.

There are also in every underdeveloped country a sizable number of private citizens who need financial aid to carry out their progressive plans for economic and social development. Their own governments are sometimes to interested in the grander scheme of economic development, too bogged down in administrative detail, and too encumbered by rigid rules and regulations to help them. In some cases the ideas and principles that these people wish to develop are to controversial or too new to receive government support.

Aid from foreign governments cannot reach them due to the government-to-government nature of foreign aid, or else it carries with it the stigma of identification with the specific policies and position of the foreign country. Some aid is provided by independent private foreign foundations, but support from this source is limited.

The people I am talking about are the community leaders, the business groups and the professional groups which cannot afford indentification with the government of a specific foreign power such as the United States because of national sensitivity, but who share many of the principles and views which have made this country the richest in the world.

The just announced independent Indian-American Foundation could be an important source of support for these people. It would not be identified with a foreign government, and it would maintain a perspective independent of the Government of India. I might add this independence from government support would represent a strength for which the Soviet bloc and the Chinese Communists have no counterpart in their foreign aid programs.

The Foundation would concentrate its support in education and agriculture. Progress in these areas is absolutely essential to economic development, and it is in these areas that innovation and experimentation are critically needed. However, it is in these areas that the governments of underdeveloped countries most often find it politically difficult to bring change or even to support change.

The professional educator resents government interference in his field, and the farmer has always had more taken from him by the government than he has received from it—a situation which is not limited to the underdeveloped countries. The independent Foundation does not suffer from this reputation, and it has already proven its effectiveness in these areas.

The Indian-American Foundation could also perform another function that the Government or Government-supported organizations are not able to perform because of their complex regulations and political sensitivities. The Foundation could quickly tap the technical resources of organizations such as universities, labor unions, cooperatives, and professional and business groups to meet development bottlenecks.

There is no doubt that the Foundation will have an impact, an influence, and an importance to the economic development of India far greater than the size of its budget.

Aid to Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has underlined the U.S. desire for peace in Asia by signing a bill authorizing this country's participation in the Asian Development Bank.

This is the editorial opinion of the Milwaukee Journal, which also hailed the $12 million American contribution for a Mekong River project in Laos.

"The river system has great potential for power, irrigation, and transportation. Properly developed it could revolutionize the area economy," the paper points out.

At this point, I request unanimous consent that the editorial "Aid to Southeast Asia" be inserted in the RECORD:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 18, 1966]

AID TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

President Johnson has underlined his statement that the United States wants peace in Asia, and is anxious to help Asian nations in development, by signing a bill authorizing this country's participation in the Asian Development Bank. At the same time he authorized a $12 million American contribution for a $24 million Mekong River project in Laos.

The latter is part of the giant Mekong River development plan. The $24 million will finance the first actual construction, a dam and power station in the Nam Ngum, a Mekong tributary. It will furnish power for parts of Laos and northern Thailand.

A survey of the Mekong River system has been under way for several years. Even the warring nations have participated. The river system has great potential for power, irrigation, and transportation. Properly developed it could revolutionize the area economy.

The Asian Development Bank, to which 31 nations belong, can play an important role to that end. What is needed now is a time of peace to take full advantage of the plans for a better life for the people of the entire area.

Mark S. Watson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mark S. Watson of the Baltimore Sun was one of the greatest gentlemen of journalism in this century. His colleagues, freinds, and admirers around the world were deeply saddened by his death last Friday, for we will greatly miss his intelligent and ironic perceptions, his sense of humor, and his calm and accurate observations on world affairs.

Mr. Watson was a man of extraordinary wisdom, outstanding ability, and unflagging energies. His career in journalism spanned more than a half century, during which his work won him the highest accolades which can be awarded to a reporter: the Pulitzer Prize, which he received in 1945; a special citation from the Department of Defense in 1961; the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award, given to him in 1962; and finally the Presidential Medal of Freedom, awarded him in 1963.

Born in Plattsburg, N.Y., in 1887, Mr. Watson graduated with honors from Union College in 1908 and worked for the Chicago Tribune until 1917. During World War I he received his first exposure to military reporting as a commissioned officer in charge of Stars and Stripes, supervising a staff which included Alexander Woollcott and Harold Ross.

After the war, Mr. Watson joined the Baltimore Sun, and served with the Sun in several editorial capacities for over 20 years. He then began a second career on the battlelines during World War II, and his distinguished dispatches from Washington and the field brought him even greater renown. He was one of the first journalists to enter Paris after its liberation, and won many exclusive interviews with European statesmen.

I need not recount all his achievements during the last two decades, for his thoughtful and informed reporting on complex military affairs is familiar to us all. Intimately familiar with fast-changing military technology, Mr. Watson was able to advise lay readers accurately and sensibly on military science and weaponry. Among the great developments which he covered were the first hydrogen bomb test, the launching of the first nuclear-powered submarine, and the development of ballistic missiles. In sense as well as in seniority, Mr. Watson completely merited the title of "dean of the Pentagon press corps."

Mr. Speaker, because Mark Watson never retired, there was no opportunity for his colleagues and friends to pay full tribute to this perfect reporter and perfect gentlemen. I wish to offer my small tribute now, and to extend my heartfelt sympathies to Mr. Watson's wife and two daughters.

Our understanding of the world in which we lived was far greater because Mark Watson taught us through his work.

Washington: How To Make Things Worse Than They Are

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for some observers the idea of mining the harbor of Haiphong seems to be a tempting course of action. The danger inherent in such a move are made abundantly clear by Mr. James Reston of the New York Times. I include herewith his masterful article on the subject and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1966]

WASHINGTON: HOW TO MAKE THINGS WORSE THAN THEY ARE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—The pressure seems to be building up in the Senate for a policy of bombing, mining, or blockading the North Vietnamese harbor of Haiphong, and one reason for the pressure is obviously the forthcoming elections.

Not to close that harbor to the ships carrying war materiel to North Vietnam and the Vietcong, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, said today, "flies in the face of commonsense." He was supported by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, and HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

"It is going to be necessary to have a change in policy in some direction in the very near future, in my opinion," Senator RUSSELL added, "or this war will assume political proportions that will absolutely force it upon any man who has to go before the electorate of this country and seek public office." He thereupon proposed a blockade.

WAIT A MINUTE

Maybe we should look this one over a little before we jump. The thing can be done easily enough. Legally, it is a little misty since the United States is not formally at war with North Vietnam, but the lawyers will find a way through that thicket. An effective sea and air blockade of Haiphong, however, raises more practical questions.

First, if a Soviet ship carrying munitions to North Vietnam is intercepted by an American destroyer approaching Haiphong and refuses to turn around or be boarded, what do we do? Blow her out of the water? The consequences of that are likely to be rather awkward.

Second, a policy of mining the harbor, therefore, seems more likely to be more practical and less risky, though this too has to be considered in something other than domestic political terms.

No doubt it would have considerable effect on free world shipping now carrying supplies but not munitions to Haiphong. Insurance rates on ships heading that way would reach almost prohibitive heights as soon as the mining was announced. That would discourage those who are making a profit out of the war, and nobody would sob much about them.

THE SOVIET PROBLEM

The critical problem lies with the Soviet Government, now approaching a major ideological showdown with Communist China at the Communist Party congress later this month. Peking's charge against Moscow is that it is soft on capitalism, timid in its approach to the Vietnamese war, and more interested in peaceful coexistence with the United States than in waging the Communist revolution.

In these circumstances, the Soviet Union is not so likely to turn back, as it did in the U.S. blockade of Cuba during the missile crisis of October 1962; but even if it decided not to risk blowing up its men and ships in Haiphong, there would still be a problem.

For diverting Soviet seaborne shipping to the air or the land would mean rerouting it over or through Communist China and thus placing the North Vietnamese Government even more in the grip of Communist China, which is precisely what the Johnson administration has always said it wanted to avoid.

This, to use Senator RUSSELL's phrase, really "flies in the face of commonsense." One objective of our policy surely is not to force Moscow and Peking closer together but to keep them apart; not to isolate Hanoi with the Communist Chinese but to give them some freedom of action to work with Moscow; not to increase Peking's leverage over North Vietnam but to limit it as much as possible.

The aim of closing the port is clear enough—to reduce our casualties—but to plunge into it worrying about senatorial casualties is another matter.

President Johnson, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of State Rusk and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, are all dubious that the advantages of closing Haiphong would be greater than the disadvantages, that it would really seriously hamper the flow of supplies to the enemy, and that it would do anything but bring about even more trouble in keeping the narrow channel of the Saigon River open for our own supplies. But Senator RUSSELL differs on both military and political grounds.

POLITICS AND POLICY

"I do not think we can afford to let this war drift on and on as it is now," he told the Senate yesterday. "Search and destroy tactics may, after 10 or 12 years, bring the Vietcong to their knees, but the American people are going to be very unhappy about it, and someone who comes along and says: 'I will go in and clean this thing up in 6 months,' will, I'm afraid, have some advantage over the Senators who say 'let's play this thing along for 10 or 12 years as we're going now.' "

Politicians who run for reelection, of course, have to worry about such things, but good politics is not necessarily good policy.

Peace—But Not at Any Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the shadow of Vietnam has hung heavily over every day of this session of the Congress.

The problem of what to do has been widely discussed and solutions have run the gamut from abrupt withdrawal to possible world war. Our concern deepens each day, and we continue to seek an honorable solution, bt never to sacrifice freedom.

On Monday, March 28, 1966, a provocative editorial appeared in the Knoxville Journal on this most important issue, and I would like to insert it at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

PEACE—BUT NOT AT ANY PRICE

A plastic surgeon returning from 2 months' voluntary service in South Vietnam provides a striking picture of the methods employed by the Vietcong, about whom a handful of U.S. Senators and some other leftwingers are so concerned.

The returned surgeon describes the scene: The parents of a small boy stand before their hut in South Vietnam. The small boy clings to his father's legs in fear. The group is surrounded by Vietcong terrorists who demand food, perhaps, or information, or an oath of allegience. The father demurs, he is slow to yield to the demands of the Cong. Suddenly, the small boy is grabbed up by one VC, his lower lip cut off and thrown in the dust in front of the hut. If either of the parents protests, or perhaps even if they don't, they are shot down in cold blood.

This is the Vietcong. This is the "liberation front" for which the FULBRIGHTS and the KENNEDY's plead, demanding that they or their representatives sit in the high councils of nations which would negotiate peace in southeast Asia if there were anyone in North Vietnam or Red China willing to sit down at a council table.

Thus a majority of Americans has reason to be righteously indignant when, as was the case last Saturday, hundreds of thousands of demonstrators in dozens of cities took to the streets, a few groups even carrying the Vietcong flag.

This indignation is not an intangible thing, based solely upon emotion or conviction that the right of dissent guaranteed by our Constitution is being carried too far. Rather, it is the recognition that those who put on these noisy peace demonstrations are costing and will cost the lives of thousands of loyal American fighting men in the jungles and the rice paddies of South Vietnam.

The plain fact is that these demonstrators, these mobs which have been encouraged by the likes of the Kennedys, the Fulbrights, and the Morses, have created the conviction in both Hanoi and Peking that if they simply decline to halt aggression, our great country will in the course of time reward their aggression because we are, if you don't stop to consider who the demonstrators are, a divided people.

Well, of course one should not damn the whole bunch as being traitors. In the ranks of those who march our streets in the guise of peace lovers there are some conscientious individuals, but they take their places alongside other characters whose interest in raising disturbances grows out of other motives.

There are two groups which readily meet the eye. One is made up of native Communists, Americans who are dedicated to the service of a foreign power whether it be based in Moscow or Peking. They demonstrate because of this loyalty, in the hope of breaking the will of a great people to act for the preservation of freedom.

A second group, including the beatniks and the draft-card burners, comprises young Americans who, we are ashamed to say, are just plain damned cowards. They have yellow bands running down their backs that justifiably concern and arouse indignation in the hearts of millions of American veterans who have fought this Nation's wars in the past. They are fearful that unless appeasement of the enemy can be achieved, they might have to risk their own little lives and give up the creature comforts, and yes, the freedoms, which have been their heritage because brave men in the past have fought for, and sometimes died, to preserve them.

We are all for peace, but not at any price. Few of us are for the kind of peace sought by traitors to our country and by out and out cowards. These hatched up demonstrations make us sick.

Cigarette Smuggling Racket Cheats New York State and New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the growing practice of cigarette bootlegging is depriving State and municipal taxing authorities of millions of dollars in revenue. With New York State and the city of New York searching for new sources of revenue to meet the increasing costs of government operations and services, it is high time they plugged up the loss in tax revenues resulting from cigarette bootlegging.

Recent disclosures indicate that New York State and New York City may be losing approximately $50 million annually in tax revenue due to the growing practice of interstate cigarette smuggling. Other States and cities are also affected and I am hopeful that my colleagues will immediately review the picture of cigarette tax revenues in their own States and municipalities to determine the extent of loss of cigarette tax revenue.

Mr. Speaker, of equal importance is the effect of this unlawful trade upon the small businessman—the independent retailer—the backbone of our free enterprise system. The retailer not only loses the cigarette sales but also suffers the loss of other business resulting from other purchases which the customer makes when he comes to his shop. We cannot rely on the bootlegger or the smuggler to think about the small retail merchant—we must speak out—act promptly to protect his interests.

As if this is not enough damage, the smuggler and bootlegger are involving innocent merchants to dispose of the cigarettes they illegally transport in interstate commerce to evade city and State taxes. I have been told but I do not have confirmation that they are enlisting our youth, in plying their illegal trade in the sale of bootleg cigarettes, thus contributing to and promoting juvenile delinquency and disrespect for law and order.

The wholesale tobacco industry, the chain store and the department store are also affected by the loss of sales of cigarettes and other products as well. These merchants are threatened with substantial damage and loss of business.

In 1949, there was a wide practice of advertising and offering for sale, tax-free cigarettes by mail. This occurred when there developed a wide difference between the selling price of cigarettes in one State and that of a neighboring State. State and city taxing authorities, retailers, wholesalers, and merchants complained and the Congress passed the Jenkins Act of 1949 which was later amended—15 U.S.C. 375–379.

The Jenkins Act was passed to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes for shipment into a State where a tax is imposed by requiring the seller to file a report of the sale with the taxing authorities of that State. When the Jenkins Act was signed the practice stopped. I am today introducing a bill to amend the Jenkins Act to require that any person or firm selling or transferring in excess of 5,000 cigarettes to file a report with the taxing authorities of the State into which the cigarettes are being transported. The purpose of the legislation is to eliminate the bootlegging of cigarettes and to protect the small businessman who suffers economic harm as a result of the illegal transportation of cigarettes in interstate commerce. Just as the original Jenkins Act effectively eliminated the mailing of cigarettes for tax evasion, so do I believe this amendment will effectively eliminate the practice of bootlegging of cigarettes in interstate commerce.

The expanded growth of cigarette sales in the nontax cigarette States like North Carolina and in low tax areas such as the District of Columbia for ultimate interstate transportation is producing a new breed of bootleggers which is not regulated by the present provisions of the Jenkins Act.

The following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 20, 1966, outlines the present loss in revenue to States and municipalities which impose sales and use taxes on cigarettes:

SMUGGLERS CUT CIGARETTE TAXES BY MANY MILLIONS

(By John G. Rogers)

The motorist in the Brooklyn filling station was paying for his 10 gallons of gasoline when he asked the attendant in a low voice:

"Got any cigarettes today?"

The attendant sized up the motorist, decided to risk it, and nodded his head affirmatively.

"I'll take two cartons," the motorist said.

"Cost you 6 bucks."

The motorist settled up and drove off. He was pleased because, against the going retail price of 43 cents a pack, he had saved 13 cents on each of the 20 packs in his purchase. The attendant was pleased because he had made a profit of 11½ cents on each of the 20 packs.

The big losers in the deal were New York City and New York State. Between them, they should have collected 16 cents a pack in taxes—a total of $3.20—but they didn't collect anything because the sale was a surreptitious one of cigarettes smuggled in the day before from North Carolina.

ESTIMATE

In various settings and through various characters, the sneak sale of smuggled cigarettes in New York City has reached the point where tobacco industry spokesmen estimate the city-State tax loss at up to $51 million a year.

Joseph H. Murphy, State commissioner of taxation and finance, will say only that the loss is "substantial." However, his current estimate for the State's annual tax share is at a rate that is $31 million less than in presmuggling days.

An educated industry guess is that legitimate cigarette sales in the city are off 22 percent. The industry believes legitimate retailers throughout the State are losing up to $138 million a year in cigarette business and, perhaps, another $60 million in related sales.

LUCRATIVE

It was inevitable that such a lucrative, subrosa racket would attract organized crime, including the Cosa Nostra. Law enforcement officials once accustomed to seeking small independent smugglers, are now beginning to see a pattern of large-scale, well-planned smuggling, especially into Brooklyn.

They know, though they didn't intercept it, that recently a trailer truck came in with 9,600 cartons, bought for about $18,000 in North Carolina, resaleable in New York for up to $10,000 profit, depending on the method of disposal.

Brooklyn District Attorney Aaron E. Koota estimates that a daily average of $50,000 worth of illegal cigarettes enter the borough by means ranging down to the small independents who stuff a few cartons under the back seats of private cars.

"The problem is serious and continually getting worse"—that's the summary of City Finance Director Roy M. Goodman.

"There are indications that such criminal elements as the Mafia are cracking down on independent bootleggers and have started to organize pickup and dropoff points for illegal cigarettes," says Morris Weintraub, managing director of the Wholesale Tobacco Distributors Association of New York.

The costly woe bedeviling the city, State, and cigarette industry traces back to April 1, 1965, when the State cigarette tax was doubled to 10 cents a pack. The price of a pack in this city of an estimated 3 million smokers shot up to between 40 and 45 cents, the highest in the Nation.

COUNTERFEITS

Almost immediately the smugglers began to roll, some in private cars, some in rented panel trucks and occasionally, some in king-size trucks. Traffic built up between New York and the two choicest supply points—North Carolina at $1.85 a carton, Washington, D.C., at $2.07.

Those are retail prices. North Carolina is favored for big operations because roadside dealers have storehouses bulging with the goods—cases which hold 60 cartons of 10 packs each.

With the cigaretes back in New York, small independents sometimes make the ultimate sales themselves, their volume not being large enough to fit in a middleman. It's not hard to sell a $1.85 carton in the city for $3. Large-scale smugglers may sell to storekeepers for perhaps, $2.75 a carton. The storekeeper then sells at the prevailing retail price of $4.30 or so.

TRAFFIC

In the beginning, small storekeepers simply risked selling packs that bore no New York tax stamps. Lately, many of the smuggled cigarettes bear counterfeit stamps. So far the State department of taxation and finance has identified 17 different varieties of phony stamps.

The smugglers' outlets have varied widely—barbers, gas station attendants, laundries, even housewives. In the first 8 months of the smuggling wave, 197 arrests were made in the New York area and 112 convictions were obtained. Prosecutors complain though that light penalties—often a $25 fine—are not rough enough to discourage a bigtime smuggler.

The State has made 746 seizures of illegal cigarettes, totaling 618,000 packs. The sale of the seized cigarettes to dealers willing to pay the required taxes brought in $325,445.

But, as the war goes on between the smugglers and the law, the State knows that more smugglers get through than are caught. One tactic found the State sending spies to North Carolina to watch for cars with New York plates loading up at roadside stands. Descriptions of cars and plates were telephoned ahead. Cooperative Maryland State Police alone seized 450,000 packs in a recent period from New York-bound cars.

Lately, however, the smugglers have been switching cars somewhere on the northbound trip, throwing off the surveillance of the law.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment to the Jenkins Act will help recoup for New York State and New York City, their respective shares of the taxes they are now losing of between $32 and $50 million per annum. Perhaps this will also stimulate the taxing authorities and the mayor of the city of New York to look into all other areas of possible tax losses and take steps to plug up the tax leaks to help meet their budget—every little bit helps.

One of the reasons I am concerned about the New York City tax situation is that the mayor of the city has proposed an income tax which would apply to resident and nonresident workers alike. I represent the Fifth Congressional District, New York, no part of which is located in the geographic boundaries of the city. However, a great segment of my constituents are employed in the city of New York. They are employed in factories, retail shops, service industries, wholesaling, manufacturing, brokerage, insurance, and banking as well as in all professions.

If one of my constituents owns property in New York City, he pays his real estate taxes. If he owns his business and pays rent, he contributes to a portion of the taxes paid by his landlord. If he rides the taxicabs—if he eats in a restaurant—if he goes to the theater—if he makes a purchase—whatever he does in the city of New York, he helps promote its economy and he contributes to the taxes collected by the city.

In only one way does the city subsidize him and that is with a subway ride for 15 cents which costs the city much more. I favor an increase in subway fare to 25 cents rather than any form of tax upon suburban residents. It is the fairest way to collect needed revenues. Just stop giving something away below cost. New York City residents should want to stop subsidizing each subway rider from out of New York City by giving him a ride which costs more than a quarter for only 15 cents.

By taking this step, the mayor of the city of New York will be taking a step in the right direction. The commuter or nonresident income tax would be a grave mistake. It will result in a loss to the city of New York of a great many service businesses and other small business which could operate out of the suburbs where their proprietors live.

On Sunday, March 27, 1966, the New York Times reported that New York City Investigations Commissioner, Arnold G. Fraimon stated that the city was losing about $9 million a year and the State of New York about $22.5 million a year as a result of interstate shipments of cigarettes to avoid the tax. The New York State tax is 10 cents a pack and the New York City tax is 4 cents a pack.

The legislation which I have introduced today would help bring about an increase in New York State's revenues of approximately $22.5 million and about $9 million to the city. In view of the difficulty in estimating the loss of revenue due to illegal operations resulting from cigarette bootlegging, this figure may be considerably higher. By plugging up such tax leaks and through an increased transit fare, if necessary, we can bring financial help to the city without a nonresidents and commuters tax.

This legislation will also help other States and municipalities to collect their just share of taxes levied on cigarettes. Where State and local legislation is required to effectively implement the proposed amendment to the Jenkins Act, it is expected that it will be forthcoming to the end that smuggling and bootlegging of cigarettes may be stopped.

Training for Volunteers in Service to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 1966, the Baltimore Sun published a feature on the VISTA volunteer training program located in Baltimore, Md.

Because this article illustrates the fine job these volunteers are doing, I would like to bring the article to the attention of my colleagues:

FAR-REACHING PROJECT—TRAINING FOR VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

(By Lowell E. Sunderland)

At approximately 8-week intervals since last April between 50 and 60 persons from all walks of life and all parts of the country have converged on the old convent and school of a west Baltimore Catholic Church for a crash course in reality.

The people in these groups have ranged in age from 18 to 74 and have come from such diverse backgrounds as college graduate and college dropout, housewife and retired businessman, teacher and dentist. They have been white and Negro, male and female, young rebel in long hair and dungarees and experienced hands in tweedy sportcoats and conservative ties.

They are people drawn together by an idea—some say it is even an ideal. They are people taking the first step in what will become a year of donating time and skills to part of the war on poverty.

They are part of Volunteers in Service to America, more commonly known by its initials, VISTA, and popularly described as the domestic Peace Corps.

For 6 weeks they live in the old convent of Fourteen Holy Martyrs Catholic Church at Pratt and Mount Streets and study across the street in the renovated Catholic school. Their practical classroom, however, is Baltimore, parts of it that the average citizen sees only occasionally and then forgets.

The trainee's day starts before 8 a.m., 6 days a week, and often is not completed until 9 or 10 p.m.

At the end of the 6 weeks, most of the trainees are assigned to slum sections in other American cities for the duration of their year in the VISTA program. Only about 10 percent who start do not finish. Once a class graduates, the training center staff takes 2 weeks to prepare for another class of 50 to 60.

The local VISTA center is one of three centers in the country (the others are Hull House in Chicago and Columbia University in New York) training volunteers especially for work in urban areas. Its program is conducted by the University of Maryland's School of Social Work under a contract with the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

VARIED ASPECTS

During the 6 weeks the course of study runs the gamut from theory (what the nature of poverty is and how one copes with it) to practicality (how to approach the poor, what to expect, and how much to accomplish). Lecturers and seminar leaders are brought in from numerous agencies and schools.

Each trainee is assigned to work 3 days a week with a social welfare, health, or educational agency serving the poor. At other times the trainees visit agencies to observe how they operate and to learn what service are available through them.

Working with the agencies, they meet—many of them for the first time—the poor face to face. Some go into houses and apartments that are incredibly dingy and dirty (rabbit warren is a description frequently heard). Others work in hospital wards with the elderly or mentally disturbed. Some work with children—tutoring in schools, coaching in gymnasiums and on playgrounds, and sometimes just talking on street corners near boarded-up stores and alleys littered with broken glass.

AGENCIES AIDED

There are also observation assignments made at places where the poor are found—in housing projects, in poolrooms, in storefront churches, in pawnshops, at trash dealers, and in corner bars. Certain times are set aside for individual exploration during which the trainees are supposed to set out on their own and learn the ways of the poor.

Essentially, the VISTA program is designed to work through existing agencies, doing some of the detailed person-to-person work that frequently is left undone by overburdened agencies short on manpower and long on requests for help.

This is not glamorous work, and it is not billed as such. VISTA recruitment literature, like that of the Peace Corps, is hardline stuff, offering challenge but little money. The literature is often illustrated with pictures of volunteers working against the stark background of littered streets and crumbling buildings.

Throughout the training period, the trainees are reminded by their instructors that, in the words of one of them, "what you are going into is, simply put, damn hard work."

STUDENT AMAZED

To most of the trainees this is not news, but what does get to them is the complexity of the problems of the poor.

In a recent class, for instance, a young man who had completed 3 years at the University of Texas and left school "because I had lost the direction of my life," commented after 3 weeks of training that he had "never realized a landlord could charge a tenant $80 a month for a rundown apartment with naked light bulbs and broken plumbing and then refuse to repair anything."

Some of the trainees come to the center with little understanding of the very nature of poverty. To combat that they are told on the first day of training something that is repeated and vividly reinforced during their stay in Baltimore:

"Poverty is not solely an economic thing. There is more than one kind of poverty."

Early in the course someone points out that on "strictly a dollar basis, it would be possible theoretically to bring every person above the poverty level for $12 billion a year. But if you had all of it at 8 a.m. tomorrow, you would not be able to wipe out poverty."

Poverty, the trainees discover, is a way of living, thinking, doing, and believing that is passed from generation to generation of slum-born people. They find children who grow up thinking that the only way a family is supported is by a monthly check from the Department of Welfare. They find parents who regard schools only as places to "get rid of the kids" in the day.

COMMENT BY MITCHELL

They find what Parren J. Mitchell, executive director of Baltimore's Community Action Agency, described to a recent class as the "crushing weight of apathy in the inner city."

"Your problem, and you will have sleepless nights over it," Mr. Mitchell told the class, "is how you can make these people see that it is not necessary for a human to live without dignity."

VISTA workers live for a year in poverty neighborhoods on subsistence wages tailored to the area; in short, learning about the life of the poor by being a part of it.

Throughout their weeks in Baltimore, the trainees are reminded that they are part of a new approach to the "new poverty," a poverty that, unlike that of the depression, is virtually inescapable for those caught in it and frequently unrecognized by those outside of it.

HORATIO ALGER GONE

"There is a traditional belief in American life that by hard work and diligence any man can become a millionaire and a success in life," a professor from New York University told a recent VISTA class. "But people have to realize now that it just isn't so. Horatio Alger ain't no more, bluntly."

What kind of person becomes a VISTA trainee?

The answer is both complex and simple. There are more young than old, more whites than Negroes, more women than men. Of five classes to graduate from the Baltimore center so far, the average trainee has had just under 2 years of college.

Each trainee has a personal reason for joining.

A young man, 20, in a recent class was from New York's Harlem; he said he joined to escape Harlem. A poll of the same class turned up frustration with college and a "desire to get my feet on the ground" as the reason no less than 17 young trainees gave in one form or another.

BACK TO SCHOOL

A 19-year-old girl from Detroit said she quit Wayne State University in her second semester because "I wanted to help the poor, not study about them." In high school she had been involved in the civil rights movement. She was majoring in sociology in college. Near the end of her course at Pratt and Mount, however, she admitted she had seen enough to convince her to go back to school after her year with VISTA.

One young man from Chicago who had another semester left in college said he was thinking about law school and then a career in politics. "The VISTA experience can't hurt me," he said, "and it will probably help me in dealing with people."

Another college dropout, this one from Boston, admitted that he was planning to go back to school and that his VISTA experience while helpful in itself might also "help keep the draft board away a little longer."

A Negro woman in her early fifties from New York said that her husband had always been interested in helping people and that when he died, she had vowed to try the same kind of work.

SINCERITY EVIDENT

The one distinguishing trait that has caught the eyes of the training center staff, acocrding to Director Ernest M. Kahn, is "sincerity in wanting to help people."

"They're all concerned about helping others," Mr. Kahn said. "Many of them started out in civil rights and from that experience they all are conscious of social problems and they want somehow to help bring about a change."

Parren Mitchell was openly surprised when after his first talk to a VISTA class on a Saturday night more than half the class cornered him in the training center's lounge. For almost an additional hour they grilled him on the nature of poverty and the work of the newly formed war on poverty agencies. He had to beg off after that amount of time. Few of the questions asked were frivolous or repetitive.

Practically, how is the VISTA program working?

It is perhaps too soon for a valid evaluation; the program is barely 13 months old. Certainly it has its critics, as any social program born of politics has. There was little precedent for its founding and less for this training that has gone into it. Successive classes at the Baltimore center have reflected changes gained from experience.

MANY VOLUNTEERS

But there is a backlog of volunteers nationally. And the VISTA administrators in Washington receive new requests daily from agencies and groups across the country eager to get their own volunteers. VISTA is unquestionably an idea that has caught on and is spreading.

Baltimore has about 30 VISTA workers of its own stationed at the training center, the Community Action Agency, the State's attorney's office (in the well-publicized bail bond program), the Urban Renewal and Housing Agency, Spring Grove State Hospital and the Western Improvement Association.

These are currently 10 or 12 other local agencies that have requested but not been assigned volunteers, according to local officials. Nationally, there are some 2,000 VISTA people already working the cities, on Indian reservations, in rural areas and among migratory workers. *There are 350 in training* and the hope is to put 1,000 more to work by June.

Nuclear Age Requires Solution to Managed News if Democracy Is To Survive, Says Cronkite

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent winter meeting of the Inland Daily Press Association in Chicago featured an excellent address by Mr. Walter Cronkite, managing editor of CBS Evening News.

In his remarks to the newspaper editors, Mr. Cronkite maintained that the nuclear age requires a solution to the problem of news management by the Federal bureaucracy.

In the interest of an informed public, I introduced at this point in the RECORD the Inland Daily Press Association digest of Mr. Cronkite's address:

NUCLEAR AGE REQUIRES SOLUTION TO MANAGED NEWS IF DEMOCRACY IS TO SURVIVE, SAYS CRONKITE

(Digest of talk by Walter Cronkite, managing editor of CBS Evening News, at Inland winter meeting.)

I'd like to use this distinguished forum to tackle a subject I believe to be close to all of our hearts—as publishers, editors and broadcasters. The subject: Government management of news.

I am deeply concerned about the matter, and not solely in the professional sense, as a journalist.

I am concerned over the growing cynicism in our society. Since at least World War I each generation has been more cynical than the last. The belief in old values slips away faster than we can replace them with adequate substitutes. Our faith in our fellow man fades and is replaced with doubt and distrust.

HONEST—OLD-FASHIONED

Honesty has become old-fashioned and the very use of the word subjects its user to that gutteral "ich" that is the younger generations' Bronx cheer.

This is not just a moral or philosophic problem. I think it has grown to the proportions that today it is a real, and immediate problem that could directly affect our ability to survive. The very foundation of the democratic system is build on honesty and the belief in the honesty of our fellow men. Those who lend themselves to the cynicism of the political lie are undermining that foundation. They are building not a strong democracy but a distrust of all government and all leaders.

POLITICAL LIE—A WAY OF LIFE

Yet the political lie has become a way of bureaucratic life. It has been called by the more genteel name of "news management." I say here now, let's call it what it is—lying.

Now let's get the terms of reference straight.

We always have had, and we're always going to have, attempts to manage the news. Everyone—in business, industry, government, individuals—everyone in the world wants the world to think the best of him, wants to put his actions in the best possible light. Sometimes the newspapers go along with this. For instance, wedding announcements, I notice, don't very often go into the bride's *earlier intentions, her indecision, her doubts,* or her earlier beaux. That's perhaps excusable managed news.

The question here, though, is a little deeper than that.

There is a clear and a very present danger to that foundation of our democracy which is the freedom of the press. But it does not come alone from this administration or its particular attitude toward a favorable image. It is inherent in the age in which we live and a solution to it must be found.

NUCLEAR AGE ENLARGES PROBLEM

Our problem, of course, is how the Nation can be kept informed and how it can be given all the information that is necessary for the viable function of a democracy while denying to the potential enemy the information which is capital to his cause. And even this *is not a new problem. But the problem is so* compelling in the age of thermonuclear weapons and supersonic rockets as to become a new problem.

When a Minuteman can be irrevocably launched from its silo in 15 seconds by the decision of one man, of what value is public *debate on the merits of the attack? And when the enemy has the capability of initiating* the attack upon the first suspicion that we are contemplating such action, how can we advise the population that such a possibility is even imminent?

Thus, it is not solely that there is no time or opportunity for dialog on the imminent danger and alternative to it, but there is, as well, no time for public reaction—and more importantly—for discussion. There is a question as to whether it is even desirable to publicly broadcast the facts. The decision that such public broadcast is not desirable then demands the greatest secrecy at the source of the news, the controlled release of all Government information and, in the ultimate moment, perhaps even the implantation—as a spokesman for this administration has suggested, of the false or the misleading.

FREE PRESS IS VITAL

Now it's hard to find quarrel with that in the context of the cold war and the ever-present danger. But it is also impossible to quarrel with the fact that it counters every traditional concept of our freedom of the press and the right of the people in a democracy to know.

It challenges again the truism that our press has held to be self-evident, that there are no halfway measures in controlling the press. We have laws against libel and against salacious literature, they don't seem to be enforced very well but we have them, and even these are subject to strict judgment and legal redress to protect us against dictatorship by the willful minority. But when we deal with the presentation of factual material, it is impossible to pass laws or edicts that can censor a confidential magazine without touching the New York Times.

Who is to determine the national interest if the people themselves cannot? We see all about us, in nations deprived of the full exercise of their democratic rights, the extent to which a determination of national interest can go. It reaches the point, almost invariably, where those in power construe their continuation in power as in the national interest.

DANGEROUS FIRST STEP

That is the ultimate. But each step along the way to that final disaster can be clearly traced. The desire for image—as Madison Avenue has named it—is understandable, but manipulation of the news to achieve it is a dangerous first step.

Another big step is the withholding of news to prevent the people from being "disturbed"—a sincere belief among the leaders that a predetermined policy is the right and only one, and that public debate of it can only "rock the boat."

This is closely related to the "fear of the people" syndrome that has undoubtedly led those with dictatorial bent to clamp the last lock on freedom of the press and public expression. This is an ever-present temptation to every government. We have seen it *in its small first manifestations here in the* years since World War II as the "restricted" stamp was used in department after department of our Government possibly with even more frequency than that love of the buck-passer, the "for your action" stamp.

It was the rampant classification of totally *unsensitive material that brought about the* congressional investigations under Congressman Moss that, fortunately, are still going on.

The very facts of our nuclear age, which has brought upon us this new problem of news management, demand that the public know more, not less, about the decisions of *Government and the men who make them.* In a thermonuclear age when more and more frightening power must be vested in fewer and fewer men, and the time allotted for debate and decision is agonizingly restricted, it becomes important that the population be more knowledgeable, not less knowledgeable; *that it be kept constantly informed of all the details, whether they seem at the moment* the major ones or the minor ones, so that, when the moment of secrecy must be imposed, it can understand the actions of its leaders and not react with violence to misunderstood decisions.

SURVIVAL REQUIRES INFORMED PUBLIC

If there is hope of surviving the nuclear holocaust, those who survive must understand through advance knowledge why and how the conflict came, else they can turn, in their shock and fury, to an anti-intellectual, antigovernment anarchy that could make the Dark Ages look by comparison like the age of enlightenment.

I would like to suggest that one of the reasons for the great confusion which wracks this Nation today over the Vietnam war is the fact that we were committed without a proper airing of the facts, all the facts.

This administration and preceding ones did not level with the American people on the nature or scope of the commitment which, I submit, they themselves must have known was one of the ultimates of our policy.

As one example: When I was in Vietnam in July, we had some 50,000 troops there. We had publicly said the number was going to 76,000. And yet out there every military man knew that 200,000 would be on the ground around the first of the year.

NEWS ON VIETNAM MANAGED

Now 300,000 is mentioned as an ultimate figure, but already the military speaks secretly, not for attribution, of 500,000. Shouldn't this be said openly so the people might know?

If there is safety in an informed electorate, there is added security in an informed officialdom. Good newspapers can provide information to Government officials that it would take them far too long to get—if indeed they ever got—through secret communications. Why, there may be a bright civil servant not on the distribution lists who has the key that can lock the door on catastrophe—or open it to previously undreamed of opportunities for negotiation. This is one of the major strengths of our system over theirs. It is this free access to information, not alone among the population but within the Government itself, that the Russian system denies to itself, and it's far the weaker for it.

Just as there's no such thing as good censorship, there is no such thing as a little censorship. And, by the same token, while the "big lie" might be justified to save us from imminent disaster, there can be no little lies in the relations of Government to the press and, through it, to its people.

We see examples constantly of the wearing away of public confidence in the integrity of Government.

DISTRUST OF GOVERNMENT GROWS

Who could believe, for instance, that the *release of Government stockpiles of aluminum* had no connection with Government pressure to hold the line on aluminum prices?

Who really believes that the Honolulu Conference was set up weeks ago when all the evidence points to a spur-of-the-moment *decision?*

Who believed the Department of Defense spokesman who said marines did not set fire to Cam Ne village when our CBS newsfilm and newspaper reports clearly illustrated the fact?

Who believes those annual cries of despair *from the bureaucrats in Washington in the* weeks preceding Congress consideration of the budget? All year those who have told us how well their departments are doing suddenly find themselves in danger of collapse.

Little lies themselves? White lies? Perhaps. But half-truths or lies, even once indulged in, undermine the *Government's* credibility and feed the fire of skepticism and cynicism that can undermine and destroy our democracy.

When our Government is caught in a lie, even if it is admitted after the fact, the damage is not alone to our image in the eyes of the world. Caught out once and we have destroyed endless months or years of good propaganda. A patina of tarnish appears on our symbol of the free press, which is the envy of the world.

You who are efficient editors, you who exercise proper skepticism over the news from Washington, are rendering a valuable public service and are in the long run helping Washington, not hindering. You are trying to preserve the bulwark of public confidence that would be quickly eroded if many of the releases from the seats of power were printed without question or elaboration.

SKEPTICISM TAINTS THE PRESS

One of the problems of the publisher and the broadcaster is that public skepticism already has been permitted by a lazy press to taint the press itself. The press appears only to be self-serving when it becomes alarmed over news restrictions, news management, and Government lies. The public fails to realize that what is at stake is not a narrow pride of product on the part of the publisher or broadcaster but the citizen's own unquestioned right to know.

Out of the welter of confusion over the Bay of Pigs came President Kennedy's determination to avoid such embarassment for himself and his Government in future crisis. He proposed to the newspaper publishers at a convention in April 1961, shortly after the Bay of Pigs, that there be some system of voluntary censorship to protect vital security matters.

He asked for help to try to reconcile the apparently irreconcilable. The two requirements, he said, were "a need for greater public information" and "a need for greater official secrecy." He got a cold shoulder from the publishers, always correctly suspicious of such overtures. It would seem, however, in light of future developments, that the publishers were far less cognizant of the grave problems of news management in an emergency than was the President himself.

PRESIDENT FINDS OWN SOLUTION

Without cooperation from the press in pre-establishing an emergency procedure, the President found his own solution when the Cuban missile crisis came. He determined that the Government action would be secretly coordinated—"orchestrated" was the word we learned then—and that through secrecy and even news management, his administration would speak with one voice.

It must be said that the concept of one voice is rather easily translatable to a frighteningly Orwellian "univoice," a word to mean the crossing of propaganda with genuine information to serve the purposes of the state.

There might be some question raised as to whether this, even in its most benign use, is a solution to the problems of democracy in crisis.

Perhaps a babble of voices from Washington could prove as confusing to the enemy as it is to our own people, and there may be real diplomatic advantages in such confusion.

I submit that if an administration speaks with one voice and controls every release of that voice's opinion, then perforce every statement from Washington must be considered to be the end result of long study and consultation and bear the imprimatur of the Chief Executive. Under that system there can be no trial balloons and no retreat without loss of face or, in the nuclear age, something more serious.

UNIVOICE MEANS MANAGEMENT

Part of the administration's univoice theory was to manage the news as a system of communications. The old-fashioned transmission of diplomatic communications prove far too slow for this nuclear-missile age. Either side could have pressed the button a thousand times over in the 4 hours it took for hand delivery of a communication from the Kremlin to our Ambassador in Moscow, coding, transmission to Washington, decoding, transmission to the White House. It was here that the most flagrant examples of news manipulation, perhaps even lying, came in. To get the message to Moscow the press was led on October 26, 1962, to print stories on the imminence of bombing or invasion of Cuba, whereas, in fact, as the New York Times later determined, that course was hardly ever seriously considered.

It behooves the administration to eliminate the press as a channel of diplomatic communications just as soon as possible by the establishment of other "hot lines" besides that one to Moscow. Indeed, all the world capitals should be linked, it seems to me, in such a communications network to eliminate the possibility of perhaps fatal misunderstandings. The President's solution of the news management problem in the Cuban missile crisis, although effective, thank God, was imperfect, if only in that it proved that it can be done and thus raised fears of the free press' role in maintaining our democratic system of checks and balances.

Well, what should we do?

A great deal of the responsibility rests directly with the Government. It's up to the administration to be certain that its own officials are informed and then shut up. The recent crisis proved that internal secrecy, control of loose talk, can be maintained by the Government at least for a short while.

DIPLOMATS ALSO LISTENERS

There must be recognition by the Government, that the domestic newsmen are not the only "big eared" listeners in Washington. The press of the world, the diplomatic representatives of other nations, certainly do not share the national loyalty or the sense of responsibility that well-meaning critics suggest the U.S. press apply to itself. If the secret is abroad in the drawing rooms of Washington, you can be sure that it's abroad in the parlors of Moscow; and the American press would be violating not its patriotism but its sacred trust, if it didn't so inform the American public. The Ambassador of Transylvania is entitled to not one more speck of information out of Washington than is the meanest citizen of the United States.

I repeat: this security is a matter for internal policing of the Government. It cannot be achieved by voluntary censorship agreements with the press. As Ben H. Bagdikian said in a Columbia Journalism Review article, there seems little question that, if the press signed a formal truce with the Government on information, Government discipline in keeping secrets would deteriorate.

CALLS FOR CRISIS PROCEDURE

There should, however, be established a clear-cut procedure for dealing with future crises. Government policy with regard to news management and the release of information should be clearly delineated in advance to avoid any confusion or misunderstanding on the part of the population.

The Office of Emergency Planning has an information policy in case of nuclear attack. Well, there should be a simliar plan to be put into effect when the President proclaims a crisis emergency so the people may know under what unavoidable handicaps the press is operating and to assure the relaxation of such news management policies the moment the crisis is past.

SUGGESTS MANAGEMENT COURT

The Moss committee or a successor might well be established as the people's court to which the news media could take for immediate remedy such cases of news control and management that it believes infringe on the people's right to know. The news media themselves cannot constitute such an appeals body quite obviously; nor can they participate as day-to-day advisers on the Government's handling of the news. To do so is an involvement that strips them of the impartiality required to serve properly their charge in our democracy.

The press has chores of its own, indeed, in getting our feet back on this news ground. There is an awareness, in theory at least, that the press has a responsibility in maintaining its own freedoms that can be discharged best by reportorial practice rather than editorial alarm.

WE MUST BE SKEPTICAL

We must be better newsmen, sharpening our diligence against fraud and deceit and fearlessly exposing those who practice it. We must be skeptical, so that people won't become cynical.

We have come a long way from the White House spokesman of Coolidge's day, who was the President himself, to the televised news conferences of President Johnson. The means of communication are superb but so are the opportunities for their manipulation.

That news management might be necessary in times of dire crisis, dire crisis, is properly established. That dead horse I think we ought to give a decent burial now. But now let's beat until we can put it to decent rest the problem of how news management can be limited so as to serve the only legitimate purpose—the guarantee and not the circumvention of our liberties.

U.S. Cutback Perils Funds for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the White House recommendation that impact aid funds be greatly curtailed will have a disastrous effect on many communities across the country and upon San Diego in particular.

A most succinct evaluation of the situation has been presented in the March 22 San Diego Union by their highly capable and experienced education writer, Mr. Charles Davis. The article carries the headline "U.S. Cutback Perils Funds for Schools" and I include it herewith as a portion of my remarks and ask each of my colleagues to reexamine their position on the impact aid issue. When considering Mr. Davis' evaluation I am sure each of us will readily see the need to vote in favor of retaining Federal impact aid—Public Laws 874 and 815.

The article follows:

U.S. CUTBACK PERILS FUNDS FOR SCHOOLS

(By Charles Davis)

"The United States has become an industrialist, a landlord, or a businessman in many communities of the Nation without accepting the responsibility of the normal citizen in a community, because property under Federal ownership or control is generally not subject to local taxation."

In 1950 this was the reasoning of a House of Representatives committee in reporting favorably on one of two bills which together have brought $45 million to San Diego city schools.

Now, as periodically in the past, there is a clamor over a threatened reduction in these bills—Public Laws 874 and 815—and implications on local property taxpayers are as serious as ever before.

In fact, they are viewed as catastrophic by a number of California school administrators who for years have relied, sometimes uneasily, on large doses of the Federal money to keep their schools going.

SCHOOLS AIDED

The laws assist schools where there is an "impact" of children whose parents live or work on Federal property, such as military installations, on which no local taxes are collected.

School districts share a prospect of either curtailing programs or levying additional property taxes as a result of any reduction in their impact aid allotments.

Presently, there are two aspects which pose budget worries for schools.

One is a lack of congressional appropriations to pay this year's full entitlement as computed by existing law. For San Diego city schools, as an example, this amounts to a deficit of about $511,604 in the district's $5,116,043 entitlement.

PROPOSED CUTS

The other aspect surrounds amendments from various sources, but primarily those in President Johnson's budget message to Congress. These would cut about $233 million from the program nationally beginning next year, or $2.6 to $3.1 million from San Diego city schools, depending on different methods of calculation.

U.S. Office of Education estimates are that 47 San Diego and Imperial County School Districts, currently entitled to $12,524,057 under Public Law 874, would drop to $6,487,154 if Mr. Johnson's amendments are adopted.

Dr. Ralph C. Dailard, city schools superintendent, sees hope in the fact that Congressmen across the Nation whose constituencies include federally impacted school districts are reacting against the amendments.

But he also concedes that Mr. Johnson has a record of success in his congressional programs that probably is greater than other Presidents in recent years.

San Diego County used to be a virtual standout in California in fighting—usually successfully—for deficiency appropriations in impact aid, or against amendments that would reduce the funds.

This year the battle has a broader base. Governor Brown, for the first time has spoken against the proposed cutbacks and the State board of education adopted a resolution condemning the reductions.

Part of this increased opposition also is undoubtedly due to a 1965 provision in the law extending impact aid to a number of big cities heretofore exempt.

ARGUMENTS CITED

Los Angeles city schools, eligible for the first time to receive impact aid, now are faced with a reduction of their $3,069,233 entitlement.

Administration arguments for reducing the program are that the money is needed for the war in Vietnam, adverse recommendations in a study conducted for Congress by Stanford Research Institute and a rationale that last year's Elementary and Secondary Education Act can replace impact aid.

The latter of these reasons has been attacked by educators on grounds that impact aid goes into general school funds while Elementary and Secondary Education Act revenues are intended primarily to improve cultural and educational outlooks of children from low-income families.

It is impossible, these educators say, for Elementary and Secondary Education Act money to be used for general support of schools.

REDUCTIONS LISTED

Prepared by the U.S. Office of Education, the following data shows estimated 1967 entitlements to San Diego and Imperial County School Districts under Public Law 874 and what these entitlements would be if the administration's proposed reductions occur.

	Estimate 1967 entitlements	Estimate 1967 entitlements if amendments are approved
Carlsbad Union School District	$76,447	$38,769
Vista Unified School District	485,853	347,358
Fallbrook Union High School District	114,019	72,111
Oceanside-Carlsbad Union High School District	272,628	161,182
San Dieguito Union High School District	32,609	7,267
Encinitas Union School District	22,076	12,676
Alpine Union School District	15,769	6,173
Cardiff School District	14,886	4,362
Grossmont Union High School District	410,164	150,374
Escondido Union School District	122,366	49,799
Escondido Union High School District	83,852	31,864
Solana Beach School District	5,298	0
Rich-Mar Union School District	42,008	20,002
Vallecitos School District	3,532	1,564
Valley Center Union School District	7,064	1,811
Del Mar Union School District	6,686	1,399
Bonsall Union School District	9,713	3,951
Ramona Unified School District	20,462	5,596
Mountain Empire Unified School District	29,508	13,058
Orange Glen School District	14,633	5,021
Palomar Junior College District	31,285	18,161
Jamul-Las Flores Union School District	5,424	2,140
Pauma School District	2,775	329
Julian Union High School District	8,873	3,168
Warner Union School District	6,181	3,046
Oceanside-Carlsbad Junior College District	39,424	25,852
Grossmont Junior College District	49,853	11,110
Julian Union School District	2,523	247
Poway Unified School District	164,648	110,057
Coronado Unified School District	548,191	390,129
Fallbrook Union School District	186,446	99,594
Oceanside Union School District	601,222	326,360
Santee School District	97,262	41,732
Cajon Valley Union School District	172,826	55,231
Lakeside Union School District	50,586	15,557
San Diego Unified School District	5,987,112	3,837,629
Chula Vista City School District	672,380	365,793
National School District	299,606	161,660
South Bay Union School District	503,843	297,392
Sweetwater Union High School District	681,084	608,701
Lemon Grove School District	96,505	40,580
La Mesa-Spring Valley School District	202,644	96,798
San Ysidro School District	9,335	494
Sweetwater Junior College District	81,646	44,868
Seeley Union School District (Imperial)	44,656	24,775
Central Union High School District (Imperial)	32,387	2,795
San Pasqual Valley Unified School District (Imperial)	95,172	68,019

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, we are in the unfortunate position of celebrating the 48th anniversary of Byelorussian independence. I say "unfortunate" because instead of being able to offer our best wishes to a free and independent people, for the present we are only able to commemorate a brief moment in history when a brave people enjoyed a temporary respite from tyranny.

On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian National Council proclaimed an independent republic. The opportunity, after many years of war and oppression, was created by the German occupation of the western portions of the country. Although the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which signified the official peace between the Central Powers and the new Soviet Government, ignored the yearnings of the Byelorussian peoples for their own state, these aspirations were not to be denied after so many years. It was quite evident that other countries were sympathetic to Byelorussia's independence: over a dozen countries accorded de jure recognition, and consulates and legations were set up in a number of foreign capitals. Before the new country, however, could properly defend and establish itself, the Red Army descended upon this hapless people. By the end of 1918, Byelorussia had come under Soviet domination.

Concerned to maintain the pretense that the many subjugated peoples of the Soviet Empire were really "constituent republics," the Soviets allowed the Byelorussian S.S.R., as it was now called, some special status. It was permitted to become a signatory of the United Nations Charter, received separate membership in that organization, and even signed the recent test ban treaty as an individual state. In fact, of course, as we are all aware, such seemingly independent actions are a sham, and the Byelorussian people have been completely subjugated, along with the many, many other peoples which the Soviet Government holds in bondage behind the Iron Curtain.

Because this country is irrevocably devoted to freedom and self-determination for all peoples, it is both fitting and proper that we join with Byelorussians throughout the free world and especially those in our own country in celebrating that brief moment when the flame of freedom burned in their beloved homeland. We rightfully take time to assure the Byelorussian people that their desire for freedom and independence has not been forgotten by those who enjoy these selfsame advantages. It is our devout hope that the day will soon come when all men will enjoy them, and that the Byelorussians will at that time take their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Eyes on Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to read in a recent editorial of the Milwaukee Sentinel that visitors to the Soviet Union had reported that anti-Semitism has not lessened in that country. The editorial calls attention to the opportunity afforded the 23d Communist Party Congress, which opened in Moscow yesterday, to declare a policy of eliminating religious persecution and anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Such action would most certainly command the respect of the world.

I introduced a resolution in the 88th Congress and again in this Congress, expressing the sense of the Congress that the persecution of any person because of his religion in the Soviet Union be condemned, and I was greatly heartened to learn that the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, for the first time, recently approved a resolution condemning anti-Semitism.

The Milwaukee Sentinel editorial follows:

EYES ON SOVIET

The 23d Communist Party Congress, opening Tuesday in Moscow, will be watched to see whether the Soviet party yields to the increasing pressure of world public opinion for an easing of the official anti-Semitism that permeates that nation.

The Soviets boast that governmental restrictions on Jewish religion and culture have been significantly reduced in recent years. They can point to an absence, since the death of Stalin, of the brutal physical oppression and annihilation that marked the depredations of the Nazi era in Germany. Yet the fact remains that sustained governmental repression has driven organized Jewish life in the Soviet Union to the brink of extinction.

Dr. Eric Goldenhagen, director of the Institute of East European Jewish Affairs at Brandeis University, recently forecast that such extinction is a certainty if present policies are continued. The Jewish community in the U.S.S.R. has been denied even a single Jewish school, and the teaching of Hebrew and Yiddish to the young is prohibited by the authorities; in 10 or 15 years, barring a change in official policy, it will be difficult to find within the Soviet Union a man capable of performing a Jewish religious burial, a Jewish wedding or a bar mitzvah.

"The Jews of the Soviet, the second largest community in the world," Dr. Goldenhagen says, "have been reduced by 50 years of Soviet rule to a state of cultural and religious desiccation without parallel among the religious and ethnic minorities of the Soviet Union."

Two Jesuit priests, both editors of the magazine America, recently returned from an interfaith mission to the Soviet Union, have reported that, while there are signs of hope for Christian groups there, Judaism is dying.

Adding to the increasing pressure on the Soviets is a resolution approved recently by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. It condemns religious discrimination and calls upon all nations to eliminate anti-Semitism. This is the first time that a specific condemnation of anti-Semitism was approved by a U.N. commission. Significantly, the Communist bloc abstained from voting. In the past, the bloc has vigorously opposed all resolutions against anti-Semitism.

Whether this absenteeism foreshadows a subtle shift in official Soviet position, it is too soon to say. Certainly the repressions that continue within the Soviet Union do not justify any great hope.

Can the accumulated weight of world denunciation persuade the Soviets to destroy the cancer of religious persecution? If the party congress fails to make even such a declaration of intent, the U.S.S.R. will have forfeited whatever small claim it may still have to the respect of the rest of the world.

Crisis in NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, we have all been concerned in the last week with further alarming evidence that the NATO forces within France must either revert to exclusive French control or be withdrawn beginning by the end of this year, there is now a real and immediate danger that the alliance will suffer a disabling setback.

It serves no purpose at this time for anyone to say "We told you so." But it is true that observers in many places have been warning for some time that if ways of settlement of major alliance problems were not explored, the result would be continued deterioration in relations among the allies. This is obviously what has happened.

Last July, a Republican NATO task force, of which I was a member, made an extensive study of United States-French relations within NATO, and recommended that intiatives be taken by this country to bring about the wider distribution of responsiblities in the alliance which many of our allies desire. Unfortunately, no such initiatives were forthcoming from either side. It seems that the decision of this country was to settle for a long-term stalemate in our differences with the French and to hope that things would not get worse as long as we stood pat.

This strategy has not worked, and now the question is whether steps will be taken to reopen some kind of dialog between the disputants, or whether we want to accept a rump alliance reduced in scope, strength, and geographic area. It is not encouraging that our Government has so far reacted with simply a hold-tight attitude. It would, of course, have been better if initiatives could have been taken when the French were demanding adjustments in the alliance rather than demanding the outright departure of all non-French forces on their territory. But it is my view that we must not act as though it is too late.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in the RECORD a newspaper editorial which makes two very important points. The first is that the difficulties in NATO are the result of more than a temporary misunderstanding. They stem from major changes in the conditions with which the alliance was designed to deal—changes which now require a realistic facing-up.

The second point is that in these new conditions, a vigorous Atlantic alliance is still just as necessary and just as vital to our security as it was in 1949. This great overriding interest deserves our best efforts and our most urgent attention.

The editorial follows:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Mar. 3, 1966]

A NATO OVERHAUL

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, conceived as a shield for Western European nations against Soviet aggressiveness, has served well. Western Europe has, in fact, become generally strong and prosperous. However, with this progress has come a tendency to take the Russian threat less seriously.

At the same time, the point of most critical East-West confrontation has shifted from Berlin to Saigon, and NATO's European members are just not interested in Communist danger that far away.

Thus, prosperity and a changing cold war frontline have taken from NATO the imperative quality that gave it its greatest strength and cohesiveness. The latest sign of this is Washington's announcement that the United States and 13 other members of the alliance will carry on regretfully without France if President de Gaulle withdraws from the integrated military commands.

Significantly, the administration statement coincided with publication of a congressional staff report suggesting that the war in Vietnam had distracted the Government from important questions awaiting resolution in the Western alliance.

The report was prepared for and issued by Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Distilled from testimony and research, it will form the basis of much-needed hearings on alliance problems this spring.

Hopefully, at these forthcoming sessions there will emerge the framework of a stronger NATO, made thus by official recognition among the members of the great changes, within and without, since its inception. Among these are the development of the Polaris missile; the altered role of the conventional weapon in the nuclear age; the status of the land army since World War II, and Russian failures in food production and heavy industry.

In addition, there ought to be a NATO examination of the Moscow-Peiping schism and an evaluation of the alliance's responsibility to resist communism on a broader basis. It is ridiculous to believe that Red aggression in Asia is something only the United States should worry about.

There ought to be new efforts to develop agreement in NATO on policies, including nonmilitary, toward the Soviet Union; simplification of the military command structure and a more equitable sharing of the costs of allied defense. At the moment, there is a reasonable U.S. tendency to suggest that if Europe isn't worrying about its defense, perhaps we shouldn't. If applied, such a philosophy would at least make American troops now in Europe available for duty in Vietnam.

Washington is unlikely to take such a stand, since NATO brought up to date is as much needed now as it was in the wake of World War II. Further, if the alliance will face the realities of today's "cold war," there is a task of mutual building and security to be performed fully as important as that of the fourties.

Jim Patton, Head of National Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join in salute to James G. Patton upon the completion of a quarter century as head of the National Farmers Union. His dedication, spirit and leadership has done much for the farmer.

In this connection, I think all of us who have grown to know and respect Jim Patton will find the attached article from the Denver Post of March 13, 1966, of interest and inspiration. The article is herewith attached, in full:

JIM PATTON, HAPPY HELL-RAISER

(By Olga Curtis)

The president of the National Farmers Union, after 25 years of fighting for social reforms, is "retiring" so he can agitate harder than ever for his pet ideas.

Tomorrow night in the ballroom of the Denver Hilton Hotel, a thousand delegates to the National Farmers Union convention will listen intently when a big, white-haired man with a dramatic black patch over one eye makes his "farewell address."

In a rumbling pipe organ baritone, the speaker will review some of the social reforms he's helped achieve in the past quarter century, shake the microphone with demands for the reforms he believes America still needs, and wind up with a promise: "I intend to continue the fight."

And that, as every person in the audience will know, is for sure.

James George Patton of Denver may be stepping down as president of the Farmers Union at age 63, but he won't retire as a fighter for liberal ideas.

"I've been a hell-raiser all my life and I intend to go on raising hell," he says. "I'm quitting as president of the Farmers Union because we've won our major objectives and it's time to let a younger man step in.

"But I'm not going to be tied down playing golf or listening to a lot of conservative old buzzards. I'm going to be out agitating for my ideas. I've got 7 or 8 years left when I can still hit the ball, and I'm sure going to use them. I'll stir up so much trouble for my ideas nobody's going to be comfortable—and that includes the Farmers Union."

From a man who looks like the Hollywood stereotype of a kindly, wise old senator, those are strong words—and they were a lot stronger the way Patton actually said them. The acknowledged dean of farm spokesmen in the United States has hobnobbed with presidents and politicians half his life—and still talks like he's with the boys out back of the barn.

"I'll tell you anything," he announced in the first minutes of this Empire interview. "After all the congressional committees I've faced, nothing embarrasses me.

"But don't you go writing a lot of plosh. I don't want any of the usual bull. I learned early you don't get anything done by brownnosing. You have to stand up and say dammit, this is what I believe. So you just tell them the truth about me."

The truth about Jim ("Don't call me James—it makes me feel like the butler") Patton makes quite a yarn. It is the success story of a Colorado farm boy who fought his way from a "flinty old farm with a two-hole outhouse" to a $50,000 Denver condominium apartment with two wallpapered bathrooms. It is also the success story of a "ragtail, low-ebb, negative" group of farmers which grew into one of the most influential and richest farm organizations in the country today—with an astounding list of legislation successfully lobbied for, and assets of more than $42 million.

Jim Patton and the Farmers Union seem to have been meant for each other. They were born a few months apart.

The National Farmers Union, the popular name for what is still technically the Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, was organized by a handful of farmers at Point, Tex., September 2, 1902.

AN ORNERY BOY ON THE FARM

Jim Patton was born at Bazar, Kans., November 8, 1902. He was the only son of an itinerant farmer who was considered quite a liberal in his day.

"My father had me passing out pamphlets at union organizing meetings when I was a kid, and he talked a lot about working conditions, and I suppose it left an impression," says Patton. "He was the kind of man who always thought the grass was greener over the hill, so I saw a lot of places when I was growing up."

The Patton family moved to Colorado when Jim was 2. By the time he was ready for high school, the family had bounced from Aguilar to Newcastle, from Newcastle to Nucla, back to Newcastle, and then to Montrose.

Patton lists only Nucla in official biographies; to him this cooperative farmers colony in southwest Colorado was "home."

"We farmed 160 acres—and I often wonder what kind of a farmer I would have made if I had stuck with it. I liked the orchards, I liked riding, I liked spraying, and I liked haying. But I sure didn't like irrigating or cleaning ditches or digging postholes. And I plain detested milking and cleaning out the barn."

Young Patton's farmhood days earned him a reputation as "an ornery boy." He says with a grin:

"I sure was full of vinegar. If I wasn't after the chickens with a slingshot, I was trying to make the horses buck or roping the girls on the way to school. I used to get thrashed regular, but I guess I enjoyed trouble. By nature I'm an agitator. I always did like to stir things up."

Oddly enough, this "ornery boy" agitated most vigorously for an education. He talked his parents into sending him to a "big" high school in Grand Junction.

"I worked my way through by milking cows and mowing the lawn and going to church regular. I had room and board with a well-known Baptist preacher, Rev. J. M. P. Martin, and he encouraged me a great deal. I won debating honors, and was an officer in every class, and even earned a teaching certificate—you could get them in high school in those days—although I was the only boy among 30 girls in that teachers' training class."

Patton, who says "I used to be shy of girls," credits sheer obstinacy for carrying him through to the teaching certificate. One recollection of his high school days is a tipoff to the "here's where I make my stand" firmness that marked his Farmers Union career.

"I like to plot ahead," he says, "so in my junior year I decided exactly what shoes I'd buy for my graduation. They were pretty slick tan shoes with high sides, and I saved up my money and bought them out of a catalog. But my feet grew so much in a year's time that putting those shoes on was agony. I wouldn't wear others though, not after all the beets I thinned to earn them. I stood in those tight tan shoes all graduation day and waited until it was dark before taking them off so nobody would see me sneaking home barefoot."

Patton was planning to attend the University of Colorado but his father's death canceled that. The 19-year-old boy found himself the sole financial support of his mother and three younger sisters. He got a job as a teacher at a one-room country school, Mountain View, 7 miles from Nucla.

Most of the students were boys, as old as the teacher, from two feuding families. Their brawls had chased out five different teachers in 1 year. Patton solved the problem with a pair of boxing gloves and a willow switch.

"The first time they started a brawl, I handed them the boxing gloves and told them they could have all the fighting they wanted. Every time they stopped, I whipped them back into action with the willow switch. We never had another brawl on the school grounds."

This episode earned Patton the title of "best schoolmarm" in the area, and he soon found better jobs, first at Grand Valley, and then as teacher and athletic coach at Eckert, Colo.

"I loved teaching," he says. "I'd have stayed in it if there was any compensation. Maybe that's why I love my Farmers Union work. It's been a combination of teaching and organizing and politicking."

In Eckert, Patton found a new reason for ambition. Her name was Velma Fouse, and she was the 95-pound, 5-foot schoolteacher daughter of an Eckert farmer. Curly-haired, 195-pound, 6-foot-1 Jim Patton went head over heels in love.

To finance his matrimonial plans, and his family obligations, Patton went to teach in Eureka, Nev., for the then fabulous salary—in 1924—of $1,800 a year. On June 18, 1925, he and Velma were married at Palisade, Colo., and they returned to Eureka in the fall.

After 41 years of marriage Jim Patton still calls his wife pet names, says "I don't know what I would have been without Velma," and admits she's the only person who can make him do things he doesn't want to do.

"She's even made me wear long ties," he growls, "and I like bow ties because they don't get in my soup."

With a family on the way, Patton began to look for a better paying career.

"I knew too many Phi Beta Kappas, at 50, stuck in small teaching jobs, while a lot of ex-football players wound up heading big business," he says. "I decided to go back to college and then go into business."

He enrolled in Western State College at Gunnison, where he had taken some summer courses, paying his way by working as assistant business manager for the school. But he quit before earning his B.A. when offered what seemed to be a good job as a typewriter salesman in Denver.

The year was 1929. After the stock market crash, even good typewriter salesmen on commission found the going rough. Patton grabbed a job offered by an insurance company on the recommendation of Western State officials, and suddenly found himself working for the Colorado Farmers Union.

It was, he admits, a case of the right man being ready when the right opportunity came by.

"The CFU was involved with the insurance company because it had a mutual benefit burial society—the sort of arrangement where if anybody died you sent out a notice and the members each sent in $1 to help bury the guy. I told the CFU they ought to get up their own company, and they offered me $60 a month to do just that."

Patton did. He turn the CFU's little burial society into a stock life insurance company, and in so doing became secretary of the CFU.

"That practically made me the Colorado Farmers Union," he says. "The secretary ran the whole show. And the farmers began to talk about me. I don't think it was just the insurance company. I couldn't help organizing and politicking and I was always down at the Statehouse lobbying for things helpful to farmers. There were maybe 2,000 members in the CFU then, and they had never felt important before. I gave them a political voice."

By 1936, Jim Patton was a director of the National Farmers Union, with which CFU was affiliated. By 1940, he was National Farmers Union president.

When elected, he was just 12 days past his 38th birthday—the youngest man ever to hold the presidency of the NFU. For both Patton and the organization, his election was a major turning point.

The NFU at the time was running a feeble third to the Farm Bureau and the Grange. NFU was a loose organization of State farmer's unions, with only 78,000 middle-income farm families as members, 15 employees and an annual budget of $25,000—which exactly matched its income. There was no headquarters; the national board met wherever the president happened to live.

Jim Patton lived in Denver, and he planted the NFU in the Mile High city permanently.

Within a year of his election, he had nationalized the life insurance company begun for CFU, built a small two-story NFU headquarters on the northeast outskirts of Denver (which was criticized vigorously at the time as "bigger than anything we'll ever need") and pulled the NFU together into a single political voice.

He had also turned down a chance to leave his $6,750 job with the NFU to try for public office.

"I was already very much mixed up in politics," Patton explains. "I was working for Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal before the phrase became popular. I was one of 'Costigan's Crowd'—a protege of Colorado's Democratic Senator Edwin P. Costigan—and it was pretty obvious that I could deliver some votes.

TURNED DOWN POLITICAL BIDS

"When I won the NFU presidency, there was pressure on me to run for office. I was offered every candidacy from State senator to Colorado Governor to U.S. Senator. I turned them all down.

"Sure, I wanted a chance to wield influence, to have power and status, but the Farmers Union gave me all that. Let's be honest—I didn't want to be king, I wanted to be kingmaker—and I've helped make quite a few.

"There's more power behind the throne than there is in front. I might have been U.S. Senator—one man with one vote—but this way I could influence 20 senators."

Patton also was, and is, a liberal, an idealist and a firm believer in man's ability to build a better world. When talking about his ideas and his plans for social reform, his body tenses, his good right eye flashes blue, and his hands clench as if he's got somebody's neck in them.

"I wanted to be a part in shaping a positive future—and I knew I could with the Farmers Union. Farmers are individuals, the most open, friendly people on earth. And they gave me what you can't buy—absolute freedom of speech. I've always been able to say exactly what I've wanted to say on this job—even when they thought I was crazy. No member of the Farmers Union has ever called me in and said, 'Watch the image, boy.' "

Patton believes his support from the Farmers Union—which reelected him to office unanimously 15 times—stemmed as much from his audacity as a leader as what he stood for. He made news from the moment he took office, was named to one government committee after another, and cheerfully fought anybody and everybody who didn't agree with what Jim Patton thought was good for the Farmers Union, and the United States.

"My concept of leadership is to pitch out your ideas and then go fight for them. You've got to be out ahead of the group or you don't lead. Sometimes I picked the wrong fights, but I sure was in a lot of the right fights. And that gave the Farmers Union status.

"Every member suddenly knew he had a leader who was in the papers, and so was the organization. For a ragtail outfit, that was impressive. I think the members loved the secondhand thrill of having me going around Washington calling big people by their first names, because they accepted the responsibility of defending their crazy leader.

"Whenever I was attacked, they fought too."

The worst attack Patton and his Farmers Union ever beat off came in the mid-40's when a congressional subcommittee accused the group of Communist ties. Patton, who was the only farm leader to give unequivocal support to the New Deal and aline his group with organized labor, vehemently denies Communist leanings.

"The smear started because of my strong conviction that farmers had to work closely with organized labor, and that was in the days when the CIO was a dirty word," he says.

"I am not now, and never have been a Communist, though they called me that. Hell, they've called me everything you can think of, including Fascist and Socialist. I'm not a Socialist, I'm a social reformer.

"I'm a total defender of the dignity and right of the individual as long as he does not claim that his right includes the right to interfere with the lives of others. Today, some people who disagree with a conservative call him a John Bircher, and that's just as bad as calling a liberal a Communist. How do you define either a conservative or a liberal, except by what they want to do?

"But let's clean the plow. I'm not a Communist or a Socialist or an anarchist. I'm a registered Democrat."

Patton doesn't like to be called a Democratic politician, however. He says:

"I'm an agricultural politician. I play with the Democrats because the Republicans have turned their back on the American farmer, and my job is to protect and represent the American farmer."

From the beginning, Patton did his "job" on two levels, financial and political.

In 1945 he created the National Farmers Union Service Corp., a private stock company, to run the expanding NFU insurance business. Today the NFU has both the life insurance company, with $193 million worth of policies, and an auto insurance firm with assets of nearly $13 million. NFU also owns half of a $33 million potash company in New Mexico, has an oil exploring unit, and runs a travel agency.

POOR FOLKS AREN'T ORGANIZED

Critics have from time to time pointed out that for a nonprofit general farm organization officially dedicated "to achieving parity of income for family farm agriculture," NFU looks a lot like big business.

"To do anything, you have to have financial muscle," Patton replies. "I've been poor, and I didn't see anything blessed about it.

"Sure, we're not poor folks, and for good reason. Poor folks aren't organized."

The affluence of the NFU, which today has 750,000 members in 44 States, 416 employees and a $2,692,000 payroll, is visible from any part of downtown Denver. (NFU now figures it is second only to the Farm Bureau Federation.) In 1955, the NFU opened its present imposing headquarters at 1575 Sherman Street, a massive beige and green 10-story building topped by a tower which flashes weather forecasts in color: green for fair, white for unsettled and red for stormy.

Patton's richly green-carpeted office is on the ninth floor. He also has an office at the NFU building in Washington, D.C. But he's seldom at either place, because for 25 years he has traveled almost constantly.

"I used to average half a million miles a year, but I'm slowing down. Nowadays I only do about 150,000 miles a year," he says. "As national president I had to travel to keep up with the members. Sometimes I'd make 10 or 12 speeches a week in different cities. Even now, I figure I'm sedentary if I only make three speeches a week.

"I always felt like a traveling circus. Everybody would enjoy my show and then go home and sleep for a week, but I had to pack up my tent and rush to put on a performance in another town."

Patton likes the speeches more than the dinners that go with them. He says:

"I've eaten more chicken croquettes, turkey, and ham than any man alive. I just can't face ham and raisin sauce any more."

When he eats out privately, he always orders the same thing: steak, rare.

Patton estimates he's uttered a billion words or so both on behalf of his NFU and for the U.S. Government. "I sometimes wonder what in the world I can say next," he admits, but his multiple activities keep providing him with subjects.

At the end of 1965, Patton was a member of 28 committees of national stature in addition to being president of the NFU and president of both NFU insurance companies. He was active in such divergent groups as the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, the American Council of Race Relations, CARE, and the Freedom from Hunger Foundation.

His achievements are just as divergent, and Patton is proudest personally of contributing to three:

The Employment Act of 1946, which cites the right of every person to job opportunity; U.S. Public Law 480, better known as the Food for Peace plan of 1954, and the founding of the World Food program of the United Nations in 1961.

He lobbied for these exactly as he lobbied for 90 percent parity, school lunch programs, and the Agriculture Bill of 1965 which he thinks is the "best farm bill ever."

"I don't bull anybody," he says, and there's a favorite NFU story about his nonconformist diplomacy that sums up Patton's blunt barnyard approach.

In 1945, Patton was asked to visit Mexico City as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Chapultepec conference on war and peace. Nelson Rockefeller, who was then assistant secretary of State in Charge of Latin American affairs, advised Patton to take his dress clothes.

Patton, who thinks a blue suit and suspenders is formal enough for any occasion, recoiled.

"If it means I have to buy striped pants, I'm not going," he announced. And when he finally did go, he didn't wear striped pants.

These days, Patton laughs about the episode, saying: "I was young and pecky then." He owns a tuxedo but he won't wear it for NFU functions, even tomorrow night's farewell appearance as president.

He is retiring officially only as president of the NFU. Under a contract that runs until December 1967, he will continue working as president of the NFU insurance companies. Since 1955, his salary has been $25,000 a year, paid by the three companies he headed on a prorated basis. He will continue to draw $25,000 until 1968, but after that his pension will be only 30 percent of his former salary, or $7,500 a year.

This is an amazingly small salary, by business standards, for a man who brought the NFU from nowhere to more than $42 million in assets in 25 years. Patton, who has been able to live comfortably thanks to shrewd land investments, buying real estate on the Denver city limits and selling off small parcels as the city grew, shrugs and says:

"I could have made a lot of money, probably millions. I've been offered a lot more by other concerns. And if I was a crook I sure could have made it. Time after time I knew about impending changes in commodity prices, but I've never owned a bushel of wheat or a bushel of corn that I didn't grow myself.

"I never cared about making money. I was having too much fun. If you count compensation in terms of doing what I wanted to do, I've been a very rich man. I've been able to get into so many good fights and hatch up so many good ideas."

Patton doesn't talk much about his personal fight against cancer, which lost him his left eye 20 years ago. If you ask him why he wears an eye patch, he says casually:

"Oh, they took my eye out in '46. Melanoma. I used to wear a false eye, but my eye socket became infected, so I've worn the patch for about 5 years."

He's equally casual about some scars on his right hand.

"Had a malignancy about a year ago," he says. "Skin cancer."

HE'LL AGITATE FOR PEACE

The disease admittedly helped him make up his mind to retire, only Patton's idea of retirement involves more action than most men of 30 undertake.

Patton talks about relaxing with his family and spending more time with his daughter, Patti, who lives with her doctor husband and five children in Greenwich, N.Y., or with his son, Robert, a real estate dealer with three children in Tucson, Ariz.

But even his wife doesn't believe it. "I don't think he'll ever really slow down," she noted while Patton was insisting he was going to take things easy. A few sentences later, he confirmed her prediction by exclaiming:

"I'm going to have even more fun after leaving my job. Just wait till I blast them with some of my better ideas. There's so much I want to get across.

"First, I'm going to work very hard for a guaranteed annual income for every American.

"Second, we have to change the perspective of the American people in relation to war and peace. If we can spend $58 billion a year for the military, to destroy mankind, we sure can spend $10 billion to see how we might save mankind. We've got to reduce the military budget. All this talk about how the United States can have guns and butter too reminds me of the butcher who claimed his hamburger was half and half—one horse and one rabbit. That's what the Great Society reminds me of, with less than a billion for social services compared to $58 billion for the military.

"I believe peace is a condition of mind—and we won't have it until mankind changes its psychological thinking and turns hate into love. Let's face it—the organized society of human beings is probably the most stinking society you can think of. Why even a pig will only dirty in one corner, but human beings mess up the world.

"Love of people is the most vital thing in life—and the only way we'll ever have peace in the world. I'm sure going to try to get that idea across. In my years with the Farmers Union, I've met thousands of people, and I know some 10,000 of them by name.

"I'm a fighter, but I learned one thing—it's wiser to make friends, to love people.

"And it's also good politics."

Whose Choice of Weapons?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

WHOSE CHOICE OF WEAPONS?

(By Ira C. Eaker)

(NOTE.—Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, U.S. Air Force (retired), writes occasionally for the Times.)

I have decried the fact that military men no longer have the prime voice in the selection of their weapons. Many readers have expressed surprise. "Who does select the weapons?" these concerned citizens ask.

The responsibility for weapons selection, under our system of Government, rests with the President as Commander in Chief, subject only to the consent of the Congress which provides the money.

Needed now therefore is a review of the process by which the President exercises or delegates the authority to select military hardware.

During World War II, President Roosevelt generally followed the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretaries of War and Navy on weapons types and quantities, although he showed a lively interest and concern particularly about naval armaments.

Following the war, both Presidents Truman and Eisenhower relied largely upon military advice as to weapons types, but each, through his budget director, controlled weapons quantities needed to meet his estimates of the current world situation and the state of the national economy.

After World War II, with the necessary introduction of nuclear weapons and the increasing technological complexity of all new weapons, a group called scientific advisers began to appear at all levels in the weapons selection process. Invited originally to be advisers only, this group now appears to exercise the primary influence upon weapons selection.

Presently, under the McNamara system, the vital function formerly played by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their weapons systems evaluation group has been largely taken over by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Analysis.

Here a group of several hundred young professors, scientists, and engineers, generally without military experience, receive, evaluate, approve, alter, or disapprove the requests of the Chiefs of the armed services for the weapons the services want for the accomplishment of their assigned missions.

The Secretaries and the Chiefs of Staff of the three services can, of course, appeal to the Secretary of Defense if they wish. This right of appeal does not appear to have been very successful, since weapons urgently requested by each of the Chiefs of Staff, and in some cases by all of them, have been denied or postponed for years.

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have supported Secretary McNamara and his present system. The Congress, although disagreeing with the Defense Secretary on many of his weapons decisions, has not to date been able to alter the system. In several instances Congress appropriated funds for weapons, like the new bomber, which the Secretary of Defense refused to spend.

The fantastic cost of current weapons systems does obviously necessitate tight budget controls. No one questions the right and duty of the Commander in Chief and his defense chief to decide upon the quantities of weapons required to support our foreign policy. What is criticized, and I believe fairly, is the failure to provide the types of weapons the men who must fight the battles want and need for the accomplishment of their dangerous missions.

Memorial Asks National Recreation and Wilderness Area for Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a joint memorial passed by the Idaho State Legislature in which the legislature asks the National Congress to enact the necessary legislation to authorize the establishment of the Sawtooth Mountains National Recreation Area and Wilderness—a multiple-use area under the administration of the Forest Service.

Mr. Speaker, this joint memorial truly reflects the thinking of the people in my State of Idaho. In a poll I recently conducted, over 63 percent of those responding favored such use. It is also my opinion that such a national recreation area would provide for maximum use by the people of Idaho and the other 49 States in such a way as to preserve its natural beauties for posterity.

The joint memorial follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the sovereign State of Idaho, hereby respectfully represent that:

Whereas the Congress of the United States will have before it, in the near future, proposed legislation affecting future management of the present Sawtooth Primitive Area and adjacent property; and

Whereas this is a region of incomparable scenic beauty and attractiveness and should be protected for the enjoyment and use of the people for all time to come; and

Whereas there is a growing need and urgency to provide adequate facilities for the public for maximum use and enjoyment of the area and accordingly an urgency for a permanent plan and policy; and

Whereas the proposed national recreation area will provide for multiple use of the area to the extent that this is practicable—for example, permitting grazing and timber management where feasible; and

Whereas a national recreation area would permit continued management of fish and game by the Idaho Fish and Game Department; and

Whereas this area has been ably administered by the U.S. Forest Service for the past 61 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact the necessary legislation to authorize, the establishment of the Sawtooth Mountains National Recreation Area and Wilderness; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

DRYDEN M. HILER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Education in South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION ON EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA, PRESENTED TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, MARCH 30, 1966

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is a great honor to be invited to testify before this committee during these most important hearings. I hope the evidence which we bring this afternoon will make it clear to you why the United States National Student Association has for many years opposed the cruel practice of apartheid in South Africa, and has advocated action by the U.S. Government to curtail America's tacit cooperation with that system.

I am Charles Goldmark, international affairs vice president of the U.S. National

Student Association (USNSA). I am a graduate of Reed College and will be entering Yale Law School in the fall. With me here today is Gilbert Kulick, special assistant for African student affairs for USNSA. Mr. Kulick is a graduate of the University of Texas and holds an M.A. in African studies from UCLA.

USNSA, as you may know, is a confederation of student governments of 300 colleges and universities currently enrolling more than 1 million students. At last year's national student congress, the most hotly debated international issue, next to Vietnam, was southern Africa. The resolution adopted by that congress "strongly condemned the practice of apartheid and the deplorable political, educational, cultural, social, and economic conditions existing (for nonwhites) in South Africa."

The American students' opposition to apartheid is the natural extension of their commitment to the ideal of a free university in a free society, both in the United States and abroad. We cannot countenance American cooperation and tacit encouragement of a system such as apartheid which is the very negation of our ideals.

As students we are particularly concerned about the educational system in South Africa. In recent weeks this committee has heard testimony concerning labor conditions, political rights, and the rule of law under apartheid in South Africa. These statements have made it clear that all these institutions have been molded—or perhaps it is correct to say perverted—to insure the maintenance of control by the white minority. Thus it should come as no surprise that education is but another weapon in the arsenal of apartheid.

Before the accession to power of the Nationalist regime, education for nonwhites, though woefully inadequate in both quantitative and qualitative terms, was based on essentially the same philosophy of education as that provided for white children. In fact, the secondary school syllabus for Africans was almost identical to that of whites. Control over curriculum, financing and standards for students and teachers was largely in the hands of the provincial governments. In addition to state schools, much of African education was conducted by the missions which generally maintained higher standards than the state schools.

However, with the advent of apartheid, the educational system underwent radical changes. In 1954 the then Minister of Native Affairs, Dr. Verwoerd, told the South African Parliament, "The previous system of education has blindly produced pupils trained on a European model, thus creating the vain hope among the Bantu that they could occupy posts within the European community despite the country's policy of apartheid."

Subsequently, the South African Parliament enacted the Bantu Education Act of 1954. Under this law, as amended, the control over all aspects of Bantu education was transferred to the Central Government under a Ministry of Bantu Education. All Bantu schools had to be registered annually with the Minister and renewal is granted only at his discretion.

Also under this law, mission schools and teacher training colleges were deprived of state aid unless they complied with Government intentions. Some closed rather than comply. Others attempted to retain control with reduced subsidies or no subsidies at all, and all have now fallen under effective control of the Bantu education department.

Our long and careful study of Bantu education has led us to the following conclusions as to its true nature and intent.

1. Operating behind a carefully constructed facade, the fundamental purpose of Bantu education is to indoctrinate nonwhites into acceptance of apartheid and to their docile and subservient role within it.

2. A secondary purpose of Bantu education is to foster a narrow racial and tribal chauvinism which will create barriers between different nonwhite groups and preclude communication and cooperation against white supremacy.

3. Finally, whatever the ulterior motive, Bantu education is so thinly spread and so poorly financed, that its effect is to produce masses of barely literate, unskilled or semiskilled workers fit only for arduous manual labor in South Africa's mines and industry.

I would now like to deal with these propositions in somewhat greater detail.

1. That Bantu education promotes the uncritical acceptance of apartheid and that apartheid postulates an inferior role for the African has been frankly stated by Dr. Verwoerd himself. "Native education should be controlled in such a way that it should be in accord with the policy of the state * * *. Good racial relations cannot exist when the education is given under the control of people who create wrong expectations on the part of the native himself * * *. Education must train and teach people in accordance with their opportunities in life, according to the sphere in which they live * * *. The Bantu must be guided to serve his own community in all respects. There is no place for him in the European community above the level of certain forms of labor." Mr. Chairman, we need not wait a hundred years for Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World." It exists in the old world of South Africa today.

Of course the Government insists that within their "own areas" the Bantustans' opportunities for advancement will be unlimited. But the Bantustan fraud has been sufficiently exposed before this committee to merit no further discussion here.

2. Our second conclusion, as you will remember, was that apartheid attempts in sinister fashion to divide the nonwhite South African groups. A consistent theme in the ideology of apartheid is the distinctiveness and separateness of the various Bantu people.

Along these lines, a recent half-page ad in the Washington Post stated, "The Bantu nations are quite as different one from another as are the nations of Europe—and just as intent on preserving their separate identities." This, Mr. Chairman, is a piece of wishful thinking. The fact is that the entire trend in South Africa has been toward detribalization and urbanization. Among urban Africans intermarriage between ethnic groups is almost the rule rather than the exception. Moreover, Western cultural values have profoundly influenced the lives of Africans.

Thus, Bantu education is but one element in the machine designed to arrest the process of westernization among nonwhites which white South Africa perceives to threaten its existence. As a direct consequence of these measures the use of tribal languages in African schools is now mandatory by the South African Government. Formerly used only through the fourth grade, African languages are today the primary medium of instruction through high school, and attempts are being made to impose them on the college level as well. (Opposition to these practices is not based on a lack of respect by Africans for their own culture, but rather on their recognition of the inadequacy of these languages for modern educational purposes, and the absence of sizable body of written literature in them.) In addition, learning of the official European languages of South Africa—English and Afrikaans—is firmly discouraged.

Not only is this system designed to foster a sense of "apartness" from white society, but also to divide one African group from another by depriving them of a common tongue and creating chauvinism and antagonism between the groups. In short, it is a modern application of the ancient tactic of "divide and rule."

3. In our third proposition we find the greatest example of hypocrisy on the part of the South African Government, for even if the foregoing facts about the rationale behind Bantu education did not obtain, it would stand condemned by its sheer inadequacy. A few facts and figures will demonstrate this.

In 1954, the South African Government pegged its contributions to African education—exclusive of universities—at 13 million rand, roughly $18.2 million (one rand equals $1.40). They have consistently refused to raise this amount despite the fact that the number of pupils has increased by over 700,000.

Over and above the contributions from general revenue, costs of Bantu education are borne directly by the Africans themselves. Africans have been encouraged to divert money for the feeding of schoolchildren and the building of classrooms to pay teachers' salaries. Africans—but not Europeans—must pay a compulsory annual fee of R4 for secondary education. Africans must pay for most textbooks and supplies. The minimum estimated cost to parents of keeping an African child in the last 2 years of secondary school alone is R70. Mr. Chairman, the average per capita income of nonwhites in South Africa is only 73 rands.

Despite all these measures, the annual per-pupil expenditures in 1964 were approximately R120 for whites and R13 for Africans. Per-pupil expenditures for Africans have declined almost every year since Bantu education was introduced in 1954. In that year the figure was R17.08. With such a discrepancy in expenditures, the drastic inferiority of Bantu education is inescapable.

However, in the face of these woeful inadequacies the South African Government still like to boast of the high percentage of African children enrolled in school. What it fails to point out is that 96.6 percent of all African schoolchildren are in the primary grades (the comparable figure for white children is 58.5 percent). Fully half of the nonwhite pupils leave by the end of the fourth grade, and one should remember that in the United States a sixth-grade education is commonly equated with literacy. Only 1 student in 200 finishes high school and of these less than 30 percent qualify for college entrance.

Up to this point I have dealt only with primary and secondary education. Most of what has been said about the theory and practice of Bantu education can be applied to higher education as well, so there is no need to burden you further with statistics. I would, however, like to give a brief account of the imposition of apartheid on South African universities.

Of the eight major universities in South Africa, four use Afrikaans as the medium of instruction. These universities have traditionally been the fountainheads of Afrikaner nationalism and hence never presented any problem to the Government in the implementation of apartheid. The English-medium universities, by contrast, have generally recognized the internal contradiction of "the pursuit of truth" in a university which runs on a segregated basis. Historically, two of these—the Universities of Capetown and the Witwatersrand—had been "open" universities; that is, they admitted students of all races without discrimination. A third—the University of Natal—admitted non-Europeans who attended separate classes but shared the same faculty and course content.

In 1959, it was decided—over the almost unanimous opposition of the South African academic community and the usually acquiescent parliamentary opposition—to "close" the open universities. According to the provisions of the Extension of University Education Act, the Government was empowered to set dates after which nonwhites would be barred from enrolling in the open universities. Without written permission which could be granted under certain conditions, any nonwhite student who enrolled in a white university could be punished under the law.

The act further provided for the establishment of colleges for nonwhites including a college for colored students, a college for Indians, and three tribal colleges for Africans. At these institutions the Government exercises complete control over staff appointments and dismissals as well as over all phases of student life. To the greatest extent possible, instruction will take place at the Bantu colleges in the native languages. The lack of autonomy and the terms of the code of discipline preclude the critical thinking that is the basis of a true university education. In point of fact, the nonwhite colleges are merely an extension of the system of Bantu education which I described earler. In such a setting, terms such as academic freedom are meaningless.

While seemingly impossible, South Africa has been even more lacking in the case of its mandated territory. No universities exist in South West Africa and to the best of my knowledge, there are very few places available in the South African tribal colleges for students from South West Africa.

It is not just at the nonwhite colleges that academic freedom and university autonomy have been infringed. With the extension of the University Education Act the Nationalist regime violated the autonomy of the English-medium universities for the first time. The attempts to impose apartheid on these universities have been vigorously resisted by administration and students alike, and this has led to a running battle between the South African Government and the English-medium universities. On several occasions university professors have been banned under the arbitrary "Supression of Communism Act." A "banned" person is forbidden to attend public meetings and, in the case of a professor, summarily deprived of his position.

More recently the Minister of Education, Senator J. de Klerk, attacked a "conspiracy" to frustrate the Government's policy in which nonwhite, mainly colored, students were encouraged to select courses not offered at the nonwhite universities. They then sought exemptions to enter the white universities to study these courses, thus creating, in the Minister's words, "an artificial multiracialism * * * at the English-language universities." The Minister announced his intention to introduce legislation in the next session of parliament to make it more difficult for nonwhites to obtain exemptions.

Just today we received a notice from South Africa that the Student Council at Capetown University is under heavy Government attack because of its refusal—in keeping with its tradition of nonracialism—to recognize a student group which restricts its membership to whites only. Once again Government reprisals have been threatened.

In the forefront of the struggle against apartheid in the universities has been USNSA's counterpart organization, the National Union of South African Students (NUSAS). NUSAS's commitment to nonracialism and academic freedom has withstood constant harassment by the Government, the planting of informants, raids by the secret police, and personal diatribes by the Minister of Justice, Mr. Vorster, who has attacked NUSAS's leadership as "the offsprings of snakes."

Despite the fact that the nonwhite universities are prohibited by the government from affiliating, NUSAS has fought to keep open the ever-narrowing channels of communication between white and nonwhite. Each year they hold a day of affirmation to reaffirm their commitment to academic and human freedom. Their invitation to Senator ROBERT KENNEDY to address them on the day of affirmation this year has, in the opinion of an influential Afrikaans newspaper "overstepped the privileges of free speech and association in a free country. And if authority takes action, as it must, the one responsible is not the one who takes action, but the one who provokes it." The extent to which apartheid warps conceptions of freedom is clearly revealed in this incredible statement. We can only hope that the action referred to does not result in the demise of this valiant organization, though reasons for pessimism are great.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to address myself directly to the issue which brought these hearings about—the problem of U.S. policy toward South Africa. Although our association has advocated sweeping changes in that policy, I will confine my recommendations to those having to do with education for South Africans.

Because of the virtual impossibility of Africans receiving an adequate education within South Africa, and because of the physical persecution of those who try to do so hundreds of young Africans have fled from South Africa and South-West Africa to seek an education. Many of them have come to the United States, along with refugees from tyranny in the rest of southern Africa, under the special African student program which was inaugurated by the Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs of the Department of State. This program is, in my opinion, the most constructive and meaningful way in which the United States is at present giving substance to its verbal commitment to self-determination in southern Africa. I am certain that many of the participants in the special African student program will be among the leaders of their countries in the not-too-distant future.

However, there is far greater need than can be met by the present program, which involves some 400 students. While we should not be motivated solely by considerations such as these it should be noted that many times this number of students are receiving training in the Soviet Union, China, and the Communist world.

We would like to recommend that:

1. The special African student program be enlarged to at least twice its present size so as to make a significant contribution to the body of educated African leadership in South Africa and South-West Africa and in the rest of southern Africa.

There is, perhaps, an even larger group of refugees who have not attained college entrance, but who nevertheless could learn a skilled trade by working in the United States for several years. At present, such people encounter great obstacles and redtape in seeking employment in the United States, largely because of their statelessness. Therefore we recommend:

2. That special arrangements be made to enable refugees from apartheid, who wish to learn or grain practical experience in their trade or profession, to immigrate to the United States on a temporary basis. The full cooperation of the Department of Labor should be enlisted in this program. Further, this privilege should be extended to South Africans currently studying in the United States in the event that they are unable to find employment elsewhere in Africa, for they are almost certain to face persecution and imprisonment should they return to South Africa.

Finally, we recommend that:

3. The U.S. representatives to the United Nations explore the possibility of further American support for the U.N. scholarship trust funds for South Africans and South-West Africans. We must not falter in our efforts to build an educated and capable leadership for the nonracial South Africa of the—hopefully—not-too-distant future.

These three recommendations, Mr. Chairman, if implemented would go far toward removing the tarnished image of the United States among the majority of nonwhites in South Africa. Such positive and constructive action would be tangible evidence of what I believe is America's firm opposition to the principles of apartheid. Failure to take these and other actions against apartheid would be a negation of the very principles on which our country was founded and a denial of the principle of self-determination which the United States has long sought to uphold.

Rights of Majorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, the Johnson County News, in my district, carried an editorial which I believe accurately points out a dangerous trend in our country today. We as individuals tend to neglect our responsibilities as citizens of this great country of ours, and leave action to those of a small but vocal minority who are attempting to destroy the very foundations that have made this country so strong and so free.

I call this article not only to the attention of my colleagues, but also to others who as citizens are concerned as I am:

A SIGN OF OUR TIMES

We can get mighty excited these days over some pretty trivial things. By the same token, we placidly accept a lot of other happenings which could well prove to be disastrous to our way of life.

All of a sudden the right of a youth to wear his hair like a girl becomes a major issue in a neighboring school, and parents of the modern-day "Goldilocks" display unrestrained criticism against school officials who require their students to have reasonable haircuts and decent attitre. They even go so far as to demand the resignation of the entire school administrative staff over what, in other days, would have been just another process of growing up.

A college student in a West Texas college is expelled for violating the rules of behavior set forth by the school. His parents take the case to court and the judge rules the college must reinstate the student even though he admits he broke his pledged word.

The right to determine the styles of clothing and personal grooming habits, along with demanding proper conduct, has long been an accepted prerogative of elected and appointed school officials. We hope it always will be. We need to return to the days when fathers like ours told their sons that if they got a whipping in school for infraction of the rules or for sassing a teacher, they could expect another when they got home. For there has always been and always will be a few extremists who will test the rules in any society, and we have always needed someone who can say "whoa."

But the sad thing is that while we become greatly concerned with what we classify as our rights—the right to demonstrate, sit-in, sit-down, wear long hair or short skirts, or a hundred other asinine things—we scarcely give a second glance at the real rights that are going down the drain at an unprecedented rate.

Too many of our people are like the fellow who was so busy chasing the boy who took a loaf of bread from his car that he took no notice of the thief who was stealing the car.

Why not concentrate on some of the real problems that need our attention as responsible citizens?

How about getting concerned over the ever-increasing and obvious inroads of big government into our personal lives?

How about getting concerned over a trend in Government that allows Federal bureaucrats to dictate to the individual States how they shall elect their officials, throw out a State-adopted registration system by court edict, and then send FBI agents to oversee the new system as if all elected officials in our State were convicted criminals incapable of carrying out their sworn duties?

How about getting excited over that vocal minority which has succeeded in almost removing any mention of a Supreme Being from all phases of public life in our Nation, and has had their contention upheld by a Supreme Court that was once looked upon as the guardian of our inherent rights and freedoms?

How about being concerned over the rights of the majority that have been trampled on by a stampede of small minorities seeking recognition at any cost without any regard for their accompanying responsibilities?

How about getting concerned and alarmed over the threat of anarchy such as recent outbreaks in Los Angeles and other cities where mobs roam the streets at will, killing, plundering and looting, while national leaders sit back and give tacit approval in the name of rights?

Yes, there are a lot of really important things that we scarcely notice as we concentrate on trivial matters that plain commonsense should solve.

Chief Justice Earl Warren

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, a distinguished citizen and public servant, Chief Justice Earl Warren, celebrated his 75th birthday.

Across the Nation, tribute was paid this man who has served as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court for over 12 years.

Earl Warren has been likened to John Marshall in his personal impact on the Court. History will be the final judge but, certainly, his role as defender of individual rights has been established even now.

The Oakland Tribune, the home newspaper of the Chief Justice recalled:

> In 1953, after his appointment, to the Nation's highest court, someone asked how he classified himself. He quoted Lincoln: "I am a very slow walker, but I never walk backward."
>
> Warren added: "And so I like to feel that while I also am a slow walker, I always like to walk forward and it is always a sad day for me if I go to bed at night thinking we have not made some progress."

The San Francisco Chronicle editorialized:

> Earl Warren, the Chief Justice of the United States, is 75 today, and in the opinion of many he is entitled to be considered among the greatest Chief Justices of our history. One has only to consider how, since his coming to the Supreme Court in 1953, it has altered the most fundamental considerations of American society, such as the equality of white and black skin and of the rural and urban voter, in order to understand this admiration for him. Under the present Chief Justice, the Court has undoubtedly done more to strengthen the rights of the individual than it ever did in all the years up to his appointment.
>
> In California, the warm, friendly, familiar Earl Warren is unforgettable as its Governor through the war and through the strains of postwar growth, change, and betterment. It would not be true to say he is receiving the universal tribute of good wishes from his fellow citizens today—there are too many of the Birchite "Impeach Earl Warren" billboards around to justify that statement, but he may be assured that he has our affectionate regards.

The Los Angeles Times said:

> It cannot be said of him yet that he has outlived his critics. But he has lived to see his concepts of American society accepted by most of the country despite bitter and still continuing criticism.
>
> He failed in his ambition to become President of the United States, yet came to exert an influence on American life that has been matched by few Presidents.
>
> Although his career until 13 years ago had been confined largely to local and State affairs in California, he now enjoys throughout the world a unique reputation among his contemporaries for humanitarianism and libertarianism.

The Sacramento Bee noted:

> After 13 years of the Supreme Court he is the strongest and most influential Chief Justice in American history, with the possible exception of John Marshall.
>
> As the Marshall Court created sovereignty of the Federal Government over the States, saving the grand experiment of national union from chaos in its days of origin, the Warren Court has confirmed the personal liberties of the people, has enforced the separation of state and church, has created new protections against unreasonable seizure and search.

The Washington Post said:

> Not since the formative days of the Republic when John Marshall presided over its deliberations has the Supreme Court played so dynamic a part in American affairs as during the dozen years since Earl Warren became Chief Justice of the United States. Great issues of individual rights, not yet ready for judicial decision in the first century and a half of the country's territorial and economic development, presented themselves inescapably for adjudication. A willingness on the part of Justices to meet issues when they become ripe for resolution * * * is really nothing more than a recognition of the Supreme Court's responsibility to serve effectively as guardian of a living Constitution related to current realities—and to serve especially as guardian of the spirit of liberty characterizing that Constitution.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch cited:

> In three fields, the Warren Court has caused profound alterations in the fabric of national thought and action. The school desegregation decision of 1954 paved the way for the civil rights revolution and made clear the Federal Government's long-ignored responsibility to oppressed Negroes.
>
> Subsequent civil rights decisions kept the promise held out by the first.
>
> Decisions on legislative reapportionment beginning in 1962 ultimately will affect the makeup of legislatures in all 50 States. The Court established the principle that now has become a slogan—"One man, one vote."
>
> Police procedures and the rights of persons suspected of crimes are undergoing a metamorphosis as a result of Supreme Court actions dating to 1957. The constitutional right of a poor man to a lawyer and of an ignorant man to protection against self-incrimination were established for the first time by the Warren Court.
>
> More and more, Justice Warren is being hailed as one of the great Chief Justices in history, a towering figure ranking with John Marshall and Charles Evans Hughes as the leading lights among the 14 men who have led the Nation's highest court.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the California State Legislature, it was my privilege to introduce a resolution which was unanimously passed by that body and which I presented to the Chief Justice on the 10th anniversary of his appointment as Chief Justice of the Court. I would like to read a portion of that resolution into the Record at this time:

> Whereas Chief Justice Earl Warren was born in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 19, 1891, the son of Methias and Chrystal H. Warren, and attended Bakersfield public schools and the University of California in Berkeley, where he received his J.D. in 1914 and thereafter was admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of California; and
>
> Whereas Chief Justice Warren began his public career in 1919 as clerk of the assembly judiciary committee, and later served as deputy city attorney for the city of Oakland, deputy district attorney of Alameda County from 1920 to 1923, chief deputy district attorney from 1923 to 1925, and district attorney from 1925 until his election as the attorney general of California in 1938; and
>
> Whereas the people of California elected Earl Warren as California's Governor in 1942, an office which he held and in which he served with great distinction, until September 30, 1953, when he was appointed Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court by President Dwight D. Eisenhower; and
>
> Whereas, as Chief Justice, Earl Warren has lent the weight and prestige of that high office to the struggle for equal rights for all persons and has been an outspoken defender of the civil liberties guarantees of our Constitution.

Hon. John F. Baldwin

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add at this time my own word of sincere regret at the passing of our conscientious colleague, the Honorable John F. Baldwin, of California.

Since coming to Congress, I have been impressed by the backgrounds of public service of many of my colleagues, of both political persuasions, and I noted with particular interest the World War II record of our colleague, Mr. Baldwin, in which he enlisted in the Army as a private in 1941 and served for 5½ years, being discharged in the rank of lieutenant colonel.

The important thing about his military service, as I reviewed it, was the excellent work he did in Italy toward the stabilization of the currency of that country in the postwar years.

Later, as his own people well know, he devoted himself to public improvements in his own State and community, with particular emphasis on recreational development. At this sad time, my sympathy goes out, as I know it does from his other colleagues in this House, to the family in this great loss.

For Retirement, "Home Is Best"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of our major concerns today is the aging of our population. With better medical services than we have had in the past, our senior citizens are finding they have more and more life expectancy. What we do with that life expectancy is of paramount importance.

In planning for longer lives, our senior citizens are required to consider one of the most basic of requirements—shelter. An excellent article on this subject recently appeared in the Des Moines Sunday Register. I am placing it in the RECORD so that my colleagues might have the benefit of this material. I am certain it will be of interest to everyone who is concerned with this problem.

The article follows:

WHERE IT'S FEASIBLE, MOST AGREE THAT—FOR RETIREMENT, "HOME IS BEST"

(By Frances Craig)

Hanging on the dining room wall of a cozy bungalow on 60th Street in Des Moines is a little red heart with a motto beginning: "Lyckan kommer lyckan gar."

The 78-year-old Swedish woman living there with her husband—a year older—translates it:

"It's all right being away, but home is best."

Nobody would argue with her. Seeing the Eric Olsons in the home they have occupied for 42 years—a little house nestled among tall spruce and balsam trees that Olson planted half a lifetime ago—it's hard to imagine anything better.

Many people are convinced "home is best" for the aging. There is hardly an Iowa city or community that isn't working on some kind of plan making it possible for retired people to remain in their own homes.

Home care-homemaker service is one such plan available in Des Moines and other communities. Another is services for the aged in Cedar Rapids.

Where it isn't practical for the elderly to stay at home, much thought goes into retirement dwellings aimed at being the closest thing to a home setting. Often these are available at rentals almost anybody can afford. A nonprofit apartment unit at Massena (55 miles east of Council Bluffs) is an example.

These provisions for independent living are an answer to an expressed need in Iowa—a State which leads the Nation in percentage of population 65 and older.

(Twelve percent of Iowa's population are in this age group, compared with 9 percent over the country as a whole. And 4½ percent of Iowa's population are 75 or older—about one person in every 22.)

Five years ago a 13-county survey of "Life After 60" was conducted by Iowa's State universities and the State department of social welfare.

It showed that two-thirds of Iowans 60 and older preferred living alone in homes of their own.

The next preferred arrangement was a residential center with separate apartments or cottages. A nursing home or boarding home rated third.

They wanted familiarity and security of long-standing personal and place ties.

(This is part of a report published in bulletins of the University of Iowa's Institute of Gerontology at Iowa City, an institute devoted to studying the needs of Iowa's aged.)

The Eric Olsons are part of the 4½ percent in the 75-and-older age group, yet they are able to remain in their own home.

HOW DO THEY MANAGE?

This is where the Home Care-Homemaker Service comes in. (Similar plans, perhaps called home-health aids or some other name, are operating in Davenport, Burlington, Mount Pleasant, Earlham, Sioux City, Centerville, and Cedar Rapids and surrounding areas. Information about such service usually is available through county health departments.)

In Des Moines, a pleasant middle-aged woman from the Homemaker Service comes in 1 day a week to visit the Olsons where she may vacuum the plushy, comfortable furniture, fluff up bright pillows and perhaps cook up some food for the week ahead.

Mrs. Olson can dust the many souvenirs from the couple's trips to California to visit their daughter Britta and family. This doesn't require her to lift her right arm, made almost useless by a severe fracture a year ago.

But she can't do many other tasks necessary to keep the house livable.

The Olsons' helper is one of more than 150 women in the Des Moines area who have had special training by members of health and casework agencies, especially fitting them to work where people are ill or disabled. It is a program administered by the city-county health department and council of social agencies and an advisory committee of 36 health and casework agencies.

Of course, the service is not free to the Olsons, who are a comfortably retired couple.

Mrs. GIG Shambaugh, who directs the Des Moines area homemakers, says there is a maximum charge of $2 an hour and the homemakers receive $1.25 of this, plus transportation, social security, and fringe benefits.

Where recipients can't afford the maximum fee, cost is adjusted. (The service also helps others besides the aged.)

Because Olson is well, and fairly agile, and can do many tasks around the home—he boasts "I'm a tough old Swede" and chops wood to prove it—they have a homemaker only 1 day a week.

In the Beaverdale area lives a retired watchmaker-engraver whose homemaker comes in every afternoon. And not far from him is a couple in their eighties who have had homemaker care 5 days a week for more than 2 years.

An unexpected benefit has come along with the service: It makes life more interesting and worthwhile for the homemakers themselves. Many of them belong to that 12 percent aged 65 or over and at least one is in the 4½ percent aged 75 or older.

This 75-year-old woman has "really bloomed" in the couple of years she has cared for an elderly pair, says Mrs. Shambaugh. A childless woman who was widowed 3 years ago, she was at loose ends. Now she thrives under the affection of people who really need her.

In Cedar Rapids there is yet another substantial boost for elderly people in their own homes provided by a program called Service for the Aged of Linn County. It is housed in the courthouse and directed by Wiliam J. Turner. Begun in 1961 with a 5-year grant from the National Institute of Mental Health to the University of Iowa, this is basically a program for training graduate students in sociology and for studying needs of the aged.

However, community benefits are many, (Cooperating are the State department of social welfare, Linn County, Visiting Nurses Association and other agencies.)

Mobile meals for the aged, infirm or handicapped in their own homes is one of these benefits.

A five-course hot meal, regular or dietary, is prepared at Meth-Wick Manor, a retirement home, and delivered by a Linn County civil defense truck. Twenty-five persons currently subscribe at $5 a week for a hot meal a day, 5 days weekly. Since the plan was initiated, 68 persons have been helped.

("Mobile meals" or "meals on wheels" are available in other communities, too, under varying sponsorships, with Ottumwa perhaps having the oldest program, administered by Ottumwa Hospital, and Centerville just organizing the newest.)

Another of the Cedar Rapids services for the aged is one that doesn't cost recipients a cent but probably is worth a million dollars to some elderly persons and their relatives.

It is a daily telephone call just to check on those who live alone, perhaps to remind them that it's time to take medicine, or just to chat awhile.

A handy man or household helped service provides high school boys to hang screens, mow lawns, clean cellars or do other jobs around the house, with a $1.25 hourly charge. The services for the aged acts as middleman, at no charge.

The program's grant at Cedar Rapids will expire this summer and Turner says these services probably will be "picked up somehow by the community," but planning is indefinite.

The town of Earlham also will face converting a pilot program to a community-sponsored one. A 5-year home care project was begun there in 1963 with a generous Federal endowment. Administered by the State health department, it makes available a variety of services for elderly at home including; "Meals on wheels," visiting nurse service, homemakers, a handy man service, counseling, and employment help.

These are all good plans for the aged who can stay in their own homes. They also can extend to people who must live in substitute homes.

But is it possible to create satisfactory substitute homes for people who can't remain in their own houses, which sometimes are too big or too remote from help?

Don Curry of the town of Massena thought so. This young man is president of the Massena Bank and he grew up on a near-by farm where his parents still live.

When the chamber of commerce began talking about low-cost housing for citizens who were struggling to get along in big, old houses, either on the farm or in town, Curry readily assumed some leadership.

He became chairman of the board of directors of a nonprofit corporation which applied to the Farmers Home Administration for a loan to build a four-apartment unit.

(Also on the board of directors are a rural mail carrier-farmer, a lumberyard manager, a grocer and a postmaster.)

There is enough land to build more units and the corporation might do so, but Curry says, "We don't want to become big, and lose this feeling of privacy. These are homes."

Community enthusiasm ran so high from the first that $2,000 rolled in as donations in the first weeks.

One widow sold her large home and announced that she was ready for the new building—before ground was broken.

The centrally heated building was completed in October at a cost of $36,700—and immediately occupied by four widows who pay $65 a month each, including all utilities except telephone. Each apartment has a living room, kitchen with a new stove and refrigerator, and bath. Occupants bring their own furniture.

Admiring the natural wood cupboards and sunny appearance of each apartment, a visitor might miss some of the features that make these places homes.

Take the little storeroom or pantry off each kitchen: Curry says, "We really had to argue with the home administration to get that."

He thought this space was necessary for women who had done canning all their lives.

"It wouldn't be 'home' unless they could continue to put up a few jars of fruit and have a place to put them."

And they needed a spot for a big old trunk and maybe a box of letters.

There has been a steady procession of visitors to the Massena project, finished just after another low-cost unit at Irwin. Similar projects are underway at Lake View, Earlham, Pilot Mound, Dows, and New Virginia.

Gene L. Hoffman, State director of the Farmers Home Administration, says this kind of building is meant to "provide independent housing for individuals who are able, and desire, to care for themselves" and to allow them "to live out their lives in dignity in communities where they have spent their working days and where their roots are deepest."

Some of the considerations in building these units are ones that all good retirement homes strive to meet.

For example, homes should be attractive inside and out because the elderly are confined to their dwellings for longer periods of time, says Hoffman. And although they should be convenient, these "shouldn't overemphasize features that remind occupants of their age."

The aged aren't so likely to be driving cars, so their homes should be near such community facilities as the post office, churches, doctors' offices, and stores. This has much to do with how independent—and how "individual"—older people feel.

There ought to be something interesting to observe. A big rope swing for neighborhood children hangs on a tree in the foreground of the Massena unit, and although the building is far enough from the street to avoid noises, it is on a main thoroughfare.

The people who plan retirement dwellings don't want the residents to feel they're "away."

Because they also are convinced that "home is best."

Anna Hyatt Huntington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District, which contains more than its share of gifted, creative people, I have often had the pleasure and privilege of addressing this body to pay tribute to these artists for their fine works. One of these outstanding artists, the noted sculptress, Anna Hyatt Huntington, of Redding, Conn., has recently celebrated her 90th birthday, and this milestone in a career of fruitful aristic achievement was duly marked in an article appearing in the Waterbury Republican of March 20, 1966. As I am certain that this item will be of interest to my colleagues, I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRATULATIONS DUE

Belated congratulations are owed Anna Hyatt Huntington, of Redding, to the west of us here in Waterbury, on her 90th birthday, which was celebrated last Thursday. The noted sculptor received all manner of accolades on this occasion and well she might as her renown in her field is worldwide and deservedly so. Anyone who attended the World's Fair—and there were millions who did so—must remember her "Abraham Lincoln: On the Prairie." In the field of heroic statues Mrs. Huntington is unsurpassed here in America.

Despite her age and the productivity of her past, Mrs. Huntington carries on today much as she has down through her fruitful years. Age has never been a barrier to the continuation of her work as a sculptor. Even now she is working on an equestrian statute of Gen. Israel Putnam which one day will stand at the entrance of Putnam Memorial State Park in Redding, where Mrs. Huntington lives and works. May her genius remain our heritage through her remaining years and long after.

Support Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor notes in a recent editorial there has been a solidifying of public support behind the President's Vietnam policy.

The newspaper feels that we should not lose sight of the three main purposes of American military action, and it states: "The first is to bring an early and decisive end to terrorism from within and aggression from without. The second is to bring all legitimately interested parties to the negotiating table as quickly as possible. The third is to enable the South Vietnamese to have a government of their own choosing."

The opinions as expressed in the editorial to which I have referred will be of general interest, and I, therefore, include it in the RECORD.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 12, 1966]

SOME IMPROVEMENT

For some months President Johnson has had to fight two Vietnamese wars—one in South Vietnam itself, the other back in the United States. Neither has gone as well as he wished. But each has now taken a turn for the better as judged from the White House.

Although the actual fighting still stretches ahead along a long, dark and hard road, nonetheless there are not a few indications that the struggle in Vietnam is going better. For many months the growing weight of the American military presence has made itself increasingly felt. And during the past few weeks this has become even more evident in a series of heavy Communist setbacks.

Perhaps the most encouraging lesson which recent months has taught is that previous estimates of the degree of manpower superiority which a Regular Army had to have over its guerrilla foe were wildly exaggerated. Such superiority was perhaps needed in the days before highly mechanized warfare. But America's stupendous airpower, firepower, mechanical equipment, and the other products of Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Los Angeles have radically changed the situation.

These have neither ended the guerrilla threat nor yet brought that end in sight. But they have increasingly meant that the guerrillas are the hunted instead of the hunters, that their problems of supply, of rest areas, of maneuverability are growing worse, and that there are now signs that the present course of the war is beginning to tell on enemy confidence.

In both Hanoi and Peking within the past month there have been official Communist Party statements which reflect either pessimism or concern over morale within the party. These statements are unprecedented and significant.

Meanwhile, back home there is evidence of a solidifying of public support behind the President's decision. The latest Louis Harris poll said that the public supported a resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam by the overwhelming margin of more than 7 to 1 and found that opinion was hardening behind the conviction that only military success would resolve the war. Furthermore, the American people would support blockading the port of Haiphong by 2 to 1.

Thus on both fronts the President might well feel that spring has at last come to this past winter of severe discontent. Yet none of this should cause Washington to lose sight of the three main purposes of American military action. The first is to bring an early and decisive end to terrorism from within and aggression from without. The second is to bring all legitimately interested parties to the negotiating table as quickly as possible. The third is to enable the South Vietnamese to have a government of their own choosing. If military successes speed this process—fine. But the main goals must never be forgotten.

Need for Manganese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will permit the free entry of manganese ore and certain related products from any available source.

Manganese is one of the basic raw materials in the production of steel. With the demand for steel increasing each and every day, particularly due to Vietnam, the pressures on the supply of basic raw material becomes greater and greater. It is in our national interest to secure manganese from any source available.

The Congress recognized the pressures on raw material supplies in the 88th Congress, when we enacted Public Law 88–338, which suspended the duty on manganese imported into the United States from free world countries. In the House report accompanying the bill which became Public Law 88–338, H.R.

7480, our committee—the Committee on Ways and Means—stated:

> Your committee also believes that enactment of H.R. 7480 is desirable from the standpoint of domestic producers of ferromanganese and other manganese alloys. Suspension of the existing duty on the basic raw materials will reduce costs to these processors and should result in enhancement of the competitive position of domestically produced alloys in the market.

The report also pointed out that the principal use of the ore and the ferroalloy was in the production of steel.

In consonance with the suspension of duty on manganese ore, the 89th Congress enacted Public Law 89-204, which suspended the duty on nickel in various forms in a further effort to help stabilize the production costs of steel.

There remains only one other significant sources of manganese available to the United States and that is ore from the Soviet-bloc countries and primarily from Russia proper. The Russians are presently selling an estimated 600,000 tons per year to Western Europe. There has been none imported into the United States for a great many years due to the prohibitive duty on manganese from the bloc countries. It is believed entirely appropriate that the duty on manganese ore from the bloc countries be suspended in the same manner as is the case of that entering other free world countries, in order that sufficient quantities of manganese be available to meet our own growing requirements and to help hold down the costs of steel to U.S. consumers.

Public Law 88-338 referred to above expires on June 30, 1967. It is believed that the most expeditious way of improving the manganese situation is to amend the present law by expanding the suspension of duty on manganese to cover ore from the bloc countries. Such an amendment means that the matter would have to be considered in 1967 when the present legislation expires, but during this time, sufficient experience could be gained in endeavoring to buy from Russia to govern our actions in 1967.

In the November 22, 1965, issue of the Engineering and Mining Journal "Metal and Mineral Markets" there was a special study on manganese. This was one of a series of such studies made on various materials by this highly reputable publication. Among other things it concluded that with the current prosperous free world economy pacing the demand for steel and ferroalloys, a manganese ore shortage is not an impossibility. They also stated that the political situations in Africa, Brazil, and India reduces them as a dependable source of supply.

The most recent published report shows that over 127 million tons of manganese was consumed in the United States in 1964 as compared to 85 million tons in 1958. This significant upward trend has continued to date and we face a more serious problem as we superimpose the growing requirements of the Vietnam situation which are materially increasing the demands for steel and ferroalloys in various forms. The increasing demands for manganese has firmed up prices for manganese ores, ferroalloys, and metals. As the demand increases due to the Vietnam requirements, prices of the commodities must logically increase. This in turn will increase the cost of steel for our domestic users and defense effort.

As you know, our steel industry has been seeking every conceivable way to hold down its production costs. This is necessary not only because of the increasing competition from foreign steel in both domestic and foreign markets but to assist in holding their prices within the guidelines specified by the President.

It is recognized that some may object to this action because of their opposition to trade with bloc countries. However, our growing need for manganese from all possible sources should far outweigh this position. This is particularly true since the demands for manganese will grow stronger as we feel the effects of the heavier appropriations for Vietnam. I yield to no one when it comes to opposition to any proposal which gives any advantage to the Soviet bloc.

However, in this case it is obviously in our national interest to secure manganese from Russia since manganese is absolutely necessary to us in our steel production. This is the sort of trade with the Soviet bloc which no one can question redounds to our own benefit.

The acquisition of needed materials from Russia is quite common. One example is Russian chrome ore which is vital in the production of steel and ferroalloys and which enters our country free of duty. It appears entirely consistent that manganese be given the same treatment. In this connection it should be noted that Russia is supplying approximately 25 percent of the total chrome consumed in the United States and without it our steel industry would be severely handicapped. This is particularly true at the present time since chrome ore from Rhodesia, another large supplier, is not presently available due to the adverse political considerations which prevail today. In addition to chrome, other basic materials such as platinum, palladium, and potash are examples of materials which are acquired from Russia.

If enacted, the proposed legislation should lessen the pressure to increase steel prices due to the greater availability of a high-cost item in the production of steel. This in turn will help keep down the spiralling costs of the war in Vietnam and at the same time make American steel and ferroalloys more competitive in the markets of the world.

This should not be confused with the emotional, political question of trading with the Soviet bloc. The only relevant aspect involved is good hard American business.

Secrecy and Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post commented favorably on March 26, 1966, regarding Sargent Shirver's directive instructing local antipoverty agencies to open their books for public inspection. I want to join the Post in applauding Mr. Shirver's action on this point.

Now, if the administration could be convinced to emulate Mr. Shirver's action by supporting instead of opposing the public records bills, the Nation would be much the better.

The comment from the Post follows:

SECRECY AND POVERTY

> Sargent Shriver's publicity directive, instructing local antipoverty agencies to open their books for public inspection, is a proper acknowledgment of the right of citizens to know about their own Government.
>
> That right never should have been in doubt and it is to be hoped that the directive will make it clear to officials that the administration wishes them to do what they should have been doing without instruction.
>
> Quite rightly, the directive States that disclosure must be made "to any person for inspection and examination." Government, in a democratic society, is the servant of the people and if the people cannot discover what their servants are doing with public authority and public money they do not really enjoy self-Government.

Evidence of Peace Corps Effectiveness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of seeing firsthand some of the magnificent results of Peace Corps work in Central America. I was in Guatemala and Panama, meeting with officials of the Organization of Central American States.

The United States is doing great things south of the border, making progress in helping the Central American nations help themselves. The Peace Corps is playing a large role in this, a role that is winning praise and respect every day.

In reporting this reaction to Mr. Jack H. Vaughn, I was pleased to be reminded that the work of our Peace Corps is benefiting the members of the Corps in terms of giving them a valuable insight into the way people in other lands look at the world. Mr. Vaughn has passed on to me an inspiring letter from a Miss Elaine Mrachek which I wish to share with my colleagues. Miss Mrachek served in Panama, and her words should be an inspiration to all of us:

> DEAR MR. VAUGHN: I wish you the enjoyment of learning and challenge along with congratulations on your recent appointment as Director of the Peace Corps. One day you stated to our training group at the University of Arizona that the Peace Corps in Panama was of more value to the United States than any other American program there. I went to Panama and served as a volunteer there always believing this to be true and insistent on living this ideal.
>
> People always ask, "Why did you join the Peace Corps?" I cannot reply verbally. I only know that within my heart I believe my decision to become a volunteer was the wisest and most rewarding decision of all my 24 years. In knowledge and wisdom I grew, but

mostly in love for my people. Now—whenever someone attacks Panama in conversation, I object—sometimes violently. I feel like a mother protecting what I know so well because I worked, lived, danced, ate, and hoped with them.

My village in the Province of Los Santos was Los Asientos. The people of this forgotten village gave much meaning to my life.

In July I will marry Tony Masso, also an ex-volunteer from Bocas del Toro. Perhaps you remember him. He is now one of your recruiters.

Sincerely,

ELAINE MRACHEK.

Applauds Schoolbus Drivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, we Americans can most certainly take pride and comfort in the fact that we have such loyal dedicated citizens who give their valuable time serving countles generations of students as our schoolbus drivers.

I believe all too often our schoolbus drivers are given such little recognition for their unfailing, self-sacrificing efforts in providing for the safety of our children, as drivers of schoolbuses.

I want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives an editorial which appeared in the Batavia, Iowa, Batavia Beacon on Thursday, March 24, 1966. I believe this gives an excellent description of the role of a schoolbus driver, and one which so richly deserves recognition from all of us.

The editorial follows:

NO RECOGNITION GIVEN BUS DRIVERS

Of all the dates set aside to recognize dairies, health, know your neighbor, beauty salons, etc., there doesn't seem to be time for recognition for the schoolbus driver. This driver carries one of the biggest responsibilities there is. He or she carries a priceless cargo—our children. The only cargo that cannot be put on a bill of lading in the value of dollars and cents—yet contains more activity, laughs, pranks, and trust in their driver.

It is one of the many thankless jobs. Pay—yes, they all get paid as far as money valuation on an hourly scale, but the thanks is little.

Very few of us took the time recently in all the fog to thank and bless these cautious drivers for getting our children to school safely and on time. But let one small fuss between the passengers on a bus occur and we are all ready to jump up and scream to high heaven about the lack of discipline permitted.

Lack of discipline—to most is something altogether different—clean dress or shirt remaining that way, personal items getting home instead of being left behind, no blue and black marks from wrestling or perhaps a smile instead of a frown or a tear.

The responsibilities of the school bus driver are many. The arrival and safety of the passengers as far as driving a bus is concerned is of little note in comparison to the many hazards that are brought onto the bus from home. Pencils—already sharpened, an eraser with a pin in it, sewing kits for the home ec class, finger nail files—all usually safe enough until in the hands of a child on a bus. Then they become weapons against the one sitting just in front or just behind where hands can be put under the seat out of sight of the driver.

Fifty passengers of priceless cargo and yet we expect this one driver to be able to drive the bus, watch the car in front, the car behind and the car that isn't there, to be able to spot the needles, nail files, pencils, to be able to hear every remark that could and often does insult his fellow passenger, while we send them off each day without a thought of what it concealed to damage or harm.

Hats off to these remarkable people that are so equipped to handle so many problems and still do their job well and a shoulder big enough to take all the complaints dished out without checking where the actual blame is or was.

If we, the parents could help these wonderful people by giving a few minutes of our time and ride the bus our child does, not once as a newcomer which causes a silence that is almost deafening, but several times, to where the children revert to their usual selves. Good policy and closer friendship among the drivers and the parents, a better understanding of the various problems, could result in a happier medium for all.

Private Loss Versus Public Gain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 28, I introduced two bills to bring Federal aid to bear in the fight to preserve our Nation's historic landmarks.

My bills differed from others which have been introduced in that they emphasized preservation of landmarks of local as well as national historic interest. This difference reflects my concern in seeing that efforts like those of New York's Landmarks Preservation Commission qualify for Federal assistance.

The New York Times magazine of March 27 had an interesting article on landmarks preservation in New York City. As it shows some of the problems of landmarks preservation, while concluding as I have that landmarks preservation is yet worthwhile, I shall insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE GREAT LANDMARKS FIGHT—PRIVATE LOSS VERSUS PUBLIC GAIN

(By Sherwin D. Smith)

Pennsylvania station has become little more than a hole in the ground—30 of its giant Doric columns strewn as landfill in a Secaucus dump. The Brokaw mansions at Fifth Avenue and 79th Street disappeared—zot—one weekend last spring. The wreckers' scaffolding is up around the Savoy Plaza, and the Jerome House at Madison Square, built by Sir Winston Churchill's grandfather, is threatened with demolition to make way for a $10-million office building.

To many New Yorkers it has seemed all too true that, "all too often, the wreckers' ball crashes and the bulldozer ravages for no better reason than to enable someone to make a quick buck," as Richard J. Whalen wrote recently in "A City Destroying Itself"—and that there is nothing anyone can do about it. Now those who feel this way see a glimmer of hope. Last April, New York followed some 70 other American cities in adopting a landmarks-preservation law, and this winter the resulting landmarks preservation commission has been holding its first public hearings in the white and gold board of estimate chamber at city hall.

So far, the commission has named 76 structures (ranging from the 17th-century Wyckoff House in Brooklyn, believed to be the city's oldest, to city hall) as landmarks that may not be torn down or changed in external appearance without its approval. Decisions are pending on another 158. (In addition, the commission has designated a "historic district," under its protection, in Brooklyn Heights; it is considering establishing another in Greenwich Village.) Sixteen proposed landmarks have been rejected by the commission—including the Metropolitan Opera House.

What is a landmark? According to the law, it is a building at least 30 years old, "which has a special character or special historical or esthetic interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city, State or Nation."

The 11 unpaid commissioners who decide must include at least 3 architects, 1 historian, 1 city planner or landscape architect, 1 realtor, and at least 1 representative from each borough. The present members are Geoffrey Platt, an architect, chairman; Stanley B. Tankel of the Regional Planning Association, vice chairman; Juliet Bartlett of the Women's City Club; J. Clarence Davies, realtor; William R. Fisher, lawyer; L. Bancel LaFarge, architect; Samuel J. Lefrak, realtor; Russell Lynes, managing editor of Harper's and author of "The Tastemakers"; Loring McMillen, engineer; Mrs. Roderic B. Swenson of the Riverdale Community Planning Association; Frederick J. Woodbridge, architect. They have a small full-time staff, headed by Alan Burnham, an architectural historian and editor of the Municipal Art Society's New York Landmarks, as executive director.

"We have finished phase 1 our our work. We have shown that there is a widespread public interest in preserving the city's landmarks—and that something can be done," said James Grote Van Derpool, a former professor of architectural history at Columbia, shortly before his recent retirement as the commission's first executive director.

Phase two is going to be rougher. As Mr. Burnham says: "Real estate developers continue to assemble parcels for the construction of vast new buildings, without any regard for notable landmarks which will be lost on these sites. One of the factors which contribute most to the actual preservation of buildings will be the realization on the part of corporations and other organizations that great prestige and useful office space can often be found in an existing landmark."

"In addition, the present owners of potential landmarks must respond by making their future planes in terms of preserving these landmarks," says Chairman Platt. "Here is one problem where individual owners are in a position to do something affirmative for their city."

Many owners, however, have threatened to fight the designation of their buildings—among them such powerful and eminently respectable forces as the New York Stock Exchange, First National City Bank, and Trinity Church. Their arguments raise grave issues about the rights of private ownership.

The stock exchange, for example, plans to move to the Battery Park area within the next few years (assuming that it does not carry out its threat to move out of the city entirely in protest against the proposed stock transfer tax). When it does move, it maintains, there will be no practical use to which the present building, with its cavernous trading floor, can be put. Therefore, the exchange wants to be sure that it (or, more likely, a purchaser) will be free to demolish the old building and put up something new. Some $13 million in assessed valuation is at stake. As Charles Klem, vice president of the exchange, says: "The designation of the building as a landmark could seriously disrupt the new building plans of the exchange." The commission's decision is still pending.

The First National City Bank has no announced plans for moving, but it fears having its hands tied in respect to its main offices at 55 Wall Street, the old Third Merchants' Exchange, whose lower floors Ada Louise Huxtable, in "Classic New York," calls "noble * * * the answer to any Greek Revival architect's grandest dream."

"We are not Philistines," John A. Wilson, the bank's spokesman, told the commission, but the building is only "one example of Greek architecture. * * * Certainly not all present examples of Greek architecture in our city are to be preserved—only * * * the finest. And, in our opinion, our head office building is not in that elite category."

Besides, he warned, "if the city of New York should seek to preserve it as a landmark, the city would—in all probability—have to condemn the site. This would surely impose tax burdens amounting to millions of dollars upon the taxpayers." Yet the commission went head and designated the building a landmark.

Trinity Church, as might be expected, argues the separation of church and state. As its counsel, Spencer Byard, told the commission at its first public hearing: "We think that by designating Trinity Church as a landmark, the commission will supplant the proper authority of the church, by its vestry and by the church authorities, with, to a very important degree, the judgment of this commission, and in that respect it constitutes a taking of Trinity property without due process of law, and also an element of government control of the operation of a structure used directly for religious purposes in a manner which is not permitted by the Constitution." In this case, again, the commission's decision is still pending.

The commissioners do not feel they are as powerful as some owners seem to fear. The law under which they operate contains one giant loophole, inserted at the insistence of real estate interests. After an initial period ending next December, the commission can hold no more public hearings for 36 months (while the wreckers presumably work overtime); then there will be a 6-month period for hearings on new landmarks, and the cycle will repeat.

Designations are subject to the veto of the board of estimate. Owners of landmarks are guaranteed a "reasonable return" of 6 percent of assessed valuation, plus 2 percent for depreciation—through tax exemption or remission, if necessary.

The commission's strength lies not so much in its power to stop an owner from altering or destroying a building, if he is really determined to, as in its power to delay him—while using the time to find an acceptable solution. "The commission expects to work with an owner on his problems after a building has been designated," says Mr. Platt.

So far the commission has had one spectacular success—saving the old Astor Library on Lafayette Street. The commission saw it as a landmark; nearly everyone else saw it as a white elephant. Its owners, the United HIAS Service (the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society), had already contracted to sell it to a developer, Lithos Properties, Inc., to be torn down to make way for an apartment building. The commission brought HIAS and Lithos together with Joseph Papp, founder and producer of the New York Shakespeare Festival, who was looking for a year-round home for his troupe, which gives outdoor park performances in summer. By mutual agreement, Papp took over the purchase contract (Lithos even donated $15,000 toward the final sale price of about $560,000). Next fall, the Shakespeare Festival is to open its first indoor season in the Astor Library.

Not every case will be so smoothly settled. "There is no doubt that the commission is going to get taken into court again and again," says one man who has followed its work closely. The first important suit against the commission is already pending in the New York State Supreme Court; it seeks to have the landmark designation lifted from the Jerome House.

An elegant "private palace" in Second Empire style, the mansion was built by Leonard W. Jerome, the flamboyant financier, lover of operas, prima donnas, and race horses, whose daughter became Lady Randolph Churchill. For years, it has been occupied by the Manhattan Club (tradition holds that the first Manhattan cocktail was mixed there), but the club's members have moved to midtown and the club is following them.

Last summer, before the Landmarks Commission had announced any interest in the building, a group of real estate developers including Herbert Fischbach of Herbert Charles & Co. contracted to buy it for $600,000, solely in order to raze it and erect an office building. Then the Commission designated the mansion a landmark.

As with the Astor Library, the Commission hopes to find a new purchaser—in this case, perhaps, a corporation in search of a jewel-box headquarters—to take the Jerome House off the hands of the present set of buyers. They agree they would be perfectly willing to sell instead of build—at a decent profit. But who knows how long finding a new purchaser might take? Meanwhile, the plans for the new building have been drawn, some $400,000 in cash has been immobilized for months, the closing date has come and gone, and the developers are stymied. "That," says Mr. Fischbach, referring to his colleagues' impasse, "is hard to stomach." No one could disagree.

Another case, and one that—because no question of private profit or loss is concerned—may become a landmark in the Commission's record of success or failure, concerns Sailors' Snug Harbor, a home for aged seamen on Staten Island.

Sailors' Snug Harbor was endowed in 1801 by the will of Capt. Robert Richard Randall, whose principal bequest was a 21-acre farm in what is now the Washington Square area. Snug Harbor still owns the land; its income from rents last year was more than $900,000.

Over a period of nearly 50 years in the 19th century, Snug Harbor built a row of four dormitories and an administration building on a 40-acre tract on the Staten Island waterfront, overlooking Kill Van Kull. Greek Revival in style, columned and pedimented, matched and balanced, they form a unit that architectural historians consider one of the two finest of its kind in the country (the other is a group at Girard College in Philadelphia). When, in 1957, after long deliberation, the Committee on Historic Architecture of the Municipal Art Society compiled a list of just 19 New York "structures of national importance which should be preserved at all costs," the Snug Harbor group was one.

But the trustees—a distinguished, dedicated and determined group that includes the president of the New York City Chamber of Commerce and the rector of Trinity Church—would like to tear down the dormitories and replace them with modern facilities. They have no intention of cashing in on the Staten Island speculative land boom. "The trustees must be faithful to their duties imposed by the trust," their president, Walter F. Pease, told the commission. We should not and cannot be compelled to continue for all time the use of a group of buildings which are now functionally inadequate and which, in light of modern conditions, have grown uncomfortable and inappropriate as homes for the elderly."

There are no quarters for married couples, no private baths, no elevators. Fire Department regulations forbid cooking facilities—not so much as a hot plate—or smoking in the rooms. More than a third of the 202 old sailors now living there are housed in semibasement rooms (dank in winter, and with bare pipes) or attic rooms (ovens in summer). If the buildings were replaced, the trustees' consulting architect estimates, 1,000 could be housed comfortably and safely on the site.

As for the obvious compromise of retaining the buildings as a memorial or museum, and constructing new housing elsewhere on the 40 acres, the trustees feel the benefits would not be worth the effort. "For the general public of New York City," said Mr. Pease, "[Snug Harbor's] existence largely [goes] unnoticed. * * * The architectural or historical interest of the buildings themselves is indiscernible to the members of the public generally."

Yet the commission, without a dissenting vote, declared the row of buildings "a great and enduring architectural masterpiece * * * a priceless part of our heritage"—a landmark to be preserved. Snug Harbor has replied by threatening court action to set aside the designation. There is, however, some hope that a compromise may yet be reached—perhaps a fresh architectural approach to giving the old sailors new quarters while preserving Snug Harbor's unique group of buildings.

The outcome could do much to determine which of two philosophies will prevail. One has been stated by Mr. Pease: "The preservation of old buildings which still enhance the lives of the living is good and desirable, but if our devotion to the concept of preservation leads us to preserve buildings which diminish and impair the lives of the living, our values have become twisted, we slip into decadence, and we accomplish no private or public good."

The other was summed up in a recent remark by an activist of the Municipal Art Society, an architect named Arthur C. Holden: "To say they can do nothing unless they destroy a building is a palpable confession of impotence and intellectual bankruptcy."

But imaginiation requires expenditure of effort—and sometimes sacrifice of immediate profit. Is the preservation of a landmark worth the cost?

Former Mayor Wagner, discussing the Landmarks Commission, spoke of the need "to insure that the threads of our past are woven into our patterns of the future." Mayor Lindsay says: "Too often have we allowed neighborhoods of irreplaceable historic and cultural importance to our city to be wiped out without thoughtful consideration." Jane Jacobs, in "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," writes of the importance of landmarks to "emphasize (and also dignify) the diversity" of the city.

They are none too far from what urban planners and urban sociologists mean when they talk of the necessity of providing a "pleasing cityscape" to hold back the soul-destroying surface monotony that blights city after city.

Perhaps the last word on the case for preserving landmarks should go to a man who was born in one, long before it achieved that status. I. N. P. Stokes (1867–1944) was an architect and historian whose six-volume "Iconography of Manhattan Island" is the definitive study of early New York buildings. His family owned the brownstone at 231 Madson Avenue which was later J. P. Morgan, Jr.'s home and which the commission has now designated a landmark. Late in life, Stokes wrote his memoirs for private circulation:

"I have always been a dreamer of dreams," he recalled. "At night I still, occasionally, wander through unknown lands, and accomplish impossible feats. I have long specialized in dreams of old New York, and they are the most delightful of all my dreams. I usually start out from some point in the modern city and on my way—perhaps to keep an appointment at some other well-known point—I am tempted to try a shortcut, and soon find myself in strange and impossible surroundings—from the modern point of view. The houses are those with which I am familiar from the prints and other pictures of the 18th or 19th centuries or, almost as often, belong to still earlier times.

"My last dream of this kind occured only a few nights ago. I went to see Jack Morgan, at our old house on Madison Avenue and 37th Street. He received me in the scarlet uniform of a general of Revolutionary times. We went together to my old rooms in the rear of the house on the third floor, and from the windows looked over wooded park lands to Kip's Bay, where a number of British warships lay at anchor in the sun.

"As I walk in the daytime through the streets of the modern city, it is a source of much pleasure often to be able to recall something of their ancient appearance, but a constant source of regret to reflect that so many interesting old landmarks have been destroyed, and that so little actually remains from the past—so much less than in many of our other early cities."

Future Homemakers Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of National Future Homemakers of America Week—March 27 to April 2, 1966—I extend congratulations and best wishes for the future to the Future Homemakers of America, a national organization of 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses with local chapters in every State, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

We hear constantly these days about the delinquents, beatniks, and draft card burners, while the vast majority of our hard-working, serious and law-abiding youth, who prepare themselves to become our good citizens of tomorrow, receive little or no attention. This distorts the true picture of our youth. It is time we recognized and paid tribute to the virtues of this vast majority.

National Future Homemakers of America Week spotlights a 4-year program to help each member recognize and develop her abilities and to participate in family, community, and world projects. From their ranks will come the future mothers, wives, teachers, jobholders, voters, and opinion makers of our great country.

The Future Homemakers of America was founded in 1945. It unified under one organization the various State and local clubs of high school home economics students. Its membership grew from 100,000 at the end of its first year to its present 600,000 members. Twelve national youth officers direct its work programs and plan and preside over its meetings. High school teachers serve as local chapter advisers. It is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association.

Ninety-five Percent of Cook County Senior Citizens Have Signed Up for Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the eve of the deadline for our senior citizens to sign up for the medicare insurance program approaching, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent series on this program that recently appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times. I think the Sun-Times is to be congratulated for their public service.

In view of the problem that has apparently developed in many communities, I think it is really astounding that as of today only about 30,000 of the 600,000 persons in Cook County eligible for this program have not yet made application.

One of the problems encountered in many localities in getting maximum registration for this program is that many older people do not understand that while they are automatically eligible for hospital insurance, if they are presently on social security or railroad retirement rolls, they must file an application and pay a small premium to become eligible for medical insurance which helps pay doctor bills and many other medical costs not covered by the hospital insurance program. Another factor has been that many are fearful that making application for this program will result in their losing benefits they may be receiving from other sources.

I feel that the fact that we in Cook County have had close to 100 percent of those eligible sign up for this program is a tribute to all the media—press, radio, and television—and certainly a tribute to the leadership that Mayor Daley has given to marshaling the forces to make such a record possible.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

Elderly Get Medicare Message

(By Lloyd Green)

The white-haired man stopped us even before we got in the door of the public housing building for the aged at 838 North Noble.

"You're just the people I want to see," he said, as he observed our red, white, and blue armbands. They bore the words, "Operation Medicare Alert."

"What can we do for you?" asked my partner, Ralph Crowl, of 745 West Cornelia. I accompanied Crowl to learn how he found elderly persons who had failed to enroll for medicare.

"I'm a veteran," said the man, "and I'd like to know whether it's worth while for me to sign up for this medicare business? I can go to a veterans hospital free whenever I want."

Crowl, himself a golden-ager, explained that medicare, for $3 a month, would pay a large part of physicians' fees for home or office calls. In addition, he said, a person could not always be certain there would be space in a veterans hospital.

"Then you think medicare would be a good thing for me?"

"Absolutely," said Crowl. "But if you decide to drop out later, you can do that, too."

"Well then, I'm going to send in my card," said the man.

He thanked us profusely, and we headed toward the elevators in the 20-story Eckert Park Apartments to visit other elderly residents.

Crowl, a retired officeworker, is one of 300 canvassers in a seek-and-sign program being conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity in cooperation with the Senior Centers of Metropolitan Chicago.

In their door-to-door rounds, canvassers have found that the majority of persons 65 and over who have failed to enroll for medicare do not understand the program.

Once it is explained, most sign up readily.

Medicare is actually two programs—automatic hospital insurance for persons on social security or railroad retirement pensions and a voluntary supplemental medical insurance to pay doctors bills and other medical costs.

Persons must apply and pay a small premium for the supplemental benefits and it is for this reason that the big push is on to find those eligible before the March 31 enrollment deadline.

As Crowl continued upstairs in the Chicago Housing Authority Building, he found men and women anxious to talk with him.

SOMETIMES A DOOR SLAMS

On the 13th floor, a woman in a wheelchair, with a parakeet for companionship, said she already had sent in an enrollment card.

Crowl had her fill out a duplicate card, since social security records he carried with him did not show her as signed up.

"Sometimes I get the door slammed in my face," he said, "but not very often."

Back on the street, Crowl climbed the backstairs at 952 North Noble to sign up a 72-year-old widower, a retired employee of the Morton Salt Co.

"Why you're just a youngster," Crowl told him. "I'm a year older than you are."

For his efforts, Crowl receives $1.50 an hour, although two-thirds of the canvassers in Operation Medicare Alert are volunteers and get nothing.

Many church, industrial, labor and social groups also are trying to sign up people.

The director of the Operation Medicare Alert program is Mrs. Lorraine Babcock, who has a makeshift office on the 11th floor of the Senior Centers headquarters at 501 West Surf.

MORE VOLUNTEERS NEEDED

"Getting these old people signed up is extremely important," she said. "It's something they need and something they have coming to them."

More volunteer canvassers are needed to answer the questions of the elderly. Among the most frequent questions asked, she said are:

Question. What is Medicare? Answer. A health insurance program to help people 65 and over to pay hospital and doctor bills.

Question. Are persons who do not receive other Social Security benefits covered? Answer. Yes, almost all citizens who were 65 or older as of last Jan. 1 are eligible.

Question. Who might not be covered? Answer. Members of subversive organizations who have no social security credits, some aged Federal employees covered by other government-sponsored health insurance plans, and aliens with less than 5 years'

U.S. residence and no permanent residency permit.

Question. Can persons employed full time enrall. Answer. Yes.

Question. Will I have to use government-appointed doctors and hospitals?. Answer. No. You select your own doctor or hospital. The insurance covers all accredited hospitals and all reputable doctors.

Question. What if my doctor wants nothing to do with Medicare and asks that I pay him directly? Answer. Go ahead and pay him and get an itemized receipt. Medicare will reimburse you.

Question. I draw disability benefits from Social Security but am not 65. Am I entitled to health insurance? Answer. No. Medicare covers only persons 65 and older.

Question. Where are the social security offices where I can enroll. Answer. City locations are at 111 North Wabash, 2306 West Lawrence, 2345 West North, 4255 North Milwaukee, 4635 West Madison, 1775 West Ogden, 4731 South Park, 8828 South Stony Island and 1256 West 69th.

Suburban offices are at 924 Chicago, Evanston; 2500 Grand, Waukegan; 735 Dundee, Elgin; 410 Washington, Gary; 636 State, Hammond; 225 North Chicago, Joliet; 15325 Page, Harvey; 1930 Harlem, Elmwood Park, 6311 Cermak, Berwyn, and 122 West Downer, Aurora.

TWO-PART PROGRAM

Medicare is divided into two parts:

1. Hospital insurance, which helps pay the bills when a person is hospitalized. No premiums are charged for this. Persons drawing Social Security or railroad retirement checks get it automatically. Others must apply for it.
2. Medical insurance, which helps pay doctor bills and many other medical costs not covered by the hospital insurance program. Enrollment in this is voluntary. To pay for it, the Government will put $3 with each $3 paid monthly by individuals.

Persons who are 65 or older and fail to sign up for the second part of the benefits by the March 31 deadline will have to wait until October 1, 1967, if they want to enroll. Benefits for them won't begin until July, 1968.

Also, persons who wait until the 1967 enrollment period (October 1–December 31) will have to pay a 10-percent penalty on all future premiums. In addition, basic premiums may be raised by then, according to Harry R. Shandelson, district director for the Social Security Administration.

EXPLAINS REASONS FOR PENALTY

One reason for the penalty, said Shandelson, is to encourage people to enroll. Another reason, he said, is that the persons will be over a year older and thus will be more adverse risks in the insurance plan.

There is no deadline for enrollment in the first phase of the medicare program—the hospital insurance. Shandelson said a person will be allowed to sign up for that even after he is hospitalized.

Although the medicare plan is complex, enrollment in it is simple.

All persons 65 and over drawing social security or railroad retirement benefits were mailed enrollment cards. All they have to do is sign their names and check whether or not they want to pay for the supplementary benefits.

After the March 31 deadline, those persons will be mailed three-page forms to fill out. Persons who visit social security offices fill out the complete forms on the spot.

All but one of the questions on the application forms are routine.

It says, "Are you now or have you been during the past 12 months a member of any organization which is required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950 as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization or a Communist-infiltrated organization?"

Under the law, an answer "yes" will mean that a person will be denied medicare.

Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball has asked Congress for permission to have the question stricken. It is not included on forms to be sent persons drawing social security or railroad retirement benefits.

"Congress apparently felt that medicare was a gift to persons who have paid nothing into social security or railroad retirement," said Shandelson, "and for that reason didn't want subversives included."

To help persons sign up for medicare, the area's 19 social security offices will be open until 9 p.m. next Thursday and until noon next Saturday. Normal hours are 8:45 a.m. until 4:45 p.m. Monday through Friday.

During the final days of the deadline, from March 28 to 31, the offices will be open until 9 p.m. daily.

COVERAGE EXPLAINED

Persons who reach age 65 in the future will have an initial signup period of 7 months. It will include 3 months prior to the month of their birthday, the month they become 65, and 3 months after that.

Medicare, like most health insurance plans, will not cover all hospital and medical costs when the Government begins paying benefits July 1.

The hospital insurance, for which persons pay no premiums, will cover these basic costs:

1. Up to 60 days in a hospital, except for the first $40, and all but $10 a day for an additional 30 days for each period of illness. (There is a lifetime limit of 190 days on payments for treatment in mental hospitals.)
2. Up to 20 days in an extended care facility, such as a nursing home, and all but $5 a day for an additional 80 days for each period of illness. These services will be provided only after a hospital stay of at least 3 days. (This part of the program begins January 1, 1967.)
3. Up to 100 home-health visits by nurses or other health workers in the 365 days following release from a hospital or extended care facility. (Doctors' visits are covered only under the paid medical insurance plan.)
4. Eighty percent of the cost of outpatient diagnostic tests in a hospital, after the person pays the first $20. Each series of tests must be completed in a 20-day period.

Under the medical insurance plan medicare will pay 80 percent of the "reasonable charges" for the following services after the first $50 in each calendar year:

1. Physician and surgeon services.
2. Up to 100 home-health visits a year, even if a person has not been in a hospital.
3. A number of other medical and health services, such as diagnostic tests, surgical dressings and splints, and rental of medical equipment.

Local committees will decide what reasonable charges are for various medical services.

Not covered by medicare are routine medical examinations, orthopedic shoes, immunization, and drugs for use outside a hospital or extended care facility.

Also not covered are eyeglasses and vision examinations, hearing aids and examinations for hearings aids, and dentures and the care, treatment, filling, removal and replacement of teeth.

The Social Security Administration will not make payments direct to doctors and hospitals. That will be handled in Cook, Du Page, Kane, and Will Counties by the Illinois Medical Service (Blue Shield) and in the rest of the State by Continental Casualty Co.

DISCOUNT OVERCROWDING FEARS

Although there has been concern expressed by some medical men that Chicago area hospitals may become overcrowded when medicare starts July 1, most authorities discount the possibility.

"On the basis of reliable information, I do not anticipate that any real crisis will develop," said Dr. Samuel L. Andelman, city health commissioner.

He noted that many hospitals have utilization committees that guard against overcrowding.

Dr. John Hall, Cook County health director, said there might be some overcrowding in suburban hospitals, but he noted that those institutions also have utilization committees.

Edward J. Miller, associate director of the Illinois Hospital Association, said Chicago's hospital occupancy is now about 80 percent but will be lower by July.

In the winter, respiratory ailments send many persons to hospitals, he observed. In addition, he said, many physicians and their patients go on vacation in the summer, and that often delays hospitalization.

"Illinois is fortunate," Miller said, "that 94 percent of its hospital beds are in accredited institutions that will be approved for medicare patients. In some Southern States, only 40 to 60 percent of the beds are in accredited hospitals."

FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND ELIGIBLE HERE

Social security officials estimate there are 500,000 persons in the Chicago area eligible for medicare.

So far, 82 percent of them have signed up to participate in the full program, according to Edward Stec, a staff assistant at the U.S. Bureau of Health Insurance office in Chicago.

Canvassers for Operation Medicare Alert have found that some of the 90,000 persons in the area who have failed to sign up for the full program felt they could not afford $3 a month.

However, Kershon Hurwitz, assistant director of the Illinois Public Aid Department, said old persons drawing public assistance would be reimbursed for the insurance premiums.

The area's social security offices, in addition to signing up persons who come in, also have telephone crews trying to reach people to explain their rights to them.

"You hear a lot of weird things," said Nelson Komaiko, of 3335 W. Balmoral. "One woman I called told me the program was socialistic and was ruining the country. But she said she supposed that it wouldn't save the country if she didn't sign up, so she agreed to send in her card."

Cards of elderly persons who have no phones and have made no reply by mail are turned over to canvassers for Operation Medicare Alert.

In directing the canvassers, Mrs. Babcock said she also had heard some strange reasons for failure to enroll.

A man living on North Lake Shore Drive told a canvasser he didn't think he was eligible because he was still working. The canvasser assured him that he was, even though he was earning $35,000 a year as a salesman.

"One woman said she hadn't signed up because she didn't want her neighbors to know she was 65," said Mrs. Babcock. "When we told her we wouldn't tell her neighbors, she agreed to mail in a card."

Memorial Service for Hon. James A. Stire of Hammond, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, recently an old and dear friend of mine, James A. Stire, of Hammond, La., lost his life in a tragic automobile-train accident. Mayor Stire was an outstanding mayor of Hammond for 16 years during which he provided enlightened and progressive leadership for that growing city. At the time of his death, he was clerk of court of Tangipahoa Parish.

All of us who had the good fortune of being his close personal friends were deeply saddened by his accident and I personally will miss his valued counsel and friendship. On Friday, March 18, 1966, memorial services were held for Mayor Stire in the main courtroom at the courthouse in Amite, where he served his parish so well. The following is an account of that service published in the Hammond Vindicator on March 24, including a moving eulogy by his close friend, Joe Arthur Sims, a prominent attorney of Hammond, La.:

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR JAMES A. STIRE HELD FRIDAY MORNING

The main courtroom at the courthouse in Amite was filled to overflowing Friday morning at 11 o'clock when special memorial services were held for the late James A. Stire, clerk of court, who lost his life in a train-automobile accident on February 13.

Arthur Macy introduced Tom H. Matheny, who gave the invocation. Sitting on the bench were Judge Warren W. Comish, division A, and Judge Ben N. Tucker, division B, 21st Judicial District Court. Facing them and reading the impressive eulogy to Mr. Stire was Joe Arthur Sims, chairman of the memorial service committee.

Following the eulogy, Joseph H. Simpson introduced Bill Witbeck, who had made the last portrait of Mr. Stire. Mr. Witbeck, in a few well-chosen words, presented a 16- by 20-inch framed picture of Mr. Stire to Mrs. Stire to be hung in the clerk of court office in Amite. This presentation concluded the memorial service.

The following is the eulogy to Mr. Stire, as read by Mr. Sims:

"James Alfred Stire, known to his multitude of friends as "Jimmy" or "Mayor," was one of eight children born to Rose Louise Caubert and Theodore Williams Stire on September 25, 1900, in Abita Springs, La. He attended the public schools in St. Tammany Parish and in 1918 married Estelle Smith. Of this union were born four children; namely, Margie Stire, wife of Frank Cazanove; Betty Stire, wife of L. T. Patenotte; James Alvin Stire, hsuband of Dauphine Pearson; and Charles Herbert Stire, husband of Anna Duczer. His widow, children, and nine grandchildren survive him.

"He worked in St. Tammany and Orleans Parishes before settling permanently in Hammond in March of 1929, where he was employed as chief engineer for the Southern United Ice Co.

"In 1944 his friends persuaded him to run for police juror for the seventh ward and he was elected overwhelmingly in the first primary. His was the unique distinction of receiving all of the votes in his home precinct, Hammond City Hall box, except two. This couple later stated that they voted against Jimmy because he was friendly with a man they were at odds with at that particular time.

"In 1945 he was elected mayor of the city of Hammond and remained as the mayor for 16 years before he was defeated. While serving as mayor he was appointed a member of the Louisiana State Hospital Board by the late and lamented Gov. Earl K. Long and reappointed by Gov. Jimmy H. Davis who also named him vice chairman of the said board.

"After leaving the office of mayor in 1961 he was employed by the Lcuisiana State Department of Highways until 1964 when he ran for and was elected clerk of court, in and for the Parish of Tangipahoa, State of Louisiana.

"On Sunday, February 13, 1966, at or about noon, while traveling between visits to sick friends, his car was struck by a train and he met his untimely death at the age of 65.

"He was a down to earth man with a dogged determination to help build and expand the community in which he lived.

"His friends were legion, irrespective of race, color, or creed and ranged from the poorest to the richest.

"In political circles he was friendly with the smallest precinct worker on up through Governor, Congressman, U.S. Senators, and even two Presidents.

"He worked untiringly with the dairy and strawberry industries, participated in the southeast Louisiana dairy festivals and assisted in obtaining national publicity for our strawberries.

"While serving as mayor of Hammond, he sponsored and helped make a reality, a multitude of civic projects, among them being the erection of an Army Reserve training center and a National Guard armory. He took pride in the construction of parks and recreational facilities such as swimming pools, baseball diamonds and playground equipment. He was the guiding light behind the Reimers Field and the Zemurray Memorial Park.

"In 1957 he was presented with the Distinguished Service Award by the Louisiana Municipal Review. He was a strong advocate of the Seventh Ward General Hospital which was dedicated in 1960. In 1962 he was nominated for the Mayor of the Year Award.

"Kind gestures were important to him, like paying his last respects and visiting the sick and infirm.

"In his passing we mourn the loss of a friend and a truly great diplomat."

Idaho State Legislature Wants National Potato Labeling Act Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho has forwarded to me a copy of a joint memorial which it recently passed urging that the Congress enact legislation requiring the labeling of potatoes as to the State of origin.

I have introduced such legislation, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2982—referred to in the joint memorial. I have also requested that the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], conduct hearings on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the producer of the famous Idaho baker entitled to protection in the marketing of his product, so is the consumer. A consumer buying a potato represented as being from Idaho should have the security of knowing that it actually was grown there. I urge prompt consideration and passage of this legislation.

The joint memorial from the Idaho State Legislature follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 9

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the members of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas there are now pending in Congress several bills, including S. 1058, H.R. 909, and H.R. 2982, proposing the enactment of legislation to be known as the National Potato Labeling Act; and

Whereas such proposed legislation will require that all fresh potatoes marketed in interstate commerce be labeled to show the name and address of the packer or repacker and the State in which such potatoes were grown; and

Whereas the widespread practice by packers and repackers of mislabeling fresh potatoes has resulted in potatoes which were grown in one State being labeled, advertised, and sold as having been grown in another State; and

Whereas such false labeling has misled the consumer and in many instances has caused the consumer to buy potatoes that are wrong for the intended use; and

Whereas the consumer has a right to protection from such deceptive practices and a right to choose from among various potatoes in the market on the basis of correct information as to their State or origin; and

Whereas since similar legislation has been enacted to protect farmers in the purchase of seed potatoes, the consumer is entitled to the same protection in the purchase of fresh potatoes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (senate and house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact the proposed National Potato Labeling Act as proposed in S. 1058, H.R. 909, and H.R. 2982; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Idaho, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, and to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

This joint memorial passed the house on the 28th day of February 1966.

PETER T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 2d day of March 1966.

W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

DRYDEN M. HILER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Anniversary of Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that today is the 26th anniversary of the terrible Katyn Massacre of 15,000 Polish prisoners of war by Soviet Union officials. On this day in 1940, this incredible mass murder occurred in the Katyn Forest region of the Ukraine, and it has never been rectified.

A select committee of the House made a report on the Katyn Massacre in 1952, but Congress has not taken further action on the matter, and there has been only limited discussion of it since that time.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress must never permit such crimes by the Soviet Union to be forgotten since they illustrate the true nature of communism. That is why we must not only remind the American public of these historical tragedies by observing them on the floor of the House, but we must establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

I am sure that the three Members of the House who served on the special House Committee on the Katyn Massacre who still serve in the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski], will join me in urging all of the Members to review the report of the special committee and apply its message to current events.

Food to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the emergency shipment of an additional 3.5 million tons of food grain to India as proposed by the President deserves the full and immediate support of Congress.

It would be a moral wrong for our Nation to simply sit on its mountain of surplus food while millions in India face the threat of death through starvation.

The drought now sweeping India is the worst in modern history. Resources from all over the world will have to be mobilized if a monumental tragedy is to be averted.

These additional amounts of grain the President seeks for this humanitarian purpose, along with the 6.5 million we pledged earlier to this effort and coupled with the generous donations of other Nations, will mean that today's threat of famine can be replaced with hope for tomorrow.

We are being asked to give of what we do not need, of that which we do not require, to keep alive our bodies, our economy and our Nation. Yet, this gift can mean life itself to a great nation.

It can mean that India can avert a tragedy and instead of going through a long period of recovery, face tomorrow with hope and confidence.

It can mean that India can concentrate upon the means of finding a solution to its own growing food problems.

Even after these surplus foods are donated to India, there will still be the monumental task of transporting this grain to India and to those parts of that vast country where famine is the worst.

I feel certain that these problems can be and will be solved by cooperative efforts between India, ourselves and other friendly governments throughout the world.

Indianapolis VISTA Volunteer Up Front in the Poverty War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most honorable service a person can perform is to help other humans to help themselves. It is the objective of Volunteers in Service to America to do just that.

One of my constituents, Miss Sandra Deeter, personifies the unselfish attitude characteristic of VISTA volunteers.

The Indianapolis Star Sunday magazine recently described some of Miss Deeter's experiences as a VISTA volunteer in the hills of Kentucky.

Because of the widespread interest in the VISTA program, I insert in the Congressional Record the article written for the Indianapolis Star by Gretchen Wolfram:

Life in impoverished Appalachia has been the target of hundreds of "think pieces," articles, books, and television "specials" about that "other America," a kind of nagging embarrassment that betrays the United States as a land of plenty. Most people would rather keep it on the television screen and stay a comfortable distance away.

But not Sandra Deeter, an Indianapolis teenager who would rather fight than switch channels. Sandy, knee-deep in the trenches of the war on poverty, now lives at Bull Skin, Ky., as a member of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA).

Until August 30 Sandy was the proverbial typical teenager. An above-average pupil, she had been graduated from Bishop Chatard High School on Indianapolis' north side. Named the outstanding member of the music department, she assisted the school's band director besides playing clarinet, saxophone and piano.

For 3 years she worked on the newspaper, the Trojan Shield, moving up to circulation manager her sophomore year and into the editor's position her junior year. As a senior, the Quill and Scroll member helped put out the Citadel, young Chatard's first yearbook.

But when more than 180 members of her 205-member senior class typically trekked to college campuses this fall, Sandy took an atypical turn: She headed for Tuskegee, Ala., and 6 weeks of intensive training for VISTA to begin a kind of postgraduate course in people.

"I was the shortest (5 feet, 1½ inches) and the youngest one there," recalls the adventurous teen who had celebrated her 18th birthday August 14. (Volunteers must be at least 18 years old.)

She and 40 other trainees went through 2 weeks of lectures (problems and answers to poverty), 2½ weeks of training "in the field," and 1½ weeks of roundup-type discussions on the Federal programs to combat poverty.

During the field training period, Sandy lived with a Negro family in an isolated area near Tuskegee. The closest Volunteer was about a half-mile away.

"Alabama was a great adjustment because of the extreme racial problem, although it didn't openly affect my particular area," she says. "Mostly, I just learned to know the people and the problems of the poor, how they think, their language."

Training completed, Sandy was off for mountainous Clay County, one of the poorest areas in Kentucky, and the inhabitants of Horse Creek.

In January, she was assigned to Bull Skin, the composite name for a series of "hollers" where settlements of several houses each are nestled in the Kentucky hills. There, she met up again with Ed Godfrey, a 23-year-old Buffalo, N.Y., native with a college degree in sociology who had also been in training at Tuskegee.

Actually, Sandy lives at the "head of a holler" (as far in as you can get) called Jake's Branch which consists of three or four houses. The only way to get there is by stepping across a rickety, swinging bridge; the nearest telephone is about a quarter-mile away. "The people welcomed me like one of the family," she reports, "and they're so eager to get started on the programs."

Sandy lives with a 73-year-old farmer and his wife in a house with no heat (they use a coal stove) or running water (they pump it from a well). The couple has two cows, some chickens and their own garden. They grow corn and hay.

"She (the farmer's wife) cans fruit like mad—peaches, apples, and everything else," says Sandy whose diet consists mostly of pork and potatoes. "Every morning for breakfast we have biscuits, coffee and bulldog gravy (flour, water and grease)." Sandy loves to listen to the farmer tell stories about Old Dan, his mule, that they use to plow the garden.

One of the first projects she and Ed tackled was turning a one-room schoolhouse into a community center; now they'e enlarging it. Bull Skin people, mostly Baptists, use the building for Bible-reading sessions or for popular "cream-pull" parties.

"The candy creams right in your hands if you don't pull it right and it's a mess to clean off," reports Sandy who has become proficient with practice.

They've also tried to make ice cream in a bucket with a churn, using ice from the creek. "This didn't turn out too well. It didn't freeze," Sandy recalls ruefully.

Bull Skin residents have little to do for recreation. Not many have television sets because of the costs of aerials, a necessity in the mountainous area. "Some do have radios," Sandy says, "but mostly they just stand around and talk."

Most of Bull Skin's approximately 500 inhabitants receive welfare aid, some are coal miners and more are tobacco farmers.

About 150 children go to grade school about 5 miles away or to the high school at Manchester, about 30 miles from Bull Skin. (Another VISTA project has been building wooden shelters at bus stops to protect the children in bad weather. Six unemployed fathers did the job.)

"The children love to read" but there's no bookmobile so Ed and I are trying to get a library started. Most kids just go as far as the eighth grade, if that far, then leave and usually head for Ohio or Indiana. There's really not much they're able to do as far as job skills go, but some do make it to college."

To get things moving in Bull Skin, Sandy and Ed have undertaken a door-to-door survey to get information on age, sex, education and income of the people, whether they have water and toilets, whether housing is standard or substandard. Once this data is gathered and community needs are outlined, Sandy will send a grant proposal to Washington in hopes of getting funds.

Meanwhile, the people themselves are helping plan their own self-help projects. "So far, they want to set up programs in health, recreation and home management," Sandy explains. "These people are fantastic: they are really doing things."

The musically talented teenager has discovered this interest fits right in at Bull Skin. "Music is the heart of living in Appalachia," she says. "They'd almost rather sing than anything—mostly spirituals and folksongs about everyday life. They make up a lot of the words as they go along." Sandy didn't lug her clarinet or saxophone to Bull Skin, but she did buy a guitar to play for songfests at the comunity center.

Her youthful enthusiasm is paying off but not in money. While the little more than 1-year-old VISTA program comes under the administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity, there is little economic opportunity in it for the volunteers. They get living expenses and $75 a month for incidentals. Fifty dollars is put aside for them each month so that, at the end of a 1-year term of service, they have $600. In some cases, this is below the average income of the people VISTA workers help. The average family income for America's 300,000 migrant harvesters, for instance, is $900 a year. So, money provides no motivation for a volunteer.

Sandy explains: "I know I want to go into sociology and this seems like a good way to get some practical experience."

Her mother, Mrs. Edward F. Deeter, says, "We were a little apprehensive at first, but we knew that's what she wanted to do."

So Sandy joined ranks with about 1,400 VISTA workers now helping on 191 projects in 42 States and the District of Columbia. Her own group, those working with the rural poor, number about 350 on 58 projects in 27 States.

What's next for this action-conscious teenager? "After my year is up, I am thinking about staying with VISTA for another year. If not, I'll take courses at Indiana University's Indianapolis Extension or go on to Ball State University to major in sociology," she says.

And, like the much-publicized problem of "reentry" for returning Peace Corps volunteers, Sandy's adjustment to her "old world" might take time. But curing the ills of the impoverished is, after all, VISTA's aim.

If Sandy succeeds and VISTA works, there will eventually be less and less need for adjustment between America's "two worlds."

Fino Blasts Farmers Home Administration Laxity and Loan Giveaway, Introduces Corrective Legislation To Tighten Loan Standards and Urges Cutback in Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would restrict the situations in which the Farmers Home Administration may make loans to country dwellers who allegedly cannot get other credit.

Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture can make loans to rural residents for rural housing at advantageous rates varying with the economic condition of the borrower if the Secretary decides that other credit is unavailable. Unfortunately, the Agriculture Department has been lax in establishing whether or not other credit is available.

The Comptroller General recently examined loans made in five States by the Farmers Home Administration and found that 20 percent of the total number of loans examined were made to applicants who could have obtained financing from other sources. The Comptroller General citing language of Congress stating that the program was not intended to supplant or compete with credit available from other sources, blamed the laxity of Farmers Home county supervisors.

My bill deals with this situation by requiring applicants to show, as a condition of getting loans, that they have been refused credit of a sort the terms and conditions of which they could reasonably have been expected to fulfill. This will make the program live up to the intent of Congress that it not compete with private credit.

There is a section of the farm housing title of the 1949 Housing law—section 502(b)(3)—which provides that some farm housing loans may, if the Secretary so decides, be required to be refinanced by the borrower through responsible private credit sources. I think that the Secretary of Agriculture should look into exercising his powers under this section with respect to the loans which should not have been made. Such refinancings could restore millions to our treasury.

A few weeks ago, I introduced legislation to provide that the loans of the Farmers Home Administration, the Small Business Administration, and other agencies cannot be put into the pools of Government loans in which the Federal National Mortgage Association—as agent for the agencies—is going to sell participations. My reason for trying to keep these loans out of the pools by restricting the pools to Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration insured loans is that, in addition to trying to stop a budget gimmick, I do not want to see programs like the Farmers Home Administration rural loan program get any bigger. It is big enough already and if the Comptroller General is correct, it is wasteful enough already.

If Government agency loans of all kinds can continually be put in pools, in which participations are then sold, this will greatly encourage the Government to take over an ever-increasing share of national loanmaking. The Government will make the loans at cheap rates. Then it will sell some kind of notes or participations at higher rates to get its money back. Then it will make more loans. It looks like Government is out to socialize lending. That is not surprising. The administration is out to socialize residential patterns, and the idea of socialized lending seems to go hand in hand. What is bad is that socialized lending is subsidized lending. Someone is being asked to subsidize someone else's loan. There is enough of this already.

The bill I am introducing today will tighten Farmers Home Administration loan requirements and hopefully take that agency out of some competition with private credit. My previous bill to keep Farmers Home Administration loans out of the proposed pools will, if passed, block a budget gimmick and head off the large-scale expansion of the farmers home loan program that would follow on the heels of use of the pools to steadily refinance loans and increase the supply of available funds.

The Comptroller General has put his finger on a program that needs scrutiny. My bills will do the job. I urge this House to act.

Rebuild the House?

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary a statement in which I outlined a proposal which would provide for alternating 2- and 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives.

My proposal calls for a congressional election in a State each time an election is held in the State for a normal 6-year senatorial term. Since there are two Senators from each State, and since the two Senators from a given State are not elected for full terms in the same year, this would, in effect, create a system of alternating 2- and 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives.

In an article published in the Johns Hopkins magazine of March 1965, written by Robert L. Peabody, entitled "Rebuild the House?" the 4-year term proposals are discussed. Mr. Peabody speaks favorably of the alternating term proposal. I request permission to reprint his article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

REBUILD THE HOUSE?

(By Robert L. Peabody)

(NOTE.—Robert L. Peabody is an associate professor of political science at Johns Hopkins. He is the author of "Organizational Authority" and coeditor and contributor to "New Perspectives on the House of Representatives." Under a Social Science Research Council grant, Dr. Peabody spent a leave of absence last year in close study of congressional bargaining, hierarchy, and legislative outcome. He is currently the acting director of the American Political Science Association's study of Congress.)

The present 2-year term requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning—depriving the Nation of the fullest measure of both their skills and their wisdom. Today, too, the work of Government is far more complex than in our early years, requiring more time to learn and more time to master the technical tasks of legislation. And a longer term will serve to attract more men of the highest quality to political life. The Nation, the principle of democracy, and I think, each congressional district, will be better served by a 4-year term for Members of the House. And I urge your swift action—President Lyndon B. Johnson, state of the Union message, January 12, 1966.

The President proposes that our Representatives serve 4-year terms. Is his case a sound one?

Should Congress pass a constitutional amendment extending the term of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years?

If so, should the terms of office be staggered? Or should they run concurrently with the term of office of the President?

What would happen, under either version, to executive-legislative relationships and the system of checks and balances upon which our Government is based?

If the questions are perplexing, we can take comfort in the knowledge that debate over the length of the House term is as old as the Constitution itself. The present 2-year term was a compromise between those who favored annual elections, and others, including James Madison, who advocated 3-year terms. Madison later defended the compromise version in "The Federalist Papers":

"As it is essential to liberty that the Government in general should have a common interest with the people; so it is particularly essential that the branch of it under consideration [the House] should have an immediate dependence on, and an intimate sympathy with the people. Frequent elections are unquestionably the only policy by which this dependency and sympathy can be effectively secured."

The question then, as now, was how frequent House elections must be in order for one branch of the Government to maintain "an intimate sympathy with the people."

Senators, on the other hand, were granted relative independence from the short-term changing moods of the country. Each Senator was to be elected for 6 years, with one-third of the Senate up for reelection every 2 years. The resulting check and balance of the two Houses upon each other, and of Congress upon the executive branch and the courts, has effectively prevented usurpation of power by any one institution of our National Government.

Sporadically, since 1787 the issue of longer terms for House Members has made its appearance. In 1950, the American Political Science Association's Committee on Political Parties issued a report, "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System," which advocated 4-year terms for House Members running concurrently with the President as a means of promoting legislative-executive party solidarity. This recommendation, by no means uniformly endorsed by political scientists, was but one of a series of proposals designed to bring about more centralized political parties in this country.

Fortunately, like most proposals drafted without the participation of the people to be affected, almost nothing came of them.

The passion for reform and the particular fondness of some political scientists for political parties modeled after the more disciplined parties of Great Britain has never completely died out. James McGregor Burns gave these themes their most eloquent recent restatement in his book, "Deadlock of Democracy." For Burns and other political scientists who are executive branch oriented, 4-year terms running concurrent with the President would tend to reduce what they perceive as a "deadlock" between the two branches.

Ironically, the election of 1964 and the subsequent legislative successes of the 89th Congress took away much of the pressure behind congressional reform at the same time that heavy Democratic majorities in Congress increased the probabilities that major changes could be implemented.

The issue of 4-year terms for House Members had generated considerable interest in the 89th Congress even before President Johnson endorsed the idea in his state of the Union message early this year. Representative Frank Chelf, Democrat, of Kentucky, third-ranking member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, had waged a vigorous letter-writing campaign to secure support among his colleagues for his own resolution. His version, introduced in March of 1965, called for staggered 4-year terms, with one-half of the 435 Members of the House to be elected every 2 years.

A Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress had been created at the beginning of the 89th Congress, and it added further impetus to the drive for 4-year terms. Last year 18 House Members and several Senators testified before the committee in favor of 4-year terms. Senate supporters included Birch Bayh, Democrat, of Indiana, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, under whose jurisdiction such resolutions would come. Several of the House Democratic Members of the Joint Committee on Organization, including one of its two cochairmen, Representative Ray Madden, Democrat, of Indiana, were pushing strongly for 4-year terms as part of the committee's recommendations.

What moved this particular constitutional amendment beyond the realm of congressional dreams and academic speculations was President Johnson's strong endorsement in his January speech.

Why did he make this recommendation? The President is not a reformer of political institutions by inclination. He has made the existing system work well for him. As Democratic floor leader in the Senate from 1953 through 1960, he was by general agreement the most skillful and successful floor leader in recent memory. His record as President during the epic first session of the 89th Congress had already established him as one of the most effective presidential coordinators of legislation in all history.

Perhaps uppermost in President Johnson's decision to endorse 4-year terms for House Members were three factors. First, the amendment appeared to be popular with many House Members. A 1965 poll conducted by Representative Chelf showed 251 Members for, 41 against, and 65 in doubt, of 357 replies received. Sentiment in the Senate, the traditional source of opposition to such proposals, seemed favorable. Of 50 responses, 31 were for Chelf's staggered-term proposal, 7 against, and 12 doubtful. And indeed, Johnson's endorsement of 4-year terms drew more applause from Congress than almost any proposal put forth in his state of the Union message.

Furthermore, it generated a great deal of positive publicity in many national newspapers and magazines.

Finally, and most important, this proposal would add nothing to the mounting costs of carrying on the Great Society programs and the war in Vietnam.

In a special message sent to Congress on January 20, accompanying a draft of his proposed amendment, President Johnson set forth in detail three arguments in favor of 4-year terms for House Members. These arguments, all quite sound, can be reduced to the following essential points:

(a) The United States of America has undergone tremendous expansion. The legislative process has increased in scope and complexity. Demands upon Congressmen are ever more time consuming.

(b) The costs of campaigning every 2 years are becoming more and more burdensome, if not prohibitive.

(c) Four-year terms would attract more and better-qualified candidates.

Before turning to a fourth and, in my judgment, the crucial argument, each of these points needs brief development.

There is no question but that the United States and its political institutions have undergone great change since the Constitution was ratified. In 1789, America was a very small country. Most of its people lived in relative isolation. Of its 4 million population, only about 200,000 lived in cities and towns of over 2,500 persons. New York City, then the Capital, had a population of 33,000. Washington, D.C., was only a swamp. The First Congress was composed of but 26 Senators and 64 Representatives. A Member of the House represented but 30,000 inhabitants. Only 144 bills were introduced in the First Congress, 108 of which became laws.

Today, the population of the United States numbers more than 190 million people. Almost two-thirds of the people live in urban areas. Social mobility, ease of travel, television, and newspapers have brought more and more people into communication and contact with one another. As the Federal Government has grown and the role of Government in the economy has increased, the demands on Congress have multiplied. Each House Member now represents, on the average, 430,000 constituents. The workload of Congress has increased in volume and complexity; over 14,000 bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 89th Congress alone, and of these, 349 became public laws. Congressional sessions increasingly run for 10 months or more of the calendar year.

In his first two or three terms, a House Member's effectiveness as a legislator is reduced by his need to build a firm base of district support. As he gains in experience, of course, his ability to check upon and ameliorate the impersonal impact of the Federal bureaucracy on his constituents is increased. As he begins to master the skills of serving his campaign and his constituency, a Congressman can afford to devote more and more of his time to committee work and influencing the outcome of legislation.

He must still face the hazards of mounting campaign costs. Federal and State expenditure ceilings are ineffective and totally unrealistic. While campaign costs vary considerably from "safe" to competitive districts and from rural to urban districts, expenditures of $50,000 to $60,000 per campaign are not uncommon. Attempts to unseat incumbents can send these costs much higher. For example, a freshman Democrat from New York filed campaign expenditures of almost $200,000 in a successful bid to defeat a Republican incumbent in 1964.

As another freshman Democratic member argued: "Four-year terms would prevent congressional offices from being 80 percent campaign headquarters and only 20 percent offices for legislative activities. As it is now, I am constantly involved in fund-raising."

The most direct approach to these problems, however, would be sensible revision of laws governing campaign expenditures and contributions.

Third, it is argued, 4-year terms would probably attract more and better-qualified candidates for public office. By reducing the frequency of elections and the costs of continual campaigning, presumably more people would consider running for public office. The caliber of Congressmen, already quite high, would no doubt be improved.

Sound as this argument may be, from a political standpoint it may be self-defeating. For this argument, unlike the others, can cut two ways in terms of mobilizing support for this constitutional amendment.

A fourth and crucial argument, used by many advocates of 4-year terms for House Members, is that it would enhance the influence of the President by centralizing party organization and making Members more responsive to presidential programs. Members running with or against the President would be forced to campaign on national issues. "Coattail effects," or the tendency for congressional candidates of the same party to benefit from the size of the vote for strong presidential candidates, would be magnified.

President Johnson did not make use of this argument in his Presidential message. However, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, did emphasize the impact of concurrent terms on executive-legislative party unity. Under this proposed amendment the President and Congress would be more likely "to be able to carry out a program without unreasonable deadlocks."

The rationale for closer harmony between the President and Congress is given its more positive statement in Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK's book, "Congress: The Sapless Branch." If a House Member, CLARK argues—

"Comes from a competitive district, he will be more of a statesman and less of an errand boy if he runs always at the same time and on the same ticket as the presidential candidate of his party. The strengthening of the national interest in terms of the effective dialog on issues which such a procedural change would bring about is substantial. The strengthening of the national parties is even more so. The strengthening of the hand of the President, who alone speaks for all Americans, is the most substantial of all."

There rests the case, a strong one, for longer terms for House Members. The first three arguments are especially appealing. A much stronger case, however, can be made for maintaining the present system of 2-year terms.

The argument turns on commitment to the principle of coordinate branches of Government. The practice of "separate institutions sharing power" is insured by multiple checks and balances built into our Constitution. Variation in the lengths of terms among our political leaders is one of the most fundamental safeguards against any single leader or institution dominating all the others to the detriment of democratic freedoms.

In our Government, the House, Senate, and President frequently represent quite different political interests. These different interests deserve a hearing and need to be reconciled if public policy is to reflect the will of substantial majorities. Members of the House act as spokesmen for local, sometimes even parochial, interests. At the same time, they are called upon to legislate in the national interest.

Which interest should House Members represent? Edmund Burke, in his "Speech to the Electors of Bristol" in 1774, presented what has become the classic arugment in favor of representation of the national interest over local concerns. As Burke said: "Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests; which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; but Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole; where, not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole."

What is sometimes overlooked is that hostility among the electors of Bristol to Burke's national views later forced him to withdraw as a candidate from this constituency.

In our country, a Representative must remain sensitive to the wishes of his constituents. He recognizes that they can turn him out if he does not vote in their best interests. If a legislator decides, as he not infrequently does, that national interests outweigh local considerations, then he does so at some risk.

It is this sensitivity to the will of the people which 2-year terms of office help to preserve. This continuing tension between local and national interests is a strength, not a weakness, of the representative process. Many factors in our political system are at work to reinforce the impact of national interests: 2-year terms assure that local needs will not be overlooked in an era increasingly characterized by expanding Federal powers.

Furthermore, the elections of House members that occur between presidential elections perform several basic functions which add to the stability of our political system and strengthen our two-party system. Off-year elections provide an opportunity for a review of presidential policies. The results can either extend the presidential mandate, as the election results of 1934 and 1962 were largely interpreted, or dampen it, as in the elections of 1918, 1946, 1954, and 1958. The election of 1966 may well turn on the success or failure of President Johnson's policies in Vietnam.

Midterm elections also provide the "out" party an opportunity to increase its strength in Congress. Since 1900, the party which does not control the White House has averaged a net gain of 38 seats in off-year elections. In only one midterm election, 1934, was the party in power able to make a net gain of House seats. When the same party controls the White House for 8, 12, or a longer period of years, midterm contests may become crucial for preserving a minority that can successfully criticize and provide alternatives to the majority.

A third and related point is that 2-year terms provide a fundamental check on the powers of the Presidency. As the Federal Government has grown, the power of the President has increased. Four-year terms running concurrently with the President would weaken Congress at the same time that it would enhance the powers of the President. Some Democratic Congressmen clearly owe their seats to the length of the President's "coattails" in the election of 1964. Yet few of these Congressmen would welcome the idea of becoming more dependent upon presidential favor and national party, as distinct from congressional campaign committee, contributions.

Supporters of 4-year terms may argue that these would give Representatives greater independence from interest-group and constituency pressures. But they can hardly argue that it would make them less susceptible to White House pressure at the same time that they say that it would lead to greater executive-legislative party solidarity. Four-year terms would remove one of the most effective shields now used by Congressmen to withstand pressure. Almost every Congressman has, at one time or another, found it convenient to take refuge from executive "armtwisting" by the simple but almost irrefutable argument: "My people back home are opposed to this measure, and I am up for reelection next year."

Thus, it is for the very reasons that Burns, Senator CLARK, and others support 4-year terms running concurrently with the President, that this constitutional amendment should be opposed. Such a change would drastically alter the separation of powers and checks and balances upon which our governmental system is based. Congress needs to maintain its independence from the Presidency. Reelection every 2 years furthers this independence, helps to maintain a viable minority party, and thus promotes the balance of power within the Government.

The staggered-term proposal advocated by Congressman CHELF would counter this danger, but impose further problems of its own. Each State delegation would be divided by lot into two classes as equal as possible. One-half of the Members would run with the President and the other half would run in midterm elections. Such a proposal runs the risk of splitting the House of Representatives into two classes of Congressmen: those disposed to support the President, and those Members elected in the off year who would likely oppose Presidential programs. This might well lead to greater "deadlock" and prevent the occasional extraordinary Congress, such as the 89th, where legislation comes of age and productivity is exceptionally high.

In short, 4-year terms concurrent with the President would promote a Congress overly responsive to the President. Staggered terms, on the other hand, would create a class of half the Members who quite likely would be unresponsive. Reapportionment and redistricting would create still further problems.

One possible way out of this dilemma has been suggested by Representative DONALD RUMSFELD, Republican, of Illinois. His proposal calls for alternating 2- and 4-year terms for each Member. Over a 12-year period a Member would run four times, as compared with the present six elections: twice during presidential years, and twice in nonpresidential years. This would seem to mitigate a division of the House into two classes, one overly responsive and the other unresponsive.

Such a proposal seems preferable to still a fourth variation: 3-year terms for House Members with one-third of the Members up for relection every year. Yet, both run the risk of further confusing a relatively uninformed, if responsible, electorate.

What are the chances that any of these variations will end up a constitutional amendment? In passing, let us note that constitutional amendments are difficult to create. More than 20,000 have been proposed in the history of the country and only 24 have become the law of the land. The Founding Fathers provided for change but they did not intend for change to come about easily. Hence the requirement that constitutional amendments receive two-thirds of the votes of both Houses, followed by ratification of three-fourths of the State legislatures.

For the current proposals to tamper with the 2-year terms for House Members, the probabilities of adoption are becoming increasingly slim. Hearings held before the House Committee on the Judiciary in February 1966, have, if anything, dampened some of the early enthusiasm for either the President's or Representative CHELF's proposal. A January poll by the Congressional Quarterly revealed a stiffening opposition. Of those Members who replied, the vote was 105 to 90 in favor in the House and 19 to 20 opposed in the Senate.

Among key Democrats who oppose 4-year terms are EMANUEL CELLER of New York, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary; FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey, an influential House liberal; and, predictably, a number of southern conservatives, including HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia. The two most influential House Republicans, Minority Leader GERALD FORD of Michigan and Republican Conference Chairman MELVIN LAIRD of Wisconsin, have been issued statements warning of the inherent dangers in the 4-year-term proposals.

Most of what support remains for 4-year terms comes from the younger Members of the House, particularly those associated with the Democratic study group (of which FRANK THOMPSON is chairman), an informal grouping of some 175 northern and western Democratic moderates and liberals.

Behind the growing opposition are practical considerations as well as the constitutional arguments. A major stumbling block, heretofore, has been opposition from U.S. Senators. Without built-in restrictions against running for other statewide offices, a 4-year term would be a virtual invitation for sitting House Members to take on incumbent Senators or Governors up for reelection in the off years. Presently a House Member almost always is forced to give up his own seat in order to campaign against a Senator or Governor. These public officials would prefer to keep it that way. A similar argument has been used against 3-year House terms; this arrangement would allow State legislators with 2- or 4-year terms a free crack at incumbent House Members.

The President's proposal has done away with most Senate opposition on these grounds by including a section which prohibits Members of Congress from running for the other House unless the Member resigns 30 days prior to such an election. The Chelf resolution goes even further. It would prohibit a House Member from seeking nomination or election to any office, other than a vacancy, unless he resigns in advance.

A final argument from the standpoint of practical politics is that 4-year terms may lead to greater, not less, turnover among House Members. There is virtual unanimity among successful Congressmen that elections are really won in the odd years. Non-election-year activities provide them with opportunities to make nonpolitical speeches and emphasize their role as spokesman for all their district's interests. Incumbent Congressmen have many advantages, including franking (free mailing) privileges, the assistance of a trained staff of up to 10 members, and multiple chances to build good will and develop favorable publicity. So great is this advantage that, over the years, more than seven out of eight incumbents who run for reelection are victorious.

At first glance, 4-year terms would seem to improve an incumbent's chances of being reelected. He would, after all, have 3 nonelection years to solidify his position. But this view may be misleading. If a Member were not up for reelection every 2 years, the pressures on him to return to his district would be lessened. Polls reveal that, even now, as few as one-third of the electorate can name their Congressmen. Elections every 2 years provide a Congressman with a opportunity to get his name before the public.

The existence of off year elections are particularly valuable, since they allow Congresmen to establish their independence from the national ticket. This independence is especially important in areas where the national party or its presidential candidate is not popular. Thus, a number of southern liberal Democrats were able to withstand the Goldwater tide in their States because they had developed name familiarity and independence from the national ticket. Similarly, a number of northeastern liberal Republicans, most notably John Lindsay, were able successfully to divorce their 1964 campaigns from a losing national cause.

Four-year terms would probably lure additional candidates from private and public life into competition for House seats. Districtwide races would almost inevitably be lower in cost than statewide Senate campaigns. Young lawyers, labor leaders, businessmen, and other professionals might find running for the House almost as attractive as a Senate seat. Present incumbents will undoubtedly think twice before they vote for an amendment which poses the threat of increased competition and the danger of potentially greater turnover among House Members.

Congressmen are overworked. Given their high responsibilities, heavy expenses, and the burden of frequent trips to and from their districts, annual salaries of $30,000 make Congressmen, if anything, underpaid. Many must start fund raising, if not campaigning, almost as soon as the last election is over.

Yet, as the Washington Post recently commented in an unusually sympathetic editorial, "no one compels these men to run for Congress. Presumably they seek election to Congress because they like it, because they want the salary or because they see opportunity to render a national service, and we surmise that they will continue to do so regardless of how long the term is."

The Constitution requires that all Members of the House of Representatives be elected every 2 years. Every 4 years they must run with the President of the United States, thus providing an opportunity for a strong presidential candidate to bring Members along with him who will be sympathetic to his programs. Every 4 years, at midterm elections, House Members have their own contests. For the most part, these are relatively insulated from the forces which shape the outcomes of national presidential elections. From time to time they provide a mechanism for endorsing or rejecting administration policies.

It is a relatively simple and uncomplicated election system which has withstood the test of time. Occasionally the House responds slowly, or not at all, to the demands placed upon it by the President and the executive branch. On other occasions, its Members may overreact to crisis. But the House continues to come closer to reflecting the will of the diverse local interests of our country than any branch of our National Government.

On the whole, the House of Representatives has proven its worth as a viable and responsive legislative assembly. Two-year terms of office have been basic to the maintenance of this responsiveness to the will of the people.

Joint Memorial on Land-Grant College Fund Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the proposed curtailment of funds for the extension services of the land-grant colleges has met with strong opposition in the State of Idaho. I, too, oppose this proposed cut in funds, and so testified recently before the Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee of the House of Representatives.

In order that Idaho's opposition to a reduction is the services provided by the extension services be fully recognized, I include in the Record a joint memorial, passed by the Idaho State Legislature, which sets forth clearly and concisely such opposition.

The joint memorial follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 14

Joint memorial to the Honorable President of the United States, the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled and the Honorable Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the most important industry in the State of Idaho is agriculture, an industry that produces crops of many kinds; and

Whereas the teaching of instructors in the field of agriculture extension work, to provide assistance to the agriculture industry, is very necessary to the industry; and

Whereas the agriculture programs of the extension service do more than any other single program to keep our young people in the field of agriculture on the farm; and

Whereas a program of agricultural research is vital to the agriculture industry of the State of Idaho, and is the only program that we now have in the development of new strains of seeds and the control of diseases and insects that in so many ways destroy farm crops; and

Whereas the Federal budget for 1966–67, appropriating moneys to these programs, has drastically reduced these funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully request that action be taken by the President and the Congress of the United States of America, to restore these funds to the original amounts as provided in the 1965–66 budget; and be it further

Resolved, That attention be drawn that the growing population of the world will bring additional strain on the production of foods and fibers; and to curtail the development and selection of instructional personnel and deter the research in the area of agriculture is not in line with our American principles; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.
Attest: DRYDEN M. HILER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Fruitful Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor recently ran an editorial on "The Humphrey Mission" to Asia in which it stated:

> In his enthusiasm for helping those who desperately need assistance, Mr. HUMPHREY is merely expressing a widely held American attitude. Nor can we believe that statements of encouragement and offers of help fall on unhearing ears.
>
> A nation like America, caught up in difficult affairs around the globe, needs high officials who can speak convincingly of American's true aims and efforts.

The Monitor has done a short but thoughtful summary of the Vice President's mission, and I ask that the article be included in the Record.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 26, 1966]

THE HUMPHREY MISSION

There has been a steady drumfire of criticism of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY's 2-week swing through nine Asian nations. He was accused of overoptimism, underrestraint, of pledging away the Treasury, and of not really hearing what the Asians said to him.

These are unjustifiably harsh criticisms. It cannot be denied that Mr. HUMPHREY is a bubbly person. He exudes energy, confidence, liberality, good will, and good-fellowship. It is true that he is often overly optimistic and underly cautious.

Yet, for all this, the Vice President's swing throughout southern Asia was not without its good effect—both at home and abroad. As a liberal of long standing, Mr. HUMPHREY is in a position to speak to many Americans who deserve to be spoken to by someone whom they feel they can trust to understand what is bothering them.

When the Vice President returns from southern Asia convinced that there is an overhanging Chinese threat and that this threat is widely and deeply feared in that part of the world, we hope that this will carry more weight with many who are disturbed over American attempts to restrain Chinese imperialism than have the words of some others. We also hope that when the Vice President tells Congress and the country, as he has already done, that he is confident of the "ultimate triumph" of the goals for which America is fighting, this will hearten the fainthearted.

It is never easy to be truly sure of the impression which a whirlwinding American may make upon the more traditionally minded Asian scene. In Asia, as elsewhere, courtesy often masks disagreement. Yet, in his enthusiaasm for helping those who desperately need assistance, Mr. HUMPHREY is merely expressing a widely held American attitude. Nor can we believe that statements of encouragement and offers of help fall on unhearing ears.

A nation like America, caught up in difficult affairs around the globe, needs high officials who can speak convincingly of America's true aims and efforts. Mr. HUMPHREY is, on most occasions, such a man. We do not think that his 43,000-mile swing was fruitless.

Food for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento Bee comments editorially:

> A massive effort will be required to meet the problem of feeding the world's hungry and to help them produce more by themselves.

In his food for freedom message, President Johnson "called for increased movement of food to needy areas but also stipulated this aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it," the paper says.

It adds:

> The clear superiority of democratic food production over that of Communist countries places this Nation in the forefront of what will in the last third of this century be the major international political battle of history—the feeding of the world's hungry and showing them how they can help themselves.

The thinking back of this editorial will interest my colleagues, I feel sure, and it is with this in mind that I insert it in the RECORD:

DEMAND TO FEED WORLD'S HUNGRY WILL REQUIRE MASSIVE U.S. EFFORT

The U.S. food industry has entered upon the most challenging era of its history. The last third of the 20th century will place greater demands upon this Nation's farmers and food distributors. A massive effort will be required to meet the problem of feeding the world's hungry and to help them produce more by themselves.

Consider these facts: Experts figure the population of the world will double from the present 3 to 6 billion by 2000, just 35 years away. Food production is not keeping up with the population explosion. The nation which conquers the complex difficulty of raising and distributing sufficient food to maintain living conditions will be the leader of the world.

Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of agriculture at Purdue University, in a recent talk before the International Industrial Conference in San Francisco, said the world must duplicate in the next generation the production record that man has achieved since the dawn of history.

The yield per acre in North America has increased in the last 25 years by 109 percent. In the same period, there has been only a 7 percent increase in Asia. The United States in the last decade hase provided over 140 million tons of food for needy nations. Americans have committed their public conscience to the propostion that no one should go hungry while there is surplus here. While this is a commendable social concern, it also has tremendous implications upon international diplomacy.

In a speech in Philadelphia last year, W. B. Murphy, president of the Campbell Soup Co., stressed this point. He observed that the Achilles heel of communism very likely is production and marketing of food. On the other hand, private enterprise, with governmental assistance, has made the standards of living in the United States unequaled in the world.

Murphy pointed out that if Russia and Communist China cannot satisfy their people on foods it is unlikely they will be able in the long run to maintain their present forms of highly centralized economic control and dictatorship.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his food-for-freedom message to Congress earlier this month, called for increased movement of food to needy areas but also stipulated this aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it.

The clear superiority of democratic food production over that of Communist countries places this Nation in the forefront of what will in the last third of this century be the major international political battle of history—the feeding of the world's hungry and showing them how they can help themselves.

Salute to Earl Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr: MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a truly great American has reached the three-quarter century mark. His wisdom and brilliance as a jurist have earned Chief Justice Earl Warren the respect of his Nation.

It is with pleasure that I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following tribute by Ralph McGill which appeared in the March 27, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

SALUTE TO EARL WARREN

(By Ralph McGill)

Chief Justice Earl Warren recently celebrated his 75th birthday with his family. The event stimulates appraisal.

Now and then, driving through the southern countryside, one comes across fading old signs urging that we impeach Earl Warren. This form of idiotic prejudice flourished for a few years, but it now seems to be dying out, overcome by events and commonsense. The signs flourished before the White Citizens Councils and other racist, hate organizations themselves began to fade. Some such signs were put up by the extremists of the far right who saw the Supreme Court's careful protection of the rights of all citizens as a Communist plot. These persons made a Communist plot of the civil rights decisions by the Supreme Court. But now that the Congress of the United States has enacted civil rights legislation and followed it with a comprehensive voting rights act, this particular brand of prejudicial dementia seems to have lost steam. The Congress in a sense appraised and approved by its acts what the courts earlier had said.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, a gentle, kindly, intelligent, scholarly man, a good husband and father, who possesses all the Horatio Alger, 100-percent American virtues, became the target of all those extremist organizations. The witch hunters, the Klans, the White Citizens Councils and extremists of the far political right who would prefer a Fascist-type government to one of equal civil and political rights—all these, and more, sought to picture the Chief Justice as wholly responsible for shoring up the American guarantees of equal political rights and opportunity. For this they hated him.

In a way this was odd. The decision, which most angered all such organizations and individuals was that of May 17, 1954, declaring school segregation unconstitutional. It was a unanimous decision. The Chief Justice, who wrote it, nonetheless was merely one of nine who voted for it. Yet, for no good reason the Chief Justice became the sole personal target.

The passing of time and the events therein have fully demonstrated the correctness of the Court's findings. The schools were separate, but had never been equal. They were inferior. They did, in fact, discriminate. They had, in fact, always discriminated. That the Court's conclusion was long overdue now is plain to the thoughtful American, especially the southerner. The latter begins to see at what high costs to education, the economy and the overall health of the region the old system has been maintained.

Thanks to the Court, the Congress and the Chief Executive, the national health is better. The constitutional rights of the citizens are more strongly affirmed and more clearly delineated than ever before. It would be difficult to find any American, save those lost in the darkness of blind commitment to some narrow view of the rights of man, who would want the Nation to be what it was before May 17, 1954. The problems created by the school decision have been many and complex. But that the decision was wise is no longer disputed.

Some of the attacks on the Court have been cynically dishonest. One such example is the accusation that the Supreme Court barred prayer and reading the Bible. This, of course, is not true. What the Court did say was that prayer and Bible reading could not be compulsory. It should have been obvious to all willing to look honesty at the decision that a Nation which guarantees religious freedom cannot allow a public school system to impose Christian prayers on Jews, Moslems, or holders of other religious beliefs.

So, we salute and honor the Court, the great bulwark of personal liberty, and its Chief Justice, whose birthday reminds us to weigh results in the balance.

Presentation to U.S. Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department, in its effort to develop additional Coast Guard revenue, has caused the Coast Guard to exercise all existing taxation provisions and to propose several new methods. The following statement was presented to the U.S. Coast Guard by Paul Kettenburg, of San Diego, Calif., commodore of the Southern California Yachting Association. It indicates that big brother government has once again overstepped its mounds—this time by proposing unnecessary regulation and taxation of small boat enthusiasts.

The statement follows:

PRESENTATION, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA YACHTING ASSOCIATION, TO U.S. COAST GUARD

My name is Paul Kettenburg from San Diego, Calif., and I am appearing as commodore of the Southern California Yachting Association. Our association consists of 48 member yacht clubs covering the area from San Diego to San Luis Obispo, Calif. I am here today to represent our membership of 13,000 yachtsmen to oppose the proposed regulations to charge a fee for processing an application to hold a regatta or marine parade.

A very high percentage of these yachtsmen are owners of inexpensive sailing dinghies and trailerable-class boats. I wish to express our objection to the $10 fee that is being proposed for each regatta permit. Although $10 as much does not sound like very much in this day and age, many of our clubs will hold as many as 50 functions per year and under the present wording of the permit requirement, a permit could be required for each function. In our opinion, most of these functions or regattas are of a rather minor nature.

If these clubs were required to pay a $10 fee for each of 50 applications, the total amount required per year would be in excess of the total dues that are received by these clubs from their membership. Obviously this would cause a serious curtailment in the development of the younger sailers to whom we are looking to represent the United States in future international events; such as the Olympics, Pan American Games, Star Internationals, and the like. We, as well as most other areas of the country are making every effort to develop sailers to the extent that the United States may be represented by the best sailer rather than the best wealthy sailor. We question the need for the permits at all, however, if they must be continued, the requirement should be clarified to the extent that only where a large number of contestants and/or spectators are liable to be involved, would it be necessary to apply for a permit. In the case of the southern California area, there would only be 10 or 12 such events per year under which condition it is obvious that the Coast Guard would not be flooded with paper work, consequently should not require the proposed fee.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear at this hearing and sincerely request that you not only eliminate the proposed $10 fee in its entirety, but also eliminate or clarify the existing requirement for regatta permits to the extent that it would only be necessary when over 50 boats are involved, or where the event might be taking place in very narrow or confined areas that could cause an abnormal hazard.

PAUL A. KETTENBURG,
Commodore.

The 25th Anniversary of the USO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the United Service Organizations, Inc., was created to bolster the morale of the millions of young Americans about to engage in the great life and death struggle of World War II.

The methods of warfare have changed since then, but human nature and human needs have not. Winning the peace is still a lonely battle, and the USO, entirely supported through public contributions, has offered a service of friendship and support for a quarter of a century to the boys who must bear the burden in our fight to maintain freedom.

USO clubs are operating virtually around the world. From Anchorage to Istanbul to Saigon, they are acting to further the welfare of the members of the Armed Forces by offering a friendly, wholesome rendezvous point for our uniformed youth. About 80,000 civilian volunteers are working to make these clubhouses a home away from home. And, these volunteers, aided by the USO professional staff, are the backbone of the USO service. They are men and women of all ages, professions, races and religions whose unselfish work is making possible this wide-scale contribution to military morale.

The USO comes to the young GI through no enforced legislation or military directive. It is a voluntary expression of the American people for the spiritual and moral well-being of our sons and daughters in the Armed Forces. The USO is a federation of six civilian agencies supported by the direct contributions of the American people through the United Fund and similar groups. The member agencies are the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Catholic Community Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army and the National Travelers Aid Association.

The $6 million USO budget for 1966 will provide off-post morale services which the command itself cannot create or achieve. One of the organization's most popular efforts is the sponsorship of live shows on the average of more than 2,500 a year. Groups of entertainers travel by plane, helicopters, even dogsled, to reach the most remote outposts of our troops.

One of the most beloved celebrities to lead the troupes of USO performers has for many years been the great comedian, Bob Hope. His humor has bolstered the spirits of a generation of American fighting men. In Vietnam last Christmas, his jesting comments were worth a hundred sermons in reassuring the men of America's support.

"I forgot to burn my draft card," he said, "and here I am."

At the request of the White House and the Pentagon last year, the USO embarked on an expansion program to achieve full wartime footing. The military buildup in Vietnam and the prospects of a long-term struggle means that thousands of young men will feel the loneliness of a far-off and war-torn land. But the USO clubhouses in Saigon, Danang, Nha Trang, and Tan Son Nhut will be there as a reminder that the American people will not forget nor neglect them. The friendly services of USO will offer a comforting welcome.

This week, as the United Service Organizations proudly celebrates its 25th anniversary at the Washington Hilton, a special award will be given to Bob Hope for his years of devoted service. Both USO and Mr. Hope merit our tribute and national thanks.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall the feeling of warmth and fellowship which the USO brought to me and to my fellow soldiers during World War II and so it gives me a great amount of personal satisfaction to note that my very able administrative assistant, John R. Buckley, has been unanimously elected by the Board of Directors of the National Capital USO to membership in the USO Corporation.

I am certain that he will bring to his new position with the USO the same tireless energy and unflagging loyalty with which he continues to serve me and the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida.

Economic Picture of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made many references about inflation during debate on the supplemental appropriations bill. They cite wholesale price indexes and cost of living increases as the major villains in the war to hold the line on price increases.

In the light of what has been said, I would like to quote a few figures from the March 26, 1966 Business Week magazine where a weekly tabulation is made on the economic picture of our Nation.

While the distinguished minority leader was citing figures based on February price indexes to prove his point about inflation, I would like to call your attention to current March figures.

Production in steel, electric power, oil, coal and paper are all almost equal to or above production of a year ago. Retail and department store sales are far ahead of 1 year ago and business failures are below a comparable period last year.

While it is true that the food prices have risen over the past 12 months, a look at the figures clearly shows that food prices today have declined from the February figure by 2.1 points. Today, the food price index is only 0.3 higher than the 1957–59 average. One can hardly call this "swirling" inflation.

Personal and farm incomes have made dramatic gains in the past year. Farm income has gone up almost 25 percent and personal income has increased by a huge 52.3 percent. When compared with a wholesale price index rise of 5.3 points, it is quite evident that the economy is able to sustain this rise without dire consequences.

Sometime I wish the opposition would argue a bill on its merits without resorting to the devious method of bringing in fears about matters that can not stand the test of investigation.

Sweet Is Adversity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, adversity and the ordeal of criticisms have drawn Secretary Rusk out and given him the reputation of a man who has strong and laudable convictions.

This is the thesis of Columnist Carl Rowan, who in an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star says that much of Rusk's mail praises his "great knowledge, deep understanding—and tremendous patience."

The Rowan column will, I believe, be of interest to those of my colleagues who have not seen it and I include it in the RECORD:

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 9, 1966]

RUSK EMERGES AS A PERSONALITY

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Adversity has done for Secretary of State Dean Rusk what 5 years of prodding by his advisers failed to do.

The ordeal of congressional and press criticism on the Vietnam issue has drawn Rusk out to the point where he is developing a public image. He seems suddenly to be acquiring the reputation of a man who has strong and laudable convictions.

His recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has pulled in what State Department officials say is the largest volume of mail ever received on a single event—with the exception of the announcement of the fatal illness of John Foster Dulles.

I examined hundreds of the letters, which are running 10 to 1 in Rusk's favor, and they clearly indicated that Rusk emerged from the hearing as a "personality" with whom the public could identify.

Previously he has been regarded as so lackluster, so unassertive, that even after 5 years in office most Americans did not identify him with any aspect of foreign policy.

But the recent mail praises his great knowledge, deep understanding—and tremendous patience. It calls him a wonderful partner to our boys in Vietnam. It says Rusk was forceful and made sense. A housewife in Winnetka, Ill., stated the essence of hundreds of the letters about his testimony by writing on a postcard: "Never in all my life have I been so proud to be an American."

One of Rusk's aids asks proudly: "Would you ever have believed the public would write letters like these to Dean Rusk? The Secretary has finally won the people's confidence."

It is risky to try to read too much into the flow of mail from the public. One of Rusk's main antagonists in those hearings Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, says his mail has been overwhelmingly favorable, too.

Yet, the mail to Rusk must have meaning because it is so unprecedented. And this will surely enhance his position with President Johnson, who only recently reiterated the view that "Rusk sits first in the Cabinet and he is first with me."

Because the President has a strong aversion to criticism, some observers speculate that he has embraced Rusk all the harder because of attacks on the Secretary and predictions that he will be replaced.

If there is anything that the President reacts more strongly to than criticism, it is praise; so these public tributes are likely to put Rusk in the strongest position he has been in since 1961.

In fact, last Friday's Presidential decree giving Rusk unprecedented authority over all U.S. Government activities in the foreign policy field was a bigger vote of confidence than anything the President has said.

The President is known to hold some of the same misgivings about the State Department as an institution that caused the late President Kennedy to throw his hands up in disgust.

The President apparently believes that Rusk can effectively alter a situation where Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, Labor, the Pentagon, the Central Intelligence Agency and the U.S. Information Agency each exercises a degree of initiative and autonomy in foreign policy matters.

Some have acted more independently than others. Thus the fighting in Vietnam could be labeled "McNamara's war," after the Defense Secretary. Thus the view can be widely held abroad that the CIA is overthrowing governments without State Department knowledge and is generally pursuing its own foreign policy.

However, the initiative of some departments and agencies was laudable in the sense that they could act speedily without the interminable delays so often imposed by State's bureaucracy.

The new system promises a speedy and systematic hearing for other agencies, with the Under Secretary of State empowered to make and execute immediate decisions. The other agencies would have the right to appeal to "higher authority," which really means the President.

If Rusk's stature in Johnson's eyes is as high as it now seems to be, there will be few successful appeals.

And if Rusk is now as boldly assertive as some letterwriters think, the Secretary of State will really be running American foreign policy. That, to his credit or discredit, is just how it ought to be.

Operation Peanut Shell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an article written by Moe Biller, president of the Manhattan-Bronx Postal Union.

The article, which appears in the March 1966 Union Mail newspaper, speaks for itself in its first line. Mr. Biller writes:

> The 3.2-percent White House pay proposal was the most shocking news to postal employees in a decade.

I agree. I agree with Mr. Biller's description of the President's program as "Operation Peanut Shell." The President is using the shell game on the postal employees of America. The pea is not under their shell—it is under the shell of the foreign aid program or the poverty program—or under the shell of Vietnamese corruption.

I understand from European newspapers that $200 million a year of U.S. aid to Vietnam is being hijacked and deposited by Vietnamese in European bank accounts. I would like to see some of this go to our civil servants instead of profiteering Vietnamese civil servants.

Mr. Biller's article follows hereafter:

STRAIGHT FROM THE SHOULDER

(By Moe Biller)

The 3.2-percent White House pay proposal was the most shocking news to postal employees in a decade. I have never heard such mass resentment and anger from rank-and-file members, who have long been engaged on the pay-front battlefield, as that which arose in the 72 hours following release of the President's program. And for good reason, first, it is not a 3.2-percent pay increase, because included are very minor fringe benefits on health and retirement which reduce the average pay raise to 2.5 percent; secondly, because it offers not one red cent this year, becoming effective January 1, 1967.

OPERATION PEANUT SHELL

Our members quickly labeled the offer, "Operation Peanut Shell." Who can deny it is a tailormade, straitjacket fit?

Administration opposition on bread-and-butter issues, despite unfairness and the bitterness generated, is not new to postal employees. However, after several prominent union leaders brilliantly document the need for an immediate 7-percent increase, and then wind up accepting the proposal—this was a hammer blow that staggered postal workers. To prove you need 7 percent and then take the 3.2-percent package, just doesn't add up. It is to the eternal credit of NPU's National President Sid Goodman, that he told the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, "We cannot agree * * *. We do not accept."

The voluminous testimony of the union leaders, despite their compliance, completely indicts and exposes the myth of comparability. It confirms our feeling that the administration turned its back on the solemn pledge in the 1962 Pay Reform Act.

THE WORD WAS GIVEN

John Cramer, noted columnist of the Washington Daily News, on March 9 in his article sub-titled, "The Undiluted Word," reports that postal and Government employee union leaders got the "word," a 3.2-percent ceiling, and not a fraction more. Cramer states, "A more likely version, as I got it, is that they agreed only that there isn't a hell of a lot they can do about it * * * and that, of course, is something quite different."

Just a little significant background on the history of the guideposts, to which postal employes are asked to succumb. The 1963 Report of the Council of Economic Advisers reads in part, "These guideposts were designed to provide standards for evaluating those price and wage decisions where the public has an interest. They cannot, and should not, replace the normal processes of free private decisions and negotiations." Postal workers are hard put to believe this has been practiced.

Let's examine the concept a bit further. John Cramer, on March 11 again wrote, "Guidelines are being broken all over the pasture." Truer words were never spoken. Three and one-half million building workers and 20 rail labor organizations have said they are not complying. The transit workers teachers and other organized workers are breaking them.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council, at its meeting in Florida this year, said, "Organized labor has consistently opposed the Government's wage guideline policy as unfair and unworkable. By discarding its own rules for calculating the wage guideline, in a flagrant effort to keep it low, the President's Council has destroyed the guideline's credibility."

HOW ABOUT PROFITS AND PRICES?

Chairman of the President's Council, Gardner Ackley, in an NBC television interview on March 11, declared that prices have risen more in the past 12 months than in the previous 5 years. In view of this, is it fair to lash postal and Government workers to any guidelines? We should be free to negotiate with our employers, the American people, through their elected representatives. This is the heart of the issue. The right to decent wages and working conditions is a fundamental American concept.

And so far as an extraneous issue that has been injected into the debate, postal workers yield to no group on their patriotism. This has been proved again and again. A large percentage are veterans and have children in the Armed Forces who undoubtedly want their parents to share in America's unprecedented prosperity.

But how about other pointed issues that aren't even mentioned? Where are the guidelines for corporate profits and dividends, now at their absolute peak? Where are the assurances that rising prices will not continue to gobble up slimming paychecks?

GREATEST MYTH OF THE ERA

Comparability stands exposed as a myth, with no validity in fact, particularly for Uncle Sam's workers. When the pay reform law was enacted in 1962, postal workers were already far behind, having suffered 7 lean years from 1953 to 1959. Each year since 1962, we have told to wait until next year to catch up. Next year never comes for us, even though the comparisons used were unreal to begin with.

We pulled up quite a bit since 1962, though not adequately as we all well know. Now, they want to hold the bind on us and restore the wretched economic status of the Eisenhower years. You gave your answer in a clear resounding "No" * * * When you labeled the proposals "Operation Peanut."

Postal workers are citizens with all Americans. Are we any different than transit workers, sanitationmen, firemen, policemen, teachers or teamsters? Do our merchants or creditors give us lower terms or prices? And how about the fact that we cannot strike? Are we not entitled to full and fair treatment because advantage can be taken of us? We insist this is wrong, practically, morally—any way you look at it.

CRY FOR FULL HEALTH BENEFITS

This is the first time in many years, as an officer, that your president has heard members say they want Congress to oppose the current pay offer. The cry is, "Let the Government pay full high option health benefits rather than the peanut increase." This is something for local and national leaders to ponder.

Our rank and file can still assert itself at various national legislative conferences in the near future. The old proverb, "God helps those who help themselves," is the battle cry of the rank and file postal worker. If we don't help ourselves, who will do it for us?

This is the most critical legislative battle we have faced in a long time. As union people we have a right, yea, an obligation, to advance our dignity and economic status. This is the American way and we shall never abandon it.

Tales From the "Workers Paradise"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TALES FROM THE "WORKER'S PARADISE"

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

What do the people behind the Iron Curtain really think about their Communist systems?

Even the dense fog of Red propaganda sometimes parts long enough to let a glimmer of truth escape onto the pages of the government press.

From Poland:

"Full-scale automation in the Lowicz fruit and vegetable processing plant. Bottles are being filled with juice—the machine grabs the bottle by the neck and the bottle breaks, or maybe not.

"If it doesn't another machine sticks a pipe in its gullet and the bottle breaks, or maybe not. If not, still another machine grabs the bottle and puts a stopper on it, and the bottle breaks.

"The bottles cannot be filled automatically, because our glass industry can't produce bottles of standard size. A line of women has been placed at the conveyor belt. They measure the size of each bottle and its opening before allowing the bottle to continue into the automatic cycle.

"It would have been much faster to fill the bottles by hand.

"But then the automation quota would go unfulfilled." (From Zycie Gospodarske, Warsaw.)

"Using what they call a 'new and ingenious gadget,' a piece of string, the Wroclaw Polytechnic of Poland studied the workers' movements in a steel mill.

"It found that during the working day a lathe operator walks 16 kilometers (10 miles).

"He makes 4 trips to the tool shed to borrow tools; 10 trips to get his work plans; 8 to the technical control stand; 6 to the refreshment stand, and in addition walks 2 kilometers to find the foreman.

"He sits on the lathe the rest of the time. He is too tired to work." (Zycie Gospodarske.)

From Czechoslovakia:

"Again and again the Czechs and the Croats have been told they are peace-loving people * * * as a result the majority of the young generation finds military service is unattractive * * * they live in a fool's paradise.

"Their desire for peace and their love for peace is so strong they believe that all will end well * * * a high percentage of 19-year-old boys are unaware of the existence of the Warsaw Pact." (Smena.)

From Rumania:

Looting in factories is on the increase.

Factories which use their own produce "oversupply themselves" above their planned quotas, depriving other factories of these goods, throwing the plans out of gear.

Romania Libera disclosed that 1 million square meters of veneer were thus diverted in 1963, 50,000 cubic meters of timber in 1963, and 62,000 cubic meters in 1964; 16,000 tons of ferrous metallurgical materials were looted in 1964 and also 10,000 tons of cement, 13,000 tire casings, etc.

They were used for what the Communists call "nonchecked and often noneconomic purposes." That's a polite way to say "black market."

We didn't think such things could happen in a "worker's paradise."

Urges U.S. Tax Relief on Home Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 14051 which would permit single-family homeowners to deduct from their income tax all expenses for repair, maintenance, and improvements to their homes.

I sincerely believe such tax deductions should stimulate home improvement, and in the final analysis, would contribute much to avoid deterioration of private home dwellings.

The board of directors of the National Home Improvement Council has urged such legislation. I am including at the conclusion of my remarks an article about the NHIC's proposal.

Under existing Internal Revenue regulations, owners of multiple family, income-bearing rental buildings may deduct whatever money they spent on repair, maintenance, and improvements.

For some time I have been studying the problem of the single-family homeowner. I can find no justification for denying private nonincome bearing property owners the same rights of deducting the cost of repair and maintenance of their homes.

The Federal Government now spends large sums of money on urban renewal and slum clearance. It appears to me that by giving the individual homeowner every incentive possible, we can prevent the creation of slums and ultimately save large Federal expenditures on urban renewal projects.

There are several areas in my own congressional district which have predominantly very old single family residences which have been somewhat neglected. These pockets of potential deterioration could create serious problems for the entire community. It is my hope that with the incentive of a tax deduction for any expenditure on these single family dwellings, we can restore them to an acceptable norm.

My legislation would provide that a tax deduction be allowed for the cost of repair and maintenance, for alterations, and additions, and other improvements to property owned by the taxpayer and used by him as his principal residence, to the extent that such expenses are not otherwise allowable in computing the taxpayer's deduction under the Internal Revenue Code.

One example where such deduction could prove beneficial is in those areas where homeowners still suffer considerable flooding of basements and see no early hope of relief. Under my proposal, whatever such a homeowner would spend on installing overhead sewers would be tax deductible. Such expenditures are not now deductible.

I have been deeply concerned with the deterioration of older homes in otherwise lovely neighborhoods of our community. I firmly believe that preventing the beginning of slums is much more desirable than trying to eliminate them after they have been created.

We now have under the Housing Act provisions for long-term federally guaranteed home improvement loans. But, I feel that until we permit these home improvement expenditures to be tax deductible, the loan program will continue to lag.

Tax deductions are now permitted on improvements to income-bearing property on the theory that the additional income provides taxes for the Government.

My bill presumes that by maintaining a high standard for single family non-income-bearing properties, the increased value of such properties will be ultimately reflected in additional revenue to the Federal Government if the building is ever sold.

I hope to get administration support for this proposal because it would not only prevent slums but would also stimulate the building trades industry which is suffering a slump in employment in some parts of the country.

President Johnson said the other day that he is concerned with the slump in new housing starts The building trades council has also stated its concern over the slowdown in home construction.

I am certain my bill would help take up this slack by stimulating new jobs through home improvements.

Mr. Speaker, the NHIC article follows:

URGES U.S. TAX RELIEF ON HOMES

A proposal to stimulate home improvement and check blight across the country by giving homeowners the same tax benefits as landlords has been made to the board of directors of the National Home Improvement Council.

John R. Livingston, council president, urged that homeowners be allowed to deduct maintenance and repair costs and depreciation of property, as can the landlord.

Tax benefits would encourage and help finance greater efforts in home improvement and prevent today's new homes from deteriorating into a target for tomorrow's urban renewal, he said.

FAR FROM ENOUGH SPENT

Although more than $12 billion was spent on home maintenance and repair in 1965, this was far from enough to stem the tide of decay, Livingston said.

There are about 60 million homes in the country, meaning the average amount spent on maintenance or repair was $200. But 43 percent of the homeowners spent less than $100 for this purpose, and many spent nothing.

"Even if the $200 figure were realistic," Livingston said, "We would still have a sorry picture. Today you cannot maintain, far less improve, the vast majority of homes on $200 a year.

LOSES IN LONG RUN

"And consider the consumer who buys a new home, typically a $20,000 investment. If he spends only $200 a year maintaining and repairing it, before his mortgage is paid, his home will have slipped into an advanced state of decay."

Livingston pointed out that both landlord and homeowner may deduct real estate taxes and interest paid for money invested in the property. However, the landlord also deducts not only the cost of maintenance and repair, which sometimes mean improvement, but for depreciation.

The homeowner cannot deduct either item.

The very best deal, Livingston said, "would be to team up with a friend and each buy a house, then rent to the other. That way, both parties would be landlords and make money because of Uncle Sam's help, in contrast to living in the home each owned."

MOVE COULD REVERSE TREND

The tax credit would help prevent deterioration of housing and in many instances would lead to a reversal of deterioration that already has been established, he said.

Maintaining homes would make them more salable, and, as the used home market was stimulated, the turnover of homes would be increased and new home buying and the homebuilding industry would be stimulated.

Lack of money is a major element in the lag in home maintenance and improvement work. However, motivation and know-how also are factors.

URGE EDUCATIONAL DRIVE

An educational campaign pointing out what can and has been done in areas such as Old Town is one means of providing the motivation.

On the problem of know-how, Livingston proposed a joint program with the Government to encourage home improvement among lower income groups.

A small trade fair could be established in an area to stimulate residents in home maintenance, and, at the same time, teach them what to do and how to do it, he said.

Statement of the Honorable George V. Hansen, of Idaho, Before the Appropriations Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the proposed reduction in funds for Public Laws 874 and 815—and the proposed reduction in funds for vocational education—are matters of grave concern to the people of the State of Idaho.

Following is a copy of a statement I made today before the Appropriations Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee, and also copies of two joint memorials I received from the Idaho State Legislature and which I included in my statement:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE V. HANSEN, BEFORE THE APPROPRIATIONS LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SUBCOMMITTEE, MARCH 30, 1966

Mr. Chairman I appreciate the opportunity of presenting my views on the proposed reduction in funds for Public Laws 874 and 815, and for vocational education to you and this committee.

Mr. Chairman, Idaho is a State rich in natural resources. Idaho has an abundant supply of fresh, clear water for domestic and municipal use; for use in irrigation and reclamation; for use in creating electric power; and for recreational use.

Idaho is rich in timber stands and in mineral resources. It has some of the richest farm lands in the United States.

Unfortunately for the citizens of Idaho, however, is the fact that two-thirds of the State is owned by the Federal Government—which pays no taxes.

It is also a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the population of many of Idaho's school districts have increased to a great extent in recent years through the influx of Federal employees and their families. This has placed a heavy financial burden on the local taxpayers but, with the help of Public Laws 874 and 815, they have been able to meet the demands.

Now, however, they are threatend with the loss of vital revenue through the proposed reductions in the Public Laws 874 and 815 programs. This cannot be allowed to happen.

Federal funds allocated to school districts through Public Laws 874 and 815 are not mere grants—or gifts—from the Federal Government. They are, in essence, a payment to those school districts in lieu of taxes with the Federal Government realizing its responsibility to the districts because of the increase in their school populations caused by actions of the Government.

The superintendents of school districts in my congressional district overwhelmingly oppose these cuts. Typical comments from these superintendents are: "This money is very essential * * * without these additional funds, our minimum school curriculum would need to be curtailed even further." "Reduction of funds will create very serious budget problems * * * tax base in serious disproportion to our student population due to high proportion of Federal employees." "Many schools including this school will be forced to cut their school programs back." "Would have a staggering effect on the Pocatello schools." "Our educational program would be drastically hurt."

The superintendent of one district, Mr. Chairman, said that 70 percent of the children were there due to an Air Force base. He said reduction in Public Laws 874 and 815 funds would make it impossible for the district to continue educating these children, and that the Air Force would have to establish its own school for them—which, he said, would cost the Government at least twice as much to set up and administer.

Also, the proposed reduction in funds for vocational training would seriously hamper occupational training in Idaho where plans have already been made for the 1965–67 biennium, based on the assumption that the Congress would not cut back funds for the program. I believe it is obviously quite unfair and unrealistic to encourage the States to establish programs based on a certain degree of Federal participation, and then to change the rules in the middle of the game.

Mr. Chairman, I most emphatically urge and request that these funds not be cut back.

To show the strong feeling in my home State on this matter, I request permission to include as part of my statement communications I have received. These include: joint memorials from the Idaho State Legislature; letters from Mr. D. F. Engelking, Idaho State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Mr. S. R. Glenn, director of the Idaho State Board for Vocational Education; a most comprehensive résumé of major educational programs supported by Federal funds, prepared by Idaho State University; and letters and telegrams from superintendents of individual school districts.

Thank you again for the opportunity of presenting these views.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 16

Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the impact of Federal programs has long been evident in the State of Idaho, and will continue to affect this State; and

Whereas such federally sponsored programs result in the immigration of large numbers of families, and children of these families must be educated; and

Whereas the education of these children places great burden upon existing instructional facilities and educational resources of this State; and

Whereas it is the heritage of our country and the right of all to receive the benefits of a good and competent educational program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to proceed with all due speed to extend Public Laws 81–874 and 81–815, as amended, authorizing the funds for educational purposes in areas burdened by the increased numbers of educable children, caused directly by the impact of Federal programs; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

DRYDEN M. HILER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 15

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled.

We, your memoralists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the sovereign State of Idaho, hereby respectfully represent that:

Whereas the Federal budget request for vocational education for fiscal year 1967 is considerably lower than the amount authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963; and

Whereas a reduction in Federal appropriations under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 will seriously curtail the development of public vocational education programs in the Nation, and reduce the number of youth that might otherwise benefit from such programs; and

Whereas a vigorous and expanding program of public vocational education is essential to the domestic and military economy of this Nation; and

Whereas the Federal-State-local relationship built up over the many years has proven itself for an effective program of vocational education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate the full amount authorized under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

DRYDEN M. HILER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Honor World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that last week a very distinguished citizen of the First District of Iowa, Mr. Harry Ramseyer, former State legislator and veteran of World War I, participated in a formal presentation of legislative goals of Veterans of World War I before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Ramseyer and his buddies throughout southeast Iowa contributed a great deal to the strength of our Nation by their contribution during World War I.

I think it is very appropriate that the Members of the House of Representatives have an opportunity to consider their legislative requests which have been submitted to the Veterans' Committee.

I have myself introduced H.R. 11247, Veterans Equality Act of 1965, and H.R. 8633, a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from income pension and annuity payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's pension under chapter 15 of that title.

The full presentation made by Herbert M. Houston, distinguished national commander of Veterans of World War I, is a matter of considerable interest to Members of the House of Representatives, and I want to take this opportunity to present a major portion of Mr. Houston's statement, which is, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HERBERT M. HOUSTON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

As men who served their country in 1917 and 1918, and now within the ever lengthening shadows of age 72 (on an average), we are still desirous of serving our country and its people.

We are, of course, deeply concerned in the welfare of those who served in the great wars, and while our primary function is in behalf of our veterans: nevertheless, we are also interested in national affairs and unequivocally support the present administration in its foreign policy.

We wish to commend the President on his stand in the Vietnamese situation, and our organization was one of the many veterans' organizations that industriously supported his policy as early as September 1965, by a resolution at our national convention.

Down through the years, this committee has done a magnificent job of maintaining and improving the veterans' benefits program. A list of your many accomplishments would be far too great to list in this particular presentation, and the most recent event of your care and solicitude for the veteran was the recently enacted veterans' readjustment benefits act of 1966. We believe that this is one of the finest pieces of legislation that has originated in your committee and confirmed by the Congress of the United States in many years. And, of course, reflects your continuing interest in behalf of the veterans, their widows and dependents.

In relation to our legislative program, there are three main objectives that we would like to bring to your attention at the present time. Our main objectives is our program for the non-service-connected disability or death cases, embodied in H.R. 13215, which was introduced by your distinguished chairman, and provides for increases in benefit payments to veterans, widows and their dependents. The main provisions are shown as follows:

Amend the table of rates and income limitations applicable under subsection 521(b) title 38, United States Code, to unmarried veterans to provide that if a veteran's annual income does not exceed $2,400, the rate of pension shall be $100 a month.

Amend the table of rates and income limitations under subsection 521(c), title 38, United States Code, applicable to married veterans or veterans with children to provide that if a veteran's annual income does not exceed $3,600, the rate of pension shall be $105 a month, with $5 a month to be added to these rates for each additional dependent, with a maximum of three.

Amend the table of rates and income limitations under subsection 541(b), title 38, United States Code, applicable to widows without children to provide that if a widow's annual income does not exceed $1,800 the rate of pension shall be $65 a month and if her annual income is more than $1,800 but does not exceed $2,400 the rate of pension shall be $55 a month.

Amend the table of rates and income limitations under subsection 541(c), title 38, United States Code, applicable to a widow with one child to provide that if a widow's annual income does not exceed $2,400 the rate of pension shall be $80 a month, and if her annual income is more than $2,400 but does not exceed $3,600, the rate of pension shall be $65 a month.

The next bill that we have a very deep and abiding interest in is H.R. 13216, the dependency and indemnity compensation bill which was also introduced by the chairman of this committee.

Here we have attempted to expand the earnings limitations to a reasonable degree; that is, to the extent of $250 in all categories, with approximately an 8½-percent increase in monthly benefits. We would like to bring to the attention of the committee, the rates requested in relation to dependent parents. This is one group that we feel should have an increase because it has been many years since they have received any actual increase in monthly payments. Again, as well you know, there are a great number of beneficiaries under this section of title 38, of the United States Code, that are members or our respective organizations; that is, the barracks membership and the Ladies Auxiliary, and are recipients of such benefits under this title because of their status as parents of World War II veterans who may have died of service-connected injuries or have been killed in action.

The veterans of World War I have a genuine interest in legislation to increase DIC payments to parents of deceased veterans.

We respectfully urge, Mr. Chairman, that you and the members of your committee give sympathetic consideration to this much needed legislation.

The third feature of our program, and here again the chairman of this committee has been kind enough to personally introduce this measure, H.R. 13217; we are seeking an improvement in the lot of a great number of our beneficiaries under what is known as old part III. There is estimated to be approximately 450,000 veterans receiving benefits under this law, and nearly 150,000 death beneficiaries also entitled to benefits.

There seems to be a prevailing opinion that these two particular groups are such that they are not entitled to additional recognition by virtue of some small advantages that they may enjoy over the beneficiaries under Public Law 86–211. However, there are additional factors that should be considered in behalf of the old part III beneficiaries. One is, that they may be reluctant to change over to Public Law 86–211 because of the possibility of having their payments restricted, reduced, or in some instances, cut off altogether by virtue of income which may result from invested or inherited interests, or the possibility of some slight income on the part of a working wife.

In this measure we are not only asking for an increase in monthly payments, but we have requested that the income limitations be expanded to a substantial degree. Supporting the equity of our plea is the fact that there has been no cost-of-living increase for these beneficiaries since August 1954. We prayerfully petition the committee to take favorable action on this bill for an improvement in the economic condition of those who constitute the older segment of the veterans of World War I and their dependents.

I would like to call to the committee's attention another of our legislative objectives, and that is the nonconsideration of income of any kind and from any source which a veteran may receive after he attains age 72, in determining his entitlement to a pension. As you well know, there is a tremendous amount of influence being exerted at the present time in attempting to place beneficiaries over that particular age on the social security rolls, regardless as to their acquisition of any quarters of coverage under the Social Security Act.

In addition, there is no logical reason why a veteran should be restricted in going into the labor market in attempting to better his economic condition, when beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act, are allowed to go into the labor market and earn as much wages or compensation as they possibly can, without jeopardizing their annuity or insurance benefits.

Also, this may be a way in which we can immediately get a great number of our membership on the pension rolls who, up to this time, on account of income, may not be so favorably treated. In addition, we have a great number of our membership who feel that the veterans of World War I should receive consideration in having an outright pension paid to them quite comparable to those paid to the veterans of every other war in which our country participated.

It would appear that the basis of pension payments originating with the passage of Public Law 86–211 is now seriously questioned and qualified. Since July 1, 1960, it has been stated that the elements of unemployability, need, and disability determine the rights of a veteran to a pension. In order to place this theory into operation, several stratas of income are considered; that is, those with the least income received the higher pension payment and conversely. We feel that service to one's country in time of need merits some recognition, also. And in fact, if we carry this 1960 concept to the utmost, we do nothing but promote and further the atheistic ideology of Karl Marx, leading exponent of communism, who, in his manifesto of 1848, stated: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs." The veterans of World War I abhor such a philosophy and its use in treatment of the veteran.

Perhaps the latest action on the part of the U.S. Senate in putting everyone over age 72 on the social security rolls regardless as to acquired quarters of coverage (except those drawing railroad retirement and other public and private pension benefits) is a step in the right direction. We understand there are some 52,000 World War I veterans who have little or no social security income.

I might also mention here that recent legislation which gave the Veterans' Administration authority to place veterans in private nursing homes, is not being implemented at a reasonable and acceptable pace. It has been brought to our attention that there are many veterans who require nursing type care and are being retained in VA general hospitals even though there is bed space for them in private nursing homes.

These homes, as we understand it, meet all the standards set by the Veterans' Administration and the various States, and our organization pleads with your committee and the Veterans' Administration to give sympathetic and accelerated consideration to this feature of the many faceted veterans' problems whereby our membership in particular stands to benefit by this expedited action.

We want to state here that the Veterans of World War I oppose any plan that would shift control of veterans' programs from the Veterans' Administration to another Government agency, and we protest vigorously the closing of any facilities now under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, and in fact, request that those that have already been closed be reopened, if that is at all possible.

In addition, we are convention mandated to seek not less than 135,000 hospital beds and request that the VA hospital system be restricted to the care of Veterans and members of the Armed Forces which require hospitalization, and we protest most vigorously the admission of merchant seamen, Job Corps individuals, Peace Corps individuals, and other cross-servicing practices that apparently were in vogue to some degree during the past year.

We hesitate to longer take the time of the committee in explaining the overall program that we have for the membership in our Veterans of World War I movement, but I would like to set forth for you briefly some additional measures that we are particularly interested in.

1. A resolution emanating from our national convention in 1965 requests us to attempt to write legislation seeking nonconsideration of the "net worth limitation," (corpus of estate) when determining a Veteran's or widow's entitlement to benefits.

2. Amend chapter 15 to provide that a person receiving death or disability pension based on service in World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, shall have the right to elect or reelect without limitation to receive either under chapter 15 of this title or under those provisions of title 38, United States Code, in effect on June 30, 1960.

3. Without feeling us presumptuous, Mr. Chairman, we will support any movement to take the operating and maintenance of national cemeteries from the Department of the Army and give such duties to the Veterans' Administration. We recognize that this transfer of functions would place legislative matters relating to the cemeteries under the jurisdiction of your committee. This transfer would serve to bring about a solution of the many longstanding problems associated with the national cemetery system.

4. Always in the forefront in seeking legislation on behalf of all veterans, the Veterans of World War I will actively support and promote the payment of wartime rates in the compensation, pension, and related fields to the veterans now serving in the Vietnam and Dominican areas, comparable to those payable to veterans who served in previous identifiable war periods.

5. Another legislative matter beyond the scope and responsibility of your committee but which has the continuing interest of the Veterans of World War I, is the proposal to establish a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the U.S. Senate. We believe that creation of such a committee, with an appointed full-time professional staff to assist it, will speed action on veterans' legislation in the Senate.

6. Our organization has felt for a great number of years that outpatient treatment and the benefits accruing thereby should be granted to the Veterans of World War I on the same basis as that accorded to the Spanish American War veterans.

7. Seek legislation to provide that payments received by an individual from public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs shall be excluded from determinations of annual income for pension purposes.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank you for your kindness and courtesy in permitting me the opportunity to appear before you. I want, also, to take this occasion to recognize the House Veterans' Affairs Committee staff—a staff distinguished by experience and high competence. I wish to express to each of them our sincere thanks for the cooperation, interest, and help extended to us throughout the past year.

We would like to leave this thought with you, Mr. Chairman and the distinguished members of this committee. We have many commitments of many kinds and in many countries, particularly Vietnam at this time, but we, the old 1917–18 veterans plead with you to do what you can for us, the aging veterans of World War I.

Joint Chiefs Fear Soviet Technical Coup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From Aviation Weekly and Space Technology, Feb. 28, 1966]

JOINT CHIEFS FEAR SOVIET TECHNICAL COUP: MILITARY HEADS TO WARN CONGRESS OF RUSSIAN EMPHASIS ON ANTI-MISSILE MISSILES, WARHEADS, SPACE AND AIRCRAFT

(By George C. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Joint Chiefs of Staff will tell Congress during current budget hearings that the Russians soon may spring a technological coup which could wipe cut the U.S. strategic edge or even turn it in their favor.

Those in the Pentagon who reviewed the secret statements insist that the joint chiefs are not revolting against Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara but feel they must give their own views of the Soviet threat that the United States faces between now and 1971. McNamara contends the United States and U.S.S.R. are on the way to accommodation, with the bigger threat coming from Red China.

Basically, the chiefs believe the Russians are accomplishing much more in advanced weaponry than McNamara is giving them credit for. Gen. John P. McConnell, Air Force chief of staff, whose authority covers most U.S. strategic forces, is especially worried about Russian developments in the field of anti-missile-missiles and their radars, maneuverable warheads for ICBM's, military space systems, and advanced aircraft.

The chiefs and other military leaders—especially those in the Navy—are also fearful that the Russian concentration on antisubmarine warfare may lead to a breakthrough soon which could decrease the invulnerability of the Polaris submarine force. The Polaris submarines are a substantial part of the U.S. strategic force.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

What Congress will do about the difference between the chiefs and McNamara on the Soviet strategic threat depends on whose assessment they choose to believe after the current closed hearings on the fiscal 1967 Defense Department budget. Pentagon officials predict the most controversial hearings since McNamara came to office.

McNamara's 5-year projection of military budgeting through fiscal 1971 shows no firm decision to start fullscale deevlopment of any new big weapons systems, such as the Nike-X anti-ballistic-missile defense, advanced manned strategic aircraft or advanced interceptor aircraft. As he made clear in the nonsecret portion of his posture statement last week, McNamara feels he has ample time to keep options open on these systems at least another year.

This approach is appealing to the economy-minded Johnson administration as well as many lawmakers. It sounds as though the United States will not spend money for weapons systems unless it is abundantly clear that they may be needed. McNamara argues that the development time for such weapons will be short because work is progressing on the long leadtime items, like the engines and avionics for the advanced manned strategic aircraft.

But General McConnell and other military leaders connected with strategic planning fear that continuing to rely on open options rather than working prototypes sets the stage for a technological surprise by Russia. They will argue before Congress, if given a chance, that the United States may not be able to close the technological gap in time to keep the strategic edge over Russia.

After the Chiefs give their prepared statements to Congress—which Pentagon sources say are the most outspoken in years—they will be asked for their recommendations on how the fiscal 1967 and future budgets should be changed.

How specific they become at that point will depend both on their convictions and the conflicting pressures from the Johnson administration and congressional questioners.

Chairman RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, of the Senate Armed Services Committee and Defense Appropriations Subcommittee at the outset of the fiscal 1967 budget hearing last week assailed McNamara's directive which limits the responses of military witnesses to the administration line unless specifically pressed for their personnal opinions. The exchainge may help clear the way for a frank appraisal by the Chiefs.

The conflict between the Chiefs and McNamara on Russia's military capabilities and intentions goes to the heart of President Johnson's foreign policy. The administration has been portraying the United States-Soviet Union relationship as one of growing accommodation.

PERCEPTIBLE SHIFT

In his military posture statement last week, for example, McNamara said:

"The focus of the U.S. defense problem has shifted perceptibly toward the Far East * * *. The Soviet leaders appear to share with us a desire to avoid wars which might lead to a direct United States-U.S.S.R. military confrontation and to curtail the spread of Chinese Communist influence" even though the competition for Communist world leadership and avowed support of the "wars of national liberation" impels the Soviets "to maintain militant positions on many issues and limits the areas in which they are willing to seek agreements with us."

In contrast to this view, military witnesses scheduled to testify before Congress are prepared to state that the Soviets are supplying North Vietnam with late model Mig-21's, modern antiaircraft missiles and guns, machinery and petroleum products. This assistance, combined with the continued heavy emphasis of the Soviets on strategic weapons research, appears to many military leaders far from a course toward an accommodation with the United States.

Since Soviet political intentions are outside their direct responsibility, the chiefs in the closed hearings will be concentrating on the dangers in relying on the ability to close a technological gap by exercising an option. A likely case in point to be argued is the advanced manned strategic aircraft (AMSA).

Last year, during hearings on the fiscal 1966 budget, General McConnell said the decision on whether to proceed with fullscale development of the AMSA should be made in fiscal 1967. McNamara did not make that decision in the fiscal 1967 budget and dropped AMSA one category—from engineering development to advanced development. He argued that by continuing to work on the AMSA engine and avionics the United States could keep the option open to develop a new strategic bomber.

STOPGAP BOMBER

Also, in his posture statement McNamara appeared to contradict the view of Air Force Secretary Harold Brown that the General Dynamics FB-111 was only a stop-gap bomber until the AMSA was given approval. A comparison with the Boeing B-52C through F models, McNamara said, shows that "the FB-111 is not an interim aircraft but is, indeed a truly effective strategic bomber."

McNamara requested $11 million to continue research on the AMSA in fiscal 1967.

In short, McNamara's assessment of the Soviet threat is translated in the case of the AMSA to a go-slow approach. Congress has thought otherwise in past years and appropriated more money than McNamara requested for the AMSA. But there is no way Congress can force McNamara to spend the money.

This year, however, the debate over McNamara's current and future projections promises to be much more than just a replay of the old argument of bombers versus missiles. If General McConnell does as expected and backs up his exceptionally strong warning about the Soviet technological threat with specific recommendations, many Members of Congress will demand that McNamara's fiscal 1967 budget be revamped.

KEY LEGISLATORS

Military leaders already have convinced several key Members of Congress that the fiscal 1967-71 defense budget projections amount to spreading the United States too thin militarily to fulfill its commitments.

The Joint Chiefs testimony on the threat of a "technological gap" comes at the time when Congress is challenging President Johnson on his Vietnam policy in what has been called McNamara's war by some Republicans. The relation between the White House and Congress promises to be continued strife.

COMMUNIST ADVANCES

WASHINGTON.—Soviet defense expenditures are expected to rise in 1966, and Communist China apparently has gained the capability of producing modern jet fighter aircraft, according to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

McNamara told a joint session of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee last week that, after 2 years of some decline, the Soviet defense expenditures in 1966 probably will be approximately 5 percent above those for 1965.

In reference to Communist China, he said that there "is no reason to suppose that they cannot, in time, produce long-range ballistic missile systems and arm them with thermonuclear warheads. The Chinese have been severely handicapped by the lack of Soviet sources for spares and replacements. However, domestic production of medium tanks, several submarines and apparently modern jet fighters, attests to improved Chinese capabilities."

The jet fighter is believed to be a version of the Soviet MIG-21 Mach 2 aircraft. The Chinese apparently developed the capability without help from the few MIG-21's they had received before relations between China and Russia began to cool in 1960.

One Man, One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Christian Science Monitor for March 26, 1966, contains a perceptive and illuminating examination of the political and social effects of State legislative reapportionment.

Over the past few years, 85 legislative branches in 45 States have been reapportioned. The article compares State legislatures before and after reapportionment. In Vermont, for example, representatives of 11.6 percent of the population used to constitute a majority in the lower house, and one man had only 38 constituents while his colleague had 35,531. Today, smaller towns in Vermont are grouped into districts, and the larger towns have additional representation according to population.

Many opponents of reapportionment prophesied that rural interests would go unprotected. But this has clearly not been the case. While more attention has been focused on urban problems, farm legislation has also received high priority. In my own State of Michigan, for example, a statewide meat inspection law was passed soon after the new apportionment.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this article, entitled "Now Your Vote May Count for More," at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 26, 1966]

NOW YOUR VOTE MAY COUNT FOR MORE

(By George B. Merry)

BOSTON.—Rural Americans are fast losing their once-firm grip on the reins of State governments.

Next year, for the first time in history, lawmakers from cities and populous suburban areas will outnumber those from small towns in many State capitals.

In a few States the change in legislative control already has taken place. And this trend seems sure to continue.

After decades of looking the other way, Federal and State courts are insisting that legislatures be revamped to meet "one-man, one-vote" standards.

The big reapportionment push began 4 years ago today when the Supreme Court of the United States entered the picture.

In its ruling the court said that the so-called "equal protection clause" of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution entitles citizens to certain protections with respect to the apportionment of legislatures. Federal courts, it decreed, have the power to enforce them.

But the Supreme Court Justices in their 6-to-2 decision did not spell out what action district courts might take to assure fairer apportionments. Nor were any standards set for determining whether a districting pattern is "unconstitutional."

SINGLE BASIS FOR ALLOTMENT

In June 1964, however, the Supreme Court went an important step further. In a series of related verdicts it ruled that population should be the only basis for allocating seats—and in both branches of a State legislature.

This "one-man, one-vote" directive has proven to be even more far-reaching than the decree handed down in *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Tennessee taxpayers' suit, March 26, 1962.

Few court decisions have touched off more political and judicial fireworks.

Now before Congress is a constitutional-amendment proposal that would permit a State to apportion one branch of its legislature on some other basis than population. It failed to pass last year, but a new try is being made this year.

Major developments over the past few years include:

One or more lawsuits in all but two States—Maine and South Dakota—challenging the allotment of legislative seats.

Eighty-five legislative branches in 45 States reapportioned.

Efforts now underway to redistrict five senates or houses in three States.

Redistricting involving another five legislative bodies in three States also may be tackled during the next few months.

The remaining four (49 States have two-house legislatures, Nebraska only has a Senate) legislative branches—the Massachusetts Senate, the Oregon Senate and House, and the South Carolina House—were revamped prior to the *Baker* v. *Carr* ruling but appear to meet court standards.

In a number of instances State constitutions have been changed to conform districting standards to the "one-man, one-vote" principle. Geographical considerations, long a factor in more than two-thirds of the States, have been brushed aside.

Because of the obvious political quicksands involved, most legislators—especially those from overrepresented rural areas—were reluctant to redistrict.

Yet they had little real alternative, as many found over the past few years.

While some legislatures beat the courts to the punch and voluntarily put their houses in order, many ignored their malapportionment problems until faced with a court order.

Few of them made it on the first try. Florida lawmakers, for example, have recently completed their fourth reapportionment plan since mid-1962. The three earlier ones were tossed out by a Federal court panel.

PANELS UNDERTAKE TASK

In several States, where legislators appeared hopelessly bogged down, courts have stepped in and done the job.

The first judicial redistricting involved the Oklahoma Senate and House in 1964. Since then court panels have revamped 16 other legislative branches in 9 States. The latest action of this type took place within the past 2 months in Arizona, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Some States have taken apportionment out of the hands of the legislatures and given it to a special commission. In Illinois a 10-member bipartisan commission, appointed by the Governor, redistricted the house after the legislature had tried and failed.

For some 20 years the Missouri Senate has been revamped from time to time in this way. And on February 13, Missouri voters approved a constitutional amendment providing for a similar method for reapportioning the house. And the special commission has just completed its assignment.

Michigan's new State constitution, adopted in April 1963, also took apportionment controls away from the legislature and provided for a bipartisan commission to do the job.

But this approach, too, has produced problems: Democratic and Republican members of the new special agency could not agree on a districting revamp.

Finally, in June 1964, the Michigan Supreme Court ordered the commission to adopt a reapportionment plan for both the senate and house which had been drafted by two of the commissioners.

A special board appointed for the purpose handled Alaska's redistricting job. Panels comprising top State officials did the reapportionment in Arkansas and Ohio.

The courts rejected earlier redistricting efforts in Ohio.

HOW IT USED TO BE

When the Supreme Court handed down its one-man, one-vote criterion for voter representation in State legislatures, it was saying in effect to the States:

"A majority of your legislators must be elected by a majority of the voters."

This had not been the case for decades in most States. In many cases the total of legislators from sparsely populated elective districts outnumbered those from urban districts. Rural voters outranked city voters.

The table below shows how far out of representational whack some legislatures were.

Each figure shows the percentage of the State's population living in the least-populous elective districts from which a majority of legislators was chosen as of March 26, 1962, date of the Court's original landmark ruling.

Under the Court's subsequent one-man, one-vote criterion, the ideal percentage would be slightly over 50 percent—a majority of voters electing a majority of legislators. Most of the reapportioning in the past 4 years has come close to, if not within, acceptable bounds.

(An asterisk before a figure means that branch has not been reapportioned since the Court's ruling. Nebraska has no house.)

	Senate	*House*
Alabama	25.1	27.2
Alaska	35.0	48.9
Arizona	12.8	45.8
Arkansas	43.8	33.3
California	10.7	44.7
Colorado	29.8	32.1
Connecticut	33.4	12.0
Delaware	22.0	18.5
Florida	12.3	15.1
Georgia	21.4	22.5
Hawaii	*25.9	*44.6
Idaho	16.6	32.7
Illinois	28.7	39.9
Indiana	40.4	34.8
Iowa	35.2	26.9
Kansas	26.8	18.5
Kentucky	42.0	34.1
Louisiana	*33.0	34.1
Maine	*46.9	39.7
Maryland	14.0	31.7
Massachusetts	*44.6	43.6
Michigan	29.0	44.1
Minnesota	*40.1	*34.5
Mississippi	34.6	29.1
Missouri	47.7	20.3
Montana	16.1	36.6
Nebraska	36.6	——
Nevada	8.0	35.0
New Hampshire	45.3	43.9
New Jersey	19.0	46.5
New Mexico	14.0	27.0
New York	36.9	38.2
North Carolina	36.9	27.1
North Dakota	31.9	40.2
Ohio	41.0	30.3
Oklahoma	24.5	29.5
Oregon	*47.8	*48.1
Pennsylvania	33.1	37.7
Rhode Island	*18.1	*46.5
South Carolina	26.6	*46.7
South Dakota	38.3	38.5
Tennessee	26.9	28.7
Texas	30.1	38.6
Utah	21.3	33.3
Vermont	45.1	11.6
Virginia	37.7	36.8
Washington	33.9	35.3
West Virginia	46.7	40.0
Wisconsin	45.0	40.0
Wyoming	26.9	35.8

REDISTRICTING HAMMERED OUT

With reapportionment orders still ringing in their ears and anxious jurists looking over their shoulders, lawmakers in at least six States have hammered out redistricting plans in recent weeks. Besides both branches in Florida, these involve the Idaho Senate and House, the Kansas House, the New Mexico Senate, the North Carolina Senate and House, and the South Carolina Senate.

At the same time Maine legislators, meeting in special session, approved a constitutional amendment, which if accepted by the State's voters at the November election, will pave the way for a more equitable districting of the senate.

In Rhode Island a legislative commission is trying to work out an acceptable reapportionment plan. New Jersey has a constitutional convention in session tackling a similar assignment.

The Court of Appeals in New York has just approved a redistricting plan drafted by a 5-member bipartisan commission. The task force was appointed by the court after Empire State lawmakers failed to agree on a new apportionment earlier this year.

In trying to comply with the "one-man, one-vote" dictum, many States have been forced to overlook provisions in their constitutions guaranteeing representation to each county or town.

Vermont, for example, used to allot every city or town, no matter how large or small, one and only one seat in the State's house of representatives. Under this system tiny Stratton, with only 38 residents, had a voice equal to Burlington, with 35,531, more than 920 times its size. Less than 12 percent of the total Vermont population lived in those towns which could elect a majority of the house members.

The new setup chopped the number of house seats from 246 to 150 and grouped smaller towns for the first time into districts. Also, cities got additional representation according to population.

ADJUSTMENTS MADE

At least 15 other States made adjustments in the size of one or both of their legislative bodies.

Connecticut abolished its town-by-town representation in its house and reduced house membership from 294 to 177.

In Nevada, every county used to have one senator, and 8 percent of the State's population elected a majority of the 17 senators. The revamp increases the senate membership to 20 and ups the size of the house from 35 to 40.

The latest Florida reapportionment expands the senate from 38 to 48 and increases the house from 95 to 117. Dade County (Miami) picks up 7 more senators and 4 more representatives. Duval County (Jacksonville), Hillsborough County (Tampa), and Pinellas County (St. Petersburg) add 3 senators apiece.

House reapportionment in Kansas, completed earlier this month, was the State's first full-scale redistricting in 100 years, although adjustments had been made from time to time. When the new legislature is elected this fall, each county will no longer have at least one house seat.

POLITICAL IMPACT

Besides shifting the balance of power away from rural areas to cities and suburban sections, legislative reapportionment has, in some instances, altered the political structure and given new or incerased representation to various racial and ethnic groups.

In Georgia eight Negroes won seats last year in the redistricted house. They are the first of their race to serve in that body since 1907. (One of the eight, Julian Bond, was barred from taking his seat after he criticized American policy in Vietnam.) At the same time Republicans boosted their strength from 7 to 22 in the still heavily Democratic chamber.

Reappotonment has spelled gains for the Democrats, too. The 1964 districting change in Michigan is believed to have helped the Democratic Party gain control of both houses of the legislature for the first time in 26 years.

New districting patterns in several Northern States, including Indiana, Wisconsin, and Ohio, are expected to result in more Democrats in the legislatures chosen this November.

Despite the bustle of activity now under way in a few States and that just completed, the reapportionment pace appears to be slowing down.

The big year was 1965. During its 12 months both branches of the legislatures in 23 States—Alabama, Arkansas, Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, and Washington—were reapportioned.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION

Redistricting also was carried out in one legislative body in five other States—Georgia House, Missouri Senate, Nebraska Senate, New Mexico House, and Wyoming Senate.

The 1965 Florida and Idaho plans were later tossed out by the courts and done over again this year.

While it is too early to gage what the long-term impact might be from the "reapportionment revolution," results so far seem to indicate more emphasis on so-called social legislation.

In Michigan the reapportioned, now Democratic-controlled, legislature liberalized the State's workmen's compensation program to the point where it is believed to be the most generous in the Nation.

More attention has been focused on urban problems. But farm legislation has not been overlooked as had been feared by some observers. A statewide meat inspection law was passed and a milk pricing bill almost made it.

The reapoprtioned general assembly in Delaware has a number of new lawmakers, including several from organized labor. Meaures approved last year included the granting of tax-exempt status to a union-sponsored housing development for the elderly in Wilmington.

Since redistricting, the new legislature in Iowa increased municipal home rule and passed several liberal, labor-backed bills but refused to repeal the State's so-called right-to-work law.

While some reapportioned legislative bodies were elected in 1964 or 1965, most States will give their revamped districting its first test in elections later this year. At least 32 States, and possibly several more, are involved. These revamped legislatures will go to work next January.

Many of the legislative branches redistricted over the past 4 years had not been altered substantially for decades, in some instances more than 50 years—and this despite major population shifts within the States.

The Compact for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently criticism has been leveled against the Federal Government and its educational policy. Many people are of the opinion that we are tending toward an overly centralized educational system and it will end up as a federally controlled system. To the contrary, there has been developed a new concept which will encourage State governments to actively participate with each other in exchanging educational information, carrying out research, and generally assisting one another in educational projects and problems.

This compact is an innovation which has a potential that can visibly change the systems of education in the United States. It is an extremely flexible organization with voluntary membership. The aims of the compact are high and, I believe, they deserve the attention of critics and supporters alike.

The aims follow:

WHAT IT COULD ACCOMPLISH

1. A partnership between the educational and political forces for advancement of education.
2. A stimulus for State action in education.
3. A means of interchange of information and ideas and successful programs across State lines and regions for the benefit of the States.
4. A forum for discussion and recommendation of various policy alternatives for State consideration and decision.
5. A way to collect, correlate, analyze, and interpret data for use by the States.
6. A way to assemble the best minds and the most experienced opinions into working parties to explore new ways for the States to attack the problems and carry out research on all aspects of education.
7. A way to encourage the States to fulfill their role as the senior partner in American education.
8. A place for individual States to call on for specialized help in evaluating programs and getting new ideas.

Transit Isn't Just for Big Towns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the following article which appeared in the March issue of Nation's Cities. Written by John Kohl, the able Director of HUD's Office of Transportation, the article points out the important truth that it is not only our Nation's big cities that profit from the Mass Transportation Act. I think it is important that the Members of this House who are not from big city districts realize that Mass Transportation Act moneys work for their districts too. Mass transportation—and Mass Transportation Act moneys—are not a monopoly of the big cities.

As a matter of fact, I sometimes feel that our Nation's biggest cities—particularly my own city of New York—do not get enough of the mass transportation moneys. I would like to note in passing that while I am glad to see many towns and suburbs across the country profiting from mass transportation moneys. I would like to see more of those dollars come to New York City as well.

The article follows:

TRANSIT ISN'T JUST FOR BIG TOWNS

(By John C. Kohl, Director, Office of Transportation Department of Housing and Urban Development)

The problem of providing adequate and up-to-date public transit facilities is by no means confined to urban centers. Small cities and towns also face the same situation. These communities often have the dilemma of population spread out in low densities which requires relatively costly transit service in relation to the economic potential of fare box income.

As the postwar years have shown, declining use of public transportation and rising costs of the service have brought an end to transit service in many small towns and have left many others near collapse.

With this in mind, the Federally aided urban mass transportation program, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, is open to communities of all sizes. To date, capital grants for mass transportation projects have gone to five cities of 75,000 or less population. The smallest of these, Kenner, La., (population 17,000) received a $49,000 grant to help buy two new buses, equipment, and to build a small storage garage.

Kenner began its service as a municipal operation in 1964 because no private operator could see it as worth the investment. The buses provide a loop service around suburban Kenner and connect with the airport-to-New Orleans routes of the Louisiana Transit Co.

The Federal grant which Kenner received represented two-thirds of the total project cost. The national program, first authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, provides grants up to two-thirds of the cost of facilities and equipment that cannot reasonably be financed from transit system revenues, where the facilities are neded to carry out a coordinated transportation plan for the area. The remaining one-third of the project cost must come from local sources. A 50-percent grant may be made for emergency purposes pending completion of an area transportation plan.

Federal loans for a maximum period of 40 years may be made for the entire cost of capital improvements, where local private financing is not available.

A community seeking help under this program must be part of an "urban area." This is defined in the Act as "any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place which is appropriate * * * for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality, taking into consideration the local trends and patterns of urban growth."

When the 1964 act was passed, with the strong assistance of the National League of Cities, it was expected that the first rush of applications would ask for help in replacing outworn capital equipment and improving obsolete facilities. This has been true for both large and small cities.

As of January 1, 1966, some $79.2 million for capital grant projects had been approved. More than 60 percent of it will go for needed equipment. Of the 24 approved projects, 16 involve the purchase and replacement of buses for local transit systems.

Through the end of 1965, the Department of Housing and Urban Development had also made grants for 37 demonstration projects, first authorized in 1961, for a total of $33.2 million. Grants up to two-thirds of the cost of projects are made to test and demonstrate new ideas and methods for improving mass transportation systems and service.

The most prevalent experiments concern improvements in local service and fare schedules, park-and-ride arrangements, connecting radial and cross-town routes, service to new communities, and coordinated feeder and express bus schedules.

Some small cities like Kenner are direct recipients of aid because their transit systems are self-contained. Other small cities are aided indirectly by grants made to central city and regional authorities like the Port Authority of Allegheny County (Pa.) With 180 new buses bought by the port authority, service to scores of communities in the Pittsburgh area has been upgraded.

What have other smaller cities done with capital grants for mass transportation projects?

Vallejo, Calif., population 64,000, received $77,000 toward a total project cost of $115,500. Seven buses were bought and leased to the operator to replace obsolete equipment. The new buses are the entire fleet of a system operated by the Vallejo Citizens' Transit Company. This is owned by a group of local businessmen and transit personnel who bought the system from the city in 1956 to keep it operating.

Coral Gables, Fla., population 35,000, got a grant of $324,000 toward a total project cost of $647,000 to buy 20 new buses. They replace outworn buses in the city-owned transit system. If the city meets certain planning and program requirements by 1968, it will qualify for an additional grant of $108,000.

Terre Haute, Ind., population 71,000, received a $181,000 grant toward a total project cost of $272,000. It will buy 18 new buses and fare box equipment to replace outworn equipment. The service had been operated by the city with leased equipment acquired by it from a private company which discontinued service in 1964.

Zanesville, Ohio, population 39,000, got $114,000 toward a total project cost of $166,000. It will buy eight new buses, build a garage and shop facilities for the Y-City Transit Co. This is the local public transportation service and it had been unable to replace obsolete equipment and facilities out of operating revenue.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has also made demonstration grants to four cities under 75,000 population.

Anchorage, Alaska, population 48,000, received a grant of $208,000 toward a total project cost of $312,000. The project will determine the effects of new transit service on travel habits in a rapidly growing area where development has been speeded up due to relocation following an earthquake.

Skokie, Ill., population 70,000, received a grant of $238,000 toward a total project cost of $357,000. The project will determine what a fast-growing medium-density suburban area needs for an effective intra-urban tranportation system coordinated with the central-city transit system, and by what means such needs can be met. The Skokie transportation system will be redesigned and tested in actual operation.

Rome, N.Y., population 52,000, received a grant of $99,000 toward a total project cost of $149,000. The city is demonstrating and testing the techniques of developing and operating a bus system specially designed to meet the needs of a small city lacking public transportation.

New Castle, Pa., population 43,000, received a grant of $366,000 toward a total project cost of $549,000. The New Castle Public Transportation Authority will lease 15 small buses, each seating 14 to 20 passengers. It will test whether smaller and more maneuverable buses, properly scheduled and with diversified fares, can provide more efficient transit service for a small city on a self-supporting basis.

All of these projects, involving capital grants and demonstration grants, indicate that urban mass transportation is one critical area in which the Federal Government is responsive to local calls for assistance. Hopefully, the Federal response in this area—as in others—will stimulate more local initiative and action. In this way, Federal funds spent will have a multiplier effect in overcoming present mass-transit problems, and meeting future needs.

Government Lawbreaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Washington, D.C., Post of Tuesday, March 29, 1966 which should be read by the Attorney General of the United States.

This excellent editorial points out that the laws of this great Republic bind the executive, including the attorney general, as well as everyone else.

I can see no reason whatsoever why the Attorney General should continue to sanction violation of the Federal statutes with regard to wiretapping.

No one has yet shown me how the Attorney General or anyone else in the executive is superior to the laws of our Nation, and the sooner some of the people in the Department of Justice become aware of this fact the better off this Nation will be.

The editorial *follows:*

GOVERNMENT LAWBREAKING

"Within the Federal Government," Attorney General Katzenbach testified the other day before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, "wiretapping is strictly regulated. The FBI uses wiretaps only for intelligence purposes in national security matters, and then only with the express approval of the Attorney General." By any standard, this must be reckoned a remarkable statement coming from the highest legal and law enforcement authority in the Nation.

With all due respect, we submit that the Attorney General (and a succession of Attorneys General before him) has misconstrued the law. As he told the subcommittee, he construes it "as not prohibiting wiretapping as such, but as prohibiting the interception and disclosure or use for personal benefit of the information so obtained." But he has left out of account a very important phrase of the act which we set forth here in italics: "No person not being entitled thereto shall receive or assist in receiving any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio and use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto."

When this act of Congress came before the Supreme Court for construction, the Court said: "The plain words of section 605 forbid anyone, unless authorized by the sender, to intercept a telephone message, and direct in equally clear language that no person shall divulge or publish the message or its substance to 'any person.'" Here the italics were supplied by the Court. There is nothing, absolutely nothing, in the language of the act authorizing an exception "for intelligence purposes in national security matters." And there is not a word authorizing the Attorney General to approve such an exception.

At the very least, in our view, the plain words of the act make it a crime for an FBI agent, or anybody else who taps a telephone, to communicate the substance of what he hears to any other person, even to Mr. Katzenbach or to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, or to make any use of the information for intelligence purposes or any other purposes. And with the fullest acknowledgment of Mr. Katzenbach's good intentions, we think he has no more right or authority to approve such a crime by one of his subordinates than he has to approve a search without a warrant or the imprisonment of a citizen without a trial, even if these forms of lawbreaking should be thought to serve the national security.

Like Attorneys General before him, Mr. Katzenbach seeks to justify his approval of FBI wiretapping by asserting that the President has approved this approval. But nothing is clearer about the American political system than that the President has no power whatever to authorize the violation of an act of Congress.

Mr. Katzenbach thinks of the wiretapping bill he has endorsed as a compromise because it would outlaw private wiretapping while permitting it on a wide scale by Government officials. If such a compromise is impossible of legislative achievement, he told the subcommittee, "then I would urge that section 605 be amended to prohibit all wiretapping, except that authorized by the President for national security purposes." The first part of what he recommends can be easily achieved by having the Justice Department obey and enforce the law as it now stands. The second part would be to invite a limitless invasion of the privacy which is an essential part of the American heritage.

New Advances in Visual Aids to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, an official of the American Legion called to my attention a series of educational television programs which I believe will be of interest to other Members of the House.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, therefore, I am including a description of this interesting television series, as furnished me by the American Legion headquarters here:

NBC Releases "Exploring" Films for Schools and Libraries

In response to a large number of requests and inquiries from teachers, the children's educational series "Exploring," seen Saturdays on the NBC Television Network, is being made available immediately on 16 millimeter film for purchase by schools and libraries, Edward Stanley, NBC director of public affairs, announced today. The current series on American History has been produced under Mr. Stanley's supervision.

This will be the first time that teachers and school administrators planning to purchase new audiovisual materials with NDEA and ESEA funds will be able to preview and purchase a classroom film series on a national network. The "Exploring" programs which have been a pioneering effort by NBC to develop children's programing which would be professionally useful to the classroom teacher, have had an extraordinary response from the educational world.

The series has been produced in cooperation with the National Council for the Social Studies and the American Library Association.

"Exploring" has also had a distinguished panel of advisers, which include: Dr. Lawrence Derthick, assistant executive secretary, NEA, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Mina Rees, dean of graduate studies, University of New York, member of the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Dr. John Rackley, vice president for instruction, Pennsylvania State University, immediate past president, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Gilbert Seldes, former dean, Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, Dr. W. Linwood Chase, former dean, School of Education, Boston University and past president, National Council for the Social Studies, Dr. Lawrence A. Cremin, Frederick Barnard, professor of education, chairman of department of Social and Philosophical Foundations, Teachers College, Columbia University, Mrs. Augusta Baker, chairman of the Children's Books and Broadcasting Committee, American Library Association, coordinator of Children's Services, New York City Public Library System.

Besides winning every major award in its field, Exploring was cited as an outstanding educational program by Dr. Lawrence Cremin in the 1965 Horace Mann Lecture, "The Genius of American Education." Taking the program as an example of the work of educative agencies not within the professional establishment, Dr. Cremin found it not surprising that "the program has elicited enormous enthusiasm from coast to coast. But what is of special interest," he continued, "is that more and more elementary schools are now devoting part of Friday's classwork to preparing for Saturday's television presentation" * * * Make no mistake: NBC is in the business of popular education * * * and given its technical staff and production facilities it can doubtless teach certain material more effectively and more economically than any school now in existence." Exploring, said Dr. Cremin, "conveys information directly and there is relatively little difficulty in estimating its influence."

Exploring has won the Peabody Award, the Ohio State Award, the Edison Award, the Cine Golden Eagle and the National Association for Better Radio and Television Award.

The 1965–66 Exploring programs have been built around the American History curriculum. Each half-hour film costs $150 in black and white; $300 in color. The films may be ordered from The Graphic Curriculum, 41 East 42d St., New York 10017. With the purchase of any eight films, a ninth film is available at no charge.

The 18 subjects now available on 16 millimeter film are:

"The Untouched Land (to 1492)".
"Into the New World (1492–1763)".
"Seeds of the Revolution (1763–1775)".
"The Revolution (1775–1783)".
"The Constitution (1787)".
"Emergence of a Nation (1800–1817)".
"Era of Good Feeling (1817–1828)".
"Era of the Common Man (1828–1848)".
"Prelude to the Civil War (1848–1860)".
"The Road to Gettysburg (1861–1963)".
"These Honored Dead (1863–1865)".
"The Reconstruction (1865–1880)".
"The Big Push (1865–1886)".
"Toward the Gilded Age (1876–1898)".
"Turn of the Century (1898–1914)".
"End of Innocence (1914–1920)".
"Boom or Bust (1925–1935)".
"Age of the Atom (1935–1945)".

Exploring can be seen on most NBC stations Saturdays, 12:30 p.m. eastern standard time.

Teacher interest in NBC's Exploring program is reflected by the fact that more than 600,000 received on request the teacher's guide to the program in past seasons. This is over half of the elementary teachers in the Nation, with some 18 million children in their classrooms, and makes the news of the release of these films for schools and libraries of unusual interest.

Lasting Help From the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a good example has recently been brought to my attention of teamwork between AID and the Peace Corps. Working with Gage Skinner, a Peace Corps volunteer in Chile, AID with a minimum of red tape and time helped put a tribe of Chilean Indians into the honey business which promises to improve the incomes of these farmers of the Temuco area. This example is from the La Mesa, Calif., Scout for Thursday, February 17, 1966:

La Mesan in Peace Corps Aids Chilean Beekeeper

Gage Skinner, a Peace Corps volunteer from 1841 Edgelake Road, La Mesa, and his friend, Ricardo Antileo, the old Mapuche Indian chief, sat waiting in the Peace Corps office in Temuco, Chile, for a check that would start Antileo's community on a beekeeping project.

The two, Antileo, the old chief and Skinner, the young U.S. trained apiarist, had worked together in preparing the project which would improve the incomes of farmers in the Temuco area.

Skinner prepared the request and sent it through Peace Corps channels to U.S. Ambassador Ralph A. Dungan in Santiago, Chile. Ambassador Dungan sent it on to the Agency for International Development mission.

Within a few days and with a minimum of redtape, AID determined that such a grant was eligible for help from its special activities fund, set up to provide fast small loans and grants for productive purposes. The special funds are available for small foreign aid projects to help people help themselves.

The check for 750 escudos (not quite $200) was delivered to Antileo by Don Cameron, Regional Peace Corps director in Temuco.

It was invested as quickly as possible in hives for the members of the cooperative in Antileo's community.

Already, it was late spring in Chile. Bees were swarming and feeding on the fragrant flowers of the Cautin River valley.

"There's a good market and a good price for honey," Skinner explains. Each kilo of honey brings up to 1.80 escudos (about 45 cents) and that's good money for farmers in this area.

"Each hive can easily produce 25 or more kilos of honey a year if it is well managed. And if a family has, say 20 or 30 hives, you can see how much income would increase, as well as having honey for their own use."

Skinner visited the Indian lands near Lumaco, not far from Temuco. Here he enlisted the help of the quiet old chief to tell the people there about cooperatives and how a beekeeping cooperative would work.

The people in the Lumaco area liked the idea. They had already put together money enough to buy 10 hives. These were filled with bees and honey making had begun.

Through the old chief, Skinner explained how more hives could be purchased with AID credit. He told them that they would have no trouble collecting bees to bill them since bees were in abundance in the area. He also told them that he would help them set up a cooperative and help solve problems that arose. With the AID help, the project and cooperative are on their way to becoming a success.

France Should Repay Debts to United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, American schoolchildren have long been taught that there are no people with whom our Nation has more cause for a spirit of kinship than with the people of France.

Our traditional friendship with that great people springs from the timely and courageous help given to the colonies by France in our war for independence.

But such help has not been a one-way street.

Many French towns have two American military cemeteries, one from each World War; 60,000 Americans are buried on French soil.

We have poured gold as well as blood into the defense of France against her enemies. Since World War II the United States have given France assistance totaling $11 billion, including $4 billion in outright grants.

Yet, in the years since Charles de Gaulle came to power, an increasing hostility has become the official French attitude toward the United States. And France continues to drain our gold.

Rarely has one people helped another as we have helped the French.

And rarely, if ever, has such help been rewarded with such ingratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the French people, who have watched two generations of American soldiers fall in their defense, support M. de Gaulle in his studied hostility to the United States.

At any rate, the time for patience is over.

Last year I called upon the De Gaulle government to begin repayment of the $6.5 billion France still owes the United States from World War I.

I reiterate that call today.

Mr. Speaker, the renunciation of the traditional friendship of one people for another is a grave step for a leader to take.

M. de Gaulle has taken that step.

Let our Government then respond with firmness, while remaining ever mindful that national leaders sometimes drift away from the better interests of those they lead.

Our long friendship with the people of France permits us to hope that the present situation will pass, and that our peoples will once again enjoy the friendship their mutual sacrifices merit.

Mr. Speaker, the following article from the U.S. News & World Report speaks for itself, and I include it in the RECORD.

WHAT UNITED STATES HAS DONE FOR FRANCE

(France, under President de Gaulle, is giving America a lesson in hard-boiled politics. The moral: Generosity and good will in today's world aren't always repaid with gratitude. After billions in aid to France over a 50-year span, De Gaulle wants to cut American ties with his country, force the United States out of Europe.)

Over span of nearly half a century the American people probably have done more for France and the French people than any nation ever did for another.

Americans, at a very high cost in lives and money, came to the rescue of France in two major wars. Americans then underwrote the rebuilding of the French nation from those wars. It was Americans who defended France during the postwar years when the threat of communism was hanging over Western Europe.

Now the payoff is taking place, and it is not proving pleasant for the American Government.

France under President Charles de Gaulle wants to replace the United States as leader of the defensive alliance in Europe—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The French Government has done what it could to embarrass the United States in its effort to prevent a Communist takeover in South Vietnam. France has been striving to undermine the American dollar and to block American efforts to find some other, more flexible, way to settle accounts in world trade than through sole dependence on gold.

Also, De Gaulle, is preparing to go to Moscow on a mission that tends to arouse suspicion among diplomats in the United States and in many European countries.

De Gaulle is pictured as seeking to restore France to "grandeur" and to a role of leadership in Europe and in the world. To accomplish that, he needs to try to undermine and downgrade the United States, in the opinion of those shaping American policy.

This is not regarded by U.S. officials as a very rewarding response to the huge investment in lives and in money that the American people have made, over the years, in France and Europe.

PRICE: 36,000 LIVES

In World War I, the American investment in Europe that saved France from defeat came to 36,000 lives and 224,000 wounded. In dollars, the direct cost to the United States in military aid was $27 billion, not counting $12.2 billion in loans. All this was in dollars of far greater value than today's dollars.

PRICE: 184,000 LIVES

In World War II, France surrendered to Germany without making a real fight.

In rescuing a defeated France and subduing its conqueror, the American people sacrificed 184,000 lives and suffered 479,000 wounded. They poured more than $200 billion into direct costs of the war in Europe, while giving total lend-lease and other aid of nearly $50 billion.

Since World War II, the United States has given France gifts and credits totaling about $11 billion. That includes outright grants of $4 billion, partly in Marshall plan aid to get the industry of France on its feet.

In addition, the American people have supported large military forces in Europe through the postwar years. The aim has been to assure against a new military attack on the area and to relieve the people of Europe—including the French people—from bearing a heavy burden of armament.

For all of this, Americans asked nothing in return except a willingness among the people of Western Europe to cooperate in trying to build a unified defensive force that, in the future, could do more to protect itself.

Then, too, the American Government deliberately encouraged an outflow of gold from its own stockpile so that other nations could regain liquidity of their finances as well as soundness of their currencies.

FLOW OF TOURIST DOLLARS

At the same time, Americans were encouraged to travel abroad so they would spread dollars around the world. The original postwar worry had been that the world would face a dollar shortage.

Americans traveling abroad have for many years been spending more than $100 million annually in France alone.

In addition, American military personnel stationed at NATO bases in France have poured millions into the French economy in recent years. In 1965, such spending by U.S. military men and their families amounted to an estimated $150 million.

So generous has been American policy and so ready the American people to share other people's burdens that there is now a surfeit of dollars in the world, and it the U.S. dollar whose stability is becoming suspect. The French franc, which long was one of the world's prime examples of a weak currency, has managed, thanks in part to U.S. generosity, to become one of the strongest currencies in the world, backed by a gold reserve of more than $4.7 billion.

So the France for which the American people have done so much over the years now feels strong enough—as American officials see it—to kick the United States in the shins.

A POLITE REMINDER

American officials have tried to remind France, in a polite sort of way, of one more point.

In the World War I period, the U.S. loaned France $4.1 billion, which were dollars that would buy far more than today's dollars. By June, 1925, the French had paid off 65 million of this loan and had paid 221 million in interest. The loan then was refinanced at 3.34 billion, and by 1931 France had paid 39 million in interest and 161 million in principal.

After that, interest and principal payments were ended and the loan was in default. However, this huge debt has never been formally written off the books by the United States.

Result: Interest and principal on this French debt now totals $6.7 billion. De Gaulle shows no inclination to pay. The World War I debt owed by the British actually now is bigger—9.5 billion—because Britain's original borrowing was larger. Neither of the two nations is interested in repayment. Britain lacks the means to pay, but De Gaulle in view of his country's boasted financial strength and growing hoard of gold, could be helpful in honoring a debt now in default.

IF U.S. GETS OUT

Against the background of experience running back about 50 years, American officials are beginning to wonder about something much more current.

In the period since World War II, the American people have invested heavily in France to build defensive bases and supply facilities. Military highways have been constructed, pipelines built, ports improved, air bases established. Supply depots have been created and stocked. The investment is estimated at about $2.5 billion.

Now the government of France says that it wants the United States to get out of the country.

Question: What becomes of this investment in property in France paid for by Americans? Such physical installations as highways, air bases, ports, supply depots and pipelines can't be shifted. The thought is that perhaps De Gaulle expects to take over these facilities for French use. There is some uncertainty about whether or how much the French President will want to pay for what he gets.

U.S. PRIVATE HELP

Then there is still another side to the situation that Americans have come to face in De Gaulle's France.

In recent years, American businessmen have invested heavily in France. The total now comes to more than $1.6 billion.

It is this sizable American private investment that has done so much to help modernize a French industry that had been lagging.

In one instance, in the computer industry, a large infusion of capital and know-how by an American company was required to keep the French in the running. In so basic a field as that of food canning, an American company took the lead in establishing modern processes in France.

As private investment by Americans grew, De Gaulle became disturbed and began to warn about a threatened "takeover" by American capital in Europe. To date, however, there has been no direct French threat to the large-scale American investments.

PICKING UP A BURDEN

Americans today are carrying a heavy load in southeast Asia because of French failure to maintain a position there.

At the end of World War II, in spite of U.S. urging, the French Government refused to end the colonial status of Indochina—the area now included in all of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. A colonial war followed, which Communits exploited.

When defeated in a big battle of that war, the French simply gave up and pulled out.

The burden of trying to maintain stability in that part of the world fell principally on the United States. The cost of that load in this year alone is fixed officially at more than $10 billion.

In lives the cost in Vietnam is mounting. Already more than 2,000 Americans have been killed and 11,500 wounded, and the end is not in sight.

Against that background, the French under the leadership of De Gaulle are found by the U.S. Government to be doing what they can to encourage the Communists and to complicate the problem of the United States.

It is this situation that tends to cause U.S. officials to question whether good will, great help and generosity on a scale not before seen in the world actually pay off when the chips are down.

The experience with France is not regarded as encouraging.

South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Testimony of Richard P. Stevens, Associate Professor and Director of the African Student Center, Lincoln University, Pa., Before the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, March 30, 1966

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, as the former chairman of the political science department (1962–63) at Pius XII University College in Basutoland, and a member of the college senate, I have endeavored to follow events in the high commission territories very closely over the past 4½ years. I am therefore very grateful for the opportunity of bringing the plight of these peoples, interrelated as it is with the problem of South Africa, to the attention of your committee, and hopefully to the attention of the administration.

The apartheid regime in South Africa, while primarily a tragedy for that country's nonwhite majority, also compromises the fundamental rights of its small neighbors—Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland. These three countries, having almost by chance escaped South African domination were known until recently as the British High Commission Territories. Historically caught up between the clash of British imperial interests and expanding Boer nationalism of the late 19th century, the tribal leaders of these peoples appealed for British protection rather than share the fate of their fellow Africans who were subjected to the declared racialism of the Boer community. Today, with preparations well underway for the withdrawal of British protection over Basutoland (Lesotho) and Bechuanaland (Botswana) this year, and from Swaziland within the next few years, the possibility that South Africa may yet control the fortunes of these peoples poses a definite threat to the cause of human freedom.

While insignificant in numbers and power influence, the Batswana, Swazi and Basuto have tenaciously clung to their cherished freedom over the past century and have accepted poverty under British rule as the price for maintaining their human dignity. For while British rule excluded South African control, it consciously refrained from encouraging any political, economic, or social development of the territories likely to show up to disadvantage the repressive policies pursued by South Africa toward her nonwhite majority. But however dearly purchased was their national survival, these peoples have clearly demonstrated that human values can supersede the economic.

Their actions also serve to refute the hollow protestations of some that international sanctions against South Africa would most adversely affect her nonwhite majority and must, therefore, be set aside as impractical. For it has already been demonstrated that the nonwhite population, if consulted, would accept such sacrifice as a condition for eventual freedom. But these three territories alone cannot challenge the South African monolith.

Their support must be the international community and the rule of law. Their very survival requires that those states which officially profess a belief and respect for human values within the context of international law must now demonstrate their sincerity. True, these peoples are not in the limelight of the East-West struggle and support for their rights cannot be clothed in the more fashionable garb of an anti-Communist struggle.

An American commitment in their behalf cannot be justified in terms of maintaining a power position. It can, however, prove to the world and to the Negro population of the United States in particular, that the American commitment in behalf of human liberty is just as sincere in respect to South Africa as it claims to be in Cuba or Vietnam.

On the other hand, if the United States does not now seek to grasp and pursue those peaceful and legitimate methods at our disposal to precipitate a change in southern Africa, this country may well pay for its moral tepidity by seeing the Communist world fall heir to the richest portion of the African Continent. At what a cost a real conflagration in South Africa would be to our own domestic institutions, one hesitates to speculate.

American interest in the plight of Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland does not immediately, therefore, depend on national altruism. If, unfortunately, the American Government can only respond to a crisis threatening its world position, even here there is ample cause for strong, positive action. It is precisely in regard to these three countries that the United States, alone or through the United Nations, can presently pursue a course of positive action, the side effects of which may indeed challenge the South African Government.

For too long the specious argument has been advanced that American action vis-a-vis South Africa must be qualified by respect for the sovereignty of that state. Without arguing the merits of that position when challenged by the rights of the human person, we must at least equally defend the sovereign equality of these states embedded in the apartheid complex of South Africa, an equality which presupposes free and unrestricted access to the outside world.

If the maintenance of these rights poses difficulties for the South African Government, it is nevertheless the duty of the international community to see that these rights are not sacrificed. Secured against South African encroachment, these states may seriously undertake the creation of nonracial democracies, the example of which on South Africa's borders may serve as a leavening influence upon that Government's racial mythology. It follows, therefore, that assistance to these countries will enable them to be less dependent on South African and free, within the bounds of national right, to speak out in support of human values.

As showpieces of democratic life, these countries may demonstrate to South Africa that there is an alternative to its present course which can only lead tragically and inevitably to race war if not race suicide.

A realistic American policy towards this area must be cognizant of South Africa's persistent demand for the incorporation of the High Commission Territories from the 1909 Act of Union, which gave birth to the Union of South Africa, until 1962, when Dr. Verwoerd, as prime minister, officially renounced the traditional claim. South African arguments for the incorporation of the Territories always stressed that geographically, ethnographically, and economically they formed part of South Africa, an assertion which, were it not for the present minority rule in South Africa, would not be contested.

But South Africa was patently not concerned with the incorporation of the territories for these reasons alone since she hardly intended to incur additional financial burdens without adequate compensation. Although on purely historic grounds it might be asserted that inasmuch as Britain prevented the Boers from acquiring these territories, their takeover would provide handsome redress for earlier Boer defeat, this motive was not in itself sufficient. Of greater importance was the belief that the protectorates were absolutely essential to the whole Bantustan concept, a plan for racial subordination especially promoted by Dr. Verwoerd. The blueprint for this scheme, as shown in the Tomlinson report of 1956, presumed the incorporation of the high commission territories and thus enlarged from 13 to approximately 45 percent the amount of land supposedly to be set aside for the Bantustan project. Without the inclusion of the territories, territorial apartheid would remain an unconvincing project. The South African reserve areas could not provide a living for even half the Africans of the country but with the addition of the high commission territories the scheme, at least on paper, would gain some credibility. For the purposes of foreign propaganda, they seemed essential.

Although the incorporation of the protectorates appeared necessary for the realization of the Bantustan scheme, the Nationalist Party electoral victory in 1948 ruled out the possibility of negotiated transfer. The failure of the South African Government to develop along liberal British lines made it impossible for any government in London to believe South Africa's assurances that the paramount interests of the peoples of the protectorates would be maintained. The departure of South Africa from the Commonwealth definitely precluded any possibility of direct transfer. Dr. Verwoerd therefore found it expedient to announce that the incorporation of the territories was "neither possible nor wise."

Despite this official change of heart, it would be perilous to conclude that South Africa has now abandoned its oft-repeated designs on the territories. Even the Prime Minister's timely offer, in September 1963, to lead the territories more quickly and with more financial assistance to full self-government than could be done by Britain was an obvious proof that the effort had not been abandoned. Crude methods calcuated to effect transfer had indeed been rejected as undiplomatic and untimely.

But the blandishments of immediate economic assistance and possible additions of adjacent lands in the Republic, all against the backdrop of threatened restrictions, may achieve the same object. It has also been suggested, even within South African political circles, that the independent territories will provide the basis for the big partition of South Africa, whereby the African reserve or Bantustan areas of the Republic will be thrust toward the territories which in turn will be tightly controlled through economic and other means. Dr. Steytler, of the South African Progressive Party, has not been alone in asking whether the Prime Minister's professed desire to establish good relations with the territories means that the protectorates must eventually accept policies similar to those of the South African Government.

In each of the territories the British High Commissioner, acting through a Resident Commissioner, was proclaimed sole legislative authority—Basutoland in 1884, Bechuanaland in 1891 and Swaziland in 1903—in a system theoretically known as indirect rule. The administrative responsibility for internal affairs was left on the whole to the chiefs, who continued to exercise their traditional political and judicial authority and in addition regulated the economic life of their people.

If the inhabitants were not entirely satisfied with this arrangement, fear of their South African neighbor deflected the force of their protests. But traditional leaders, unaware of the nature of the economic forces in South Africa which were transforming their lives and without real decisionmaking power, could not respond to the new challenge as it affected labor, agriculture, industry and tribal life without major institutional changes. Yet, any fundamental change in the traditional structure of society—a condition for political advancement or constitutional evolution—seemed to invite the loosening of British protection and conversely, the encroachment of the historic enemy.

In the event, the abrogation in late 1964 of the office of High Commissioner—combined since 1961 with that of British Ambassador to South Africa—reflected the changed political status of the territories as each advanced toward independence.

Already, in October 1963, the post of Resident Commissioner was upgraded to Queen's Commissioner in Bechuanaland and Swaziland. A similar step was taken for Basutoland in August 1964 and thus each territory received the equivalent of a Governor responsible directly to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Henceforth, the British Ambassador to South Africa would be informed about aspects of the three territories' affairs affecting foreign relations or defense, but he would have no further responsibility for purely internal matters. This change, long demanded by nationalist leaders as a condition for proper political and economic advancement, was more than a symbolic act demanded by the times. Hopefully, it marked the end of an era of contradiction and uncertainty as Britain debated the relative merits of her various commitments and involvements in southern Africa.

Exen before Britain undertook to bring diplomatic and political procedures governing the administration of the territories and their relationship to South Africa into line with their movement toward independence, cautious if not reluctant concessions were made toward nationalist movements demanding responsible self-government. In 1960 Basutoland became the first of the protectorates to receive a legislative council followed by Bechuanaland in 1961 and Swaziland in 1964. In each case, representative institutions were built upon the base of earlier tribal councils and were expanded to include, at least in theory, the evolving intellectual elite.

But while these changes were rapidly transforming the political life of the protectorates, South Africa made it clear that any action on the part of the territories likely to run counter to her own interests, as she defined them, would not be permitted. The fact that the protectorates were increasingly regarded after 1960 as places of asylum for South African refugees was embarrassing to the Republic's prestige and supposedly threatened her internal security. Thus, from early 1963, South Africa initiated a number of policies designed to impress the territories with her retaliatory powers. In place of unrestricted access to and from the protectorates, border posts, barbed wire fences and rigid passport controls were imposed.

Without consulting the British Government as protecting power, railway passenger service was suddenly eliminated to Basutoland. Henceforth, passengers were required to detrain some 15 miles from the border, transfer to buses and then proceed to the border, after which they would carry their luggage by hand across the border bridge at Maseru. This humiliating action went uncontested by the British Government even though the South African Railroad was engaged in international commerce. No effort made made to challenge South Africa with retaliatory regulations affecting South African rail communications through Bechuanaland with Rhodesia.

Additional restrictions soon followed. In September 1963, the South African Government announced that no airplanes would be permitted to fly to, from, or between the territories without first landing at one of 27 designated airfields. Thus, at South Africa's fiat, interterritorial travel and access to the outside world required a valid South African travel document. As far as these countries were concerned, no direct journey could be made via Johannesburg's International Airport.

Typical of Britain's timid approach to matters involving South Africa, no public protest was made against this infringement of international right of access nor was the question brought to the attention of any international body. Since Britain had obviously failed to challenge South Africa, the Republic continued, as she does today, to deny the legitimate rights of the territories. Some of the more notorious examples of this high-handedness may be cited. In mid 1965 10 Basuto students were turned back from the Johannesburg International Airport after they had arrived on a British flight from East Africa. They were refused permission to return to their own country on the grounds that they had received training in China and were without South African travel documents—documents which the South African Government then conveniently refused to grant. Without regard to whether or not the students had been in China, an allegation which they vigorously denied, their legal and moral right to return to their homes cannot be denied and in this demand they have been supported officially by the Basutoland Government. These students are presently drifting from country to country as a warning to all other travelers from the territories what their fate may be should they not meet with South African approval.

Other examples of South Africa's disregard of the rights of the territories include the refusal of a transit visa to the President of the Basutoland Senate, Dr. Seth Makotoko, in October 1965. Even a member of the Senate of the University of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland (UBBS), Dr. Samuel Guma, has been refused permission to take up a teaching position in the United States or to attend Senate meetings when held in the other territories.

Although numerous examples could be cited of South Africa's interference with the rights of the citizens of the territories, the Republic has also acted to prevent citizens of other states from enjoying free access to the territories. I might refer in particular to my own unpleasant experience in this regard. In May 1965 application was made for a transit visa so that I might visit the territories under the sponsorship of Lincoln University. Despite repeated requests and numerous direct inquiries and expressions of concern by the U.S. Department of State, no transit visa was granted. Again, in preparation for my December trip to Bechuanaland, the request was renewed and a formal proposal was advanced to fly directly by charter plane to the territories. This request was refused and, in conjunction with the Portuguese authorities in Mozambique, all access was denied. To this date the Department of State has received no reply to its inquiry concerning the access rights of Americans to the territories.

Since it is patently evident that I could not be considered a threat to the South African Government, it can only be concluded that my past public expressions on the dangers faced by the territories have led to my exclusion. If members of the American academic world are thus denied the ordinary rights of research and communication, it is inconceivable that the U.S. Government should permit, let alone foster, the presence in this country of South African researchers. This is a responsibility which the U.S. Government must assume if there is to be any hope of a free atmosphere in the territories.

Not the least of these detrimental actions against the territories, is the activity carried on in the United States by South African consular and diplomatic personnel who endeavor to keep close watch over the activities of nationals of the territories. In a document which I will submit upon request of this committee, the South African consul general in New York is instructed by his Government to maintain a watch over the activities of a national of one of these territories so that the South African Government may know if a return transit visa is to be granted.

Thus, even before the removal of British protection, the South African Government has seriously undermined the substance of independence. In the absence of any international presence or active interest on the part of those countries capable of exercising influence on South Africa, the likelihood that Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland can secure even the basic prerequisites of sovereignty is open to question. If the citizens of Berlin could be saved from a threat to their fundamental freedom, is it too much to expect of this Government that some effort should be made to preserve the liberties of these peoples? Again the righteous demands of all conscientious Americans, particularly Afro-Americans, requires an action consistent with past professions.

Between 1948 and 1963, as the lights of academic freedom flickered and died in South Africa, the high commission territories were increasingly looked to by the nonwhite youth of South Africa as an escape from the nefarious Bantu education laws prevailing in the Republic. At considerable sacrifice youngsters were sent off to mission schools in the territories and in ever growing numbers to Pius XII University College in Basutoland. In all of southern Africa, here alone students could receive a university education free of the apartheid ideology. Needless to say, the presence of South African students at the university was viewed with growing alarm by the South African Government. Consequently, when on January 1, 1964, the university passed from religious to secular control, the South African Government acted to halt the exodus of South African students. Within a short time, the student population, previously more than 50 percent from South Africa, was reduced to a fraction. In the meantime, however, the U.S. Government, through AID, began a program of financial assistance to the university.

Unfortunately, however, the U.S. Government made no effort to bring pressure upon the South African Government to permit the continued enrollment of South Africans. Here, again, it was clearly in the interest of the United States that every effort be made to induce the South African Government to permit students to attend the university. Could this matter not legitimately be connected with the accessibility of American academic facilities to South Africans, particularly inasmuch as American technology is responsible for much of South Africa's atomic research and development? Indeed, it can be further argued that unless fairly large numbers of students from various countries enjoy the right to enroll at the university in Basutoland, the atmosphere necessary for any proper university development will be lacking. Moreover, the university deserves the fullest support of the American Government so that both by reason of its facilities and its free academic atmosphere there may yet remain a true university in southern Africa. On the other hand, American support should be contingent upon firm guarantees by the Government of Basutoland, that South African pressures will not restrict the freedom of the university community to probe the basic problems of that region.

Educational assistance to the territories should not, however, be confined to local endeavors. Rather, scholarship assistance enabling students to receive education in the United States must be vastly expanded. Although in normal circumstances the needs of the local African university might be the prime consideration, here the need for potential leaders to break through the apartheid curtain of southern Africa is at least of equal importance. Moreover, it cannot be forgotten that South African pressures operate even now to limit the opportunities of those students who might oppose existing political configurations as too dependent on South African influence.

American and international encouragement must also be given to the expansion of media of public information and communication in the territories. The development of extensive broadcasting facilities capable of piercing the apartheid curtain of South Africa will place in the hands of the territories another bargaining counter in dealing with South Africa. Although it would not be expected that the governments of these independent States would launch a radio offensive against South Africa, the objective reporting of regional and international news would offer a ray of hope to South Africans, white and black, laboring under the burden of a rigidly controleld Government radio.

On the economic side, American technology is urgently required if Basutoland is to succeed in developing its most valuable assets: agriculture, water, and diamond mining. Entirely surrounded by South Africa, three of the Republic's most important rivers have their source in the mountains of Basutoland. Although the sale of water or hydroelectric power to neighboring South Africa may be a condition for short-range economic development, such projects as the oxbow scheme must not be postponed until South Africa sees fit to negotiate. On the contrary, the possibility of cheap electricity and water might bring some startling demands on the part of rural white South Africans that their Government make an adequate response.

Considering that the rural white population has always provided the backbone of Afrikaner Nationalist strength, demands from this quarter on Pretoria might precipitate a weakening of the internal apartheid structure. Moreover, South Africa has already initiated certain projects on the Orange River without coming to a formal understanding with Basutoland where this international waterway has its source.

Given sufficient external support, Basutoland, while the most captive of the territories, might be rendered more secure. The advantages in increased diamond mining are obvious since diamonds can be shipped with some facility to the world market. Intensive agricultural development would also reduce Basutoland's heavy reliance upon the export of labor to South Africa which usually totals more than 200,000 of the country's 890,000 population, or 43 percent of local adult males.

Hopefully, Basutoland might once more provide the bulk of its own grain needs. Modern agriculture would also release the potential of thousands of youngsters presently tied down to the tasks of herd boys thereby permitting them to receive formal schooling or engage in productive agriculture.

Bechuanaland's economic position is only slightly better than that of Basutoland. Larger than the British Isles, Bechuanaland is bounded by South-West Africa, South Africa, Zambia (at a point on the map), and Rhodesia. Presuming that the illegal regime in Rhodesia is brought down, Bechuanaland will look more easily toward the north.

At present, however, the country's half million people subsist on ranching some 1,200,000 poor grade cattle amid a drought which has cost the loss of 250,000 head this past year. Still, however gloomy the situation, money and training can make a vital difference. The economic survey mission led by Professor Morse of Cornell University reported in 1960 that the additional expenditure of approximately $8 million over the next 5 years, over and above existing minimal subsidies, would "set in motion in the Protectorate a series of processes that will gradually enable it to stand on its own feet." Scarcely more than a quarter of this amount has yet been made available by the British Government.

Not only must the cattle industry be promoted, but urgent projects must be initiated to relieve famine conditions through sound agriculture planning. The exploitation of rich sodium-carbonate brines in the Kalahari and vast coal deposits along the railway line must yet be undertaken.

The abundant, clear waters of the Okavango River in the northwest can be canalized to provide both irrigation water and barge transport for this desperately dry country. The Morse report suggested that the modest sum of $210,000 would suffice for the construction of a canal without lining. The expansion of health, education, and communications will also correspondingly reduce the dependence of the country on South Africa.

Swaziland's more favored economic position has scarcely affected the ordinary Swazi and approximately 28 percent of the male labor force must still seek employment in South Africa. The very attractiveness of the country resulted in the alienation of most of the land to Europeans. Even today, after government action and Swaziland purchases, some 42 percent of the land is owned by approximately 10,000 whites out of the country's total population of 280,000. One of the chief landowners, and a close collaborator with the South African Government, is Mr. Carl Todd, who also maintains an office in New York. Mr. Todd is in great part responsible for the present feudalistic, aristocratic government which governs Swaziland with South Africa's blessing.

Despite an abundance of natural resources such as asbestos, iron ore, timber, and good farmlands, profits are not even partly plowed back into Swaziland development. Leases have been made by the British Government which have not only deprived the Swazi of share holdings and effective participation in company directorship, but have even failed to provide effective guarantees for the training of Swazi in skilled work.

In Swaziland, as in the other territories, education, public health, communications, and transport have been scandalously neglected. Effective economic assistance would serve not only to offset the disproportionate influence of South African capital, but would promote cooperatives and other economic activities primarily of a developmental character.

Although Portuguese Mozambique offers little choice as an alternative access to the outside world, it might realistically be assumed that Portugal cannot long resist the Mozambiquan liberation struggle, at least if American support for Portugal can be eliminated. A liberated Mozambique will offer Swaziland new choices and a new role vis-a-vis the problem of South Africa.

American commitments in the territories must reveal a bold and dynamic approach to the southern African area. Needless to say, if American interest in these areas is to be dictated by the inadequacy of its programs to the north, then it will be obvious that the United States does not intend to challenge the apartheid structure of South Africa. The very fact of an obvious American interest will, on the other hand, concretely demonstrate this country's repugnance toward South African policies and will encourage the political leaders of the territories to maintain their historic opposition to South African encroachment.

Already South Africa has influenced to a marked degree political events in Basutoland and Swaziland. A large sum appropriated by the South African Parliament to secretly promote her interests in the territories is even now bearing fruit. Unfortunately, local British authorities, particularly in Swaziland, have reversed policy under the new Queen's Commissioner, and have encouraged, under the guise of moderation the combination of white South African interests and aristocratic tribal conservatism. In general, the object of the British Government has been first to reduce the bargaining power of the territories vis-a-vis South Africa before granting independence by restricting radio operations, imposing overly harsh regulations governing the right of asylum and by turning away from such external assistance as non-British groups offer.

Inasmuch as British policy is clearly designed to take account of her enormous investments in South Africa, it follows that no creative or bold counters to South Africa can be expected from that source. It would be tragic if American policy, with independence, continues its present disinterestedness based on the assumption that the British Government is sincerely committed to the development of the territories. Even if this assumption were true, the United States must strike out on its own diplomatic and economic initiatives in southern Africa if we are yet to show the world's nonwhite majority that our commitment to freedom is indivisible.

Hon. John F. Baldwin

SPEECH
OF

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Maine join with Members of Congress and with the people of California in mourning the passing of our late respected colleague, the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN.

I came to know Congressman BALDWIN under less than favorable circumstances. It was while I was fighting for approval of the Dickey-Lincoln school hydroelectric power project.

Congressman Baldwin was opposed to this project. While I failed in my efforts to persuade the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin] to alter his position, I came to know him and to respect him for his convictions, sincerity, friendliness, and candor.

In January of this year, I was hospitalized because of a leg injury. Congressman Baldwin was also a patient at the time and occupied a room across the corridor from me. Here, under far different circumstances, we renewed our acquaintance. During my stay at the hospital, I came to know John Baldwin more intimately and my respect for him increased immeasurably.

He was suffering from an illness from which I suspect he knew he would not recover. In spite of this fatal prospect, he continued his dedicated devotion to his congressional duties.

He was friendly and thoughtful, and his courage was an inspiration to me and to all who knew him.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Miami Local 172 of the United Federation of Postal Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is aware of the valuable assistance which he receives in carrying out his legislative responsibilities from the various postal groups throughout the country. In the forefront of these groups is the AFL-CIO's United Federation of Postal Clerks.

Such is the stature of the United Federation and the readiness with which its accomplishments in the area of Government-employees relations are accepted as integral parts of our postal and civil service regulations, that it is difficult to believe that a scant half century ago such was not the case.

Half a century ago, when south Florida was still considered the Everglades and largely populated by alligators and Indians, when there were more horses than autos, and when the average pay for a postal clerk was less than $20 per week, the laborers of this country were fighting for decent wages and working conditions. Among those who did so much to secure workers their rights were Government employees and most notably those of the postal service.

Fifty years ago a small part of the struggle for better working conditions began in Miami when a handful of postal clerks first gathered together in a secret then illegal meeting to organize their efforts. Out of that meeting was born what was to become the Miami Local, No. 172, of the United Federation of Postal Clerks.

Today close to a thousand members of local No. 172 are preparing to celebrate the 50th anniversary of those early meetings. Many of the dreams of those who gathered secretly in 1916 have become reality.

The U.S. postal service is the finest in the world. It has the highest tradition of production and service to our citizens. At the low rates charged, the U.S. mail user get the best bargain in the world. Furthermore, working conditions are the best anywhere and, under the continuous impetus of postal employees, are constantly being improved.

The struggle for comparable wages still continues despite the fact that the U.S. postal worker is better paid than ever. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, postal employees by their perseverance, courage, and farsightedness have achieved by Executive order the right to and the recognition of their organizational effort and representation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my congratuations to the present members of local No. 172 for their first 50 years of achievement. Their activities and those of their predecssors have always been in the finest tradition of our democracy.

I am certain that I reflect the sentiments of my colleagues when I say that we are all glad that this Nation has had benefit of the courage of men like those in Miami's local No. 172.

Delicate Diplomatic Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our Government is engaged at the moment in an effort to obtain the release of an AID official who was kidnaped by the Vietcong. In view of the necessarily delicate negotiations taking place in this situation it is very important that publicity be at a minimum. It is also of extreme importance that nothing be read into these contacts that is not there.

The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 29, 1966, places this problem in perspective and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

THOSE CONTACTS AGAIN

The extreme sensitivity of the American people to any hint of negotiation, or even of contact, with any of the principals on the other side in Vietnam has started a new flurry. This time it concerns efforts being made by the United States to secure the release of Gustave C. Hertz, kidnapped by the Vietcong more than a year ago.

These efforts involved contacts with the Vietcong. Presumably, they could have led —assuming any willingness on the part of the National Liberation Front—into broader negotiations, and therefore they are of interest to the public. But, on their face, they were simply attempts to arrange some kind of ransom procedure, and any publicity could have unfavorable results—possibly even fatal results, so far as Mr. Hertz is concerned.

The Government naturally tried to keep the discussions secret. It might have been more successful if it had not been for the public attitude on the subject—which is, at least in a highly articulate segment of American opinion, that any talks with anyone remotely or directly connected with those fighting against us in Vietnam must necessarily mean an attempt by the Communists to end the war, and that any secrecy cloaking such discussions is an effort by Washington to block negotiations.

In plain fact, neither assumption is necessarily correct and both together can constitute a dangerous fallacy. It is in North Vietnam and in Red China that the word "negotiation" has evil connotations, not in the United States. And it is this public Communist denunciation of every attempt to achieve a negotiated settlement that makes secret discussions seem the only way out—at least in the early stages. Since this is so plainly the case, the U.S. Government can hardly be blamed for trying to keep any overtures secret (even when, unlike the present instance, they do not directly involve a human life). Moreover, if secrecy is essential to get peace talks started, it follows that publicity is a distinct disservice to everyone.

Support of Our Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter from Mr. William D. Mitchell, clerk of the Council of the City of Martins Ferry, Ohio. This forthright expression of support of the fighting men of our armed services and the slogan accompanying it are most heartening and the council should be commended for its action:

Council of the City of Martins Ferry,
Martins Ferry, Ohio, March 5 1966.

Hon. Wayne L. Hays,
Congressman for Ohio,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Hays: The council of this city of Martins Ferry have made a matter of permanent record their unflinching support of every fighting man of our armed services.

They also have asked that I write to you their request that you consider adoption of this slogan, "for every man fighting to defend America, let America fight to defend that man."

Thank you.

Very sincerely,

William D. Mitchell,
Clerk of Council.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	2500 Virginia Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Long of Louisiana, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, McGee, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4623 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 113 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit. Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Bladensburg: Effective Police Program Lowers Crime Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an article recently published in the Maryland Municipal League magazine regarding the progress being made by the Bladensburg Police Department:

BLADENSBURG: EFFECTIVE POLICE PROGRAM LOWERS CRIME RATE

The town of Bladensburg has been making a concerted effort over the past few years to lower its crime rate by increasing the efficiency of its police operations. Despite Bladensburg's estimated 300-percent increase in population since 1960, the crime reports for 1965 indicate definite improvement over 1963 and 1964. While the national crime rate soars to new heights each year, the town of Bladensburg saw a drop of 50 percent in instances of crime in 1965. Through the leadership of Mayor Francis O'Donnell and Mr. John P. Campbell, councilman in charge of police, the Bladensburg Police Department has been increased in size, added new, more modern equipment and methods, and adopted more stringent recruitment policies, all contributing to a lower crime rate.

A good police department is only as good as its personnel and considerable effort is exerted in Bladensburg in recruiting well-qualified men. To become eligible for appointment as a policeman, young men must pass a written examination as well as a rigid physical examination. In addition, since personal attributes such as honesty and emotional stability are especially important in police work, each prospective candidate is given a personal interview as well as having his character and background checked extensively.

The town encourages formal police training and for those men who take such training the town offers advanced standing for promotions and salary increases. Several of the men presently on the force have received specialized training at the University of Maryland, the District of Columbia Police Department, and have attended extensive courses given by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Park Police. These courses have dealt with the various aspects of police work which require expertise such as crime photography and fingerprinting identification and classification. In order to further encourage its officers to attend such courses the town assumes all costs.

Due to the training that Bladensburg's police officers have received the town has been able to institute improvements in the department which has greatly increased its efficiency. They now do their own fingerprinting, keep their own criminal records and photograph their own crime pictures. However, the town continues to operate in close cooperation with adjoining cities, the Prince Georges County Police Department, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and use their facilities when necessary.

In order to offer greater protection to its citizens, the town has instituted a two-district coverage system. Previously, each police cruiser was responsible for patrolling the entire town. Under the two-district system police cruisers are assigned portions of the town to patrol and, consequently, police assistance is always closer at hand in emergencies.

Councilman Campbell, in his 17th year as a councilman for Bladensburg, indicates that still greater strides in modernizing the police department may be expected in the near future. At the present time the possibility of installing a town police radio system is being investigated. In addition, the town is hoping to move the police department to its own quarters in order to facilitate future expansion needs. Various pension plans are being considered and the possibility of salary increases for the police is being given some thought.

The number of policemen needed in the future and the nature of their work will be influenced by technological advances and the use of improved methods in police work. Along with the changes in police methods and the increase in population, police employment in the town will continue to grow. Further technological developments will increase the need for policemen with specialized skills and knowledge as well as help to make policing of the town of Bladensburg more efficient.

The town of Bladensburg has managed to reverse the trend of a rising crime rate which some other suburban towns have experienced in recent years. By keeping abreast of technological advances, by expanding its police force to meet the demands of a growing population, and by improving the quality of their police personnel, the town of Bladensburg has set a fine example in demonstrating that effective police protection is possible in a rapidly growing suburban city.

Manson Unit, Chief Joseph Dam Project, Washington

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideratoin the bill (H.R. 2829) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, when H.R. 707 to authorize the Tualatin project was being considered earlier, I indicated that these two projects constitute another step in the development of the water resources in the Columbia River Basin.

The plan for the $13.3 million Manson unit, which would be authorized by the legislation now under consideration, calls for rehabilitation of an existing pirvate irrigation system and extension of the system to serve some additional lands. In all, almost 6,000 acres will be irrigated. In addition to serving irrigation water, the reservoir will be developed for recreation. Since the reservoir will be in a national forest, the recreational facilities will be administered by the Forest Service.

Mr. Chairman, we find here a situation which is true of so many of our recent irrigation projects. The original facilities were built totally by private interests many, many years ago. The time has come when the facilities have deteriorated to the point where a major rehabilitation job is required and the cost of this major improvement plus the cost of extending the system to serve additional lands is beyond the ability of the local water users to repay. In the case of the Manson unit, the water users will repay almost 50 percent of the total project cost and the remainder will be repaid from the net power revenues of the Federal Columbia River Basin system—that is, net revenues that are over and above revenues needed to repay the entire power investment in the Federal Columbia River power system with interest within 50 years from the time each project or unit becomes operational.

Mr. Chairman, the committee concluded that the Manson unit meets all of the criteria for authorization and construction at this time. I urge the approval of H.R. 2829 as amended by the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas will discuss it in more detail. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to propose to the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, a question or two regarding recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, for the purpose of making legislative history.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand the gentleman, he wishes to have the same history made on this legislation as was made on the prior bill, so that there will be no question in respect to the matter involved.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct. I would ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, is it the intent of the committee that the Secretary of the Interior shall carry out such work as is required for recreation development and fish and wildlife enhancement in connection with the Manson unit?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes; to the extent that this is consistent with the Water Project Recreation Act. We have referred to the act and expect to have development carried on in conformance therewith.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it correct that this authority to do this work is found in the first section of the bill which both enumerates the purposes of the project and authorizes its construction?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. Will the chairman state, then, what is the purpose of section 3 of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, that it assure conformity with the Water Project Recreation Act. More specifically, it is to insure that agreements are signed as called for by that act and that cost allocations conform to the standards laid down in that act itself and that we do not vary from the provisions of the act, to which the Congress and the Executive gave their approval recently.

Mr. FOLEY. But is it correct that the recreation and fish and wildlife development are part and parcel of the project itself; that is, they are authorized by section 1 of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes; the gentleman is correct again. I add, the amount authorized to be appropriated includes an allowance for this work as well as for construction of the irrigation features of the project, and that the modes of repayment, whatever they may be, are in accordance with the provisions of the act referred to.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, just two questions, requesting technical information for the gentleman from Missouri, from the distinguished chairman.

Are these dams we are considering today in what is ordinarily referred to as high terrain—or rugged terrain—areas with boxlike canyons and steep walls or are we inundating alluvial soil in order to provide irrigation for other areas to be reclaimed?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have not seen the site of the reservoir referred to in the liquidation now under consideration, that is the reservoir that is to be enlarged. It would make very little difference in this particular instance if I understand my colleague correctly.

I have seen the reservoir site for the Tualatin project. There is a small amount of good farmland that will be inundated, but most of the area is hillsides and there would be very little of value that would be destroyed.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, my second question to the distinguished chairman is, in view of the statement that this one is entirely within a forest preserve or a national forest, would the 50 cents a day or the annual $7 fee for the Land-Water Conservation Fund be applicable for ingress into this area, since it is in another department, under the bill that we passed last year? Would that be in force, and is it contemplated that it would be imposed by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, under the President's recent Executive order?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will allow me, I cannot speak about what is in the minds of the Secretaries involved, but if there is any development which would lead to the necessity for an entrance fee, an entrance fee could be charged in this particular project.

On the other hand, a user fees will more than likely be charged. There is no question about the user fees. There is a question as to the entrance fees, because there has to be a substantial developent that is perhaps a road providing for ingress and egress, or proper policing facilities, or such.

In this particular instance, I may say to my colleague, I would doubt if the entrance fees will be charged. I mean, this is a small reservoir. There is a question about entrance fees, but I am sure users fees will be charged.

Mr. HALL. The users fees pertain to those who actually use the water for hydrology, irrigation, and other purposes in general?

Mr. ASPINALL. No. I go a little further than that. If the Forest Service, in developing a recreation area, constructs recreation facilities, such as parking places or campsites or boat ramps, something like that, then charges will be made for these facilities, but not for the water. The use of the water itself carries with it no fees, as my colleague will remember.

Mr. HALL. I do remember. But that means the only way that you can gain ingress to the lake, which is "free of charge," is to float downstream on a contributing tributary.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think my colleague is correct, providing the administrating authorities wish to go that far and incur the wrath of some of the users. I know a difficulty is going on at the present time.

Mr. HALL. It is going on, of course, on some of the Corps of Engineers impoundments. That is why I wanted to make a record here without reference to this particular project.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it will be involved here.

The New GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the so-called cold war GI bill has been widely acclaimed throughout the country and deservingly so. It has fulfilled a great need.

The attention now is to be directed to the implementation of this bill, so that it will be beneficial to as many of our veterans as possible.

Comdr. O. T. Frith, of the American Legion, Department of Tennessee, recently discussed the implementation of this bill in his column in the Tennessee Legionnaire, and I feel that his points are very well taken and worthly of careful consideration.

Therefore, I would like to insert Commander Frith's comments at this point in the RECORD:

COMMANDER FRITH'S MESSAGE

The President recently signed a cold war GI bill affecting men who were discharged from February 1, 1955, to a date to be determined later. This bill provides the same benefits given to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. The question which arises in my mind is who will take care of these servicemen and the returning veterans of Vietnam. The service officers provided by the cities and counties and the department of veterans' affairs for the State of Tennessee have a very heavy workload at the present time. The increased work caused by this bill will mean a lot of delay unless certain conditions are met.

One of these conditions is the reopening of Veterans' Administration contact offices in some of the key cities in our State. Schools must be approved by the VA and contacts established to see that these men receive every privilege granted by this present GI bill. Post service officers should secure from department headquarters all material pertaining to this matter in order that they might assist in the preparation of the necessary forms for the servicemen involved in their particular area.

Through the strong and continued efforts of the veterans organizations of our World War I veterans, the first GI bill was established when the veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict returned. The provisions of this bill were in working order. All that we had to do was to accept on a silver platter all of the provisions of the GI bill. The men of World War I launched a tremendous and most successful venture for the returning veterans.

Who will take care of them now? It becomes necessary that we of World War II and the Korean conflict pick up this torch which has been tossed to us by our older veterans and work to see that the new GI bill is made workable and successful for those returning from Vietnam and those servicemen who served after January 31, 1955.

The time has now arrived when all veterans organizations must stand together in form of a union so that their voices can be heard from here to Washington and throughout the entire country.

The veterans of this country have stood idly by and permitted privileges that were rightfully theirs to be taken away. Of course we of the American Legion and other veterans' organizations raised our voices individually but now we must raise them in unison in order that we may be heard on all affairs affecting the veterans of the past and the future.

In traveling throughout the entire State during the past 3 weeks, we have talked with many of our leaders and interested veterans about this matter. We are alarmed at the complacency shown by veterans who should be aroused at the treatment we have received in Washington regarding matters pertaining to veterans. If the Bureau of the Budget had its way, there would be no Veterans' Administration, veterans' hospitals or special privileges granted to the veterans at the present time. Pensions now being paid by the VA would be paid in some form of social security. The veterans' hospitals would be operated under the direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The word "veteran" would merely mean that a particular person was in service to his country during war time.

So, may I urge once again for one and all to stand together and together we will accomplish many goals in this form of "unity."

Let me repeat, we must have a strong and active membership in the American Legion and its auxiliary. We must join with other veterans' organizations to see that our returning veterans from Vietnam are truly taken care of in the most beneficial manner.

In closing I quote a little poem whose author is unknown.

God and the soldier
  All men adore
In time of trouble
  And no more.
For when war is over
  And all the things righted,
God is neglected
  And the old soldier slighted.

GAO Is a Fine Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the day before the House of Representatives most unfortunately chose to disregard national public opinion and fund the rent supplement program, the Republican Coordinating Committee issued a statement calling for action to be taken to commence an investigation of the Federal Housing Administration. The unfortunate truth which prompted coordinating committee action is beginning to come to light—in this month's Reader's Digest and elsewhere. The Federal Housing Administration is being proven lax and inept.

The proof of this allegation lies in 11 reports that the General Accounting Office has filed with the Congress since this present administration took office. Needless to say, these reports have been ignored. The only reward given integrity under this administration is discipline—and it now appears that the GAO's integrity is to be rewarded by a downgrading of the GAO.

That is a shame. The GAO is a fine organization. I am sorry to see them get in trouble for telling the truth. I am also sorry that the truth is so appalling—particularly in regard to the FHA, which is so badly run that, by its policies of laxity and ineptness, it has accumulated projects and homes worth more than $1 billion at the end of the last fiscal year.

The rent supplement scheme, just recently funded, will be run by the Federal Housing Administration. The possibilities of maladministration are frightening. No doubt subsidized tenants will be herded into just those lemon buildings which the FHA has accumulated by its billion-dollar ineptness.

The GAO has found that integrity does not pay. The FHA has made a different discovery.

The Republican Coordinating Committee statement of March 28 is informative and appropriate.

STATEMENT ON FHA SCANDALS ISSUED BY THE REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE, AT ITS MEETING IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON MARCH 28, 1966

The Government's official watchdog agency—the General Accounting Office—has frequently detailed a record of bankruptcies and mortgage insurance losses in the Federal Housing Administration. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, has also called attention to these, "the latest" in a series of Johnson-Humphrey administration scandals. An article in the April 1966, issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "The Stench at FHA," points out that "nearly 1 out of every 10 FHA apartment or multifamily projects across the country now has gone bankrupt." And, the article goes on to say that "At the end of the last fiscal year FHA was saddled with 575 of these failures which had cost it $536 million. It was also still stuck with 46,261 homes which cost $520 million.

We deplore the laxness which again appears to be besetting a Democratic administration. We deplore the fact that prominent Democrats appear to be playing major roles in the use of FHA mortgages for windfall profits. We deplore the fact that political cronies of the Johnson-Humphrey administration have once more turned FHA into an agency to fatten personal profits through raids on the Treasury of the United States. We deplore the fact that Democratic Congresses have chosen to ignore 11 reports submitted by the General Accounting Office pointing out the rot in FHA since President Johnson took office.

The Johnson-Humphrey administration now demands a rent subsidy program that may ultimately cost as much as $6 billion. It is proposed that this rent subsidy program be managed by FHA. These multimillion dollar scandals already have led to the resignation of one high official. They hardly justify the launching of a new easy-money program under such clouded circumstances.

To a great extent, the problems in FHA are the product of the law which permits the agency to utilize ever-increasing sums without returning to Congress for annual appropriations.

Once before, during the Truman administration, the Nation was shocked with scandals in FHA. Now again history seems to repeat itself.

We urge that Congress act. We urge that a full and complete investigation by the congressional committees concerned begin immediately to bring out the full story. Our citizens and taxpayers are entitled to no less.

Soybeans and the Fifth District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the 10 counties of my congressional district produce nearly one-third of the soybeans grown in my home State of Ohio.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's report on soybean production, dated August 1965, these 10 counties produced 13,059,000 bushels of soybeans on 554,800 acres during 1964. Total 1964 production for the State, according to the USDA report, was 41,850,000 bushels, grown on 1,860,000 acres.

Thus my district, Mr. Speaker, is a leading producer of a crop which has shown phenomenal growth in production in the United States—but of which still more is needed.

In the past decade, soybean acreage has almost doubled, while acreages for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, peanuts, potatoes, oats, hay, and flax have decreased. Last year U.S. farmers harvested 34.5 million acres of soybeans with a farm value of $2 billion. Ohio production, like the rest of the Nation's soybean output, increased—from 41 to 51 million bushels.

But there is currently a drive on by the National Soybean Crop Improvement Council to increase soybean acreage in 1966 by 3.5 million over the 1965 total. The Department of Agriculture is cooperating with this private industry group in accomplishing this goal. Secretary Freeman has announced that soybeans can be planted under provisions of the 1966 feed grain program.

The world demand for oil and protein is growing as populations of countries around the world explode. Soybeans can help feed the world's 1.5 billion undernourished or malnourished persons. In planting more acres of soybeans and also increasing their yields, American farmers can help fill this worldwide need for oil and protein and, at the same time, reap the rewards of the crop which has come into its own as a money crop.

Luminous Design

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun highly commends President Johnson for having made an effective response to General de Gaulle.

The paper states that President Johnson "has properly stressed the point that, with or without France, the North Atlantic Alliance still should be maintained and, more important, should be adapted to meet changing conditions. The essence of NATO, as the President said, is that it is a living institution."

Since this matter vitally concerns our defense posture, I offer the editorial on the subject for inclusion in the RECORD.

LUMINOUS DESIGN

As President Johnson said yesterday in his talk to Foreign Service officers at the State Department, a "luminous design woven through the history of the past 20 years" distinguishes the Europe of today from the Europe of 1945. The design of common action and collective security, embodied in NATO, has deterred war in Europe for two decades and changed the old pattern which preceded two costly World Wars.

It is too much to hope, at this stage, that a speech by an American President, or the careful way in which the United States has been coordinating its moves with other NATO members, will cause President de Gaulle to reconsider his steps to withdraw France from the NATO command structure and to remove NATO forces from French soil. But Mr. Johnson has made an effective response to General de Gaulle. Moreover, he has properly stressed the point that, with or without France, the North Atlantic Alliance still should be maintained and, more important, should be adapted to meet changing conditions. The essence of NATO, as the President said, is that it is a living institution.

Onward and Upward With the High Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune has reported that the shoe industry intends to raise the price of shoes up to 5 percent this fall. This is another increase in the cost of living—a trend that is becoming a habit under the great high society.

President Johnson has said that he may ask for a tax increase in April. Unless the Federal Government learns to live within its income, the tax increase will mean little in the battle against inflation. If the Federal Government takes the money away from the taxpayer and pours it into the economy itself, inflation has been fed, not deterred.

Federal spending is one of the mainsprings of inflation. It is regrettable that the taxpayer-consumers of this country are to be rocked to their very soles by an increase in the price of footwear. If the Great Society does not set an example of fiscal responsibility, it will not be long before all of us taxpayers will be on our uppers.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 30, 1966]

SHOE INDUSTRY TO HIKE PRICES

(By Dan Dorfman)

"Shoe manufacturers may be shooting off their mouth about a 3- to 8-percent price hike for fall, but I think it's a lot of baloney," Harold Carey, a small New England footwear retailer said yesterday. "This industry is so damn competitive that if you raise your prices 8 percent to the consumer you might as well buy a going-out-of-business sign."

Clifford O. Anderson, president of Kinney Shoe Corp., one of their industry's giants, echoed this view. This is a highly competitive industry with 900 manufacturers, he said. "You raise your prices, say, from $5 to $5.25, and hell, you're out of business," he declared.

Despite this, though, the $5 billion shoe industry, plagued by anemic profit margins and skyrocketing imports which now represent 15 percent of the total U.S. footwear market, will hike its fall prices to offset rising costs of doing business and higher hide prices. Most are talking of boosts of 3 to 5 percent. This could mean as much as $2 more for a new pair of shoes.

This action will be taken despite a promise by the industry to exercise price restraint in exchange for the Government's move earlier this month in imposing export controls on domestic cattlehides. Since the Government action, hide prices, which shot up 9 to 38 percent in the past 6 months, have dropped a bit to 6 to 33 percent.

Edward W. Graham, president of Jarman Shoes Co., said his firm will boost prices 5 percent, but he didn't think this would slow down its volume. He minimized the price impact because, as he put it: "The man in the street, particularly the teenager, is much more fashion-conscious today and he's ready and willing to pay more for his shoes if the style is right."

Price boosts were also announced yesterday by two large St. Louis shoe companies—Brown Shoe Co. (4 to 4½ percent). W. L. H. Griffin, Brown Shoe's executive vice president, said "every restraint was used in keeping the increases to the minimum allowable."

Shoe retailers in New York for the National Shoe Fair of America were generally optimistic about the prospects for fall. Most are looking for gains in the vicinity of 5 to 10 percent. But a cross section of the Nation's 26,000 independent footwear merchants expressed alarm over the burgeoning competition from discounters and department stores. Said one: "It's getting more difficult every day to make a buck."

At a press luncheon yesterday, shoe industry leaders predicted:

A record year, with retail sales of $5.6 billion, compared with $5.3 billion in 1965.

Government purchases of between 14 and 23 million pairs of shoes, against 8.9 million last year.

A 33 percent gain in imports of shoes and sneakers, with the number of pairs shooting up to 160 million from 121 million.

The first year of sales of more than a billion pair of shoes (5.1 pairs for every person), up from about 921. This includes imports.

U.S. production of 640 million pairs, up 10 million.

The Ogontz Plan for Mutual International Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding efforts of my constituents, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Stenzler, who are the principal individuals responsible for the progress of the Ogontz Plan for Mutual International Education.

Briefly, the Ogontz plan is designed to increase American students' awareness of the cultures and problems faced by other countries by having students from foreign countries, who are presently studying in the United States, meet with the American students as a regular part of their curriculum in order to better inform them of conditions outside the United States. In a way, the plan is rather like a Peace Corps in reverse.

At this point, I should like to submit excerpts from the fourth year report of the Ogontz plan and the text of Mr. Stenzler's letter outlining his philosophy of the Ogontz plan:

OGONTZ PLAN FOR MUTUAL INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION FOURTH YEAR REPORT

This is a report on the Ogontz Plan for Mutual International Education for the academic year 1964–65.

In its fourth year of accomplishment, the Ogontz plan served 16 schools in 7 school districts, involving 62 foreign students from 27 countries enrolled in 6 colleges and universities in the Philadephia area, reaching 5,100 American pupils in 7 elementary schools, 4 junior high schools, and 6 senior high schools.

Income to the Ogontz plan totaled $9,962.46; expenditures totaled $4,849.84; leaving a reserve for 1965–66 operations amounting to $5,112.62. This reserve is available, thanks to the professional volunteer efforts of Carl and Erna Stenzler, who worked without compensation or reimbursement of expenses; Mrs. Norman D. Palmer, International House trustee, who recruited, screened, and assigned participating foreign students, with only expenses reimbursed; Mrs. Bessie Husted, retired principal of the Shoemaker School, who screened applying schools, approved and supervised the participating schools, with only expenses reimbursed.

The voluntary services, without compensation, of other Ogontz plan committee members whose active participation and professional skills were the basis of the plan's acceptance by universities, colleges, schools, and foreign students and International House's services, a minimal 3 percent of income for its personnel services and expenses in support of the plan, accounted for further economies.

The Ogontz plan obligation to "match with local support" the total grants received from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the New World Foundation and from Mr. William L. Breese was satisfied in its entirety; $2,500 was received from the Samuel S. Fels Fund, a local foundation; $2,636 was subscribed by 16 contributing schools; and $275 was given to the plan by individuals. Local receipts of $5,411 more than offset the $4,500 granted to the committee by the above-noted contributors.

Thirty schools, requesting 31 teams of foreign students (5 foreign students comprise a team) have, as of this date, committed themselves for the 1965–66 school year. The committee for the Ogontz plan has judiciously limited the number of participating schools, for this school year, to 40 schools and/or 40 teams of foreign students.

The quiet, but extraordinary accomplishment of the Ogontz plan can be attributed to its quality, simplicity, practicality, and desirability. The fact that 30 school principals and faculties have overtly sought out the Ogontz plan and added to their already heavy schedules the responsibility of seeking and receiving, from many different sources, the funds necessary to pay the foreign students participating is evidence of their evaluation of the plan's merit. For too long a period of time, educators have been aware of the need to upgrade the courses in history, world cultures and social studies, as well as to activate and lay greater stress on the importance of the study of human values to prepare American pupils to be able to better understand and to cope with alien values.

LETTER FROM MR. CARL STENZLER

DEAR FRIEND OF THE OGONTZ PLAN: "The proper study of mankind is man"—Pope.

If men are to live together peacefully, they must be taught to respect and understand one another as human beings. Judgments must be made on the basis of fact, not emotion or images created by the historical distortion of reality.

A necessary prelude to international cooperation (judicial determination of disputes that cannot be settled by negotiation) must be a planned, organized educational program that will teach us to accept people for what they are, the products of many different environments who, like ourselves, are people seeking security with dignity.

Formal knowledge alone will not do. It will achieve us neither respect nor understanding. Attitudes of acceptance must be established with the same intense vigor as was and still is being used to promote attitudes of rejection which feed on ignorance, fear, and the misrepresentation of values that are different. People cannot and will not make common cause on the grand scale necessary to establish a durable peace and continuing progress when the international dialog is warped with misgivings borne of unfamiliarity, half-learning, and emotion.

It behooves us, while there is time, to unravel the skein of bigotry, bias, and prejudice that has been so woven into our mores as to negate law and order, where that exists, and dilute reason where reason is the difference between war and peace.

Such a concept is the Ogontz plan.

Sincerely yours,

CARL STENZLER,
Chairman.

Fino Urges Minority Economic Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for a Minority Economic Council to advise the Senate and House minorities on economic policy. I would also like to suggest another way in which minority and junior Congressmen might be given adequate technical staff assistance.

The Republican minority in the House of Representatives today suffer a very real handicap in the limited technical and professional staff assistance available to them in intricate fields like taxation, banking, foreign trade and investment, housing credit, and monetary policy, and so forth. The ratio of Democratic to Republican committee staff members becomes trebly unfair when it is remembered that many Democratic efforts are backed by the work and research of the many Federal departments and agencies.

The present administration has sent up a great array of complex legislation to the Hill. Often the farthest reaching parts of these bills are the most camouflaged. The lack of Republican staff assistance has been a major factor in Great Society legislative success because often we in the minority cannot complete a careful analysis of the legislation in the short time we have to act. Nor do we have adequate staffs to prepare our own legislative programs.

Today I am introducing legislation to create a Minority Economic Council to give the minority assistance in one crucial field, but this is not enough. We must go further.

I would suggest that committees be budgeted an additional $10,000 per annum per member, which money would be used to hire assistant counsel who would work not for the committee as a whole but for a particular member. This would give a newly elected Congressman immediate access to professional staff assistance in the realm of his committee's activity. I think that this would solve not only the minority staffing problem, but the staff-help problem of junior Members in general.

I would imagine that this proposal I am making would cost about $10 million per year. The House would attract young professional people by the hundreds. Many young men and women would get their professional skills sharpened without absorbing the bureaucratic psychologies dispensed by the departments and agencies in the executive branch.

While this staffing would be a boon to the minority, because the minority are presently so badly understaffed, it would also be a boon to the Congress in general. Expertise in a given subject up before the Congress or one of its committees would not be confined to committee staffs under the thumb of a chairman presumably loyal to the administration. The type staff I am proposing would be a vigilant, alert staff which would restore much of the vanishing prerogatives of congressional supervision and control of Government. We would save any money we spent and tenfold more.

I commend this proposal to the House. It will be the vehicle of a restoration of vanishing congressional power.

School Lunch and Special Milk Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to introduce for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution which was passed unanimously by the California State Legislature. The resolution indicates California's strong opposition to the President's proposed cuts in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs for the next fiscal year:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 2

Joint resolution relative to the national school lunch program and the special milk program

Whereas the National School Lunch Act, Public Law 79–396, was established in 1946 and the special milk program, Public Law 85–478, was established by Congress in 1954 to encourage the consumption of wholesome and nutritional foods and fluid milk by children in the United States; and

Whereas these programs have provided as much as a 9-cent-per-lunch reimbursement to schools in addition to section 32 surplus price-supported food donations and enable schools generally to serve a one-half pint or one-third quart of milk to a child for 5 cents; and

Whereas the success of the programs is shown by the fact that during the 1964–65 fiscal year more than 18 million children were covered by the national school lunch program; and in California, more than 800,000 type A lunches were served daily, more than 1 million cases of section 32 surplus commodities valued at more than $18 million were donated to schools; and more than 140 million half-pint equivalents of milk were served, in addition to 286 million half-pint equivalents served under the special milk program; and

Whereas during the past several years reimbursements for lunches have declined to 4 cents, stocks of surplus commodities are becoming exhausted and the Bureau of the Budget has held special milk program funds to $100 million annually on a national basis, as a result of which it has been necessary for the U.S. Department of Agriculture to reduce claims for reimbursement submitted by participants in order to keep within available funds; and

Whereas beginning February 1, 1966, a 10-percent reduction in claims has been ordered because of a $3 million cut in the current budget appropriation for the special milk program; and

Whereas the President's budget request for 1967 has cut the proposed appropriation for the national school lunch program from $202 million to $183 million and for the special milk program from the $103 million deemed by Congress to be the minimum needed for the 1965–66 fiscal year to an unrealistic $21 million, cuts which would make it financially impossible for many schools currently participating in these programs to continue their participation, or would permit such participation only at such reduced levels, and might consequently deprive millions of children of low-income families of the only basic foods they receive during the schoolday: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and Congress to restore the $3 million cut in the current budget for the special milk program and to increase the proposed appropriations in the 1967 budget for the school lunch program to at least the existing level of $202 million, and for the special milk program to at least the existing level of $103 million; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and Congress should give serious consideration to expanding both the school lunch and milk programs, and to replenishing and expanding stocks of surplus agricultural commodities for donation to lunch programs; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and and Representative from California in Congress, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Voters in California's Sixth Congressional District Express Their Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, every year, I send a questionnaire to every registered voter household in my Sixth Congressional District. I am always gratified that so many take time to answer these questions on some of the critical issues of the day. This year, over 20,000 families replied and the results are tabulated below.

Obviously, there was some confusion where "yes" and "no" answers were given to multiple-choice questions, but even though the percentage figures on some questions do indicate duplication, the results leave little doubt as to the collective views of the respondents:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. VIETNAM			
The war in South Vietnam continues to be increasingly costly to the United States in terms of men and money. In your opinion should we—			
1. Continue the present policy of air attacks against North Vietnam and ground support for South Vietnam while pressing for negotiations?	69	25	6
2. Intensify the prosecution of the war in an all-out effort to end the fighting as quickly as possible despite the increased risks involved?	61	31	8
3. Withdraw U.S. forces on the theory that continued loss of lives cannot justify whatever may be gained from an eventual settlement?	36	58	6
B. MINIMUM WAGE			
The administration has proposed increasing the minimum wage in 3 steps, from $1.25 to $1.75 in 1968, and extending protection to 7,900,000 additional persons, including hotel, hospital, restaurant, and agricultural workers. Do you favor—			
1. Retaining the present minimum wage of $1.25 an hour?	47	47	6
2. Increasing the minimum wage for those presently covered?	52	38	10
3. Increasing the minimum wage and broadening the coverage?	74	20	6
C. REAPPORTIONMENT			
In an effort to reverse the Supreme Court's decision that both houses of the State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population, a constitutional amendment has been proposed allowing other factors such as geography and political subdivisions to enter into the apportionment of one house, if such apportionment is approved by a majority vote of the people. Do you favor—			
1. The Supreme Court's decision?	43	48	9
2. Each State being able to determine the composition of one house on factors other than population?	76	16	8
D. TAFT-HARTLEY			
This session will see continued debate on the administration's bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the so-called right-to-work section. Do you favor—			
1. Repealing sec. 14(b), thus eliminating the States' jurisdiction over right-to-work laws?	28	63	9
2. Retaining 14(b) and thus continuing the jurisdiction of the States over right-to-work laws?	80	13	7
E. ANTIPOVERTY			
During the last session, Congress appropriated a total of $1,800,000,000 for the 2d year of antipoverty programs. San Francisco is to receive over $3,000,000 for such programs as part-time jobs for college students, adult basic education, day care centers, and preschool training for children from lower income families. In your opinion, these programs—			
1. Are having a positive impact on the community?	30	41	29
2. Cause little impact on the community?	53	18	28
3. Cannot be evaluated due to their relatively short existence?	77	10	13

Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Future Homemakers of America Week.

The State of Tennessee is the second largest State in the organization's membership with a total of 36,686 members.

Over 30 schools in my district have FHA chapters, and the efforts these outstanding young women are making will long be felt by their communities and State.

While congratulating all the girls in my district and State, who are members of this fine organization, I would like to single out four young ladies from my district, who are candidates for State offices in the FHA—Becky Beets of Morristown, Dorris Milligan of Jefferson City, Cathy Norris of Dandridge, and Donna Whitson of Jonesboro.

This week the 11,000 chapters of the FHA, which have 600,000 members, have spotlighted activities and projects concerned with a 4-year national program of work.

The objectives of this program of work, as detailed by the National FHA, are:

> To help each member recognize her abilities, strive for their full development, and participate actively in family, community and world improvement projects.

To further these objectives the elected youth officers of FHA developed nine projects which stress individual development; emphasize mental and physical health; encourage serious consideration in choosing and training for useful careers; develop codes of ethics, morals, and manners; further understanding of people of all heritages, customs, and beliefs; promote appreciation of all family members and their abilities and problems; teach selective spending; inculcate citizenship responsibilities; and encourage using leisure time for activities beneficial to the individual and society.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my gratitude for the ambitious and essential program, which the FHA chapters have undertaken.

I want to commend all the 600,000 students, who are members of the Future Homemakers of America, and urge them to continue to be concerned with and committed to the real values of life.

Democrat Margin of Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, time and again during the past 2 or 3 years Republican defectors have seen fit to provide the necessary votes to assure victory to the Democrat spenders on a number of their wild radical programs. On March 29 it happened again, and Arthur Krock wrote a most telling story in the New York Times which is worthy of serious consideration.

IN THE NATION: THE DEMOCRATS' GOP SALVAGE CORPS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 30.—In what has become standard procedure, House Republicans provided the votes yesterday by which a Democratic administraiton was saved from defeat on a key project of its domestic program. This was the President's rent supplement proposal, for which the Democratic Party majority owns the political patent rights as a basic structure of the Great Society.

DAMAGED PARTY LINE

If only 5 of the 6 Republicans who broke away from the other 125 in the House had followed their leadership, their party could have gone to the voters in the 1966 congressional elections on a clear position the leadership has been seeking to establish. This is, that new and increased appropriations for welfare State projects in the course of a war of undeterminable duration and cost are fueling the mounting fires of inflation, and should at least be suspended. But, since Republican votes were responsible for the rejection of this position on its first major congressional test, it has been badly damaged as a national party line in the 1966 elections.

The test came on a motion to recommit a pending appropriation bill, with instructions to eliminate the proposed $12 million to start the President's rent supplement program. Despite the overwhelming Democratic House majority, the motion was rejected by only eight votes; hence it could have carried with the support of five of the six defecting Republicans. But that was only the latest chapter of a continuing story which began in 1961, when just enough Republicans broke their party line to save President Kennedy's proposal to pack the House Rules Committee with an administration majority. Since then there have been several other instances of Republican salvage of projects for which a Democratic administration has claimed and received the credit in subsequent elections, and are the foundation on which the welfare state has steadily ascended.

EASTERN LIBERALS

The procedure has become standard also in its derivation from Eastern Republicans of the strongly liberal persuasion. Of the six who yesterday saved from defeat a key Great Society project of another Democratic President, all but Representative HARVEY (Michigan) are either the same or the successors of the 1961 New Frontier salvage corps of which Mayor Lindsay was a founder and a leader; Representatives HALPERN, KUPFERMAN, REID, and HORTON (New York), and TUPPER (Maine).

But there was a special irony in the context of other events yesterday that was not present on the previous occasions. While the six Republicans were assuring that the general taxpayer would be called on to pay the difference between 25 percent of the incomes of certain groups and the rentals of what will be bureaucratically classified as adequate housing. President Johnson was giving greater stress to raising the levies on the general taxpayer than to wartime suspension of new and increased appropriations for programs of the Great Society. The economic theory the President has adopted is that higher personal income taxes will suppress the "steam" (inflation) which is threatening to blow the roof of stability off the booming national economy.

Also, on the day of the House vote on the President's rent supplement proposal, official statistics revealed a continuing rise in the cost of living, an additional take from what is left of the earnings of the average citizen after taxes. In 1 year, these statistics disclosed, the price of meats has increased 19 percent, of eggs 27 percent, of bread 6 percent, of milk 2½ percent. Yet, insetad of accenting reduction of the current and projected expenditures for Government domestic programs, which are among the strongest generators of the "steam" (inflation) in the national economy, the President took occasion to give more weight in his public discussion to the alternative method of taking more of the earnings of still-solvent citizens.

In that case, of course, they would have less to spend, which theoretically would reduce the pressure of demand on prices. But the Government would have more to spend. And, though this could be used to reduce the national debt, it is a fair suspicion that a government with the established tendencies of this one, and as intent on building the Great Society concurrently with fighting a war whose ultimate cost can only be guessed at, will use the bulk of any additional revenues as it is using current revenues.

FANTASTIC GROWTH

Even at the present spending rate, the Great Society programing could reach an annual cost which the council of State chambers of commerce has estimated as prospectively $2.5 billion by 1970. If this seems fantastic, it will seem much less so when the small beginnings are recalled of an agricultural program which now costs $4.3 billion a year, and of foreign aid for which $116 billion has been spent since its inception.

Only Force Can Defeat Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Union for March 23 of this year carried a realistic letter to the editor which I ask my colleagues to read and reflect on. It typifies the sentiment of the bulwark of our educated citizens by clearly spelling out that only the threat of capable force can defeat Communist tyranny. The letter was written by one of San Diego's leading educators, Mrs. Charles R. LaDow, and is inserted as a portion of my remarks as follows:

ONLY FORCE CAN DEFEAT TYRANNY

Editor, the Union: The word "government" implies force. It seems ridiculous to remind ourselves of that. And yet, we have been so brainwashed with the idea of government as "the servant of the people," that we have forgotten the role of government through the ages and over the bulk of mankind, especially right now.

Our own governments, Federal, State, and local, are so busy wooing our votes that we are likely to think they are totally under our control. But just try not paying your taxes or breaking the traffic laws. You will find out that government implies force.

Of course, our governments are very forgiving. Due to the checks and balances written into our constitutions, Federal and State, we are spared the experience of evident tyranny. However, most of us, even those in political office, seem woefully naive regarding the power of government.

And so, we find ourselves struggling, on a worldwide basis, with one of the most ruthless tyrannies the world has ever known (current communism) and, at the same time, dealing with those Communist governments as if they are, or are about to become, as amendable to reason as our own governments are compelled to be by our constitutions.

The performance of our leaders, and our own acquiescence therein, shows no understanding of human nature or its operations throughout history. It is only force, or the direct threat of capable force, which will ever defeat tyranny. And it must be defeated before we can have anything resembling peace in the world.

GOP Report and Proposal on Nonproliferation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following special report is being issued to the House GOP Conference by the chairman of its Nuclear Affairs Committee under date of April 1:

SPECIAL REPORT TO HOUSE GOP CONFERENCE

From: Representative CRAIG HOSMER, chairman, Committee on Nuclear Affairs.

Subject: Treaty barring nuclear weapons proliferation—Information concerning and GOP proposals.

Soon the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will be sending to the floor a resolution giving congressional blessings to the administration's efforts to negotiate a "nonproliferation" treaty (S. Res. 179 or H. Res. 673). NBC–TV on April 17, will do a well-advertised show about it. The administration is seeking to give prominence to the subject.

This special report contains background data you may need regarding it and contains GOP initiated proposals and viewpoints which I recommend to you.

TREATY BACKGROUND

Simply stated, the burden of the proposed treaty will be (1) a promise by the nuclear powers not to aid in the spread of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers and (2) a promise by the latter not to "go nuclear."

The 18-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva has negotiated on the subject intermittently for some time. Three nuclear powers are in attendance: United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. Two nuclear powers are not: France and Red China. The latter are not expected to "go along" in the near future with the treaty if it is negotiated.

U.S.–U.S.S.R. POLITICAL HANKY-PANKY

Both the United States and the U.S.S.R. have proposed their own versions of a treaty. So far the U.S.S.R. has used the negotiations mostly as a platform to shoot verbal-poisoned arrows at NATO. Most observers believe the U.S.S.R. finds nonproliferation to be in its own self-interest and expect it to commence serious negotiation when its venom is exhausted.

Some people, including myself, believe that the time will come at some appropriate point prior to the U.S. elections in November. The basis of this belief is a feeling that a certain amount of "left-handed" cooperation behind-the-scenes is going on between the current administrations of the two countries. With the Vietnam war likely to wage indefinitely, the Johnson administration will need something to go into the campaign with that can be touted as a "peace" accomplishment. Naturally, the Kosygin-Brezhnev administration will expect something in return.

NUCLEAR "HAVE-NOT" NATIONS' DEMANDS

Although the nuclear "have-not" nations presumably stand to gain as much from a pact as the nuclear "haves" in the form of a less turbulent world, they, too, are talking in terms of getting something from the "haves" for signing up. Rather than discouraging this kind of talk, the Johnson administration's position seems poised between tolerating it and encouraging it.

In return for giving up their right to go nuclear, a number of "have-nots"—some with such slight technical and industrial capabilities for atomic weapons production as to make their chatter ridiculous—are talking quid pro quo in terms of:

1. Making the "haves" get down to business on concrete disarmament steps;

2. Holding out for provisions outlawing the use of nuclear weapons, or at least prohibiting their use against nonnuclear states;

3. Demanding side agreements from nuclear powers (principally the United States) to protect them against nuclear aggression or, for that matter, against anything at all they themselves define as aggression—nuclear or otherwise.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION BUNGLING

The nuclear "have-nots" first two conditions simply are not credible holdout positions. The third has some grains of legitimacy, but administration spokesmen and the President himself have evidenced so much equivocation and ambiguity in dealing with it there is a possibility the treaty will create more trouble for the United States than it is calculated to eliminate. The administration could be making so many loose and general defense commitments to so many nonnuclear states to rush to their rescue that we could be triggered automatically into East-West confrontations seriously involving dangers of world war III. This will be discussed in detail in a separate special report to be issued soon.

"HAVE'-NOTS" REALLY NEED "PLOWSHARE"

Actually, what the "have-nots" really need—and which neither they nor the Johnson administration yet have perceived—is in the plowshare area of peaceful atomic explosives.

The AEC is on the brink of producing practical and economic devices and techniques to put the atom's explosive power to work for mankind. They are sorely needed for such massive excavation jobs as creating a new canal supplemental to the congested Panama Canal. Other large-scale nuclear excavation needs soon will be felt to implement such bold proposals as the Amazon Basin project to turn into productive use vast South American swamps and jungles and NAWAPA (North American Water and Power Alliance) to regulate and divert this continent's rivers to meet burgeoning United States, Canadian, and Mexican requirements for water and hydropower. Much of southeast Asia and other portions of the globe also must depend on nuclear explosives for geographical face-lifting operations to reclaim land and provide an economic base for peaceful societies.

Underground there also are splendid economic potentials dependent on peaceful nuclear explosives. It is estimated the world's supply of natural gas can be doubled by nuclear fracturing of impervious gas formations deep beneath the surface.

These are but a few examples of the great future for peaceful nuclear explosives. The nuclear "have-nots" real loss from giving up nuclear development lies in the Plowshare area, not in weaponry.

UNITED STATES SHOULD SHARE PLOWSHARE

The United States not only should point this out, but should take the creative initiative of offering our Plowshare technology and devices on a fair-charge basis to any friendly country needing and wanting them. They also could perform tremendous service in our AID programs for global elimination of hunger and poverty.

In bilateral arrangements by which AEC officials retain physical custody and control of the nuclear devices until exploded, the strict provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 prohibiting turning them over to others can be met. By using a dual firing key arrangement whereby a U.S. custodian would first activate the firing circuit and the foreign official finally close it to initiate the actual firing, the limited test ban treaty's general prohibition against U.S. releases of radioactive material on foreign soil would be technically observed.

AMEND LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY TO UNCHAIN PLOWSHARE

However, as pointed out in my February 8 memorandum to you, the unrealistic provisions of the limited test ban treaty precluding release of any quantity of radioactivity—no matter how small or harmless—beyond any national boundary now paralyzes Plowshare use.

This restriction bears no reasonable relation to the purposes of the treaty. It even bars releases over empty ocean water beyond the 3-mile limit and thus we cannot proceed nuclearly with the second Isthmian Canal because of it. Until the bar is removed benefits to mankind from most Plowshare possibilities will be denied unreasonably.

Here, again, is a fruitful area for creative initiative being neglected by the administration and which only GOP sources presently are initiating proposals.

Effects of the Rise in Living Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, wild domestic spending in the face of a boom and a war simply must halt. The American family is being hurt and will be hurt much more by the administration's policy of never-ending spending as if this were in a great depression instead of an artificial boom.

In this connection, by unanimous consent, I introduce in the RECORD an illustrative article in the Washington Evening Star of March 30 by one of America's truly top columnists. Careful reading of this article clearly pinpoints what the ever-increasing and continuing spending is doing to low-income people and those retired on fixed incomes.

[Washington Evening Star, Mar. 30, 1966]

EFFECTS OF THE RISE IN LIVING COSTS

(By David Lawrence)

The "high cost of living" sometimes transcends everything else as a political issue. It was this issue which in 1910 abruptly terminated 16 years of Republican rule of Congress and gave the Democrats a majority in the House of Representatives, though 2 years before the Republicans had won the presidential contest by a landslide vote.

This week the Department of Labor revealed that the cost of living has taken a big jump—in fact, the largest of any February in 8 years.

The administration's economists are hopeful that conditions will improve and prices will be held down. But experience proves that once the cost of living rises substantially, the pressure for wage increases starts growing and there is eventually a trend toward higher and higher prices all along the line.

Food prices are the ones that now are attracting attention as they move higher. Many other items, however—such as doctor and hospital services, mortgage interest rates, home maintenance and repairs, clothing, gasoline, heating fuel, and housekeeping services—are costing more than before.

Naturally, labor unions are watching these prices and will express themselves in a demand for higher wages. In some industries provision has been made for an automatic increase in pay when the cost of living goes up, but only a small fraction of the Nation's workers are covered by such contracts. Indeed, although the average take-home pay went up by about 20 cents a week in February over the preceding month, the rising prices absorbed the increase and left the worker with less real income than he had in January.

The dollar is, of course, continuing to diminish in buying power. With the February figures included, it cost $11.16 to buy now what $10 purchased in goods and services about 8 years ago.

Not only is the nonunionized worker affected adversely but also the employees in unionized industries. Nor are the effects of the higher costs of living confined to the lower income groups.

Thus, a factory worker who earned $7,000 last year and got a $300 increase this year finds himself spending $288 of his raise not only for higher living costs but for increased social security taxes, higher State and local taxes, as well as an additional $49 in his Federal income tax payment. This leaves him only $12, or less than 25 cents a week, in the increase of his income.

A white-collar worker who earned $10,000 last year and got a raise of $400 this year winds up with only 83 cents additional a week after paying the same items of expense, including higher living costs.

A junior executive whose salary was $15,000 last year, with a raise of $600 this year, winds up with about $2.25 more a week after taking care of the above expenses.

While some of these groups of citizens are not being hurt too much by the rise in the cost of living, they are facing increased costs in other ways—as, for instance, in the higher cost of college education and other items that confront a family through the year.

It is really the low-income family that is being affected most by the higher cost of food and other necessities, and this could mean a sizable protest vote in the November elections. In every election it's not a simple issue or the attitude of any one group, but the collective reaction of all groups that changes the previous trend.

It's too early, of course, to weigh the part that any issue may play in the forthcoming elections, but certainly there are signs of increasing discontent on the economic side which is not alleviated by the latest disclosure that the cost of living rose substantially for the month of February.

Nor are economic conditions made any more palatable by the news that President Johnson now is inclined to recommend a tax increase of 5 to 7 percent—corporate and personal—as a means of preventing inflation from pushing down even further the value of the dollar. For it takes a long time before the full effects of a tax increase are known. Meanwhile, more and more uncertainty is created as to whether the economy can be stabilized or is to enter a period of greater disturbance. The mere imposition of higher taxes not only can break down a boom but can bring about an even greater deficit in the Federal Treasury and thus tend to diminish the value of the monetary unit.

Now—Koreans Stand a Foot Taller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the ability of a small nation to overcome its difficulties amid world tensions is best demonstrated by the Republic of South Korea. Here was a nation, already small before the division at the 38th parallel, struggling to overcome the stunning devastation of an invading army.

Political and economic chaos dogged its every move. Yet under the leadership of President Chung Hee Park it has made a dramatic recovery. Assistance from the United States has helped to play a key role in that recovery, but it is not fair to underestimate the role played by the Korean people themselves.

The revived economy of Korea is one of the best testimonies to the effectiveness of our foreign aid program.

A recent article by Keyes Beech in the Des Moines Register clearly outlines the progress made in Korea and I am pleased to place it in the RECORD.

NOW—KOREANS STAND A FOOT TALLER

(By Keyes Beech)

SEOUL, KOREA.—"The time has come for people everywhere to recognize Korea for what it is: a leading force in Asia and a power to be reckoned with in world affairs"—President Chung Hee Park of the Republic of Korea.

It seems rather unlikely that South Korea, a 38,452-square-mile free world beachhead on the mainland of northeast Asia, will ever become a world power. And some may accuse President Park of delusions of grandeur.

NEW SELF-CONFIDENCE

But the words are significant for they reflect the new self-confidence and sense of pride that mark what can only be described as the new Korea. The unwanted stepchild of the Far East has found a place for itself in Asia.

Korea still is a long way from being the showcase of democracy that some idealistic Americans hoped would rise out of the ashes of the Korean war.

And it may never be. But the important thing is that Korea, after 40 years of Japanese rule, the chaos of liberation, a devastating war and seemingly endless political turmoil, is on its way up.

FEEL INFERIOR

"The most important thing that's happened to Korea in this decade and possibly in the lifetime of the oldest Korean is that these people have developed confidence in themselves," said one longtime American observer of the Korean scene.

After nearly half a century as Japanese vassals and two decades as welfare clients of the United States, Koreans understandably developed a deepseated inferiority complex.

"WE CAN'T"

Urged by the United States to assume more responsibility for their own affairs, Koreans invariably fell back on the same old plea, "but we can't, Korea is such a poor country."

But the Koreans have learned that they can, and they are proving it every day. A dozen former Korean Air Force pilots are flying commercial aircraft for Air Vietnam.

A Korean contractor bid successfully on a $5 million road construction job in Thailand. Another Korean outfit won a $5 million contract for a harbor dredging job in South Vietnam.

To the great amusement of many Americans, Koreans are inclined to look down their noses at the "backward" nations of southeast Asia—forgetting that they themselves belonged in that category only a few years ago.

"The Koreans are feeling their oats," observed one American official. "For years we've been telling them to do things on their own. Now the problem is that they may try to go too far too fast."

Two major elements account for Korea's new-found sense of pride. One is the knowledge that after living for years on U.S. charity they can now pay their own way.

TROOPS SENT

The other, more dramatic factor, is that Korea has more than 20,000 troops in South Vietnam and plans to double that number. The simple fact that the rich and powerful United States could ask something of Korea and that Korea could meet that request had a tonic effect on Koreans like nothing else.

"I could swear the Koreans are at least a foot taller since they sent troops to Vietnam," said one U.S. officer.

Less than a year ago Walt Rostow, chairman of the State Department policy planning board, ventured the observation during a visit to Seoul that Korea's economy had reached the classic "takeoff" stage for underdeveloped nations.

ROSTOW RIGHT

For this he was roundly berated by the Korean press, which stoutly insisted that Korea was "too poor" to take off anywhere. But a short time later the Koreans were forced to admit that Rostow was right.

Korea's economic growth began to show only 18 months ago and still is very much in the fledgling stage. But the future is bright with promise.

U.S. aid to Korea, which has amounted to nearly $1 billion in economic assistance alone since 1954, has shifted from outright grants to a development loan pattern.

LOANS TO CONTINUE

Aid officials believe that gift aid can be stopped altogether in 4 or 5 years, although Korea will continue to need development loans.

More than anything else it is the Korean people who deserve the credit for Korea's recovery. They are hardworking, intelligent, adaptable and easily trained.

On top of these native qualities, the Koreans are also 85 percent literate, a high average for a so-called backward country.

Korea is one of the few countries left in the Far East where there is a reservoir of willing, low-cost skilled labor. And this is its chief economic attraction.

But not forever. Korean labor already is showing signs of restiveness.

Local and State Responsibilities in the Federal Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, from March 21 through March 23 a conference on Federal programs in health, education, and welfare was held at Portland State College in Portland, Oreg. Many Federal officials generously gave of their time to interpret Federal programs in these three areas to those on the local level who are charged with implementing their provisions. Oregon educators are indeed grateful to all of those who took part in the conference and especially to Secretary Gardner for his highly valued presence even though he had just returned from an arduous journey to Vietnam. That those who were trying to learn about provisions in the Federal legislation found the conference most instructive goes without saying.

There was one speech given by a former Oregonian which I found most provocative and which I think my fellow legislators here in the Congress may find of equal interest and very constructive in its suggestions. This speech was given by Dr. Willard B. Spalding who is now the director of the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Dr. Spalding discusses some of the problems encountered on the State and local level in implementing Federal programs and suggests ways in which we, the Congress, can aid in solving these. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Dr. Spalding's speech:

LOCAL AND STATE RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS

(Speech by Willard B. Spalding)

The massive flooding of Federal funds into virtually every corner of public and private education which has occurred within the past few years has obviously had a profound and exceedingly broad impact upon the Nation, and especially upon educators, State and local legislators and administrators, and community leaders as well as the general public.

While our educational philosophies and goals have always led us to seek better ways to educate more people, only the billions of Federal dollars recently appropriated have provided the means for making significant progress toward those goals. The new attitudes of the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government have furthermore encouraged the States to increase their roles in developing and financing more extensive educational programs.

The vast amounts of money suddenly available have produced heady new visions of higher levels of educational excellence, broader scope and greater influence for education throughout every segment of our society.

Educators and legislators are no longer arrange bedfellows, for it is through our combined endeavors that we are now beginning to see what can be accomplished by more nearly adequate support of schools from preelementary levels through the most sophisticated university enterprises. At the same time, State after State has begun to identify areas of greatest need and—to no one's great surprise—to realize the inadequacies of State resources to accomplish the enormous tasks of resolving the problems.

As we jointly discover the nearly unlimited opportunities for improving both education and our communities through the use of Federal funds for education, we also begin to develop a sense of urgency to make up for generations of lost time and to rescue large portions of our population from the dark corners of our society.

Such vast sums, we know, can be of benefit only if they are wisely expended. John Gardner, Francis Keppel, Harold Howe—all are providing outstanding leadership not only in education itself, but in the use of education to help resolve many, many of the social problems facing the Nation. Frank Keppel—as we all know—developed the U.S. Office of Education into a major agency for moving education ahead, and Harold Howe is continuing that development.

I think we have come to the realization in the past year that Federal leadership in the funding of, and even in some of the directions of education, is not necessarily equated with conscious Federal control of education. We have, if anything, been more than willing to welcome the addition of Federal funds to the coffers of education, and I want to state unequivocally that I am thoroughly and wholeheartedly in favor of more Federal funds for all programs and all levels of education.

Today, however, I would like to suggest both, some ways to use Federal funds with greater effectiveness than is always possible under present rules, regulations, and laws, and also some ways to ascertain where other improvements can be made.

Recently I have heard and read some adverse comments about the Federal Government and the States rushing headlong into programs of Federal support without adequate planning. But wise planning, as I see it, reaches its best level when done on the basis of experience. Rushing ahead to provide needed Federal funds, with no plans, or with partially complete plans was, in fact, wise on two counts: First, it put money into education where it was sorely needed; second, it provided many people in the States and in the Federal Government with experience which can now be used in planning truly effective goals and programs utilizing presently authorized funds. As we become more experienced both in planning and in implementing our plans, future expenditures will become more and more fruitful.

We have made the mistake in the past of attempting to plan specific programs, with detailed statements of goals and complicated procedures for attaining them. These plans were too often unrealistic, simply because we did not have enough experience to see the pitfalls, and were not wise enough to provide the necessary answers in advance.

At the Federal level, I am highly skeptical of planning which starts with detailed statements; rather, I would prefer broad general goals which can and should be reinterpreted as specific situations arise.

In place of these statements, often drawn by well-meaning and intelligent people who unfortunately have no idea of the effect of their work in actual practice, I suggest an overall advisory group appointed by the Pesident, which will be small enough to work as a unit yet large enough to be broadly representative of American education. A committee of 100 is perhaps the optimum.

In considering possible membership on this committee, one must face squarely the question "Who speaks for (higher education) (elementary education) (secondary education) (private education) (parochial education) (the student) (the State) (the counties and districts) (the faculties) (the administrations) (the public)?" I could go on, for there are many more voices desiring—and deserving—to be heard.

I am not sure that I can provide adequate answers for many of the questions that will arise. I can only suggest that the old answers will not suffice, for new forces are at work in education at all levels; the growth of erstwhile normal schools into colleges and universities, the broadening responsibilities of the land-grant colleges and older universities, the rapidly increasing numbers of community colleges and their increasing influence in the educational community, all represent major changes in the old hierarchies. Even the professional organizations feel the rumblings of change—the NEA battles the AFT in our large cities; the American Association of School Administrators is considering separating from the NEA because of philosophical and practical differences in their approaches; neither the American Council on Education nor the Land-Grant Association can speak accurately as a single voice for higher education today.

Thus we must consider new spokesmen, new arrays of power and influence, new philosophies in education which not only are far different from those we are accustomed to, but which are not themselves yet fully developed. Certainly, advice is needed. These new voices deserve full hearings; when representation is selected, they must surely be taken into account.

Let me turn briefly now to the functioning and responsibilities of the overall advisory group. It should be supported by temporary ad hoc committees in special areas of concern—libraries, teachers, teacher education, the "Headstart" operation, and so on—wherever advice can improve a Federal support program. These committies should be much smaller than the 100 suggested for the top group; membership should be rotated often to increase the number of persons with experience to be used in planning. Obviously, each committee will require staff support while it meets; each staff and committee should be dismissed when its special tasks are completed.

An early step in the group's planning perhaps the first to be considered, should be coordination of existing and similar Federal programs under the same administrative unit. For example, title I of the Higher Education Act calls for about the same plans and programs as are established by section 802 of the Federal Housing Act of 1964 and also by some parts of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Title I is administered by the Office of Education, the Housing Act by Housing and Urban Development, and the Economic Opportunity Act by its own Office of Economic Opportunity.

Dealing with three distinct agencies in respect to the same general educational program can—and often does—produce more frustrations than progress. Another example is the diffusion of problems in teacher education among a variety of agencies. A third instance involves the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1965; both deal in some aspects with similar problems, yet one is administered by the Office of Education, the other by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. While it is understandably necessary in some cases for acts to be separately administered by different agencies, this situation sometimes creates conflicting interpretations of the law, and places the States in the position of not knowing which interpretation it should use.

Another broad problem for the advisory group to consider at an early date is the occasional conflicts which arise between State policies and goals, and Federal policies and goals. I will go into this point more fully in a few moments.

Still another difficult problem for the States is the timing of publication of rules and regulations for implementing Federal legislation. State planning, like Federal planning, requires time. When rules and regulations are not published until as much as 8 months after legislation is enacted, State plans must be completed far too hurriedly for really adequate and effective consideration. Of course, this may be one of the prices the States must pay for Federal support, and perhaps as we gain the experience I spoke of earlier, the time element will become a little less important. However, I suggest strongly that a 6-month period for developing rules and regulations should be the maximum, and that efforts toward reducing the time to 4 months or less should be unrelenting.

Statewide planning should be encouraged by the Federal advisory group, with an opportunity for all appropriate voices to be heard. In some legislation, State plans are required; in other acts, they are not. The advisory group should consider the examination of existing legislation to determine further areas where State plans would better use Federal funds.

This would be especially important if proposed legislation to provide funds for long range planning of capital outlay for higher education is passed during this session of Congress. State planning under the Elementary and Secondary Act could also lead to wiser use of all funds allocated to each State, rather than allowing funds to go unused because some school districts either do not desire to use them or cannot develop plans to do so.

The composition of the agency which develops statewide plans deserves consideration by the Federal advisory group. When the plan is concerned with elementary and secondary schools, the State board of education can be an appropriate central element, with added membership to represent private and parochial education when the board serves as a planning agency. When the plan is concerned with higher education, an agency representative of the public, of public and private colleges and univerities, and of junior colleges seems best.

Two caveats should be kept in mind. First, the State agency which develops and administers a plan should not be a participant in programs developed under the plan. An example of failure to follow this principle is found in the Technical Services Act, where many States have designated their land-grant universities and colleges to develop and administer plans under which those institutions are eligible to receive grants. Aside from the conflicts of interest and the institutional prejudice which may arise in such situations, potential local administrative problems foreseen by the institutions may inhibit effective statewide planning.

Second, the use of different agencies for each act or section of an act should be avoided where the agencies are to develop State plans for elementary and secondary education or for higher education. Wherever possible, the same agency should be used for developing the entire plan for elementary and secondary education; another for higher education. The use of the same agency for planning and administering State plans under a variety of Federal laws would yield some economies in costs of administration, especially if funds appropriated for administration under each act could be commingled with funds appropriated under other acts and used as a single amount.

Both State planning and the administration of State plans require time, personnel and money. Some funds should be made available for more advance planning, as is being proposed in respect to capital outlay. And each State should receive enough to properly administer what has been planned; currently minimal amounts available to small States may be inadequate.

Both Federal and State planning will need to take full account of problems which must be resolved if present and future programs are to be improved until they become excellent. I will describe some of the problems which are of current concern in California, in the order in which they occur to me, rather than the order of their importance.

I mentioned earlier the possible conflicts between State policies and goals and Federal policies and goals. I want to emphasize the problems arising in increasing numbers in this respect. Several specific issues deserve attention:

1. Federal funds flow into the support of specific programs, thus producing relative over-financing for them in comparison with programs financed solely by State funds. For example, massive grants for research in the health sciences and for medical research have created large research institutes which study the causes of diseases and medical centers which turn out research scientists. As a result, improvement in health care services is neglected and medical instruction is out of favor. The States need improved health serivces and more doctors, yet Federal policies in making grants create other goals for universities which can get the grants.

2. Federal policies about matching funds may also force changes in State policies and goals. For example, a State may have developed an excellent equalization formula for distributing State funds to local school districts, thus helping relatively poor districts to offer better education.

A Federal program, such as the Higher Education Facilities Act, provides construction funds to junior college districts on a 40 percent Federal, 60 percent local, matching basis. I suspect that the record will show that relatively rich districts profit most under this act, for they can afford more matching funds.

In another area, a State may have decided to support continuing education wholly or largely from student fees. Yet, title I of the Higher Education Act and section 802 of the Federal Housing Act of 1964, both of which deal with continuing education, eventually require State funds to match Federal funds, with some uncertainty about the extent to which students fees may be used.

In still another area, section VI of the Higher Education Act, State or private matching funds for a college must be in excess of what was spent in the previous year for equipment at that college. Thus, the Act requires colleges to increase these expenditures perhaps beyond actual needs, with consequent possible reductions in other parts of their budgets, or to purchase equipment in alternate years in order to make full use of Federal funds.

Title I of Public Law 89–10 allocates money to school districts on the basis of the number of children in families with annual incomes under $2,000 in 1960. A State may desire to spend these funds to help these and other culturally deprived students. However, Federal policy requires expenditure of these funds to improve schooling for children whose educational achievement is below that normally expected of children of their age and grade. In other words, school districts which receive money on the basis of poverty must disburse it on the basis of a Federal definition of educationally disadvantaged. Title II of the same law requires a State plan; title III seems to do so, but may leave decisions to the State department of education in lieu of a State plan. In all titles of the act, uses of State and local matching funds deserved study.

A third issue in which conflicts may arise between Federal and State policies and goals lies in licensing and accrediting of teachers and institutions.

Federal policies in some instances may make it impossible for States to maintain the integrity of their own professional standards and those of their schools and colleges. California, for example, has worked strenuously toward higher academic requirements for a license to teach in the public schools. A fifth year of preparation is now required for a regular teaching certificate, in addition to the normal 4-year undergraduate program which includes an academic major and minor. Yet the Federal Government, in legislation to encourage teachers to work with the poor and the culturally depressed, proposes that some of these teachers be required only to have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent, and that even experienced teachers will be given no more than 3 months training before beginning their duties in what California considers a highly specialized field of instruction. Thus, California's standards are eroded to match standards that must apply to the entire Nation.

The Federal Government must necessarily seek the greatest benefits for the broadest number of people throughout the 50 States. Yet, it is vital to the Nation that the Government must recognize those States which have set higher standards than the "national average," and must make the effort to raise that average; if this is not done, we run the considerable risk of drifting into lower, rather than higher, nationwide standards, and this is true not only of teacher education but also of many other aspects of the total educational effort of the Nation.

Still another "danger zone" lies in the use of specialized accrediting agencies. Federal policies today pose a strong and increasingly powerful threat to the integrity of individual colleges and universities. The extent to which an institution's freedom to develop new programs in professional and technical fields is affected by the standards of specialized accrediting agencies has long been a matter of controversy in higher education. However, in the past the greatest dangers arising from lack of an accredited program in nursing, or social work, or engineering, et al, was that graduates might find difficulty in securing employment; and if the new program was of high quality, however, graduates were rarely handicapped, and so accreditation was at least not particularly important to an institution from the financial standpoint. Today, a college may be deprived of badly needed funds if it does not wish to meet standards of specialized accrediting agencies.

In California, for example, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation provided substantial funds to encourage development and expansion of 2-year, junior colleges, programs leading to the "associate degree nursing." In the State, we now have 31 of these programs, each of which must maintain approval by the State board of nursing education and nurse registration. Parenthetically, I might point out that they are our greatest source of nurses to meet the needs of our burgeoning population; with the advent of medicare, of course, our needs were suddenly and dramatically increased. The junior colleges which have developed the ADN program have generally not sought accreditation by the National League for Nursing, finding it excessively costly and of little or no substantive value, and rely instead on the combination of regional accreditation and the State board.

However, an interpretation of the provisions of the Federal Nurse Training Act of 1964 by the Commissioner of Education concluded that the National League for Nursing was the only agency which could accredit nursing programs so that they would be eligible for Federal funds. In 1965, the Congress amended the act to include regional accrediting agencies or other means of assuring the quality of institutions seeking funds under the act, but the Commissioner has chosen to leave the national league as the sole approving agency.

Thus, the efforts of Congress have been thwarted; we are not producing anywhere near the number of nurses we need; the National Commission on Accrediting, which has been working with little success for 5 years to accommodate the league's procedures and the ADN programs, has been bypassed; and a self-appointed private agency has virtually monopolistic control over disposition of funds voted by Congress for a program vital to the welfare of the Nation.

Another example of Federal-State conflict in accreditation can be found in the State Technical Services Act of 1965. In order for a college to receive funds under this act, it must be accredited in engineering, in business administration, or in science. Since there is now no specialized accrediting agency in science, this act seems to compound the problem by suggesting the need for one.

Standards for accrediting a college in any specialized field are developed and applied by a relatively small committee whose actions are rarely reviewed by its parent body and even more rarely by the National Commission on Accreditation. Thus, decisions as to which colleges shall receive large amounts of Federal funds are often made by small groups who are only loosely responsible to professional organizations, whose primary concerns are often determined by the personal predilictions of members, and who rarely give serious consideration to how higher education can best serve the public interest.

The Federal policy of using specialized accreditation as a prime determiner of eligibility for Federal funds places enough power in these groups for them to effectively force colleges to comply with their standards.

The integrity of individual colleges is thus in serious jeopardy. Creatively imagined new programs will emerge less frequently. With Federal funds used to increase conformity, differences in specialized programs—a critical element in progress toward excellence—are likely to be fewer and less evident.

One may well ask if existing Federal policy is not an effective barrier to the development of changes needed urgently in the 20th century.

I have spent the past few minutes finding fault with Federal support to education. I hope, however, that you will recall my opening position with respect to Federal funds, and that I will not be accused of looking a gift horse in the mouth.

I am concerned—as I know everyone in this room is concerned—about obtaining the greatest possible benefit from the total resources at our command. I do not believe that we can spend too much money in Federal support of education. I do believe that we can spend the money we have more effectively than we are now able to do, simply by recognizing some of the stumbling blocks and eliminating them.

Because I feel so strongly about the need and value of Federal aid in every single aspect of education from the smallest community to the largest State and regional efforts, I wish to close my remarks by reiterating that position.

The outpouring of Federal funds to every nook and cranny of our Nation—to every community, every district, every county, State, and region—represents the most noble use of Federal resources. It is essential if we are to continue to take great forward strides in the education and welfare of every citizen of this Nation.

But we must at the same time realize that vast sums of money will be utterly wasted unless we are constantly concerned about using them effectively, unselfishly. To do so, we must be able to sweep away the cobwebs of the past, to keep our activities in tune with the problems of today and tomorrow, to seek always more effective means of carrying out the plans and programs which our great national wealth enables us to develop, and above all, to use our abilities and resources to nurture a culture in which the general welfare and the welfare of every individual are our prime concerns.

Thank you.

Fino Urges 5-Percent Tax on Betting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, in a letter to President Johnson, I recommend a 5-percent Federal tax on betting and a new Gambling Tax Unit of the Treasury Department, staffed by thousands, to enforce the tax.

In my letter, I said:

I am writing to you about a way in which the Federal Government may tap America's illegal gambling coffers without actually participating in gambling enterprises.

I urge the establishment of a 5-percent tax on betting. This would be a 5-percent tax on gambling turnover—on the Nation's overall gambling volume. It would not be the same as a tax on gambler's receipts or income.

No doubt you are aware that the British Government just announced a proposed 2½-percent tax on betting. I think they have a good idea. The problem, of course, is in the enforcement. I think it is a problem we can and should overcome. Gambling today is a $50-billion-a-year business in the United States. That is a vast potential tax base.

To investigate gambling enterprises and provide the backbone of gambling tax enforcement, I propose a Gambling Tax Unit in the Treasury Department which would seek out gamblers and gambling the way the Alcoholic Tax Unit does with illegal liquor dealings.

I urge that gambling enterprises be identified and their turnover estimated. A tax of 5 percent would then be imposed on that turnover. It would then be up to the gamblers to disprove the estimate or pay up. In a situation like this, tax procedure of this sort would be warranted.

With a $50-billion-a-year taxable base to work to uncover, the potential of this tax would be great. It could reach $2½ billion a year.

This tax would cripple illegal gambling if enforced in the way I have suggested by a powerful and well-staffed Gambling Tax Unit. It would also be a great revenue raiser. In addition, I think a tax like this would help to shift public wagering into State-run gambling enterprises.

I urge you to give real consideration to this measure. I think that such a tax, linked with the enforcement I propose, would be a social and financial boon to America. This is a better tax than the telephone tax boost. This is a better tax than the suggested 5- to 7-percent corporate and personal income tax hike.

Minimum Wage Laws Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the Record the following article entitled, "Minimum Wage Laws Assailed," which appeared in the February 22, 1966, issue of the Daily Oklahoman:

What Others Say: Minimum Wage Laws Assailed

(By William D. Pardridge)

(Note.—Changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to raise again the Federal minimum wage will be a legislative goal of labor in the present congressional session. Although the minimum wage laws in some instances may set a realistic floor under wages for certain types of labor, they eventually work a disservice to the worker himself in other cases, according to the author of the article below. The writer is the former editor of a Washington magazine, Air Affairs.)

Minimum wage laws beget minimum jobs. Many small businesses operate of necessity on a low profit margin—even on a simple break-even level.

With no condemnation of human rights, if the hourly wage of these going concerns are forced up by statute alone with no economic support, then many little businesses will become concerns that are not going ones.

Their owners and managers will go out of business and their workers will have to seek employment elsewhere.

The minimum wage laws are a real economic inequity because they actually retard economic growth and efficiency in a free-enterprise, open-market society. They are partner to the regulations of prices and of profits.

At once, humanitarian goals and economic laws seem to be in conflict. But in the long run they are not opposed to each other at all. They are, in fact, the same. Narrow-minded perspective is the culprit.

One need only look at the historical development of the shorter workweek and bigger real paycheck of the American worker.

The tragedy of minimum wage laws—and other do-good gimmicks of the welfare state—is that the individuality of economic man is deadened by the constant meddler we know as the political man.

Across this land in countless towns and cities there are untold shops and other little businesses that are owner-operated with the paid help of the marginal work force.

Jack up the wages of these people artificially, and most of the no-profit owner-operators will either go out of business—along with their employees—or they'll go into debt and despair if not already there.

Minimum wage laws give a big assist to the welfare state, or handout economy by adding to the relief rolls those former employees who have become priced out of jobs.

There are those in America who use Goering's much-bandied phrase, "guns or butter." Some say we can not have both, and others say we certainly can have the two together. This is not the basic problem of the American social and economic structure.

The all-important question is: Can we have individual political and economic freedom, on the one hand, and at the same time have an ever-increasing plenty that eternally seeps down to include all social classes of economic income?

Minimum wage laws that increase total payrolls and decrease total employees will make us change our menus to include the do-gooding controls of prices and profits.

Minimum wages and maximum prices go together—like war and pestilence—and when they meet in the middle, profit becomes zero.

Helotes, Tex., 78023

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great honor and privilege to represent the great 20th Congressional District, this district being coterminous with the revered and historical county of Bexar. This county is the place where original community life took place in Southwestern United States over 250 years ago. It is a beauteous and diversified territory.

At one time this was known as the Bexar Territory, which extended clear over to beyond Laramie, Wyo. In fact, at least close to one-half of Texas' present counties were carved out of Bexar County.

On Saturday, March 19, 1966, I was pleased to attend a very significant event in the northern reaches of the county, at the edge of what we call the scenic loop. This is the scene of my childhood memories, the beautiful hill country, about which poets and songsters have waxed eloquent and warm. It has been my favorite haunt since childhood, when I used to, in the company of my childhood friends, walk the 20 miles from the city of San Antonio to the inspiring and tonifying air of Helotes. Helotes in Spanish means maize or corn. The purpose of my being there was the occasion of the dedication of a new post office facility for this area and my presenting an American flag which had been flown over the Capitol and the Post Office headquarters in Washington.

In attendance were outstanding citizens and dignitaries of San Antonio and Bexar County, including our great and efficient postmaster, Mr. Dan Quill, who is known as Mr. Postmaster, and is widely known and acclaimed for his long and valuable contributions and service.

Also present, from the Dallas regional office, and representing Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, as well as Regional Director B. M. Meyers, Jr., was Mr. Allen Dupree, who made an eloquent speech. Under unanimous consent I present this excellent address at this point in the Record:

Helotes, Tex. 78023

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Gonzalez, Mr. Davis, clerk-in-charge of the Helotes Post Office, members of the reverend clergy, platform guests, fellow postal workers, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a real privilege for me to be here today and it is indeed an honor to have a part on this dedicatory program with your very able Congressman Henry Gonzalez.

Today, I have the distinct privilege to represent Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien and Director of the Dallas Region, B. M. Myers, Jr.

At this time I would like to express appreciation of the Post Office Department and Postmaster General O'Brien to the many people who have a hand in seeing the fine new facility become a reality. Business people brought pressure and worked very hard. We in the region used all of our know-how in advising the Department of your needs. But the one person who worked harder and longer than all of us combined is the man who represents this district so well, your very capable Congressman, the Honorable Henry Gonzalez.

I would be remiss in my duties if I did not give credit to your senior Senator, Ralph Yarborough, who as a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, spends a great deal of time on the many postal problems confronting him, including building new post offices where they are needed.

Helping to dedicate a new post office is one of the most pleasant aspects of my job. After all postal employees are closer to the community than employees of any other Government agency.

This new facility is tangible evidence that Helotes is on the move just as most other cities and towns are in this great economic period.

This fine new postal unit is another important link in one of the greatest communications ever devised by man. Our postal service handles two-thirds of the total mail volume of the world, more than all other countries combined, which amounted to more than 72 billion pieces of mail last year, and the volume continues to increase about 3 percent each year.

It is estimated that by 1970 we will be handling 90 billion pieces of mail annually. This continued increase of more than 2 billion pieces of mail annually caused a great deal of concern to the Post Office Department as to how we can continually give efficient and economical handling with such a great increase. After much thought, the zoning improvement plan (known as ZIP code) was born. Business firms, which account for 80 percent of the Nation's first-class mail, are presently making good use of our ZIP code to help us speed the distribution and delivery of their mail. Also, the general public is showing increasing signs of accepting the five-digit coding system for addressing mail, indicating a smooth transition to the time in the near future when mail will be sorted electronically by optical scanning machines in the country's largest post offices.

Your ZIP code number here in Helotes is 78023. Won't you please include it in your return address on all of your correspondence?

Through the finest postal system in the world, you have at your command the services of 600,000 postal employees, including 31,135 rural carriers who travel 1,887,640 miles each working day, serving 9,823,256 rural families of this Nation. In Texas there are 1,546 rural carriers who travel 103,475 miles each working day serving the rural families of this great State.

Even though we do have this fine system, there has been an unfortunate and, I personally think, unjustified tendency by some speakers and writers to state the Post Office Department is inefficient and incompetently run. These writers do a gross injustice to more than one-half a million dedicated civil servants who are endeavoring to do their complex and demanding job with a maximum of effectiveness and efficiency and a minimum of expense and waste.

You also often hear the comment that the British postal system is far superior to our own, that it is more efficient and provides much faster delivery service. I want you to hear the facts. The entire British postal system has 144,000 employees who move only 30 million pieces of mail a day. New York City alone moves more than this amount of mail with less than one-third of the number of employees required by the entire British postal system.

Our main objective has always been, and always will be, rapid movement of the Nation's mail at the lowest possible cost with the best possible service, and under the Johnson administration, we are making greater strides toward that end.

The Post Office Department under this administration and under the direction of post office officials has undertaken a vigorous program of postal service expansion to meet the tremendous increase in population and mail volume. As of June 30, 1965, 5,148,982 more families are receiving city delivery service than were receiving this service June 30, 1961, and 612,313 more rural families are receiving rural delivery service than were receiving it in 1961.

Through the use of fine, new buildings like we are dedicating today, we intend to constantly improve the type of service we render and the manner in which we render it.

But let me make it clear that when we speak of improvement, we do not confine our thoughts to new buildings and mail processing machines.

One of the primary aims of President Lyndon B. Johnson and this postal administration is to instill in every employee in this vast organization a pride in their work, an appreciation for the position they hold, and a desire to improve the service they render, and to let the employees know they are extremely important in this vital communication machinery of America. The new Postmaster General, Lawrence O'Brien is determined to improve postal operation and to better the lot of those postal employees who have so long and faithfully served the Department and you, the public.

Under the Johnson administration, under the guidance of Postmaster General O'Brien, and with God's help, we will give you the most efficient and courteous postal service you have ever had.

The GAO Should Not Be Hamstrung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Government Operations Committee, I was interested in an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star, Wednesday, March 30, by Richard Wilson. I certainly share the views expressed by Mr. Wilson and am calling his editorial to the attention of the Members and others who carefully review the RECORD:

WATCHDOG GETTING TEETH PULLED
(By Richard Wilson)

The mystic symbol GAO strikes terror and anger in the hearts of Washington bureaucrats. GAO stands for General Accounting Office, called the watchdog for Congress over Government expenditures.

The watchdog is having its teeth pulled.

Defense contractors and Government officials who have had a rough time with Congress army of thousands of accountants and checkeruppers finally have gotten their message across in the House Committee on Government Operations. GAO has promised the committee it will go easier in its future reports on the extravagance, waste, and sometimes venality which rob taxpayers of untold millions.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, is chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the Committee on Government Operations. He was instrumental in getting GAO to soften up. This was done over the name of Frank H. Weitzel, who acted as Comptroller General of the United States, when tough, old Comptroller General Joe Campbell had to retire because of health after decades of unabashed meanness in guarding the taxpayers' dollars.

Thus a new Comptroller General, Elmer Staats, was sent by President Johnson from the Bureau of the Budget to take over a General Accounting Office that was apologetic of Campbell's hard-boiled handling of any Government contractor or any Government official who played loose and easy with the people's money. Weitzel remains as Staats' assistant.

What got everyone worked up were the little blue books issued by the General Accounting Office, recounting in horrid detail how to waste Government money without really trying. Occasionally GAO had the temerity to state that a case ought to be looked into by the Justice Department. Every now and then a few trade secrets of companies engaging in loose practices on Government contracts were necessarily revealed along with the carelessness or venality. Now and then, but not often, some accountants were so literal-minded that they failed to take into consideration extenuating matters of policy, particularly when Uncle Sam hands out its funds to nations abroad.

Earlier this year it all came to a head when about 50 witnesses from various Government departments and agencies, industrial and trade associations, and defense contracts contractors, related their woes before the Government Operations Subcommittee.

Now the subcommittee has reported its pride that the hearings served a "highly useful and constructive purpose." Well, it seems that some of the GAO reports contained "critical words and phrases which tended to overstate findings in their negative aspect." Weitzel promised to be careful about that in the future.

It seems also that defense contractors felt bad when GAO let it be known publicly that their relations with the Government ought to be looked into by the Department of Justice. Weitzel promised not to let the press know about it when some defense contractor was suspected of making off with x millions of dollars. This bothered some members of the committee who think the public has a right to know such things.

The committee commended Weitzel for declaring that fewer of the odious little blue books would be issued. Those that are issued will be aimed at promoting overall improvement in "agency management policies" instead of just exposing such things as waste and corruption in the distribution of U.S. Government aid funds in Vietnam.

Another thing that was bothersome about GAO was its insistence on coming right out in the open and naming Government officers and employees deemed to be responsible for wrong or careless actions in carrying out Government contracts. This was found to be "unfair * * * and unnecessarily damaging to careers and reputations," particularly since GAO finds are subject to further investigation and verification or rebuttal.

Weitzel promised to stop doing so much of this and name only top agency officials, if at all. In cases where the auditors thought the Government was due a refund because of overpricing by contractors, Weitzel promised to be much more circumspect. In a half a dozen other ways, the Congressmen got GAO to lower the curtain on public disclosure and blame for waste and misuse of public money.

The mulelike and unimaginative attitude of auditors is a well-known phenomenon of the industrial society. That is what they are paid for. It seems strange that their wings should be clipped when Government spending is rising at a dizzy rate, bizarre new projects are going forward in defense-space, and on the homefront all kinds of new projects invite new achievements in Government waste and inefficiency.

Alaska's Gold Rush Contributes to Nationwide System of Trails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pleasant experiences of man is to strap a pack on his back or climb into a saddle and head off for adventure along a primitive trail. Not only does the experience touch the senses, but it is one of the best means I know of relieving the strain of modern living and promoting good health.

The value of hiking and riding trails is well known to the hundreds of thousands that yearly make the effort to meet nature on its own terms along trails. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, of which I was a member, pointed out in its 1962 report that trails are one of the best outdoor opportunities. President Johnson stressed the need for trails available to everyone last year in his eloquent natural beauty message.

For almost a year now, Secretary Udall has spearheaded a cooperative nationwide study of trails for the purpose of developing a comprehensive, far-sighted program that will assure adequate trail opportunities for present and future generations. This study has culminated in a proposal to establish a nationwide system of trails, which the President mentioned in his recent message on preserving our natural heritage. Today Secretary Udall submitted the proposal to the Speaker, and today I have introduced that bill and urge its early consideration and enactment.

The bill that I am introducing today would substantially contribute to meet the ever-increasing outdoor recreation needs of an expanding population by establishing a nationwide system of trails serving all sections of the country and within easy reach of all segments of the population.

Several classes of the trails are recognized in the bill. National scenic trails would extend for hundreds of miles across whole regions of the country. Additional trails in scenic State and Federal forest and park areas would open new recreation opportunities for hikers and riders. Most important of all from the standpoint of the number of people to be served are trails that would be provided through green belts in and near our cities and metropolitan areas.

The bill includes provision for the imaginative development and expansion of each of these classes of trails. As the initial National Scenic Trail, the bill provides for the full establishment and perpetuation of the Appalachian Trail. This venerable trail, extending 2,000 miles from Maine to Georgia through 14 States has existed for many years. It was created by the efforts of thousands of volunteers who devoted their spare time and hard work to the task. It is now jeopardized by developments stemming from the increasing population pressures of the eastern seaboard, pressures that are greater than volunteer workers can hope to cope with.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with all of the public and private interests along the trail, including the Appalachian Trail Conference, to establish a firm route, to acquire the land, to upgrade the trail, and to regulate its use so that those who follow us will be able to enjoy the same quality experience which we now cherish.

The bill also earmarks 10 other potential national scenic trails for study by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, including an outstanding opportunity in Alaska which is associated with the gold rush era. Outstanding examples in Alaska are three gold rush trails, comprising the network of historic trails leading from southeast Alaska to the gold fields of the Yukon.

The tidewater terminus of the Dyea Trail and the White Pass Trail was the historic town of Skagway. The town of Haines was another historic gateway over the Dalton Trail. Trails in Federal and State park and forest areas would be given increased emphasis.

On Federal lands, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are directed to expand and upgrade the trail systems they administer. In State park and forest areas the States are encouraged with Federal assistance to do the same.

Trails in and near metropolitan areas are receiving increasing attention across the country. Much more needs to be done. Under existing authority, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development are directed to encourage the additional effort needed.

It has been customary down through the years to regard outdoor recreation as less of a necessity than other public responsibilities such as highways and water development projects. Through the efforts of President Johnson and of the late President Kennedy, the Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the value of natural beauty and outdoor recreation to the welfare and well-being of the people. A deliberate effort is needed to protect our places of great beauty and inspiration and to make them available. Trails to and through these great areas whether they are near at hand or far away, will help in an important way to provide the recreation opportunities that increasing millions need. The bill that I am submitting for your consideration today goes far in assuring these opportunities.

Cyprus Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the problem of Cyprus is one that has become complicated and involved because recent history of Cyprus has departed from the normal course of self-determination in consequence of the persistent denial of self-determination by the administering power concerned.

The Zurich and London agreements which were virtually imposed on the people of the island while they were still under colonial domination, produced a constitution unworkable in its basic structure. The United Nations mediator, who tried to find an accommodating solution, in his report described it as a constitutional oddity.

The constitution—to take one example—provided that in the House of Representatives of 50 members or more than 8 Turkish negative votes could defeat and negate 42 other affirmative votes in any fiscal or other important legislation, thereby stalling the whole financial machinery of government. This was surely not a constitution that has ever been, or could possibly be, applied anywhere. In addition to such imbalance, sharply divisive provisions of the constitution, creating the atmosphere of opposing ethnic camps set the stage for antagonism and friction.

Through dividing the towns and municipalities, that were never divided before in their long history, dividing the courts of justice in a way that actually has resulted in a denial of justice. Through many other provisions of separation and imbalance this basic legal framework inevitably led to the strife and trouble that erupted in the island of Cyprus in December 1963 with all the regrettable fighting and bloodshed that ensued.

Provisions in the Zurich and London agreements for intervention by three outside powers, Britain, Greece, and Turkey in the internal affairs of Cyprus and particularly the interpretation given by Turkey to such intervention as allowing it to use military force in violation of the charter, had further aggravated the situation.

The factors brought the danger of actual war between Greece and Turkey, with consequences of unknown gravity and extent. The United Nations Security Council on two occasions; namely, on December 27, 1963, and on March 13, 1964, and the U.S. efforts on the third occasion in June 1964, averted that dangerous development.

The United Nations force in Cyprus operating under the resolution of the Security Council of March 4, 1964, has done a most constructive work in preventing the recurrence of fighting and maintaining peace in the island.

The situation is now calm and peaceful, but the solution of the problem is not yet in sight. The Security Council resolution took care not only of the pacification of the island through a United Nations force, but also of the overall solution of the problem through the appointment of a United Nations mediator. According to the report of the Secretary General, however—December 1963—the peacekeeping endeavor of the United Nations has been successful, but not that of peacemaking. The reasons are:

First, that the long-awaited results of the United Nations mediation started by the late Mr. Touomioyia and continued by Mr. Galo Plaza, were brought to a standstill. The report of Plaza issued on March 26, 1965, a constructive document consistent with the principles and purposes of the charter, was rejected by Turkey, who also objected to the mediator continuing his work.

The Secretary General of the United Nations, however, in his introduction to the annual report on the work of the organization—A/6001/Add. 1—reaffirmed his confidence in the mediator and spoke of his report as "encouraging, because it envisaged a reasonable basis for a settlement of the problem." But the negative attitude of the Turkish Government, toward that report has thus frustrated the whole mediation effort toward a solution.

The second reason is that the relations between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots have not shown any improvement according to the Secretary General's report. Some constructive steps toward easing the situation and a return to normality appear to have been taken by the Government of Cyprus, such as the unilateral dismantling of Government armed posts, the reconstruction of destroyed Turkish houses, the offering of amnesty and the declaration of intent regarding international guarantees of minority rights through the United Nations.

The armed Turkish Cypriots in cell groups operating under the organization TMT and directed by officers from Turkey, oppose any normalization move. In these enclaves, which cover hardly 1.8 percent of the territory of the island, thousands of Turkish residents are being segregated against their will by this Turkish organization and forbidden to return to their homes and villages or resume their normal occupations, in an effort to promote the purpose of partition. In these areas the arbitrary rule of intimidation and terrorism prevails. A number of Turkish Cypriots have escaped at the risk of being shot if caught in the act of escaping or of being kidnaped later.

In the rest of the territory of Cyprus, which is under the control of the Government, the rule of law fully applies and the administration of justice functions satisfactorily in unified courts, in which Greek and Turkish judges work together in full cooperation, and without discrimination. The chief justice is a Turk, enjoying general respect, who has been promoted to the post by the Government of Cyprus as presently constituted. But extremists in a civil disobedience injunction issued to the Turkish Cypriots forbid them to attend these courts for any of their business or to obey its summons.

These intimidations extend also to Turks living outside the enclaves, who on the threat of retaliatory punishment are forbidden to have any relations or trade dealings with their Greek compatriots, or even to speak to them. In this way it is sought to keep up division and strife in Cyprus and to prevent the return of normal relations to which the bulk of the Turkish Cypriots no less than their Greek cocitizens aspire.

It is this divisive policy that constitutes a main stumbling block to the solution of the Cyprus problem.

It is obvious that under such conditions there can be little progress toward negotiation for solution. It should be the duty, therefore, of all who realize the need for an early solution of the Cyprus problem, to see to it that deliberate obstruction to reconciliation by extremist methods, ceases.

The United States may not at this time wish to commit itself in favor of any particular solution of the problem. But the United States certainly can, and should, commit itself in favor of a just and democratic solution and particularly in support of a reconciliation and a better climate in the intercommunal relations in the island, as an indispensable prelude to a solution.

The United States must not permit the lack of payment of the United Nations peacekeeping forces in Cyprus to cause these forces to be withdrawn within the next several months. These forces are necessary for the protection of both the Greek and Turkish populations of Cyprus and for the security of the NATO forces, peoples, and powers in the Mediterranean area. I strongly recommend prompt and affirmative action be taken by this administration.

I feel deeply that such a positive stand is one that could well be taken by the U.S. Government in the best traditions of our Nation and in the sense of our responsibility as a leading world power.

John Baldwin

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of JOHN BALDWIN's death following his long illness. His passing is a great loss to the Congress, to the Nation, and to his own people in California.

During my five terms in Congress I have been close to JOHN BALDWIN and I have always admired him for his courage, deep thought, and sound judgment. We looked to JOHN for leadership in the House and he never failed us.

At the present time, I am president of the Thursday morning prayer breakfast group. JOHN was diligent in his attendance and served as secretary, vice president, and president of the group. We know of his deep faith and with this assurance realize that he is now home with his Maker. The love of Jesus Christ was very meaningful in the life of JOHN BALDWIN. His imprint will be witnessed for a long time to come in the life of not only his family, but all of us who were in touch with him.

I pray that his family can find the same solace through their grief as he found through his trials and tribulations and realize with confidence the world is a better place because JOHN BALDWIN lived.

The 48th Anniversary of the Republic of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week, the Byelorussian people observed the 48th anniversary of the birth of the democratic Republic of Byelorussia. In honor of this occasion, I wish to express my admiration for their fortitude and steadfastness and hope that soon they reach their objective of freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

The Byelorussian people lived under the Russian czars for several centuries in their homeland. During all that time they had jealously guarded many of their national traits and traditions, and steadfastly clung to their national goal, freedom and independence. Early in 1918, when they had the chance, they proclaimed their national independence on March 25. They set up their own democratic form of government, and in the short time allowed to them, they began to rebuild their wartown country.

Unfortunately, however, the Byelorussians were not to enjoy long their richly deserved reward. In December of that very year the ruthless Bolsheviks were on the warpath; eventually the Red Army overran the country and it was annexed to the Soviet Union, thus bringing about the enslavement of some 10 million Byelorussians by the Kremlin tyrant.

Since then, for more than 45 years, these people have been living under the oppressive yoke of their heartless overlords. They live as in a large prison house. Their tyrannical bosses are trying to extinguish all ethnic and national sentiments in Byelorussia, including all hope for freedom. But the Byelorussian people still cling to their national aspiration for independence. They naturally feel that they should not be robbed of their inalienable right to freedom, and in this they have the wholehearted sympathy of the peoples of the free world.

VFW Chief Says Vietnam Demonstrators Communist Led

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, following a recent incident at Purdue University involving an open display of desecration of an American flag before a radical leftist campus organization, I introduced a bill calling for a fine and penal sentence for such offenses.

Since the introduction of this legislation I have received numerous indications of support, including a strong endorsement from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

VFW Commander in Chief Andy Borg has made an excellent statement concerning the flag desecration bill, and also the recent spate of anti-Vietnam demonstrations which many of us believe to be Communist inspired and led.

Every Member of Congress should read Commander Borg's comments on these two issues, and therefore I am submitting the following press releases issued by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The articles follow:

VFW CHIEF SAYS VIETNAM DEMONSTRATORS COMMUNIST LED

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States said today that "if those misguided vietniks and demonstrators believe that they were not giving aid and comfort to the enemy of our boys in Vietnam then they should read recent reports out of Peking and Hanoi."

Andy Borg, Superior, Wis., noted that during the weekend of March 26–27, when the so-called new left staged demonstrations throughout the United States and other nations of the world, there was a rally in Peking. "During this Red Chinese rally," Borg said, "it is reliably reported by monitored radio broadcasts that the Reds gave encouragement and applauded verbally those demonstrators in the United States.

"It is obvious to me that these peacenik movements, with their rallies and their marches and sit-ins—which I am convinced are Communist led—are having a positive effect upon both the Red Chinese and Red North Vietnamese. And, despite the fact that they are only a voluble minority, the tremendous coverage given them by the press, radio and television, has in actuality given aid and comfort to the enemy.

"It is inconceivable to me that at the same time thousands of American young men are fighting and dying to preserve freedom in South Vietnam, these misguided crackpots at home are tearing up their draft cards, defiling the flag those boys are fighting for—all ostensibly in the name of freedom. They do not want freedom as the majority of Americans know it."

Borg charged that "these petty people are nothing but sheep, being led by leftwingers and Communists. They are nothing but dupes in the worldwide Communist conspiracy to divide our Nation so that they might conquer us. I wonder how they would like the regimentation and the denigration of basic human freedoms under the Communist system of government? It is certain that they would not be allowed to speak and demonstrate as they do today.

"I visited the boys in Vietnam recently, and know firsthand what a magnificent group of young Americans they are. Each of us here at home can be proud of them and the job they are doing for freedom. Yet, the impact of the vietniks upon these boys is in the majority of cases the same as mine—a feeling of disgust for the bearded, bathless ones who flaunt the Vietcong flag before the White House and in parades up Fifth Avenue. I have received many letters from the boys overseas and many are disheartened by the news from home of the antics of these demonstrators.

"Now is the time for all Americans to back these boys to the hilt—not to stab them in the back as they push steadily forward in their battle for freedom."

VFW Chief Cites Need for National Flag Legislation

Washington, D.C.—The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States today charged that "there is too much disrespect for the American flag by dissident groups throughout the Nation."

Andy Borg, Superior, Wis., the VFW commander, noted that "there are no provisions in Federal law to punish those who desecrate the flag of our Nation. It is long past the time when such disgraceful conduct as stomping on the flag, spitting on our flag, or any other disrespect for the flag can be tolerated. After all, there are more than 200,000 young American men fighting for that same flag in South Vietnam."

Borg said that Congressman Richard L. Roudebush, Republican, of Indiana, a former VFW national commander in chief, has introduced legislation in the Congress which would remedy this situation. The Congressman's bill provides for imprisonment of 1 year and a fine of not more than $1,000 for anyone found guilty of mutilating, defacing, defiling, defying, trampling upon, or casting contempt upon the flag of the United States.

"The majority of Americans love and honor their flag. For those who would desecrate it I feel there should be punishment to fit the act, and that is just what Congressman Roudebush's bill would do. We of the VFW are 100 percent behind such legislation and I know that almost all Americans join with us."

Brooklyn, Conn., Schools Joins National Honor. Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn, Conn., School will receive a charter next month from the National Junior Honor Society as it inaugurates a chapter named in honor of Mrs. Gwladys Dorman, who recently retired after more than 30 years in the teaching profession.

I wish to congratulate Brooklyn School on joining the more than 3,000 chapters of the National Junior Honor Society throughout the country. Organized in 1929, the society is dedicated to the development of well-rounded students, scholars, and good citizens. The 91,000 active members of the society follow in the footsteps of countless distinguished citizens who early found encouragement and distinction in this organization.

Students are chosen by their respective faculties in our junior high schools using the highest standards of character as well as scholarship. The National Junior Honor Society helps develop the good citizens of tomorrow by recognition of those qualities of good citizenship in the students of today.

Brooklyn School is also to be congratulated for honoring Mrs. Gwladys Dorman, whose many years of devoted service to her pupils characterizes the best traditions of the teaching profession. A native of Wales, where she began her teaching career, Mrs. Dorman has served the Brooklyn School for more than two decades. Her service is best summed up in the words of former students, who in honoring her upon her retirement last year, spoke of Mrs. Dorman as both "friend and teacher."

I am delighted to have Mrs. Dorman as one of my constituents and wish her many long and active years, in good health, and enjoying the love of her dear ones and her numerous students.

Madame Chiang Kai-shek Addresses Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most eloquent and respected spokesmen for the free world today is Madame Chiang Kai-shek, wife of the President of the Republic of China. She is a highly recognized authority on communism and its evil designs.

I include a copy of an address delivered by this distinguished visitor to the National Press Club. It follows:

Address by Madame Chiang Kai-shek Before the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., March 18, 1966

About 7½ years ago I had the privilege of positing to an assemblage of your confreres of the National Press Club the question of how to best the continuing challenge of communism which we of the free world faced. I must say that my question was disputatious as well as quodlibetical but certainly not a quoddity since the problem is very real and the palliative solutions offered throughout the years have not lessened the tension nor deterred the Chinese Communists whose avowed aim is to change the world into their own image euphemistically called world revolution and national liberation. I might also add, if my memory serves me aright, none at that meeting volunteered to give an answer. Today I shall again ask the question in the hopes that many of you knowledgeable and authoritative gentlemen who have the pulse of the world in your collective fingertips will be good enough to offer valid solutions to many of the contusive problems that face the world.

As I have said, the problems of the free world vis-a-vis the Communist world are still very much with us, and as you all know very much alive. Even more so since what was for a time the monolith has cleft into two ideological and pragmatic entities each with its retinue of partisans and adherents, with one truculent entity doing its utmost to derogate and then tumble the other from the pinnacle of its international leadership.

A coup d'oeil will have shown any who cares to note that the original occupant of the pinnacle in struggling to maintain ideological and secular paramountcy has been steadily losing ground to the interloper. The uncouth obnoxious peasant brigand who feigns Communist intellectualism has shinnied up to the top of the Communist greasy pole, but whose manners and above all whose ruse de guerre are beneath Communist contempt; and that because of this country bumpkin, Russian primacy is very much on the wane. Granting that there are ups and downs as shown by events those who see the outward manifestations of these phenomena have but a perfunctory picture of the Soviet position. To have a complete depiction of Russia's position we must go back in time and recollect that the focus of emphasis of communism as envisioned by Marx was essentially microeconomics.

In this I mean the thematic structure of his opus and theory were built on the effects of interaction of labor and wages generously laced with fire and brimstone, accusations of exploitations and injustices of the capitalist social system of the time, and rendered perhaps more excusable in its exaggerations and distortions by a man whose talent and genius were affected through personal misfortunes, ill health, physical pain, and what seemed to him to be interminable frustrations. To digress for a moment we must take note that microeconomics be they of Smith, Ricardo, Malthus, and Marx treated specializations as distinct from macroeconomics which encompasses all the myriad elements of production, price, profit, income, interest rate, and above all Government policy that make up economics—in short, as we know economics in this day and age.

Das Kapital by appropriating only the "Hegelian Triad"—thesis, antithesis and synthesis—which is part and parcel of the necessary progression of Hegelian schematic thought and applying it to the theme of social evils and injustices, whilst discarding the Hegelian schema of harmonizing Greek ontology with Kantian psychology and the concept of the "true Being" has built within Marxism the endemic limitations which cannot permit its synthesis to continue sound and healthy ad infinitum.

I hope I have not bored you too much with a brief recitation of the nidus of Marxist dialectics, but I feel it is necessary to have a total recall of Hegelian thought in order to have a truer understanding than the usual half-veracious and hothouse ripened imagery of Hegelianism. I reasseverate that Marxism is but a partial lifting from the whole scheme of Hegelian thought in a context of intellectual theoretical exercise, and that Marx applying this ex parte to the obtaining social, political, and economic phenomena attributed to this theory Marxism as the eternal nostrum for the world's economic, social, and political maladies.

To go back to my mainstream of thought, general Russian industry compared with the industrially advanced countries in the West has been and still is behind the times, except in the glamour field of space science. But it must be said that the Communist government of Russia in 1922 had inherited greater and broader industrial base and greater industrial capacity and potentiality than China at its zenith in the years just prior to the Sino-Japanese War.

The several industrial 5-year plans embarked upon by Russia and despite her wasteful inefficiencies and inexpert unintegrated planning have increased her industry manyfold. Over the years and in the process of a building, Russian leaders and bureaucrats have found the socioeconomic precepts laid down by Marxism-Leninism to have become obsolete or rapidly obsolescent.

They have also found that human motives, values, and behavior were complex long before historical and material dialectics made them simple. And they have learned that goals of attainment in the final test must face inevitably realism and practicality, and that realism in Communist Russia is often starkly tragic in the dimensions of catastrophic failures. They have found, too, that idealism not based on the possible and the pragmatic as well as indiscriminate psittacism—the uncritical parroting of a pseudothesis or a thesis devoid of sound basis—inevitably immobilizes and stultifies doctrinal dynamism and action into stereotyped formulas with diminishing returns.

The independent often robust and irritatingly contrary views and actions of Yugoslavia even before the demise of Stalin set the pace for neocommunism. The parturient rumblings of Russia's satellites on her western marches and the bloody uprisings in Hungary impended upon the Kremlin the necessity of a reevaluation. For these many varied and dangerously abrasive reasons a change to more efficacious forms in doctrinal, sociopolitical economic unguents must be used to lubricate and insure the smooth working of her hegemony.

Moreover the repressions of the Stalin era, with the constant fear for life as a daily fare, even within the immediate circle of the Kremlin broke out in full force culminating in the cult of antipersonality with Khrushchev as its mouthpiece. De-Stalinization long latent and in the wind, only needed the death of Stalin to burst open the floodgates of accumulated deep-seated frustration, abiding hate, and acerbic anger.

With the debasement of the godhead Stalin came widespread and quickened loss of faith in the infallibility of leadership not only in Russia herself but in every nook and cranny of communism's farflung empire and organizations around the world. The new leadership saw that in order to perpetuate its rule, new inspiration and new approach must be found, and they could only be found in reinterpreting Marxism-Leninism in travail.

What Russia discarded through the empiric, the Red Chinese picked up and embraced with great gusto and fervor. For here was a chance of a dialectical lifetime (if I may coin this phrase) that Mao had been sniffing around and atheistically praying for. Here was the opportunity to capture legitimacy and assume the purple mantle of Communist world leadership by claiming catholicity as well as orthodoxy. With the help of material inducements and outright purchase, Mao and his trenchers have succeeded to make revisionism a mortal sin and revisionists, beings beyond redemption, synonymous with treachery and deceit. Thus Mao in his inquisitorial role of preserving the true faith, the Torquemada of latter day communism, has drummed out Mr. Khrushchev and now Messrs. Kosygin and Brezhnev from the orthodox Communist society and made them out to be pariahs and turncoats of the Communist dogmata.

Russia in persistence and through trial and error for some 47 years has found that the continued desolation and petrification in political dogma must give way in the long run to the rugged infinite vastness and permutations of human aspirations which still live by such bourgeois extolled virtues as friendship, loyalty, decency, compassion and charity whilst the diseased bourgeois people still look to insipid emotions of "our native land" and "Mother Russia" for inspiration and spiritual stability.

For the above contrapuntal reasons Russia is not only in the doghouse from the Chinese Reds' point of view, for good and ample reasons, but she is also in trouble with the hard-nosed Marxists who have espoused and continue to espouse the fanatical narrow straitlaced interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. Yet Russia for reasons of her own national good is in that position of paradox of having to maintain and stay on her new course of revisionism and inevitably incurring greater dissension amongst her rank and file and suffering centrifuge in her international following at the same time fighting hard to retain her position as the leader of the true believers.

The untenability of Russia's position is compounded by the irony that those leftists who are still her adherents and proponents are doing her a real disservice by chorusing or working for a united Communist front. This build-up pressure forces Russia to keep up a rigid farce to greater lengths for the sake of unity and face, and to exonerate herself by fighting off the carping criticisms that have been and will surely continually be leveled upon her by friend, sympathizer, and foe alike as having failed in leadership should she tergiversate too apparently by not supporting Red China's satellite, North Vietnam.

Indeed Russia has gone even further in the past as to include Red China in her corner only to have her teeth kicked in for her trouble.

Here is a situation which is of much more crucial purport than any single national situation where Communist power is required to push through a politically sticky wicket. The present North Vietnamese situation is one where the true Russian interest not only converges with that of the United States since given a Hanoi victory in any shape would mean an ultimate victory for the Chinese Communists which they now need so badly. For the irrefutable geographical contiguity as well as propinquity makes Hanoi the inevitable vassal of aggrandizing Peiping. Moreover painfully enough, Soviet Russia shows up better in dealing with the free world than with the Chinese Communists, for Russia knows how to make and can count on the free world collectively or individually to be her whipping boy whenever such a part is needed.

Whereas in every bout with her mortal enemy Russia because of her rationality and her right-of-left position cannot but come out second best at every encounter with the out-and-out desperado tactics with a "nothing to lose but everything to gain" posture of the Chinese Reds.

In address delivered in Miami Beach, Fla., on November 6, 1958, I said:

"True enough, Red China covertly aspires to lead. In saying openly that she will overtake England industrially in 15 years, she inadvertently is confessing to two things: first, that she is resorting to slave labor since it took England well-nigh two centuries to build up her present industrial empire. And second, that she harbors the inordinate ambition of taking away the leadership from Russia at some future time. Meanwhile, Mao and his henchmen are profuse in their professions of loyalty to Russia, and vow that in the inevitable Armageddon to come the Chinese Reds will contribute the colossal Chinese manpower to the Communist cause.

"When that giant struggle comes, Mao will be the only man in the world who will have made good his grandiloquent words: 'We can lose 300 million and still have 300 million left.' Only by adhering to Russia can Red China acquire the leadership and domination of the Communist world by outlasting the Russians through sheer number; only by adhering to Russia can Red China influence her master to fight another world war. But when Red China takes the place of leadership vacated by Russia, the free world will be indeed even more badly off since it would mean that probably hundreds of millions of people of the West as well as of China will have perished by then."

Seven years have elapsed since I thus spoke. As a student of communism of many years, and especially knowing the workings of the Chinese Communist mind, it came as no surprise to me when I read a February 1 UPI Moscow dispatch. I quote: "The Kremlin has accused China of trying to provoke a war between the United States and the Soviet Union, it was learned tonight.

"The accusation was made in a secret memorandum of the Communist Party's ruling Central Committee that is begin circulated throughout the nation among party members.

"This is the first time the new Kremlin team has told the party frankly about Peking's warmongering and the unabated Chinese hostility against the Soviet Union."

Should we further doubt that it was and still is the design of the Chinese Communists to embroil Russia in a general war so that the Red Chinese will come out the real victor?

The proponents of the Russian interest be they right or left would indeed do Russia as well as the free world a constructive service if they would pave the way for Russia to withdraw with grace from her position taken in Vietnam or indeed with any other such position she might perforce feel she must take as the champion and protector of fraternal countries.

For Russia knows full well if heretofore colored by feil hope that in any settlement favorable to Hanoi it can now only redound entirely to Peiping's benefit if for no other reason than Russia's own geographic remoteness from southeast Asia. And those who sing the refrain that the notion of a decisive military superiority over the land powers of Asia is a dangerous fantasy, in this specific relation is knowingly or inadvertently working to the detriment of Russia and to the best interest of Red China.

For every Russian exertion and effort crowned with victory in that part of the world can only mean manna from Heaven for Mao and the top 50 men in line of succession who, incidentally as Mr. Dennis J. Doolin, of Stanford University's Hoover Institute, researched and found, will take an even harder line than Mao and Chou. The immediate reaction is to ask why. This is not difficult to understand and the reason not far to seek.

We all know the platitude that nothing succeeds like success, and in this case the inheritor must in every way prove more aggressive and more worthy to be deserving of the inheritance by out-Maoing Mao, especially with 49 other possibles gloating watchfully in the wings to pounce on any sign of weakness and every Communist faux pas.

It must be remarked in fairness from our experience in China that it has often been the wont of the directing Communist apparat not to give early indication to the men in the field of a possible change of policy, and they therefore are kept in the dark till the very last.

This is partly because of the esoteric secretive nature of the bureaucracy which is reluctant to part with any directive until the very last moment, and partly because of a relishing of its prerogative and power to transmit even a complete volte face purposely and crassly, when so ordered, unmindful of the embarrassment it will cause the agents in the field to have to make excuses, accommodations and lame apologies when the moment for change or action has come to be. For that is something which the agents have to live down, not the faceless bureaucracy who slaves over reports, tactics, directives, and strategy in burning the midnight oil and whose merit and work are all but buried by the scintillating results of the field men who get the accolades, rewards, and advancements.

And lastly a stealthy furtive feeling of superiority over all field agents no matter how important in stature who are expendable if need be whereas it, the bureaucracy, is the mastermind and the indispensable.

In actuality a little consideration and preplanning for change would make the transition far easier all around in the present turmoil of championing the long-range Russian cause, especially since the Communist world as well as the free world knows that the Chinese Communists in their demented mania for world conquest have crossed the Rubicon and have deliberately chosen to go beyond the point of no return in its relationship with the Soviet Union.

It is said that coming out of the recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, a supposedly spanking new American policy towards the Chinese Reds has emerged—the "* * * most pregnant phrase to be uttered in Washington in a long time * * *" This magic phrase is "containment but not isolation."

Last Tuesday, March 15, the New York Times front-paged Red Chinese reaction to Vice President HUMPHREY's benign and well-intentioned remark as the "kiss of Judas" and his overtures of friendship "disgusting." I hope Mr. HUMPHREY is not too put out by the ravings of madmen hell-bent on world destruction although I must say that the insults are calculated to humiliate him as much as possible, and that he in personifying the alleged new American policy would aim to return for more of the same so that the Chinese Communists could heap more obloquy and more verbal refuse on his head for the world to see. Incidentally this coming back for more of the same is exactly what some have suggested very recently on a television program. Is it that pampering and molly-coddling of the violent insane will replace therapy and cure, or is it that the symptoms were correctly diagnosed and purposely fuddled-duddled to make the United States look ridiculous and tragicomic?

Gentlemen of the press, whatever your personal proclivities, whatever your inclinations and shades of suasion as provenders of intelligence as well as of intellect, culture, and mass communication, it has fallen upon your shoulders the responsibility to work in synergy with all who abhor nuclear and thermonuclear destruction of home and hearth, and to curb realistically, thoroughly, and fundamentally the running sore that spreads suppuration on the body politic of Russia and the free world with equipotent virulence.

Even as we are gathered here the dark and tendentious design of the Chinese Communists goes on without abatement and surcease, and gathers force and momentum with the greater numerical production of nuclear bombs and the completion of thermonuclear missiles with a system of delivery no matter how crude as compared to the better engineered system of the United States. This day and age will be a decisive epoch as to whether humanity will survive—survive with damaged genes or survive at all—and civilization per se, as we know it, shall or shall not perish from the earth. Here I wish to quote Mr. Stewart Alsop's article of January 15, 1966:

"President Kennedy was tragically right to worry almost to the point of obsession, as he did before he died, about the prospect of the Chinese Communists in control of the nuclear weapon. For there is a clear element of irrationality, of craziness, of paranoia in Communist China's view of the world."

And, in the very words of President Kennedy himself, "appeasing our enemies, compromising our commitments, purchasing peace at any price, disavowing our aims, our friends and obligations are actions which lead down the pathway to surrender," and may I add, ignominy.

Promoting a More Adequate National Program of Water Research

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3606) to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation in the committee, discusses what is involved in H.R. 3606, I would like to take just a few minutes to indicate the need for water research generally and how the program authorized by H.R. 3606 fits into and is coordinated with our overall Federal water resources research effort. The bill we have before the House today, of course, is limited to research into water problems relating to the mission of the Department of the Interior.

It is the ever-increasing demands upon our limited water supplies throughout the Nation that have pointed up the importance of research in the process of matching water supply to such demands. Over the years, the nature of our water problems has changed and the size and scope of the solutions have increased until, today, far greater demands are pressing upon both our water resources and the technology required to meet our varied water needs.

In the past, our Nation's available water supplies were plentiful and we let ourselves become too dependent upon nature to meet our needs. We also became wasteful of our supplies. We have expected our streams and ground water sources not only to meet the needs of our expanding population for food, fiber, and industrial processing, but also, at the same time, to carry off the waste products of our homes, industries and farms. The result has been serious shortages of usable water in many parts of our Nation and the conclusion that our water problems may be expected to become more serious in the future. Research, of course, is not itself the answer to all our water problems but it will help provide the answers we need. It has become quite clear that, if we are to find the solutions necessary to meet this Nation's growing water problems, we must have a continuing and effective water resources research program.

On March 18, President Johnson transmitted a special message to the Congress emphasizing the need for expanding our water resources research effort. The report of the Federal Council for Science and Technology which was a part of the President's message, includes a proposed 10-year expanded program in water resources research and sets out the specific goals we should work toward in the years ahead. The program which H.R. 3606 would authorize would assist in attaining these goals.

The concern which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has had with respect not only to the program involved in this legislation but to the entire Federal water research effort has been that we have had inadequate coordination and have had duplication and waste. In an attempt to overcome this situation, we placed provisions in the 1964 act requiring clarification of Federal agency responsibilities for water research and for coordinating all Federal water resources research activities. We are pleased with the actions which have been taken pursuant to these provisions.

By Executive order dated October 24, 1964, the President has given this responsibility to the Office of Science and Technology and to the Federal Council for Science and Technology. A Committee on Water Resources Research has been established and staffed, and the testimony we received during the hearings indicates that progress is being made toward the elimination of duplication and waste in this field. Other actions which will assist in this effort include the cataloging of all research work by the Science Information Exchange in the Smithsonian Institute and the establishment of a Water Resources Science Information Center within the Department of the Interior.

The report, mentioned earlier, of the Federal Council for Science and Technology setting forth a coordinated 10-year program of Federal water resources research is a product of our efforts to coordinate all Federal work in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the water resources research program which will be extended by the legislation we have under consideration today is a meritorious program which is an important part of our overall Federal water resources research effort, and I urge favorable action on H.R. 3606.

I would advise my colleagues that under the provisions of this legislation we will be able to get into the water research program many capable and able scientists and scientific groups which we are unable to get into the program with the authority that we presently have under the provisions of the parent legislation, which is centered toward the land-grant colleges and those colleges associated with them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

Do I understand that this is an $85 million bill, spread over a period of 10 or 15 years?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is spread over 10 years. The legislation that came over from the other body carried with it an open-ended authorization, no time limit on the activities of the research studies. It also carried with it additional money. But the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the House thought the program should be stepped up gradually.

This is what we did with the original bill, as my friend knows so well. It was also thought that we should put a cutoff date, that we should have a definite term for this activity, and that if it were necessary to come back at the end of 8 or 9 or 10 years, and make a new case for additional authority, the agency would have to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is a step-up from the previous program of $1 million a year for 10 years. Is that right?

Mr. ASPINALL. What we did in the House, if my colleague will remember, when we were considering the Water Research Act of 1964, is that we had no title II. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommended that title II not be included within the legislation at that time, thinking that it would be sufficient to start out with the Water Institutes which were provided for in title I.

The other body, however, placed in the original bill, as they have this time, an unlimited authority for the Secretary in respect to the authorizations contained in title II.

We went to conference. As my friend so well knows, in conference there is a give-and-take. We finally came up with a decision by the conferees to authorize $1 million annually.

The House was able to retain, however, in that legislation that provision which said that the Executive would have to send to the Congress of the United States the contracts which were provided for under the provisions of title II, and that the different bodies of Congress would have 60 days in which either to approve or disapprove.

It was to this that the Executive himself took exception, and he has failed to implement the provisions of the limited title II that we provided for in the conference report in 1964.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on page 12 of the report I see brackets, in conformity with the Ramseyer rule, that apparently the language is stricken under the terms of this bill, which provides that the Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress of receipts and expenditures, and so forth. Is there any substitute for this in the bill today?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. We have substitute language. In this we created a new section. I do not have the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think the gentleman from Iowa will find that on page 14 of the report, section 307, at the bottom of the page. That requires a more detailed report.

Mr. ASPINALL. What we had to do was work the reporting directive into both titles. This we have done. There is an annual report required. This report has to be made by March 1, so that the Congress of the United States will know what is going on before the appropriation authorities are able to make their decisions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that I think that is a very good provision. I compliment the committee upon section 307, now that I have seen it.

I ask the gentleman, will all this $85 million be spent upon research—exclusively on research—or how is the $85 million to be spent?

Mr. ASPINALL. The $85 million is to be spent by contracts entered into. Some of the moneys will be in grants, some of it may be in matching funds, and some of it will be in just outright payments for contract services.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the $85 million all Federal funds?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Then are there to be matching funds in addition to that?

Mr. ASPINALL. I might have misspoke myself in regard to the matching funds. The matching funds are contained in title I under the water institute program if I remember correctly.

Mr. GROSS. The Government is going to go out and hire consultants and research organizations of one kind and another? That is the purpose of the $85 million?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is the purpose.

Mr. GROSS. There is no actual cleaning up of streams, or anything of this kind? This is all in addition to that?

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to my colleague that the amount provided for water research activities is a very small amount of research funds expended by the Federal Government in its various activities. Two of the most important elements with which we have to live are air and water. The scientific studies which are involved in this area of research are manifold.

Mr. GROSS. I believe I understand the importance of it. On the other hand, I do not minimize $85 million being spent on research, even though it is expended over a period of years. I did not have time to read the hearings in justification of this expenditure.

I am willing to accept the gentleman's word that that much money is necessary and proper, for the purposes of research.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will permit me to say—and when we think of these figures the gentleman knows what we are up against. There were over 1,450 contracts in existence for research in water matters during this last year. These were contracts by industry, contracts by the various agencies of the Government as well as by other organizations. There are six agencies or departments of Government engaged in this work. However, if it had not been that we provided for a clearinghouse, as it were, in the parent bill, the act of 1964, so that all research activities in water is coordinated at the present time and the reporting back procedures which we have in this legislation, I would have the same fears of my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa. However, I believe we have this pretty well wrapped up so that there cannot be anything but efficient and effective operation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, so there will be no misunderstanding about the matching funds, the gentleman from Iowa is correct in his understanding that funds for this $85 million can be matching funds. This is another reason that we want it under section 307, and have these reports from the Secretary so we can see and take a look and provide the oversight that we feel the Congress should have over this program.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding that the act of 1964, and continued by this bill today, if passed, is interested primarily in doing a better job of research for the development of natural resources of water in their natural states, such as the basin development, the conservation of streams, et cetera?

Mr. ASPINALL. Only indirectly, I would say to my friend from California. As far as the overall basin development is concerned, we are not as interested here in the scientific study of water and how water can be made potable and usable and how its use can be extended as we are in the basin plans which comes under the provisions of the legislation we passed for such purposes.

Mr. REINECKE. Perhaps I should ask the question differently: Are we concerned here more with water before it gets into the pipeline than after it gets into the pipeline?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. REINECKE. Before?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the work which has been done by the committee on this matter, and I sincerely hope that through the enactment of this legislation water conservation and utilization will continue into the period after the pipeline stage as well.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

Uniform Time Act of 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe that the details were worked out so that the conference report was adopted in accordance with the bill which was presented to the House, and the Senate yielded on all points. This conference report is the House version.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I should like to make a brief statement.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House with a vote of 292 to 93. The other body amended the House version of the bill in two respects, as the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, pointed out. At the conference the conferees from the other body agreed to recede from their amendments. This action was adopted yesterday by the other body. Thus, the conference report now before the House returns the legislation to the precise posture which existed when the House acted upon it on March 16.

Unless there are any questions, I should like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Would the gentleman in a few words tell what the House version was in order that Members may know again exactly what the conference report contains?

Mr. STAGGERS. I shall try to recapitulate briefly the action taken on March 16 by this body. In plain language, the House bill states that any State that is on daylight savings time or will be on daylight savings time this year will start at a uniform date, the last Sunday in April, and end the last Sunday in October. That is simply all it does for this year. Next year, starting on April 1, 1967, every State in the Union will be on daylight savings time and start at a uniform date, unless the State legislature prescribes standard time, in which case, the whole State must be on standard time. This is the essence of the bill, very simply put.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In the consideration by this body there was considerable discussion about the legislation as it affected the State of Michigan. There was an amendment offered to correct the situation. The amendment was defeated. The bill, as it went through this body, complicated and did not resolve any problems in the State of Michigan. For that reason, many of us in Michigan, Democrats and Republicans, voted against it.

As I understand it, the Senate version would have given us in Michigan an opportunity to resolve the problem. As I understand further, the proposal, as it comes back to us today, is the House version, not the Senate version. Is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So the problem in Michigan is complicated, not resolved, by the bill before us today.

Mr. STAGGERS. With this exception, that I might explain to the minority leader. Section 4 of the bill provides that the ICC shall define by order the limit of each zone, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers and that any such order may be modified from time to time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if this proposed legislation is signed into law by the President, will it become effective April 24, 1966?

Mr. STAGGERS. Only for the purpose of establishing uniform starting dates and closing dates for this year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, if the State of Michigan is to resolve its problem, it would be necessary to go to the ICC and to get an affirmative answer by April 24, otherwise the Northern Peninsula would end up on one time, and the Southern Peninsula would end up on another time; is that correct? Is the answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. STAGGERS. I am trying to determine the intent of the gentleman's question.

I said that only starting and closing dates in any State that has the daylight saving time will be determined this year, 1966.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To further refine the question, before any relief can be obtained which would preclude the Upper Peninsula from being on one time and the Lower Peninsula from being on another time, the State of Michigan will have to go to the ICC and get the ICC to redraw the time zone line; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. If the State of Michigan does not agree with the way the zones are now, that would be the relief; they would go to the ICC and point out the problems. These are to be considered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The only relief the State of Michigan can get, if the bill should become law, is to go before the ICC and to get the ICC to redraw the time zone lines; otherwise the State of Michigan will end up with two times, one for the Upper Peninsula and one for the Lower Peninsula; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; in 1967.

I understand the gentleman's problem very well. And I believe the House does. In the consideration of these problems before the committee we tried to resolve, as much as we could, this problem, as it has existed through the years.

The gentleman from Michigan mentioned the amendments of the Senate. I am not certain that the amendments would have helped the situation to which the gentleman refers, because it referred to "contiguous" and there is a question whether a dividing river would divide these two time zones in Michigan, as they have it now.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The State of Michigan for approximately 30 years has solved this problem very, very successfully, and the net result has been that we have had continuous identical time in the Upper Peninsula and in the Lower Peninsula. Unfortunately, this legislation will change the whole picture. If this should become law, there will be people on one side of the Straits of Mackinac who have one time, and those on the other side, 8 miles away, will have another time. That just does not make sense.

The 145th Anniversary of the 1821 Revolt in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, since the House was not in session on March 25, I would like today to take note of the 145th anniversary of 1821 revolt in Greece which culminated in her independence. Many American ideals and institutions can be traced to the Greek civilization and the Grecian achievements in art, philosophy, law, literature, and science. And I am sure that most of us are aware of the diverse and important contributions of Greek-Americans throughout our history. In my district of Texas, we are blessed with a vibrant and vital community of Greek descendants who have contributed much to the culture and prosperity of San Antonio.

The recognized American concept of individual freedom owes its birth to the Greeks. Indeed, it was the basis of much of their civilization. Herodotus, the Greek historian, quotes a Greek conversing with a Persian:

> You do not know what freedom is. If you did, you would fight for it with bare hands if you had no weapons.

The Grecian culture flourished under the city-states, but the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C. and the lack of national unity laid the groundwork for defeat by Rome near the end of the Macedonian wars in 146 B.C. Greece became a Roman province; but Athens remained a center of learning, and the Greek language and culture were widely influential. In A.D. 395 the Roman Empire crumbled, and Greece became the center of Byzantine Empire for more than one thousand years—another indication of Greek knowledge and influence.

The Ottoman Turks who conquered Constantinople in 1453 gave the Greeks a large measure of political autonomy. Greek merchants became engaged in worldwide trade, and the Greek Orthdox Church gained ascendancy in communal affairs. But the traditions of liberty and individual freedom were still smoldering in the hearts of the Greek people. It was ignited in the uprising of 1770, which was crushed by the Turks and led to severe curbs on Greek nationalism. But in 1821, under the leadership of Archbishop Patras, the Greeks on March 25 launched their war of independence against Turkish suzerainty. Greek independence was recognized by British, France, and Russia in the London Protocol of 1830.

The course of the Greek nation has not been smooth. She has been visited with domestic upheavels, bitter rivalries with Turkey, and, in 1944, a civil war. But Greece now participates in NATO, and is an associate member of the European Economic Community. She benefited from some American economic and military assistance beginning near the end of her civil war, and is now living up to all expectations of economic and political stability.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to salute Greek independence.

Georgia's Official State Choir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the choir from North Fulton High School in Atlanta, Ga., is Georgia's official State choir. It represented the State and the United States in a tour of Europe last summer.

The brilliant performance and display of diplomacy shown by these young people earned recognition by the Senate of the State of Georgia and the acclaim of the entertainment director of our Berlin Brigade.

I place in the RECORD Resolution 111 of the Georgia Senate attesting to these achievements.

We in the State of Georgia are quite proud of these young people and wish to thank them for their services to our State and to this country. These young men and women are to be commended.

SENATE RESOLUTION 111

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Georgia designated the North Fulton High School Special Choir as the State choir for its concert tour in seven countries of the continent of Europe in the summer of 1965; and

Whereas the North Fulton Choir under the guidance of the internationally famous director, the Honorable Robert S. Lowrance, Jr., has for many years enjoyed a most enviable reputation and in almost 30 years of festival competition has never received any rating but first or superior; and

Whereas its 39 members selected not only for their muscianship, but also for character, scholarship, personality, and dependability, by their exemplary conduct and musical ability, by their charming manners and salesmanship, these young ladies and gentlemen made many friends for the United States and for our State of Georgia; and

Whereas the highlight of the tour was singing for the U.S. Armed Forces in Berlin and making tape recordings which were used on the U.S. radio network throughout Europe; and

Whereas like Job of the Old Testament, "When the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy," we can understand why the audiences at every concert stood and yelled when the North Fulton Choir of Atlanta sang Dixie; and

Whereas as evidence of their love of God, flag, and country and true to their southern heritage some carried little paper Confederate flags, while all of them had little U.S. paper flags; and

Whereas in recognition of outstanding patriotism two local groups awarded medals: The Whitehall Inn Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Mrs. W. E. Taliaferro, regent, and Mrs. Milton W. Davis, organizing regent; the DAR citizenship medal to the North Fulton High School, Hon. William Bryce, principal; to the Honorable Robert S. Lowrance, Jr., choir director; to Charles F. Moran, member, a citizenship and gold medal. The Jefferson Davis Honor Medal was also presented them by the Dorothy Blount Lamar Chapter of the Daughters of the Confederacy, Mrs. R. W. Weaver, Sr., president and Mrs. Milton Davis, past president: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, That this body heartily congratulates the Honorable Robert S. Lowrance, Jr., director and Mrs. Robert S. Lowrance, accompanist, chaperones: Dr. and Mrs. J. W. Veatch, and Hon. and Mrs. Charles D. Clarke and choir members for serving as ambassadors of good will for our State; namely, Christine Anderson, Beckie Bellamy, Sue Cobble, Britt Dean, Emmie Elrod, Steve Highsmith, Tommy Hyder, Nicky Nichols, Cindy Pollard, Anne Richardson, Linda Skipper, Lee Wagoner, Bill Wendell, Susan Winchester, Fred Allen, Evalyn Baron, Joyce Bell, Susan Boley, Peter Brown, Bill Fleming, Karen Gatlin, Nancy Hall, Frances Hamilton, Linda Harper, Carl Hibbert, Susan Hodges, Joan Horsley, Beverly Kardos, Gary Mehr, Cathey Miller, Charles Moran, Ann Morrison, Steve Rhodes, Mike Veatch, Kathy White, Joan Wills, Lauri Smith, Sheryl Hightower, and Betty Rainwater; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby authorized and directed to transmit appropriate copies of this resolution to the Honorable Robert S. Lowrance, Jr., director of the North Fulton High School Special Choir of Atlanta so that each member of the choir, the chaperones, and accompanist, and the organizations mentioned may have a copy as a token of our appreciation and commendation.

Testimony of Paralyzed Veterans of America, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we were treated to an excellent statement presenting the views of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Inc., on pending veteran legislation. PVA Vice President Robert T. Rohrer appeared before us, and we were very grateful for his assistance. It is my hope that the major portion, at least, of the program laid out by Mr. Rohrer can be adopted this year.

The testimony given is as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT T. ROHRER, VICE PRESIDENT, PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA, INC., BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 31, 1966

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, on behalf of the members of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, I want first to commend you for your diligence during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, which resulted in the enactment of beneficial legislation for our service-connected disabled, their children, and survivors. Your attention to the needs of the veteran stands out again in this second session with the passage of such major legislation as the Post-Korean Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act. We are sincerely appreciative of your dedication and continued interest.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you and the members of this committee are well familiar with our organization, at least insofar as our disability is concerned. It occurs to us that the extent of our programs and services may not be as well known, and we would like, briefly, to describe some of them to you.

The major portion of our time and budget each year goes into our national service program. Although we are not blessed with recognition by Congress or the Veterans' Administration, we strive, by dint of perseverance, to service the claims of our needy members as best we can. Second to our service program is our publication the "Paraplegia News" which is issued without charge to all members. It contains all news of interest to and for the benefit of all those afflicted with spinal cord injury and disease the world over.

We maintain active programs in the basic needs of housing and employment, and in the removal of achitectural barriers to the handicapped. In the past 3 years, we have contributed in excess of $50,000 to programs of spinal cord research. We are sincerely grateful to this committee for its active support and quick passage of H.R. 203, which was passed early in the first session.

A new and satisfying program during this year has been our association with the 56 Vietnamese war veterans who were brought over by our Government for emergency treatment in the VA hospital at Castle Point, N.Y. The PVA has taken these veterans under its wing and has maintained constant contact with them. We are building up a library of material for the doctors to take back to Vietnam with them, which will assist them in the treatment and care of the other spinal cord injured awaiting care there. We have thrown parties for them at the hospital and given them practical gifts to take back with them. We are currently taking several at a time and treating them to the sights and sounds and food of New York City. We are taking them into our homes to see how paraplegics and quadriplegics, given good health and training, can have a full life.

It is our sincere and fervent hope that all this treatment and training by our Government will not be wasted upon their return to their own country. The PVA does not intend to let their interest die but will maintain its contact with and its help for our Vietnamese comrades. We hope that our Government will have provided them with the resources and facilities to properly treat and train, in Vietnam, those who wait and those to come.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED VETERANS

Laws governing benefits to paraplegics and quadriplegics are becoming more prejudicial toward the veteran under the old protected pension law. We do not believe it the intent of Congress to cause discomfort or hardship to these disabled. Yet the maintenance of separate pension laws is doing just that. While the new pension law, Public Law 86-211, has been increasingly liberalized during the years, there has been no change in the old pension law since 1954. In addition, these veterans are not allowed the issue of medicine and rehabilitation equipment as provided their counterparts under the newer law.

The primary factor discouraging these veterans from applying for coverage under the new law is the reduction of pension to $30 per month after 2 months of hospitalization. Under the old law, one-half the veteran's pension is withheld after 6 months of hospitalization, but is repaid to him in a lump sum after his discharge from the hospital. We believe that the following changes in the new pension law would finally attract all totally disabled from the old law, thereby making it obsolete:

1. That a single veteran, without wife or child, shall continue to receive full pension until the first day of the seventh calendar month following admission to a hospital;

2. That 50 percent of a veteran's pension shall be withheld starting the first day of the seventh calendar month after his admission to a hospital;

3. That upon discharge from a hospital by a certified medical officer, the veteran shall be paid in a lump sum such additional amount as would equal the total sum by which his pension had been reduced during his hospitalization.

Receipt of pension benefits, while hospitalized, will enable the paraplegic to maintain that home and other obligations which he has outside the hospital, and will induce him to leave the hospital much sooner to reestablish his independence. We believe present laws adequately protect the Veterans' Administration in the matter of estate should the veteran choose to remain in the hospital for an undetermined time.

To maintain that independence, the paraplegic must retain his good health and be assured of an adequate income. If the basic pension can be liberalized to the extent mentioned above, the veteran would transfer to the new pension law and become entitled to receipt of certain medicines and drugs, and therapeutic and rehabilitation equipment, which are conducive, and necessary, to his good and continued health. For one with such catastrophic disability, preventive medicine should be carried one step further. Persons suffering spinal cord injury or disease should be permitted to constantly maintain their health by being eligible for outpatient care on a basis similar to that of the service connected.

Our organization tends toward the belief that pension benefits should be more incentive oriented. It costs about $20,000 a year to treat a paraplegic in a general medical hospital. If we can provide adequately for the spinal cord injured to remain outside the hospital, the savings to our Government would greatly exceed the amount of pension cost.

The first step is to get him healthy and give him the means of maintaining that health. The other is to assure him of an income which will adequately provide for his needs in this increasingly costlier world. Today's pension rates are insufficient to meet these growing needs. Of course, there is an additional allowance for those who require aid and attendance, but this evaporates quickly for services rendered.

The needs of the paraplegic and quadriplegic go far beyond this. His permanent confinement to a wheelchair, complicated by internal paralysis, subjects him to greater expenses than most people realize. There is special transportation, or the maintenance of one's own car; there are medical costs of illnesses the VA will not treat; there are medical supplies and prosthetics which the VA may not issue; there is greater wear and quicker replacement of clothing, and much, much more. For this we recommend special consideration as would be provided under H.R. 12500, which is now before your committee.

IMPROVED PROGRAMS OF MEDICAL CARE

Mr. Chairman, there are bills in Congress the intents of which are to improve medical care for all Americans. The Paralyzed Veterans of America, among the most seriously disabled of our country, well recognize the need fo quick, efficient, and improved methods of treatment, care, and rehabilitation. It recognizes also the specialized attention necessary for those afflicted with spinal cord injury and disease. Therefore, we fully support these measures.

But there is apprehension among us that the disabled veteran may lose his priority of care in hospital facilities because of increased demands on bed space. We are seriously concerned with the thought that medical advances may jeopardize the special spinal cord injury services now within VA hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, the experience of more than 20 years has proven that the health of paraplegics and quadriplegics is hazardous in other than such specialized services. We hope that those who guide our destiny will keep these needs in mind by setting up a greater number of spinal cord injury services within our Nation's hospital program, and improve upon them, for ever-better care of our most seriously disabled. We hope that favorable attention is paid to the immediate budgetary needs of the Veterans' Administration so that it might check continuing deterioration in its hospital program. Although we plan inspiredly for their future, the needs of our ill and disabled veterans must be adequately met today.

NURSING HOME CARE

Transfers of paraplegics and quadriplegics to domiciliaries and nursing homes keep reoccuring. We feel that the use of this program for paraplegics is not in the best interest of the patients.

The Veterans' Administration has stated that no paraplegic would be transferred to a nursing home unless he (a) had reached the ability to care for himself, (b) the patient agrees to accept that type of care and (c) the home has the ability to provide adequate service and attention.

PVA has long supported our spinal cord injury services which had direction and purpose aimed at self-sufficiency and a return to community life. The program had the effect of reducing bed requirement for paraplegics to about 15 percent of the census of these veterans. This was primarily because of sufficiently trained staffs and more advanced patients who assisted in teaching the new. Today, the situation has changed. Our programs are no longer well staffed. Nor are the staffs as well trained, and the advanced patients have been discharged to their homes.

In spite of the expressed pride in our programs, the Veterans' Administration is admitting failure of their program by sending paraplegics to nursing homes, domiciliaries and restoration centers. These programs are supposed to extend rehabilitation and social work aid to the patient to help him return to his home—a result the spinal cord injury service did achieve. But, will this be the result in the nursing care type facility?

Nursing homes and domiciliaries operate with smaller numbers of staffs—which are usually very low paid and have a minimum of professional supervision—and without adequate rehabilitation programs. They tend to become a caretaking establishment which is a dead end for the patients with chronic ailments. Lack of trained staff will only return paraplegics to the VA with pressure ulcers and deteriorated mental and physical conditions.

The nursing homes do not segregate their patients. They mix the aged senile with the young chronic cases. The size of their facilities and the numbers and training of staff prevent them from providing an environment that is conducive to rehabilitation.

VA policy is supposed to be directed toward aiding the veteran in making the transition from the hospital to the community. No patient is supposed to be considered for the program unless reasonable outplacement potential exists. Outplacement planning is supposed to determine that nursing home care can be terminated in 6 months. Most paraplegics sent to nursing homes have been, and will be, nonservice connected. These patients are being put into homes with no adequate programs, inadequate environment, and without the financial ability to forestall the ultimate.

The spinal cord injury program should be revitalized into a producing program; so that, it achieves its goals of rehabilitation without resorting to medieval medicine and the salving of conscience with the nebulous term "adequate." The program needs more personnel, better trained personnel, more emphasis on activities of daily living, and a philosophy based upon active care rather than a nursing concept. Because of this, the Paralyzed Veterans of America must still register its objection to the transfer to nursing care homes of those afflicted with spinal cord injuries and diseases.

DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION

In 1956 a system of dependency and indemnity compensation was established for the survivors of veterans who died in military service or of disabilities suffered as a result of that service. Payments are based on a rate of $120 per month to a widow without children, plus 12 percent of the basic pay of a serviceman with equal rank and length of service as her deceased husband. This amounts to $133.27 per month for the lowest enlisted man with 2 years or less of service, with an inequitable increase for widows with two or more children. Mr. Chairman, we respect the privilege of rank in the living man, but we cannot justify it in the consideration of benefits for his widow and children. On the contrary, it would occur to us that the survivors of deceased veterans of lesser rank might need the greater consideration. We sincerely hope this committee will closely examine the program of dependency and indemnity compensation with a view of increasing the minimum rates receivable by these survivors.

EQUALIZATION OF COMPENSATION RATES

Early in the first session of this Congress, our organization was privileged to present before the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension its recorded position on the matter of equalizing compensation rates between peacetime and wartime veterans. We heartily endorse H.R. 7851, which would finally erase the archaic differentiation between these veterans, and establish one rate of compensation for all our Nation's service-connected disabled veterans.

AUTOMOBILES FOR PEACETIME VETERANS

In the same sense of the opinions expressed elsewhere, we believe that all VA benefits should be extended to veterans of our peacetime conflicts. This would especially include the benefits of such legislation as H.R. 7852, which would extend to all veterans who have lost the use of their lower extremities, a special grant toward the purchase of an automobile or other conveyance.

LOANS FOR SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING

Under Public Law 702, 80th Congress, service-connected paraplegics were allowed a one-time grant of $10,000 toward the construction of a specially adapted wheelchair home. In the majority of cases, the cost of such homes greatly exceeded twice that amount. In these days of tighter money, veterans eligible for such housing are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain loans to finance the balance of the cost of such homes. Commercial mortgagors are reluctant to lend to these veterans if they are not employed because their compensation is not attachable. There is apprehension about their health and longevity, and the ability of their survivors to maintain mortgage payments. To resolve this shortcoming, we recommend that a revolving direct loan fund be created by the Veterans' Administration. This fund would be made available to those veterans eligible for housing under Public Law 702 at rates comparable to those charged veterans under other guaranteed home loans. Such a program will fill a much needed service and will cost the Veterans' Administration nothing.

SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, we want to express our sincere appreciation for the privilege and honor of being permitted to present our legislative program before this committee. In the interest of conserving the valuable time of yourself and the other members of the committee, we are taking the liberty of attaching resolutions on those matters in which we are interested, and which have not been discussed in this report.

Thank you very much.

Natural Disasters Strain SBA Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my unqualified support to efforts to pass S. 2729. This bill would increase the Small Business Administration's lending authority and would provide for two revolving funds for financing SBA functions.

The SBA has had a great impact on my district during the past year, because of the devastating floods than hit the Denver area last June. Damage estimates were more than half a billion dollars. These damages included—in addition to public roads and bridges—homes and private businesses.

As of now, the SBA has made more than $35 million worth of loans to more than 1,200 people and businesses in the Denver area as a result of this flood. These loans—for 30 years at 3 percent interest—in many cases have meant the difference between hopeless ruin and the chance to begin again.

However, 1964 and 1965 were years with an unusually large number of such natural disasters. Floods struck California, Oregon and Washington and the Mississippi River Valley; Louisiana, Mississippi and Florida were hit by especially damaging hurricanes.

These natural disasters put a strain on the funds available to the SBA. SBA had a statutory responsibility to meet disaster needs. In order to do so, SBA diverted money from other areas to handle disaster loan applications. The demand for such loans was so great that by last October SBA had to stop accepting regular business loan applications.

This legislation now before us would help prevent such situations by creating two revolving funds—one to finance the disaster loan program, and the other to handle SBA's remaining functions. Purpose is to prevent disruption of SBA's regular lending activities in the future because of unexpected disaster loan requirements.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is sound. SBA has demonstrated time and again that it is playing a vital role in our economy by helping people to help themselves. I strongly urge passage of S. 2729.

Freeman Assailed on Commodity Credit Corporation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the following release describing a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman was sent to me by Mr. Windy Lenton of Stewartville, Minn., who was very distressed about the action of the Department of Agriculture to load out all of the warehouse corn in the Upper Midwest. This will be creating a hardship in my area and I commend this to the attention of my colleagues.

CHICAGO.—The board of trade of Kansas City, Mo., has dispatched a letter to Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, emphasizing opposition to the manner in which the U.S. Department of Agriculture has handled enormous sales of corn. The letter said that USDA's present corn selling policy is a serious threat to the agricultural and transportation industries as well as being the cause of higher prices to consumers at the producer or country elevator level. The exchange said current Department policy is bringing huge losses to USDA itself and the taxpayer and added that the recent huge corn sales have caused "untold damage to producers, taxpayers, transportation system, and the general economy at a time a department of the Government should be striving to ease the problem."

The letter follows in part:

"For a number of weeks the Department's selling policy has been unpredictable—changing on a day-to-day basis. The markets are unable to function in a normal and orderly fashion under these conditions. Sales and pricing by the Commodity Credit Corporation indicate a concerted effort to force the price of corn down at the terminal, yet causing the consumer at the producer level to pay a higher price.

"The problem was intensified on February 11 when the Department unexpectedly dropped their corn price at terminal markets but not to country elevators. While successful in breaking the terminal corn price in Kansas City by 10 cents, in the period from February 11 to March 11 Commodity Credit Corporation's Kansas City office sold more than 36 million bushels. Of this amount, 22,574,000 bushels were sold from country to the Kansas City terminal market. Just to fill these sales will require 11,287 boxcars.

"If the Commodity Credit Corporation was able to maintain a flow of 300 boxcars a week into the Kansas City terminal (which it has not been able to do), it will take at least 37 weeks to deliver the corn.

"The Evanston, Ill., office of Commodity Credit Corporation from January 7 to March 4 sold 101,934,000 bushels for domestic use. This will require 50,967 boxcars, and if that office was able to ship 800 cars a week, it would be 63 weeks before these sales are delivered.

"In less than 28 hours, March 2–3, the Minneapolis CCC office in a deluge of sales booked more than 47 million bushels to terminal buyers. To fill these sales, it is estimated by the trade that CCC will have to move in approximately 70 million bushels due to the portion shipped which will not deliver due to grade. By applying 100 cars a day, it will take the CCC about 70 weeks to fill these sales of just 2 days.

"Considering the fact that the Nation's boxcar supply is already in extremely short supply and that in less than 3 months the wheat harvest will be in full movement, these commitments of the Department will intensify an already perilous situation.

"The seemingly incongruous movement of corn away from the feeding area is difficult to understand. Many country elevators are literally scraping the bottom of their bins to satisfy needs from feeders. Yet they are either forbidden the opportunity to buy Government stocks through incommensurate pricing or are refused the opportunity to purchase the corn ordered out.

"Many authenticated letters are on file at the Kansas City Board of Trade exemplifying this price discrimination. CCC prices the corn at the country level over the market—then ships the corn to a terminal and sells at a much lower price net to them. Example after example shows a price loss to CCC of from 4 to 18 cents per bushel.

"Historically, approximately 85 percent of the corn crop remains for local usage in the area where it is produced. At a time when there are appreciably more cattle on feed in this area, the Government insists on moving a tremendous volume of corn out of the consuming area and dumping it on the terminals at a huge loss to the taxpayer.

"The Department is determined through the sheer weight of sales—regardless of the expense and regardless of the detrimental effect on the transportation system and feeding industry to depress the corn price in the terminals to lower levels.

"The purpose of the Department in causing this unusual movement of corn is difficult to comprehend. On February 11 when the Government lowered the terminal corn price, but not the country price, the range at Kansas City for No. 2 corn was $1.31½ to $1.37½ compared to the range of $1.31 to $1.35¾ a year ago. Thus the Department's action could not be called anti-inflationary. The press has recently given attention to the heavy selling of corn and deduced that the sales were made to induce the farmer through sharply breaking prices to sign up in the current feed grain acreage control and price-support program. If this is the purpose of the Department, they are defeating their own cause as their policy has caused higher prices at the producer level by moving the corn out of this area and thus reducing the supply available to the corn buyer."

Statements by Dr. Isaac Lewin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am very pleased to include two statements made by Dr. Isaac Lewin on behalf of the Agudas Israel World Organization before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

Dr. Lewin has, since 1948, been associated with the work of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. In 1948, he was appointed as representative of the Agudas Israel World Organization which has consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to that body. He closely collaborated with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt when she was chairman of the Commission on Human Rights.

Dr. Lewin's addresses to the commission are collected in three books: "Religious Jewry and the U.N.", "In the Struggle Against Discrimination," and "Late Summer Fruit."

Dr. Lewin is one of the great historians whose books in the field of medieval and modern Jewish history enjoy great authority and renown. He is a professor of history in the Bernard Revel Graduate School of Yeshiva University in New York, and is recognized as one of the leaders of religious Jewry in America. He is a member of the Cultural Committee of the Joint Distribution Committee, a vice president of the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization, chairman of the American section of the Agudas Israel World Organization.

Statement by Dr. Isaac Lewin, on Behalf of the Agudas Israel World Organization, Before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, March 10, 1966

Article IV of the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance deals with a problem which has historically a great importance. It does not only protect the rights of parents, nor does it refer only to the rights of children. It clearly refers to one of the worst aspects of religious intolerance.

Let us first take the case regulated by article IV section 1: "The States parties undertake to respect the prior right of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians, to choose the religion or belief of their children." The motive behind this statement is the prevention of the terrible injustice which is being perpetrated by the forceful taking away of children from their parents just to educate them in a different religion.

History has taught us a terrible lesson about this problem. Allow me to mention one example. In the 19th century, Nicholas I of Russia issued a decree to take away young Jewish children and keep them for 25 years in the army, where they would be educated in the Greek Orthodox religion. Children of 12 years of age were to be conscribed for military training. We know these children in history as the "cantonists," and volumes have been written about the horror caused to countless Jewish families by this decree of 1827. This is not an isolated case in history. I could quote other examples where Jewish children in the former Austro-Hungarian Empire were taken from their parents and were brought up in a different religion. A history of religious persecutions in the middle ages will tell so much about such criminal acts, which had the open or tacit support of the respective governments, that it is really not necessary for me to go into the detailed descriptions.

It is primitive justice now in the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance to state that modern society is not going to tolerate such brutalities any more. This is not only a safeguard for the rights of parents or children. It is the removal of medieval brutality in our new world which opens the book of history and learns from it. The lesson is that there is no better way to keep mankind on a sound moral foundation than to respect the natural rights of a family. Parents and children belong together, and therefore must parents choose the religion of their children. This has nothing to do with the actual teaching of religion. This right, also extremely important, has been safeguarded in article III paragraph 2(b) of the draft convention.

Even more drastic is the case of intolerance perpetrated on orphans if they are not being educated in the religion of their deceased parents. The Bible says (Deut. 24: 17): "Thou shall not pervert the justice due to the orphan." Obviously this means that one must replace the parents to the orphan. If a child has no parents, it is the moral obligation of our society to give to the child what the parents would have given to him, and among the most essential things that parents give to the child is the religion, the direction of the child into a certain sphere of ethical life which was dear to the parents. Plato said in his "Laws" (927) that "Orphans should be placed under the care of public guardians. Men should have fear of the loneliness of orphans and of the souls of their departed parents. A man should love the unfortunate orphan of whom he is the guardian as if he were his own child." Also this great philosopher has shown full understanding for the connection between the surviving child and "the souls of his departed parents."

It is, therefore, only a safeguard against intolerance if the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance has provided in paragraph 2 of article IV that "in the case of a child who has been deprived of its parents, their expressed or presumed wishes shall be duly taken into account."

This formulation is indeed too weak. I would expect a stronger wording of the removal of religious intolerance which is contemplated here. However, this wording is a result of a compromise between a demand which was presented by me to this Commission on Human Rights as far back as 1949 and the judgment of some members of this Commission at that time. At the fifth session of the Commission, when the covenant of human rights was discussed, I presented the demand to include the following sentence in the covenant: "Children whose parents were killed during a war or other catastrophe, shall be brought up in the religion of their parents." I described to the Commission the unprecedented situation that had developed after World War II. I said then:

"Six million innocent Jews were brutally murdered by the Nazi hordes, among them more than a million children. But some children escaped, due to the compassion of the gentile neighbors of the tortured Jews, and they survived by hiding in non-Jewish houses. However, to our deep sorrow and regret, even these children in many instances are lost to their people. More than 20,000 are now being brought up not in the religion of their murdered parents."

I asked the Commission: "Is this not one of the greatest cruelties committed posthumously on the victims of Hitler's gaschambers by the free world?"

I stated then and I repeat it now: "Hitler took from his Jewish victims their lives and their property. What remained was the orphans, infants or children, who could not at the time understand the tragedy of their parents and their people. Those who alienate these orphans from the religion of Hitler's victims are helping to fulfill the aims of Hitler toward extermination of the Jewish people. For there is not only physical extermination but also spiritual; and this occurs when helpless children are taken away from the religion of their slaughtered parents. This is like a man who helps another who has been attacked by a robber in the street; the fact that he has helped him does not create any right to dispossess the victim of his property. This belongs either to the attacked man himself, if he is alive, or to his legal successors. The man who has helped does not inherit the rights of the victim."

Subsequent to my address, the member of the Commission on Human Rights who represented the Philippines at that time, Judge Ingles, proposed the insertion of the following clause into the draft covenant:

"In the case of a minor, the natural parents shall be free to determine the religious teaching, if any, he shall receive. In the case of an orphan, the presumed will of the parents as regards the religious teaching to be given to him, shall be taken into consideration." (Summary record of the 117th meeting of the Commission on Human Rights, held at Lake Success, on June 7, 1949, E.CN/4/SR. 117.)

Seventeen years have passed since Judge Ingles' proposal and it is essentially the same formula that is now the subject of discussion at the Commission on Human Rights. I can only express the hope that the present Philippine member will continue in the liberal tradition of his country. I also hope that the entire Commission will support paragraph 2 of article 4 of the draft convention.

May I conclude with a word of explanation what, in my opinion, means "the expressed or presumed wish" of the deceased parents. Let me illustrate it by a historical fact. When the hundreds of thousands of Jews died in Auschwitz, Treblinka, Majdanek, Buchenwald, and other concentration camps which the German Herrenvolk had established for the people that gave the world the Bible, very little remained, of course, from them because the Germans did their work of extermination very thoroughly. But a few of the victims left somewhere in the camps some notes.

These notes were discovered later when the camps were taken over by the victorious allied armies. On some of these notes the parents, who left their children somewhere with the gentile neighbors, wrote: "Take care that my child be educated as a Jew."

This, it seems to me, is what the draft convention describes as the "expressed" wish of the parents. But in countless cases such notes disappeared. People who escaped from Auschwitz and the other places of shame and horror tell us, however, that practically all the parents of such children had in their last hours only one thought: "How could I secure that my child, left with the neighbors before I was removed to the ghetto, or whom I smuggled out from the ghetto to the Aryan part of the town, remains a Jew?"

This, I think, is what has to be understood as the "presumed" wish of a parent, and for the inclusion of these safeguards in the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance I am pleading now, in the hope that this Convention will see better days when such safeguards will be only reminiscent of the past history and have no more actual meaning.

Statement by Dr. Isaac Lewin, on Behalf of the Agudas Israel World Organization, Before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, March 16, 1966

I am not going to speak on the problem of anti-Semitism because I have done so already before this Commission, at its 20th session. I took then the liberty of suggesting to include the condemnation of anti-Semitism in the convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. The representative of the United States on the Commission, at that time Mrs. Marietta Tree, became the sponsor of a formal motion to this effect. My organization, the Agudas Israel World Organization, which represents orthodox religious Jews the world over and has national branches in 23 countries, is very grateful to the delegations who support now the idea.

I would like to say a few words on another problem in connection with article 5 of the convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance.

This convention, besides containing concrete provisions concerning the various rights ensured to groups and individuals, includes also a general statement referring to the guiding principle of the convention. This principle, regulated by article 5, is of paramount importance. It imposes on the states parties to the convention an obligation "to adopt immediate and effective measures" in order to create the proper atmosphere in the respective countries for the observation of the convention. It indicates that these measures should be channeled through "teaching, education and information." It names also quite clearly the ultimate goal of the states' endeavors in this area—"to promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among the nations and religious groups."

It is obvious that this is the main goal of the convention. While other aims are also mentioned in the same article, the verb "to promote" is used only in reference to the three concepts: "understanding," "tolerance," and "friendship" among nations and religious groups. With regard to these aims, the draft article V uses two other expressions: "to propagate" and "to combat". The difference is, of course, clear.

I would like to suggest the addition of one more goal in the sentence which speaks of the ideals to be promoted by the states parties to the convention. This goal is peace.

It seems to me that it would be a serious mistake if peace would be forgotten in enumerating the ideals which might be served by the convention. I firmly believe that this convention is an instrument of peace. Religious intolerance was always the forerunner of wars. Religious misunderstandings caused untold sufferings to mankind. Religious discrimination creates such tension in any country which tolerates it that very often war is the only alternative. On the other hand, where religious tolerance is practiced the danger of war is remote.

It is significant that the most beautiful vision of peace, that of the Prophets Micah and Isaiah speaking of times when "swords will be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks," is connected by Micah with the ideal of religious tolerance. After the prophecy that "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore, but they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree," Micah adds (4 : 5) "For let all the peoples walk each one in the name of its god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever."

Does it not indicate clearly that the most complete religious tolerance is, in Micah's vision, the basis and foundation of peace? He could have said that all peoples must unite in their religious convictions; but he says differently: "Let all the peoples walk each one in the name of its god," and "we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever."

I take the liberty of presenting the suggestion that in article V after the word "tolerance" a comma be added instead of the word "and". The word "friendship" should then be followed by the words "and peace."

May I add that the convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance will certainly be greeted with even more enthusiasm if among the goals and aims to be promoted by its states parties is peace.

Robert Nichols Speaks on Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspirational pieces of patriotic writings I have seen in a long time recently came to my attention. It is a speech written by a young man from my hometown, Robert Nichols, of Muskogee, as his entry in annual Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Bob's speech was judged the best entry in Oklahoma, and Bob competed in Washington with winners from the other 49 States for college scholarships. While he did not win first place, he won the respect of all Oklahoma VFW members for his fine conduct.

It was refreshing to me to read this speech, which shows a remarkable grasp of the real meaning of freedom and democracy, during these days when some Americans are seriously questioning our commitment to these principles in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues may find the mature thoughts expressed so well by this high school student as inspiring as I have, and I would like to have Bob's speech appear in the RECORD:

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

(By Robert William Nichols)

"Democracy is the worst system of government—except for all the rest." The late Sir Winston Churchill, with his unique capacity for expressing great truths in few words, coined this phrase many years ago. He was speaking of that system of government which controls both the mightiest nation in the world and some of the smallest—that form of government whose gift of freedom to the people allows for the profound achievements of individual men and women to be fully realized in society.

Churchill, the eloquent spokesman of the British Isles, was referring to the most powerful force behind the greatness of America—the one motivating spirit which has spurred our Nation to its present position of world leadership.

I am proud to be a citizen of this free Nation. My birthright of freedom was given me by freedom loving men who labored with their hands, spilled their blood in battle, and debated in peace to establish this legacy. The governments of other nations—monarchy, oligarchy, aristocracy—had been tried and found wanting. My ancestors chose democracy. Theirs was the first payment on the enormous debt Americans still owe democracy, and each succeeding generation must make its own entry in the ledger for freedom.

More than ever, today, Americans must know that democracy is not an assured possession, that it is threatened from within and from without on new battlefields and by new enemies. As an American youth, I have glibly mouthed the word and have accepted the tangible and intangible securities that it gives me. But today, it is time for a personal assessment and restatement of democracy—what it means to me.

I am given, under democracy, more rights and privileges than any other man in history. James Madison, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and the other signers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, by risking their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor, gave to me certain inalienable rights. The right to individual liberty, the right to think and act freely, the right of self-government, and the right to free communication. These freedoms, now woven into the fabric of my daily life, cannot be denied me by anyone.

My founding fathers obviously placed great trust in me and my judgment. They believed, as Thomas Jefferson said in 1787, that "on the good sense of the people we may rely with the most security for the preservation of a due degree of liberty." Democracy does, as it must, place great faith in the people to whom it gives this awesome responsibility of self-government. To make democracy work, I have the duty to qualify myself through education and experience to judge fairly and accurately the issues of my time. This, so that I might act with reason and responsibility in the face of the serious challenges which will inevitably confront our Nation.

Let us be thankful that democracy is still alive in America. It lives in the golden brown fields of wheat stretching across the plains and in the steel-glass cities ever growing skyward. It motivates exploration in outer space and in the depths of the oceans. It creates the desire for advancement—in education, in the standard of daily life and in the fellowship of man. In sum, democracy and the free enterprise system which it spawned have created the prosperous society in which we now live.

Thus, as Daniel Webster said, "It is to self-government, the great principle of popular representation and administration, the system that lets in all to participate in its counsels, that we owe what we are, and what we hope to be."

Yet, as Mr. Churchill implied, democracy is not perfect. The Nation's imperfections must be recognized but they cannot be charged to the Communists, to the John Birch Society, the Bobby Bakers, or to the Supreme Court; the truth is that we have been negligent in our attention to the preservation of democracy. Because of the nature of this system of government—of, by, and for the people—the future of America will inevitably reflect the devotion and determination of its citizens to uphold these principles.

Democracy, then, means to me that form of government which is inspired above every other with the feeling and consciousness of the dignity of man, and has given to you and to me the power to shape our country's destiny.

Our American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech delivered by Vice Commander Michael P. McDonough, at the American Legion Headquarters, Elm Park, Staten Island, N.Y., for which he received an honor certificate from Freedoms Foundations, Valley Forge, for "Outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American Way of Life." I commend to my colleagues this fine speech:

Ladies and gentlemen, honored guests, the 26th President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, once defined Americanism as the virtues of courage, honor, justice, truth, sincerity, and hardihood.

There has never been a greater need for these virtues than at the present time. We are faced with a godless conspiracy which has as its mission the enslavement of the entire world. In print and via the airwaves one is told that there is nothing to worry about; the Communists are mellowing.

The sad fact of life is this: during the past 50 years, Communists have succeeded in spreading their influence over more people than the Christians have in 2,000 years. People assume, mistakenly, that Communist propaganda is a danger to the United States only if a majority of the Americans can be induced to want communism. The Cubans didn't want communism. But they got it.

The reason? They did not choose communism, but while they were still free, they chose subordinate objectives, which, step by step, advanced the Communists to power. To apply this premise to the United States, may I remind you that there are forces at work which would remove acknowledgement of our Creator from all phases of American life. Already, prayers have been removed from our public schools, with some outcry from the American people at first, but which quickly died down to a trickle. These same forces are working like demons to have "In God We Trust" removed from our coins, and the words "Under God" from our pledge of allegiance.

You may be asking yourselves: "What has this to do with Americanism?" Our Founding Fathers recognized that it is the divine order in man which enables him to be free. Indeed, William Penn proclaimed "Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants."

The Communists know this, even if a lot of us don't. .One top American Communist has said: "All our talk about capitalism being our enemy is just for public consumption. Our real struggle is against religion. That is the one big obstacle in our way."

Karl Marx called for two aims: (1) to dethrone God, (2) to destroy capitalism. Notice which he placed first. From his place down below, Karl must be pleased that his dreams are materializing right under the noses of the unsuspecting American public. America was born out of God; as long as our faith remains strong, we will continue to be free. That is basic Americanism.

There is also a concerted effort being made to downgrade our glorious history. Many schoolchildren are not aware, for example, that Patrick Henry said "Give me liberty or give me death" because it is simply not to be found in most of the current textbooks. Those who express love for the flag are called "flagwavers" or "superpatriots" or, in the vernacular, "squares." Patriotism is just not "hip" to certain elements in our society. Sincere anti-Communists have been so smeared that it is they who are on the defensive, not the Communists. How do you suppose that Castro was able to expel nuns and priests from a stanchly Catholic country? He was able to do this, not because the Cubans were against religion, but because he succeeded in smearing the religious as traitors to the people's cause.

We hear that there is no threat from within. Think a moment of the DuBois Clubs, founded last June, dominated and controlled by Communists, directed specifically at our youth. No threat? Edmund Burke, noted statesman and scholar, pointed out: "Tell me what are the prevailing sentiments that occupy the minds of your young men, and I will tell you what is to be the character of the next generation." No threat? The Communist Party, USA, has never deviated one iota from the proscribed Soviet line.

J. Edgar Hoover says: "The Communist party is not simply un-American; it is anti-American in every conflict. Its members are not simply pro-Soviet; they are deliberately and intentionally an active part of the inflexible Soviet Empire."

Is there really no threat? Intelligence sources tell us that trained Red agents operate in phases. Phase 1 is to ferret oneself into a strategic position—in the universities, trade unions, etc. It seems rather strange that last year, when agitation was strong for a civilian police review board in New York City, a man with a long record of Communist-front affiliations volunteered to be head of the board. This man had testified under oath before congressional committees that he even condoned murder as a means to effecting changes in our Government. Phase 1?

What more strategic position than that which would hamstring and harrass law enforcement officers? The head of the police review board in Philadelphia has a similar record. As late as last month, this man was mailing petitions and soliciting funds to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The Legislature of the State of Louisiana has in its files a letter signed by this man, on his letterhead, asking for funds to help pay the salary and traveling expenses of Frank Wilkinson, an identified Communist. Phase 1? No threat from within? Our honored guests, Senator Marchi and Messrs. Federici and O'Neill of the Daily News can tell you better than I about the infiltration of mobilization for youth.

What can we do to foster Americanism and combat the forces seeking to destroy our way of life? First of all, we can stop being Rip Van Winkles who tolerate abuses of our institutions and the downgrading of our ideals. Second, we must be informed. Know your facts.

There is nothing more dangerous than a little knowledge used by misguided people. Share your knowledge. Pass on to everyone you know any cold war facts as you may have or receive. Don't be a lone wolf.

Join and support organizations such as the American Legion, which have proved that they know the nature of the cold war. Subscribe and distribute. Subscribe to as many publications as you can afford, which give space to cold war facts. Then give them to your library or school or the organizations to which you belong. Be alert and vigilant.

One Communist tactic is the fragmentation of the non-Communist population through diversionary techniques. This takes attention away from the real enemy. The old maxim—"Divide and conquer." We must inspire and activate others. The Communists succeed not because they are invincible, but mostly because of non-Communist apathy.

All of us must put more into the fight than we have in the past. Speak up. Protest any and all Communist coddling. If you are sure of your facts, don't be afraid to challenge a speaker, writer, newspaper, etc., who may, innocently or otherwise, be echoing what you know are pro-Commnuist arguments.

Lenin once boasted that he depended on the bourgeois press and non-Communists to advance 80 percent of the Communist line. Defend those who are defending you. Never remain silent when the FBI, congressional committees, your police force, are attacked. Be an American. Study your American history and the Constitution and know why America became the greatest Nation in history. See that your schools inculcate patriotism. Have faith in and give service to God. While not all atheists are Communists, all Communists must be atheists. Attend and support the church of your faith. Only a revived and strengthened faith can overcome and destroy the greatest evil in all history.

In conclusion, as Legionnaires, it seems wholly fitting and proper to call to mind the words of General Wainwright: "In gratitude for all those who paid the price of victory, we now dedicate ourselves to that cause for which they gave their last whole measure of devotion—Lord of hosts be with us lest we forget."

Miss Porter Does Some Updating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the well-known economic analyst and columnist, Sylvia Porter, last week produced an especially timely and succinct article which summarizes the state of our national economy as seen against the estimates only 2 months ago of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

With respect to the Council's and Miss Porter's estimates on the degree of inflation we can expect, it should be noted that subsequent to her article's publication, the consumer price index rose during the last month by one-half of 1 percent, the equivalent of an annual rate of 6 percent.

For the information of our colleagues—and all of us must be prepared to take early and effective action to halt this rapid increase in consumer prices—I am pleased to include Miss Porter's column as a part of my remarks:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 22, 1966]

NEW FORECASTS LOOK LIKE FLOPS

(By Sylvia Porter)

On January 20 the President and his Council of Economic Advisers sent Congress the administration's forecast for the economy in 1966. As of today, they well might moan, in the immortal words of boxing's late Joe Jacobs, we "shuda stood in bed."

Few of the statistical predictions are holding up. The economy is expanding at a pace and we are developing a fever not anticipated as recently as 2 months ago. The economic report did recognize that we had moved to a point where we must grapple with the "problems of prosperity." But it did not foresee the extent of today's pressures on prices and wages, of today's degree of manpower and material shortages, of today's swollen plans for spending on new plants and equipment. Here are some of the big numbers.

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT FAR HIGHER

Forecast: Gross national product (the total value of all the goods and services we produce) "is expected to be within a $10 billion range centered on $722 billion, given the $675.6 billion level now estimated for 1965."

Updating: 1965's gross national product actually turned out to be substantially higher, which by itself made the $722 billion forecast too low. Meanwhile, in the first months of 1966, industrial production has been surging and economic activity generally has been much stronger than the most optimistic prediction. Some private estimates of the gross national product in 1966 now run as high as $735 billion.

Forecast: Inflation is a clear threat but "no major departure is expected from the 1.8-percent increase of overall prices in 1965."

Updating: This one was suspect from the day it was published and the accelerating pressures of January-March make it among the most dangerous of underestimates. Even with today's record tight money and the possibility of increased taxes, a price rise of less than 2 percent seems doubtful. Many observers think we'll break the 3 percent mark.

Forecast: Business spending for plants and equipment will rise but the advance is not expected to match the 15½-percent increase of last year.

Updating: The latest Government survey puts the rise in plant and equipment spending at 16 percent to an alltime peak of $60.2 billion—an all-out investment boom on top of 1965's boom on top of 1964's powerful upsurge. This is simply too much spending in an economy obviously straining at a capacity of materials, manpower, and money. This spending must be stretched out (by design) to avert the danger of too much building now and sharp cutbacks later—the boom-bust investment cycle.

EMPLOYMENT MOUNTING

Forecast: Unemployment as 1966 progresses will be below 4 percent, lowest since 1953.

Updating: It already has happened. In February, the jobless rate dropped to 3.7 percent and the Government now acknowledges labor shortages in leading areas.

Were today March 22 of any year from 1960 through 1965, I would have applauded the upward revisions, for they would have signaled gains in our drive toward broad prosperity with stable prices. But on this March 22, 1966, I report them with concern, for they are awfully risky inflation stuff in an economy as boomy as ours.

In fairness, it must be emphasized that economists in private life also were way under in their January estimates, but they can upgrade their figures behind closed doors and they have no responsibility for policy. The administration's estimates are in a 306-page book. These figures must be changed in public and must be the basis for policies affecting everyone.

Byelorussian Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks I have been privileged to speak before gatherings in my home State of New York on the occasion of the 48th anniversary of Byelorussian independence.

The United Byelorussian-American Commemorative Committee held a rally for Americans of Byelorussian descent at the Astor Hotel, New York City, on March 20, which I had the honor of addressing.

At this meeting, a very forthright resolution was passed, and I would like to bring it to the attention of the House:

RESOLUTION OF THE RALLY OF AMERICANS OF BYELORUSSIAN DESCENT

Whereas in the historical past Byelorussia was an independent country which in 1795 was conquered by the czarist Russia Empire;

Whereas at the time of collapse of czarist Russian Empire in 1917, the first Byelorussian Congress satrted restoration of independent Byelorussia, but was dispersed by armed forces of Soviet Russia;

Whereas on March 25, 1918, the Council of Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed the national independence of Byelorussia, which subsequently was attacked, conquered and subjugated by Soviet Russia and Poland;

Whereas at the end of the Second World War in 1944 the Second Byelorussian Congress confirmed the proclamation of independence of Byelorussian Democratic Republic, but Byelorussia was conquered again by Soviet Russia;

Whereas the Soviet Russia created the fictitious state—the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, included her into USSR and completly subordinated to the Soviet Russian Government in Moscow;

Whereas the Soviet Russian Government is continuously applying in Byelorussia a colonial rule to benefit the Russian empire and Russian people, committing outrageous crimes against Byelorussian people;

1. By partition of Byelorussian ethnographical territory. Only less than half of it has been included within the Byelorussian SSR. Over half of Byelorussia has been annexed to the Russian SFSR;

2. By murder or deportation to concentration camps in Russia over 6 million of Byelorussian population. Russia is continuously using deportations of young people from Byelorussia to various forms of forced labor and to concentration camps in Soviet Russia;

3. By colonizing Byelorussia by the settlement of Russians, mostly Communists, providing the preferential treatment to them in relation to Byelorussian population. All leading administrative posts in Byelorussian SSR are filled with Rusians;

4. By enormous economical exploitation of Byelorussia to the benefit of Russia;

5. By forcible superimposition on Byelorussian people a kolkhoz-slavery system for peasants, a forced labor conditions for industrial workers, and concentration camp system of work without pay;

6. By oppression of religious life of all denominations in Byelorussia;

7. By russification of Byelorussian people with the aim for complete merge them into one Soviet Russian nation.

Whereas the Soviet Russia and Communist China at this time are trying to expand their Communist domination by military aggression in South Vietnam, and are preparing similar conquests of other countries of the free world:

Now, therefore, we, the participants of the above mentioned rally, are protesting against occupation of Byelorussia by Soviet Russia, we are asking you, sir, to take the necessary steps for support of the aims of the Byelorussian people for their liberation from Soviet Russian colonialism; we are approving as completely right the action of American Government and the allies in South Vietnam, stopping the Communist conquest of free countries.

New Commissioner of Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the neglected needs of American Indians are belatedly but surely coming more sharply into focus, a promising figure has emerged into whose experienced and able hands the interests of our Indian population are being placed. That figure is Robert La Follette Bennett, recently nominated to be the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. Bennett possesses many attributes and qualifications that make his selection an outstanding one. Two of them are immediately discernible and especially notable: First, he has been a career employee of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for 29 years, and since last October has served as Deputy Commissioner; and second, he, himself is an Indian.

Mr. Bennett was born on the Oneida Indian Reservation in Outagamie County in the Eighth Wisconsin District which I have the honor to represent in this body. He is a graduate of De Pere High School and attended St. Norbert College. Later he was graduated from Haskell Institute in Kansas where he qualified for a civil service position with the Bureau.

Only one other Indian before Mr. Bennett served as Commissioner, and that was under President Grant from 1869 to 1871.

Mr. Bennett is the father of six children. He is a veteran of World War II, having served with the U.S. Marines. His last assignment with the Indian Bureau prior to his appointment as Deputy Commissioner was as the Bureau's area director in Juneau, Alaska.

This change in the Bureau's leadership provides an excellent opportunity for the country to reexamine its obligations and responsibilities to its citizens of Indian birth, and to do something about them.

I congratulate Mr. Bennett on this recognition of his years of outstanding service to his country and our Indian Americans especially, and extend very best wishes for continued success in his new assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an editorial concerning Mr. Bennett's appointment which appeared in the March 27 edition of the Green Bay Press-Gazette. The editorial follows:

THE BENNETT APPOINTMENT

The nomination of Robert La Follette Bennett, a native of Oneida, as commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs will provide the Nation with an opportunity to focus fresh attention on the neglected problems of its Indian population.

While the Nation has before it constant discussion and proposals for the economic problems of urban slums and distressed areas of white population, like Appalachia, it has paid little attention to the economic distress of decades in Indian reservations. The reservations, a reflection on our history, often are in remote sections of the Nation and on land with no agricultural or industrial potential.

Bennett will replace Philleo Nash, another Wisconsin native, and the circumstances of the Nash resignation underline the complexity of the Indian economic plight.

From what can be learned, Nash aroused the ire of his superior, Interior Secretary Udall, when he halted plans to move a garment factory from New York to an Indian reservation in Arizona, Udall's home State. Nash's position was that there is no point in curing one economic problem by creating unemployment elsewhere, and in this case he was right.

Bennett, a graduate lawyer, has devoted all his Government career since 1952 to Indian problems either with the Bureau of Indian Affairs or with the Veterans Administration.

He has served both in Washington and in the field in Western States and Alaska.

Secretary Udall has promised that a reorganization is coming at the top level of the Bureau "*to make it more action minded, to speed up the process of serving Indians.*" The Bennett appointment should be used by the Nation as a time to take a new look at its neglected responsibilities to its Indian neighbors.

Vietnam Debate Reflects the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, debate and discussion over our mission and obligation in Vietnam have been much in the news the last few months. There are those who feel such debate—coming, as it does, largely from within the ranks of the Democratic Party—hinders our Vietnam efforts.

I feel that such debate is not only fundamental to the American way of going about things, but also it aids in formulating a national resolve by thoroughly airing the complexities of the picture. I bring this up because Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, recently delivered a speech on the subject in Denver. I had the privilege of hearing that speech, delivered at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Colorado Democratic Party. I want to share Senator PROXMIRE's excellent words with my colleagues, and I respectfully include that portion of the Senator's address pertaining to Vietnam in the RECORD:

I support the administration position in Vietnam. I support it because it has wisely accommodated to the constructive criticisms of Democratic critics.

Senators MANSFIELD, MORSE, ROBERT KENNEDY, and others have done far more than keep the U.S. Senate's tradition of debate and discussion alive. They have made explicit suggestions that have been accepted and have measurably improved the administration's position in Vietnam.

As an administration supporter in Vietnam I say thank God for Senator FULBRIGHT's courageous insistence on holding open hearings on what we are doing to achieve negotiations and a defensible peace in South Vietnam.

Those hearings not only vastly increased public understanding of the stringent limitations on our alternatives in Vietnam, they also forced the administration to rethink and clarify as well as defend its position there.

The Fulbright followthrough with hearings on Red China have contributed a far greater understanding in Congress and the country of China, and how we can best pursue Asiatic freedom and peace—in Vietnam and elsewhere.

This country has never engaged in a war in which the party controlling the Government has itself had such a monopoly on criticism or in which that criticism has been so consistent and powerful. And certainly we have never before so clearly incorporated that criticism so quickly into our national policy.

Critics asked the President to call for a ceasefire. The President has done so.

They called for a lengthy bombing pause. The President did just that.

They asked the administration to put the controversy before the United Nations. It has done that.

They called for our reaffirmation of the Geneva accords, and our request for reconvening the Geneva Convention to act as intermediaries. The President has done this.

They called for a vigorous peace offensive. The President sent his top foreign policy officials throughout the world in the most vigorous peace offensive the Nation has ever engaged in.

They asked that we call for a free election in South Vietnam and announce we would abide by the results even if the Communists won. President Johnson has done this.

They called on the President to accept a Vietnam-wide election—north and south—and abide by the results. The President has agreed to do so.

They have asked that the war be limited to military targets. It has been rigorously so limited.

They ask that we not insist on unconditional surrender by the North Vietnamese. The President has made it clear that we do not insist on unconditional surrender; that we will not invade North Vietnam.

We are not bombing Hanoi, nor blockading Haiphong; we covet not a foot of Vietnam territory, north or south; we want no base in Vietnam; we do not ask that South Vietnam align herself with us.

Indeed, we offer a billion-dollar economic reconstruction program after the war to include North Vietnam itself.

At the moment the difference between President Johnson's position and that of his toughest critics in the Democratic Party in the Senate is a narrow hair's breadth.

Neither would withdraw from Vietnam.

Neither wants a wholesale attack on North Vietnam.

Both wants to negotiate peace as soon as possible.

Both want the people of South Vietnam to decide their future freely.

This is a national policy that unites the Democratic Party and the Nation. It does not divide our party or our country. It is no accident that the demonstrations, the teach-ins, the sign-carrying protests, the peace marches have all but ceased.

We have at last a national policy in Vietnam that won overwhelming national support. And it has been won in the best American tradition—by debate, dissent, discussion.

Of course, differences remain but they are differences over military tactics or political ambitions or just plain personal animosities, and as long as we're human those differences will always be with us.

Census Bureau Report on Building Research Programs of National Bureau of Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the building industry of the United States, according to recent Census Bureau report, accounts for one-seventh of the gross national product and about 10 million Americans have jobs related to this important $90 billion segment of our economy. These figures illustrate why all Americans have an interest in the progress and development of building, and in a good working relationship between the industry and appropriate agencies of the Federal Government.

Over the years such a relationship has existed between the building industry and the National Bureau of Standards. The Bureau of Standards has contributed greatly in building research, and industry has cooperated with the Bureau.

Recent discussions about the future of this relationship and of the expanded research that may be required by the continued unprecedented growth of building led to a paper outlining the purposes, intent, and scope of the building research programs of the Bureau of Standards which I wish to submit for the RECORD. The paper follows:

CENSUS BUREAU REPORT

INTRODUCTION

This is a statement of the purpose, intent, and scope of the building research programs of the National Bureau of Standards. It does not purport to limit, or circumscribe, thereby the role or responsibilities of any other Federal agency. It is presented for discussion and comment by all of those industries, professional organizations, and trade associations which share with us an interest in advancing the scientific and technological capacity of the Nation for the creation of better buildings.

THE PAST HISTORY

Shortly after its formation 64 years ago the National Bureau of Standards became engaged in research work related to building. During this time the associated building industries (hereafter called the building industry) have utilized much that has resulted from the NBS research as background knowledge materially assisting in industry progress. Through these years the building industry has cordially and effectively supported building research at the Bureau and has continuously carried on joint cooperative work with the NBS research groups. The cooperation has taken many forms, such as, maintenance of research associateships at NBS; efforts in codes and standards organizations where industry and NBS personnel have acted in close union to develop building standards on which the industry depends; contract research with industry groups, and daily personal exchanges of information and advice between NBS and industry scientists, engineers, and administrators.

In the course of the past six decades building research at the NBS, and elsewhere has changed character as building technology developed. It has been extended in some directions or diminished in others so that at all times it would be in accord with the needs of the Nation. (These changes have often been carried out with the advice and knowledge of the building industry.)

The historic building research programs of the NBS have been in the field of science of materials, structures, mechanical and electrical services, fire and combustion, and other related fields of building technology. The results of the work have been disseminated in many ways: Publication in BMS (building materials and structures) series of brochures; participation by NBS personnel in professional, scientific, and engineering societies; participation by building research personnel in committees developing building standards and codes; books and lectures written and presented by NBS scientists; reciprocal activity on industry advisory bodies by NBS personnel; etc.

RECENT HISTORY AND CURRENT EVENTS

During and immediately following World War II, building research at the National Bureau of Standards, of necessity, diminished while other research activities of perhaps more urgent character expanded. The NBS also began making preparations for a long-contemplated move from its old location in the District of Columbia to a new rural site in Gaithersburg, Md., where its work could be carried out in the kind of space and surroundings demanded by the new era of scientific and technical predominance. In connection with these vast and impending changes the NBS has been going through a rigorous course of self-examination as well as examination by other concerned interests both public and private. For example:

1. On request of the Director of NBS, the National Academy of Sciences conducted, in 1961, a study of the role of the U.S. Government in building research and more specifically for the National Bureau of Standards, as related to building research in general in the United States. The Academy recommended and outlined a national core program for building research to be organized under the National Bureau of Standards because its research has international as well as national recognition, its research provides a practical service to the Nation, and its research is relatively free of policy and program-oriented requirements. The Academy further recommended that the activities of the NBS Building Research Division be incorporated within this program.

2. The National Academy of Sciences has also for many years provided NBS with advisory panels to its various divisions. In 1964, the Advisory Panel to the Building Research Division was expanded and strengthened by including in its membership more executives from the building industry as well as the traditional representatives from academic institutions. This panel has recently said:

"The National Bureau of Standards is a competent organization sufficiently removed from the industrial field and without bias to develop knowledge and techniques fundamental to the establishment of performance criteria, test methods, and standards."

3. The Committee on Fire Research of the National Academy of Sciences on several occasions has sought to stimulate greater participation by the Federal Government in a national fire research program. The Federal Council on Science and Technology has designated NBS as the agency which should assume the leading role for fundamental fire research within the Government.

4. Representatives of the building industry have been brought together by the construction and community development department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States for informal meetings. This group together with other informal meetings of industry representatives has helped also to examine the nature and scope of the building research programs and plans of NBS.

PURPOSES AND SCOPE

The building and construction industries and the professionals who are associated with them have the responsibility and the opportunity for developing and improving the environment in which the people of the United States work, worship, are educated, and live their daily lives. Other fundamental needs of man, such as food, health, and transportation are being progressively met and improved through the combined effort of private and public research organizations. Well-designed and farsighted cooperative research in building, a major factor in our environment, has been and will continue to be necessary and desirable.

It is now recognized by industries, organizations, agencies, and institutions concerned with building in the United States that the volume of building in this country in the next two or three decades is going to be so great that an unprecedented effort will be demanded from all who have any responsibility for building progress. The total research and development effort required should be on a scale commensurate with the need. The climate within which these needs are met should be as free from unnecessary restrictions as possible.

In accordance with the scope of the activities as stated below NBS then should be prepared to play a vital role, as it has in the past. This role with respect to building research has three primary parts:

1. Providing fundamental knowledge as a technological bases for assistance to others in the writing of performance criteria, standards, specifications or codes, and the development of test methods and other methods of evaluation.

2. Providing advisory services to other Government agencies in their roles as monitors, specifiers, or purchasers of goods and services from the building industry.

3. Maintaining and extending its role whenever appropriate in the acquisition and dissemination of fundamental knowledge of value to industry and government.

The scope of these activities are intended to recognize the following considerations:

1. These programs are operated within the limits of the Organic Act of NBS dated March 3, 1901, but are at all times subject to modification by Congress or the President.

2. It is the exclusive concern of private industry to undertake the research and development of specific materials, products, and systems.

3. The building research programs of NBS will at all times be available for public review by appropriate advisory committees or through other established channels.

4. Long-range planning will always precede any requests to Congress for extensions of funding, or staff, or new facilities, but additional resources will often be required if the program goals are to be realized.

5. It is understood that methods of measurement are needed for the purpose of evaluating the performance characteristics of building articles or substances. Upper and lower limits (usually numbers) established according to chosen measurement procedures determine the range of values of the performance characteristics within which the measured article will be found acceptable or unacceptable.

These limits are often incorporated in codes. NBS attempts to identify those characteristics of building products and systems which should be subjected to measurement and evaluation. These characteristics will increasingly reflect the performance of products and systems generated by the potential users of such products and systems. NBS further tries by its research to devise tests or other evaluative procedures necessary to carry out the indicated measurement or evaluation.

NBS does not establish the limits (upper or lower) which determine the acceptability range. (Note: Whenever the words "performance criteria" are used with respect to building research in other publications or statements of the Institute for Applied Technology or NBS, they should be understood to designate "performance characteristics" as defined above.)

6. Finally, the building research programs of NBS will be characterized by being highly cooperative with all organizations and institutions interested in building research. There should be opportunity for exchanging workers between NBS and such interested groups; there should be participation by NBS staff in technical and working committees of such groups; and at all times NBS affairs should be so organized as to facilitate the flow of information about the results of its work.

Cooperation Between the Food and Drug Administration and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration has often been an unsung hero in its countless contributions in protecting the health and lives of every individual in this country. From its inception, it has conducted extensive research, enforced voluminous statutes and extended a cooperative hand to industry.

An article in the March 1966 Monsanto magazine, "How Industry Works With the Food and Drug Administration To Keep the Nation Healthy," relates some of the problems incurred by the Food and Drug Administration, its functions and achievements and the outstanding cooperation between Government and industry which it has fostered in the vital area of health.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert into the Record the Monsanto article:

HOW INDUSTRY WORKS WITH THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION TO KEEP THE NATION HEALTHY

WASHINGTON.—Last November, with very little fanfare, a new building was dedicated here in the Nation's Capital. It is the headquarters of the Food and Drug Administration, and it looks pretty much like many other Government buildings.

But its six floors of offices surrounding a central core of laboratories house some 1,200 people whose daily job is to keep you alive and healthy. The dramas of life and death played out within its walls wouldn't keep Dr. Kildare going for one TV season, for there are no bedside scenes, no crises in the operating room.

But what goes on at chemist's bench and laboratory in FDA headquarters—and at other FDA installations in the Washington area and around the country—is vital to the Nation's health and welfare. The agency is, of course, part of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FDA's new commissioner, Dr. James L. Goddard, is expected to bring vigorous management to the agency which, since the early thirties, has experienced rapid growth, intense pressures—and some resultant growing pains. Whatever changes he makes, the FDA is likely to remain one of the Government's principal law enforcement agencies and scientific institutions.

Science got into the picture early. The Pure Food Law was enacted in 1906, and techniques had to be established to detect impurities. Responsible industry was glad to comply and welcomed protection against marginal operators who were offering substandard foods and drugs. Industry and the Government worked together to interpret the new law and furnish proof that a given substance was or was not safe.

Enforcement, however, was the FDA's biggest job until the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. This act established the principle of premarketing clearance—of proving the safety of new drugs before they are offered for sale. Tragedy had spurred the enactment of the new law: more than 100 people had died from using a liquid sulfanilamide preparation which had not been properly tested or investigated.

It was the beginning of the era of wonder drugs. Then came the war, with increased demands on science and technology. Research became an increasingly heavy responsibility, not only for the FDA, but for industry as well.

In the early 1950's, a select House committee began to conduct hearings on the use of chemicals in food. Although the practice was an old one, dating back to the time when man first used salt to preserve meat, the Congress wanted evidence that substances added to foods were being proved safe.

The hearings turned up some evidence of products that had not been thoroughly tested over long periods of use. But they also demonstrated the value of additives in modern food production.

The eventual result of the hearings was some major amendments to the law. First came the Pesticide Chemicals Amendment of 1954 and the Food Additives Amendment of 1958.[1] In 1960 the color additive amendments were passed. The law now required manufacturers to prove safety before their products were marketed; it also aknowledged the vital role that chemicals play in producing foods. It was up to the FDA to decide how much, and what kind, of residues constituted safety. And it was up to industry to meet those standards.

Thus the need for cooperation between Government and industry became imperative. The new FDA building is, among other things, a tribute to that cooperation and a pledge to its future.

The cost of the building was about $13 million. About half that much again went into scientific equipment and furnishings. About two-thirds of the building houses scientific activities that range all the way from determining whether materials used for food packaging will be absorbed into the food, to detecting counterfeit drugs. (Did you know that it is possible to look at a pill under a microscope and determine who manufactured it?)

There are 325 laboratories and animal rooms in the building, and an animal population of about 17,000—mostly rats and mice but including some rather rare South American opossums. The animal rooms have sheet-vinyl covered walls for spotless cleanliness and long-term service and economy.

The animals are of utmost importance in toxicity studies. Their day-to-day health is studied as patiently as your own doctor studies you when you get that yearly checkup. Indeed, the animal patients at the FDA are helping to guard the Nation's health.

New techniques of research are daily outmoding the old ones. And new techniques in agriculture and industry—particularly as they affect the growing and processing of food—makes clearances on new products an increasingly complex procedure. When you consider all the things that can happen to an item of food—from the farmer's field through packing, shipping, handling, processing, packaging and marketing, to your dinner table—you can understand the magnitude of the problem.

So the protection is needed. And here is how Government and industry, working together through the FDA, provide it.

First it is necessary to examine what is meant by "food additives," both from a practical and a legal point of view. According to the law, a food additive is "any substance the intended use of which results or may reasonably be expected to result, directly or indirectly, in its becoming a component or otherwise affecting the characteristics of any food * * * if such substance is not generally recognized * * * to be safe." Thus a food additive may be something that is deliberately added to preserve, emulsify, flavor or otherwise accomplish a specific effect; or it may be something that inadvertently gets into the food through deliberate use elsewhere, such as substances "migrating" from packaging materials.

So when a company like Monsanto wants to introduce a new product such as a plasticizer for use in plastic films, coatings and adhesives for food packaging, it must travel a long route to premarketing clearance, because if the chemicals involved may migrate into the food, they are legally classed as "food additives." Substances deliberately added to foods such as flavorings and acidulants travel the same long road; so do pesticides, although here the U.S. Department of Agriculture registers them and approves the labeling, while FDA sets the tolerances.

Two things have to be determined before FDA approval can be secured: Is the food additive safe under its intended conditions for use? Does it do what it is supposed to do?

To answer those questions the manufacturer must use certain prescribed tests and furnish other detailed information required by the FDA.

In the case of pesticides and additives, there must be toxicity studies on animals, usually on at least two species, one a nonrodent. There must be both "acute" studies, to determine the smallest amount that will produce a physiological response and the amount that constitutes a fatal dose; and "chronic" studies to demonstrate the effect of food additives over a lifetime.

The manufacturer must also include a description of the manufacture of the chemical; a detailed description of its proposed use; quality control data; a method of analysis that can be used by the FDA; and ample evidence that the substance will produce the effect claimed for it.

Thus, in a typical case (as with Monsanto's dicyclohexyl phthalate plasticizer), almost 3 years of concentrated study are necessary before the petition can even be submitted to the FDA. But once a manufacturer has done his homework properly, the percentage of petitions that are approved is very high.

The manufacturer usually submits several copies of his petition. One is reviewed in the Petitions Control Branch; others go to the divisions within the FDA that are concerned with checking for safety, efficacy and methods of analysis. A petition may run to several thick volumes of typed sheets, representing untold man-hours of research—all of which is checked by the FDA.

The enforcement end of the FDA's job is equally important. Here the Agency not only helps food and drug manufacturers protect health and life, but it guards against trickery, deception, and dishonesty. It protects the consumer's pocketbook and helps to promote fair competition by clamping down on misrepresentations.

In packaging, for instance, there have been cases where tinted film was used to improve the poor color of the food inside, or film with opaque areas was used to conceal inferiority. Under certain sections of the act, these infractions are punishable.

Premarketing clearance remains the best guarantee against violations, even though the job is getting tougher every day. One official points out that "since cooking has moved out of the kitchen and into the factory, a whole set of conditions has changed." This makes the role of industry even more important.

In today's complex world of food production, nothing can be taken for granted. Substances once used in a limited way now find much broader uses—uses that weren't even thought of a few years ago. Chemicals cleared in one instance may be blocked in another. There are no easy answers. But the joining together of knowledge from both industry and government—and from the universities as well—is essential to the portection of the public.

That's why the research goes on. And that's why the FDA's new building has a special meaning for you. The men and women inside are working to keep you healthy.

---

[1] The first petition filed and approved under the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 was for Monsanto's Santoquin antioxidant used in animal feeds.

Indications of More Work for Our Shipyards and Safer Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the need for work for our domestic shipyards and for updating our merchant fleet has been apparent for some time, even to those with only a vague knowledge of our commerce, shipping industry, and shipyard situation. Two articles appeared in the Baltimore Sun recently by Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, the maritime editor, which I think are encouraging.

One article states that new companies may extend their present activities to the shipbuilding field. This certainly seems to indicate that the prospects of more work for our yards are brightening.

The other states that Liberia, the nation with the largest merchant fleet, would bar the use of old and obsolete ships. Many of our old vessels are now flying under the Liberian flag.

This would mean that to meet the shipping needs, new shipbuilding would be necessary and from the present sad condition of the domestic shipbuilding industry, and the need for much safer vessels, this is very good news. In the belief that these two articles will be of interest to the Members, I insert them in the Appendix:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 18, 1966]

AROUND THE WATERFRONT: LURED BY PENTAGON'S GOLD, NEW FACES FLOCK TO YARDS

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, March 17.—Soon new names will appear on the shipbuilding horizon, names that have been familiar only to the airplane and general manufacturing industries. Then, boasts the Pentagon, "we'll get new methods and cost reductions in shipyards of the United States."

The principal reason there has been a flutter from "new names" like Lockheed Aircraft Corp. and others who never before have been near the waterfront is because the Navy Department is dangling an $800 million contract.

CRITICISM ON MODERNIZATION

Never before has there been such an offer in "peacetime" to the starving shipbuilding industry, which has been severely criticized in Government circles because it has not modernized its facilities to the extent that the foreign yards have.

They always fail to add that these modern yards in Japan, Italy, France, West Germany, and elsewhere were made possible through Uncle Sam's doles to the tune of at least a billion dollars.

But never has there been any Government suggestion that the same Uncle Sam should make a parallel effort for the shipyards in his own country, rather than to reserve his handouts exclusively to the competitors.

INTERESTED IN FAST DEPLOYMENT LOGISTIC

The airplane manufacturers who have sent wavelengths to notify the Navy Department that they are interested in the construction of the fast deployment logistic (FDL) ships are well accustomed to the subsidization of their plants and buildings by that same generous Uncle Sam.

He has paid most of the costs of all of their manufacturing facilities, their research and development, and then got them well started on production through large contracts for the Air Force and Navy Air Arm.

Therefore, when the Pentagon late last year let it be known that it was going to apply the "total package concept" for building fast deployment logistic ships, the healthy airplane industry began getting in line. They knew from experience it was a good thing.

At that time, the price per vessel was quoted around $20 million.

Yesterday, Robert H. B. Baldwin, Navy Under Secretary, told Congress the price now is estimated at $40 million to build each ship.

A check today revealed that the figure was solely for the construction, not for future maintenance. Since future maintenance is to be included in the contract—or at least so it was originally announced there is more money to attrach a would-be shipbuilder.

The $40 million figure was like an electric shock to the much-maligned maritime industry, for 18 to 20 of these vessels are planned initially. Never before in peacetime has a contract of such proportion ever been laid before the American ship construction industry.

THINKING IT OVER

And when the shipowners think over how much criticism has been heaped on them because of the high costs of operating their vessels and then look at the plans for the fast deployment logistic, they cannot fail to wonder.

For the $40 million figure, three modern-day cargo ships could be built. And instead of sitting out in the middle of an ocean waiting for a Vietnam to occur and rusting away—and their military hardware aboard rusting away as well—the ships could be serving a useful purpose such as transporting America's foreign commerce and helping on the balance of payments.

Representative MAILLIARD, Democrat of California, remarked that this seemed to be a whale of a lot of money to spend on a ship to just sit and wait, maybe to participate in maneuvers once in a while.

It particularly seems like a whale of a lot of money when one considers that the total allotment in fiscal 1967 for construction of merchant ships to replenish the fleet—85 percent of which is more than 20 years in age—is $85 million.

Out of that plus a bit of juggling of other funds, 13 merchant ships are supposed to be built—and then literally under protest.

With costs climbing as they are, 11 ships seems optimistic.

What a difference: $800 million for 20 ships versus $85 million to replenish 800 old ships.

The difference, of course, is that the $800 million is to be spent by the Pentagon which bestows billions with a free hand, while the $85 million comes from the penny-pinching Maritime Administration.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
Mar. 28, 1966]

WATERFRONT SIDELIGHTS

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Liberia—the nation with the world's largest merchant fleet—surprised that world this month by adopting a new policy that will not permit any ship built before January 1, 1946, to be registered there.

Such a move was least expected from a country which seemingly has been grasping at every ton of merchant shipping it could obtain in order to build up its fleet, although it knew that almost none of that tonnage would ever call at Liberia for exports or with imports.

The African nation has been accused of being a country "of convenience" for registering ships by owners who wanted to escape strict safety regulations such as those imposed by the U.S. Coast Guard, high crew wages and high taxes to the Government.

OWNERS FROM EVERY NATION

Shipowners from every maritime nation in the world have vessels sailing under the Liberian flag.

Despite the advantage of having as much tonnage as possible registered—since every ton means some revenue to the country—the authorities in Liberia realize that ships over 20 years in age are passe, are obsolete. They want nothing to do with any more of them, although the new policy does not affect those already registered in that country.

Apparently it was the recent move by the British insurance underwriters to clamp down on ships over 20 years in age that prompted the Liberians to take steps to protect ships under its flag.

MOST OF ITS SHIPS ARE YOUNGER

To this end it made the new rule, despite the fact that most of Liberia's 28,506,000 deadweight tons is 10 years old or younger.

And although the British insurance colony—which determines the destinies of the maritime world as far as insurance is concerned—could wipe 80 percent of the American merchant marine off the high seas tomorrow by simply reenacting that blanket high premium rate on all cargoes transported on ships over 20 years of age, no one in the U.S. Government seems to be duly concerned about it.

It was only the loud protests from the American shipowners that caused the British to temporarily withdraw the blanket high premium particularly from American ships kept in first-class condition—which they must be to meet Coast Guard regulations.

LIBERTIES, VICTORIES SUFFER

However, American Liberties and Victories in first-class condition were not exempt—because they are over 20 years in age.

And 80 percent of the active American merchant marine was built before January 1, 1946, which means it is more than 20 years old. The average age actually is 21.4 years for the active fleet, while 100 percent of the reserve fleet not only is more than 20 years of age, but is closer to 25 years.

This means it would still take only the stroke of a pen in the vicinity of the Baltic Exchange in London to decrease the American merchant marine to almost nothing, and yet no one responsible in the United States shows any concern.

If those in charge would only look back in history a bit to 1890, they would see that the British then actually did wipe the American merchant marine off the high seas by giving more favorable insurance rates to cargoes aboard British iron ships than those on American wooden ships, even though American wooden ships were proved to be better. History often repeats itself.

Despite all this, the utterances from the official circles are that the American merchant marine is adequate—adequate for what? Adequate perhaps to haul enough supplies for what is supposed to be only a brush war over in Vietnam but not much more than that.

There is a definite question whether it is even adequate for that.

KING LISTS INADEQUACIES

Only last week, Archibald E. King, chairman of the board of directors of the American Maritime Association, pointed out the inadequacies of the American merchant marine before a subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

"The present Vietnam conflict has served to highlight the vulnerability and inadequacy of our merchant marine," King said, and asserted the following illustrations to support his contention:

1. To meet the military needs, the Defense Department is chartering foreign-flag vessels.

2. Vessels from the reserve fleet are breaking down before completing their first voyages.

3. Allied vessels "available to us in time of crisis" are refusing to go to Vietnam, but are going to North Vietnam.

U.S. LINES CHARTER SHIPS

4. American steamship companies have had to charter foreign ships to supplement their remaining vessels on essential trade routes.

5. American shipping companies on regular trade routes lost $16,500,000 in revenue to foreign companies from July through December of last year because of the ships turned over for Vietnam service and not replaced by American bottoms.

6. The United States is not going to carry 50 percent of the aid cargoes it provides to foreign nations this year because there is an inadequate supply of American bottoms.

And before the same committee this week, Vice Adm. Glynn R. Donaho, commander of the Military Sea Transportation Service, indicated in one breath he was satisfied to use ships up to 30 years in age if necessary, but in another said he had been advocating new ship construction for several years but had gotten nowhere to date.

OFFICIALS SEEM UNMOVED

Even though there is no doubt that the American merchant marine is in critical condition because all there really is available is tonnage—most of it in rust-bucket condition, not quality, the kind of quality that the top officials say they really need—no one has taken any firm steps to do anything about a new maritime policy for the United States.

On the other hand, there is Liberia—a nation not dependent upon a merchant marine for its industrial might, not dependent upon a merchant marine for its defense, not dependent upon a merchant marine in its role as leader of the free world, and not the richest nation in the world—but a nation wise enough to realize that old ships are no asset under any condition.

American Host Program in Fourth Successful Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, here in Washington, the board of directors of the American host program will meet to discuss the program's upcoming summer's activities. This summer, Mr. Tom Murphy, the director of the program, reports that some 290 teachers from Great Britain, France, Holland, Austria, Germany, Wales, and Scotland will be participating.

In these troubled times where all Americans are sincerely concerned about the state of U.S. foreign relations, Mr. Tom Murphy and his wife Frances, through the American host program, are making solid and positive accomplishments in providing the machinery for international understanding. Well might we be concerned with our image abroad. It was exactly this concern that prompted Tom Murphy to leave a successful career in teaching in order to do more than complain about a deteriorating American image overseas. Mr. Murphy and his wife felt they had a personal responsibility to somehow correct the falsehoods and misconceptions about the United States.

A man of perception as well as action Tom Murphy quickly recognized that many schoolteachers in foreign nations lacked a real understanding of America. Here was an entire community of important influence leaders who, if given the opportunity to firsthand view and participate in the daily life of the people of the United States, would be able to more accurately report on the real character of the American people. The teachers of the world share the responsibility of preparing the minds of the millions of students who will eventually make up the body of world public opinion. What more important or effective group of people could as easily reach so many with a more meaningful, realistic, and truthful picture of American life?

This was Tom Murphy's reasoning, and from this embryo of an idea Mr. Murphy has translated into action, in 4 short years, a vital and dynamic program involving thousands of Americans and hundreds of European teachers. Operating from their busy and vibrant headquarters at the Hotel Empire in New York City, Tom Murphy and his wife Frances now direct an ever expanding organization composed primarily of dedicated volunteers who have the same spark of imagination, fervor, and feeling for our country so typified by Tom and Frances.

This year 290 teachers will spend 4 weeks in the United States hosted by American families throughout the country. Each teacher will spend 2 weeks with an American host family. After the first 2-week period in one portion of our country the teacher will travel to another section of the Nation and spend 2 weeks with another host family.

From Englewood and East Brunswick, N.J., to New York City, Wells, Minn., and Canton, Ohio; from Baltimore to Louisville, to New Bethlehem, Pa., and Shrewsbury, Mass.; and from Hartford, Conn., to Sacramento, Calif., thousands of Americans from 200 cities in 30 States will host the 290 European teachers.

In less than 4 years Tom Murphy has developed a program, sponsored and financed entirely through private initiative, that is making a significant contribution to international understanding. Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I shall be privileged to meet with Mr. Murphy, his lovely wife, and the other six distinguished and able members of the board of directors. With the addition of myself the board of directors of the American host program include:

Gen. James M. Gavin, chairman of the board, Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.; Mr. David C. Cory, David C. Cory Marketing Services, Englewood, N.J.; Gerald M. Mayer, vice president, the First National City Bank, New York, N.Y.; Mr. J. Stuart Perkins, president, Volkswagen of America, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N. J.; Mr. Paul W. Norris, president, Denison Division, American Brake Shoe Co., Columbus, Ohio; Mr. George W. Koch, president, Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

At the conclusion of my remarks I will have printed some of the statements of American host families and European teachers who have participated in the program.

What Host Families Have Said About the American Host Program

"We only wish we could house a dozen teachers—from any country. Our time with Mrs. Polling-Vest was rich with fun and goodfellowship, and we look forward to seeing her again in a year when we hope to visit her in Europe." (Mr. and Mrs. Dana T. Warren, 330 Michell Court, Livermore, Calif.)

"What a wonderful 2 weeks we have had with our American host guest. Our lives have been enriched by our new friend and so have those of all who met her while she was here." (Mr. and Mrs. James H. Terry, 316 West First Street, Geneseo, Ill.)

"I cannot tell you how much I enjoyed having Miss Mary Moore of England with me for 2 weeks. You could not have found two more compatible people. Everywhere we went people were delighted with Miss Moore, and I know that she gained a better understanding of the United States." (Miss Olive Potrude, Cadillac, Mich.)

"I'm sure you will agree that only every once in a while someone rather special comes along. We have discovered that our American host guest, Miss Doris Bagg of England, is just that sort of person. Having her with us was a most enriching pleasure." (Mr. and Mrs. James W. Annis, Blue Ridge Summit, Pa.)

"My family and I thank you for your selection of our guest, Mrs. Ruth Barry. Her visit with us was very enjoyable and much midnight oil was burned in comparing notes on our countries and school systems. Not only the adults but also the children enjoyed the visit as Mrs. Barry took time to tell them about her country and to answer their questions." (Mr. and Mrs. Richard Engeswick, 875 Logan Avenue, Ventura, Calif.)

"Our English guests, Miss Bland and Miss Bagg, were terrific. No two persons could have been more wonderful, and we certainly hated to see them leave at the end of 2 weeks." (Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Thompson, Mickleton, N.J.)

What European Guests Have Said About the Program

"We have learned one thing about America * * * in Europe many say there is money in the streets in the United States—that everyone is rich. It is not so, the people here work hard just as we do." (Inge Schweisfurth and Margot Odenwald, high school teachers, Stuttgart, Germany.)

"For the first time I now understand many aspects of American life—I wish that every teacher in Britain could have this experience." (Leo Clish, high school teacher, Oldham, England.)

"Before coming to America we had a completely false impression of your youth. We thought that they were all little monsters. Where is the rowdiness we have heard so much about? Since coming to your country we have been greatly impressed by the helpfulness and resourcefulness of your American youth." (Miss Ray Thomas, high school teacher, London, England.)

"What I have seen in America has impressed me * * * the good things you have come from hard work * * * American parents spend a lot of time with their children. I have seen them everywhere—in museums, Coney Island—fathers explaining things to their children." (Mrs. Hilda Fleck, school principal, Saarbrucken, Germany.)

"We have come here to see the good things about the United States—in Europe we hear only the bad." (Mr. Georg Haidan, high school teacher, Warrendorf, Germany.)

Korean Development: Retrospect and Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the text of speech delivered by Mr. Ho Sun Yoo, congressional fellow of the American Political Science Association, before the American-Korean Society in Washington, D.C., on March 8, 1966:

Korean Development: Retrospect and Prospects

BASIC PREMISES

1. Korean development should be based on free and democratic political, economic, and social institutions.

2. All social elements, political, economic, cultural, and international, are interdependent in their effect on a nation's course of historical development.

3. Economic factors play a substantial role in national development and affect political and cultural changes.

I will deal principally with economic matters, but my subject will not be limited to a specific field or aspect.

RETROSPECT

1. Korea's strategic geographic location, surrounded by great powers such as China, Japan, and Russia, has for many centuries exposed her to either aggression, domination, or threatening pressure. I grew up in a Korea under Japanese domination. My immediate ancestors lived in a Korea which owed fealty to the Chinese Empire for centuries. Because Korea never found any friendly neighbors in the past, Koreans tend to look upon foreigners with distrust and suspicion. Of course today the majority of Koreans regard America as a friendly nation since the United States of America helped achieve Korea's independence, fought with Korea against the Communist invaders, and continues to assist my country economically and militarily.

2. Korea is now on the frontier between the Communist world and the free world, still exposed to either naked attack or subversion from Communist North Korea. Some Utopian theoreticians express their belief that communism will disappear from the earth when material abundance is realized through growth and productivity. I believe, however, world communism is still inspired

by its original aim to bring the whole world under its banner. I do not advocate that we annihilate communism on the earth by another big war but I do believe that the free world should maintain the power balance attained by the Korean war. Korean national security is directly related to the existing balance of power. The Korean people feel the necessity of strong ties and collective efforts by free world nations to counter integrated moves made by Communist powers. The United States is a nation trusted by the Korean people in their hearts and they rely upon the United States to safeguard their country from threat of overwhelming Communist powers.

3. Now let us return to economics. I grew up in the circumstances of scarcity and poverty which prevailed during Japanese rule from 1910 to 1945. During World War II the situation was worse. There were forced sales of farmers' products and rationed consumer goods, etc. For a few weeks after World War II ended, Japanese army supplies flooded the Seoul market and people enjoyed goods after long scarcity; this did not last long.

Soon the Korean economy was caught up in an inflationary spiral. In the suddenly disorganized industrial economy almost all production stopped. The situation was made worse when North Korea cut off the power supply which caused a complete stoppage of manufacturing and made Seoul a blacked-out city. The United Nations Command and the Economic Cooperation Agency made vigorous efforts to maintain supplies and the building or repairing of powerplants. These efforts showed little result before the start of the Korean war in June 1950. May I remind you that there was also political and social chaos, caused partly by Communist front activities and partly by the inexperience of political and social leaders, which lasted until constitutional government was established in September 1948.

Korean war period, June 1950–July 1953: The Korean people suffered nearly 2 million casualties, total destruction of their cities and towns, and the social dislocation caused by shifting populations and a flood of refugees from the north. The Republic of Korea had an influx of almost 5 million people during the period August 1945–July 1953. Financing the war without collecting taxes caused serious inflation. During this period domestic political conflicts occured between late President Syngman Rhee and the opposition political party.

Reconstruction period, July 1953–December 1957: Reconstruction of the war-torn economy was achieved through combined efforts by the Korean Government, the U.S. Aid Mission and the United Nations Reconstruction Agency. The restoration of manufacturing facilities, agricultural production and infrastructural facilities was begun. For the first time since World War II, inflation was controlled. During this period, the political scene was dominated by late President Syngman Rhee, although an opposition party existed and had its candidate elected a vice president in 1956.

Intermediate period, 1958–1959: From 1958 onward prospects for development improved. Accelerating production and expansion showed in a higher growth rate. During the year 1958, in spite of a sizeable monetary expansion, the price level fell below that of the previous year. In this period political discontent and agitation against increasing corruption and malpractice grew. The opposition believed that political reformation would lead to economic reformation. Korean society faced a challenge of structural transformation to cope with innovation and new ideas.

Revolutionary period, 1960–1963: Two subsequent revolutions set back the Korean economy. The 1960 April revolution, led by students, was sparked by the rigged election in March 1960. The Democratic Party government which followed instituted various basic reforms including a constitutional amendment, the main feature of which was adoption of a British-type parliamentary government. They promoted free enterprise, attempted to establish a fiscal policy aimed at permanent economic stability, and tried to cut down military manpower to lighten defense expenses and shift resources into an economic buildup, etc. The government, however, lacked the power to control the students, labor unions and military groups. The main cause of its weakened position was the split which occurred just before it assumed authority. Growing discontent among the people in general and intensified demonstrations by students, war veterans and labor unions generated social unrest. In the wake of what many people believe to be a degenerating situation, there was a military coup in May 1961. A military group headed by the Supreme Council for National Reconstruction ruled until general elections were held in the fall of 1963. On December 17, 1963, power was transferred to the newly elected president and national assembly.

Economic developed period, 1964– : In 1962 the first 5-year plan was launched and achieved with a fair success. The years 1962–1963 can be termed as a period of adjustment. Remarkable progress has been made since 1964. Under the strong leadership of President Chung Hee Park, the Koreal economy has made big strides toward development and self-sufficiency. In 1965 the growth rate reached 8 percent, price increases were limited to 7 percent, and exports jumped to $180 million from $30 million in 1960.

PROSPECTS

Prospects for Korean development are good if the Republic of Korea is not attacked by Communists again. Security is the most important factor in continuing economic stability and development. In my view, if the following conditions are met Korean development will be further accelerated:

1. Continued political stability under the competitive party system and peaceful transfer of power. Insulation of military power from politics is also essential.

2. Establishment of competitive market system which will eliminate corruption, malpractice, and misuse of resources. The Korean Government has already undertaken substantial economic and social reforms leading toward a free market economy, i.e., realistic exchange rate, flexible interest rate and liberalized foreign trade policies, etc.

3. Emphasis on development in the agricultural sector is necessary to insure balanced growth between agriculture and industry.

4. Decentralization of administrative power, improved staffing, and reasonable compensation for civil servants.

5. Education emphasizing quality rather than quantity, and improved research activities to increase the supply of technical manpower.

6. The building of a strong ethical force which will identify national goals and social values as well as inspire national morale and vigor for development.

7. Stable and responsible government is essential. This is the core of the problem.

CONCLUSION

Korea must continue to safeguard its national security, independence, and sovereignty. This requires conscious determination, courage, prudent wisdom, and unity against external pressures.

Achievement of a self-sustaining economy is now foreseeable. Korea should be a show case among emerging nations maintaining a just and efficient government, and an economically competitive market system with strong productive power to insure rising living standards. Culturally it should strive to preserve and cultivate traditional values as well as adopt modern ones suited to its needs and aspirations.

If these things are achieved, unification of Korea under a free and democratic form of government will be possible when the international situation brings forth such an opportunity.

April Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, APRIL 1966

Gallery hours: New summer hours, starting April 1 and ending September 5; weekdays 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.; Sundays, 12 noon to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Continuing 25th anniversary exhibitions: French Paintings from the collections of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon and Mrs. Mellon Bruce. First public showing, galleries 59 through 68, through May 1.

Drawings from the collection of the National Gallery of Art. Central gallery, through April 17.

Twenty-fifth anniversary publications: Twenty-five years of National Gallery publications, central lobby.

Catalog. French paintings from the collections of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon and Mrs. Mellon Bruce. 248 pages, 10 by 7½ inches, with introduction by John Rewald, 20 color plates, and 226 black-and-white illustrations, $3 postpaid.

"A Pageant of Painting from the National Gallery of Act," edited by Huntington Cairns and John Walker; 2 volumes, 518 pages, 225 color plates, 10½ by 14 inches, $35 postpaid.

"Dutch Landscape Painting of the 17th Century," by Wolfgang Stechow; 256 pages, 240 illustrations, 10¼ by 7⅛ inches, $12.50 postpaid. First of the National Gallery of Art's Kress Foundation studies in the history of European art.

"John Singleton Copley," by Jules D. Prown; 2 volumes (boxed), each 272 pages. 677 illustrations, 8 by 11 inches, $25 postpaid. First of the National Gallery of Art's Ailsa Mellon Bruce studies in American art.

Fifteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lecturers in the fine arts: Lord David Cecil, Goldsmiths' professor of English literature, Oxford University, England, will conclude his series of six Sunday lectures, entitled "Dreamer or Visionary, a Study of English Romantic Painting," on April 24.

Radio picture of the week: The 1966 series which started in February will run through June. To subscribe, send your name and address to Radio Picture of the Week, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 20565. Orders taken only for complete series of 20, $5.50 postpaid. Checks should be made payable to: NGA Publications Fund. The color reproductions on 11- by 14-inch heavy paper, suitable for framing, come with short explanatory texts in a portfolio cover.

New publication: Color slides, a new slide catalog is available free of charge, listing over

300 new subjects, making a total of 427 slides. All slides are original 35 millimeter transparencies, photographed directly from the work of art, provided in standard 2- by 2-inch cardboard mounts. Thirty-five cents each, orders under $1, add 25 cents handling charge.

Cafeteria: New summer hours, starting April 1 and ending September 5. Weekdays, luncheon 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.; snack service 2:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.; dinner 5 p.m. to 8 p.m.; Sundays, dinner, 12 noon to 7:30 p.m.

MONDAY, MARCH 28, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 3

Painting of the week: Lucas Cranach the Elder, "The Nymph of the Spring" (gift of Clarence Y. Palitz), gallery 41, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Twenty-fifth anniversary exhibition, the Realists, Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: Fifteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts, "Dreamer or Visionary, A Study of English Romantic Painting (III)," guest speaker, Lord David Cecil, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, APRIL 4, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 10

Sculpture of the week: Solari, "The Man of Sorrows" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 18, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Twenty-fifth anniversary exhibition, the Impressionists. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: Fifteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts, "Dreamer or Visionary, A Study of English Romantic Painting (IV)," guest speaker, Lord David Cecil, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor; Emerson Meyers, pianist, east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, APRIL 11, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 17

Painting of the week: Nardo di Cione, "Madonna and Child With Saint Peter and Saint John the Evangelist" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 3, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Twenty-fifth anniversary exhibition, the post-Impressionists. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: Fifteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts, "Dreamer or Visionary, a Study of English Romantic Painting (V)." Guest speaker, Lord David Cecil, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: International Society for Contemporary Music, Chesapeake chapter, east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, APRIL 18, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 25

Painting of the week: Toulouse-Lautrec, "Alfred la Guigne" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 85, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Twenty-fifth anniversary exhibition, early 20th-century artists. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: Fifteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts, "Dreamer or Visionary, a Study of English Romantic Painting (VI)." Guest speaker, Lord David Cecil, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Millard Taylor, violinist; Barry Snyder, pianist, east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with radio picture of the week intermission talks, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

AMVETS Present Their 1966 Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ralph E. Hall, National Commander of AMVETS appeared before my Veterans' Affairs Committee today and presented the program of his organization for the year 1966. As always, it was exemplified the longstanding policy of his organization to seek reasonable and conservative programs which give ample consideration to both veterans and taxpayers alike. His statement follows:

STATEMENT OF RALPH E. HALL, AMVETS NATIONAL COMMANDER, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON AMVETS' 1966 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, MARCH 31, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, I appreciate the opportunity and privilege of appearing before this committee to present the views of AMVETS with respect to the various legislative proposals of our organization.

With me this morning are national and department officers, national service officers, and national staff members.

Commenting on Public Law 89–358, I know that I express the gratitude of AMVETS and America's veterans for the historic action of this committee which will profoundly affect immediately, the lives of a new group of veterans and provide them with a vista of opportunities for self-improvement and economic welfare which the Congress provided in the past for veterans of other wars.

Commenting on the revision of dependents indemnity compensation benefits currently before this committee, we feel that an equitable adjustment will be resolved by the committee.

We are mindful of the numerous economic and social factors having an impact upon all persons whose income is of a fixed dollar amount. The need for some form of continuing reappraisal and readjustment of such benefit payment systems has been reflected in all the programs so effectively updated by this committee and the Congress in other areas of veterans benefits.

It is our considered opinion that an equitable increase in each of the dependents indemnity compensation categories of dependent parents would bring these dependent parents into approximate rate comparability with those of other benefit increases already brought forth by this committee. In addition, we feel that consideration should be given to permit a 10-percent exclusion, as provided for in Public Law 88–664, in computing annual income for those dependent parents receiving dependents indemnity compensation benefits.

AMVETS believes that some formal legislative requirement such as that embodied in H.R. 202 is necessary to insure for the future, an orderly justified basis for any agency actions such as reorganization consolidations, closings and so forth which may have widespread and adverse effects on the Nation's veterans.

We believe that the Veterans' Administration should maintain at least one regional office or Center with full regional office facilities in each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

The soundness of this belief has been demonstrated during the past year by the return to certain regional offices, of divisions previously consolidated in other offices.

The rapid growth of some States until now sparsely populated and the continuing movement west and south as the veteran population shifts in response to employment opportunities in previously undeveloped areas indicates it is good commonsense and management to have a Veterans' Administration regional office facility available in the veteran's State of domicile.

I would like to reiterate AMVETS views previously expressed before this committee with respect to the influence of the Bureau of the Budget on Veterans' Administration operations. There has still been no indication that the cost factors derived from work measurement systems are truly sound, representative or comparable in a business practice sense in spite of the introduction of yet another budget justification and forecasting system called, "productivity, planning, and budgeting."

We feel that sometime there should be a definite restatement of the actual savings and a clear demonstration of the increased efficiencies after these improved systems have been installed. To our knowledge, the tremendous savings projected for automation have never been clearly shown nor have their true costs been stated in clear language. Where management decisions have a direct and inescapable bearing on the administration of the Veterans' Administration benefits programs which vitally affect services to veterans. AMVETS is of necessity vitally interested.

In the area of matters proposed for possible future consideration by this committee, AMVETS reaffirms its position that it is desirable to associate rates of compensation and pension to a sound cost-of-living index or separate indexes. We believe the justification for the development of such a formula would obviate some of the difficulty inherent in securing periodic adjustments and considerations by placing such matters on a more automatic and regularly recurring basis.

There is need for an immediate upward revision of the present income limitations in the pension system under Public Law 86–211 as amended. The greatest increase in present cost-of-living factors is food, clothing, rent, and other necessities of life for which the average pensioner actually spends the money he receives. The exact amount of such readjustment to provide a comparable and equitable increase of the income limitations can be left to the best judgment of this committee.

AMVETS commends this committee for its preparation of, and the House passage of the medical trainee bill (H.R. 11631) which will profoundly affect the availability of skilled medical personnel and provide a reserve to overcome an existing scarcity to assist the medical needs of the Nation.

AMVETS is pleased and gratified to learn that it is the intention of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to examine the national cemetery system. We are heartened to know that this committee has become impatient with this critical situation.

The accomplishments of this committee and the devoted support of the Members of both Houses of the Congress in securing passage of the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, Public Law 89–358, the first veterans' benefits bill with an open end, for America's future veterans is a truly amazing accomplishment and one which this committee can be eternally proud.

I would like to assure you, Mr. Chairman, and each member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, that I will deem it a high privilege to hold myself available to assist the committee in any capacity for which I am qualified, now or in the future.

Thank you.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181, Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b, Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held Friday, April 1, at noon.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

FARM LOANS

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Subcommittee on Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification, in executive session, approved for full committee consideration with a technical amendment S. 2822, providing for more flexible operation of the Farm Credit Administration.

Subcommittee ordered reported to the full committee without recommendation S. 1126, authorizing emergency farm loans in areas where credit is not otherwise available because of serious economic conditions for farmers.

APPROPRIATIONS—SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on proposed second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1966, receiving testimony in behalf of funds for their respective agencies or departments from the following Government witnesses: Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, on funds for the Asian Development Bank; Howard Bertsch, Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture; George B. Hartzog, Jr., National Park Service, and Martin P. Mangan, Office of Territories, both of the Department of the Interior; Robert J. Freehling, Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review; Herman Edwards, National Capital Housing Authority; and John E. Horne, Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Also, testimony in support of the rent supplement program was received from Senator Douglas, and the following clergymen: Rev. C. Parke Street, Louisville, Ky.; Mr. Robert Marshall, of Philadelphia; Rev. Lawrence Walker, East St. Louis, Ill.; Rev. Eugene P. McManus, S. J., New Orleans; Rev. A. Murray Goodwin, Hartford, Conn; and Rev. William Wendt, Washington, D.C.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded its executive hearings held jointly with the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on proposed fiscal 1967 authorizations (as embodied in S. 2950) and proposed appropriations for military procurement, after receiving testimony from Lt. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, Deputy Chief of Staff for Systems and Logistics, and Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, Deputy Chief of Staff for Research and Development, both of the Air Force.

BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Committee on Banking and Currency: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions continued its hearings on H.R. 7371, S. 2353, and S. 2418, bills to amend in several regards the Bank Holding Company Act, having as its witnesses Arthur L. B. Richardson, CIT Financial Corp.; Hue E. Nunnallee, Avon Citrus Bank, Avon Park, Fla.; Corley Chapman, president, and James G. Clower, both representing the Troy Bank & Trust Co., Troy, Ala.; and J. A. Maloney, editor and publisher of the Times, Apalachicola, Fla.

Hearings continue on Tuesday, May 3.

CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

Committee on Commerce: The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee held hearings on S. 2858, to extend the 55-percent ceiling on merchant vessel construction differential subsidies, with testimony from James W. Gulick, Deputy Maritime Administrator, Department of Commerce; Peter N. Teige, American President Lines, San Francisco, and Gilbert F. Nuse, J. J. Henry Co., Inc., New York City, both on behalf of Committee of American Steamship Lines; and Edwin M. Hood, president, Shipbuilders Council of America.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call.

POPULATION CONTROL

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures resumed its hearings on S. 1676, proposing certain reorganizations within the Departments of State and HEW relating to population con-